

AGENDA
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA
Thursday, November 18, 2021 at 5:30 PM
Virtual Meeting Only via Zoom Webinar
<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/99741860260>
or call: 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 997 4186 0260

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Roll Call**
- III. Selection of Presiding Officer**
- IV. Approval of Agenda**
- V. Property Appeals**

Attached is 2021 commercial property appeals being brought before the Board of Equalization for final value determination. The Appellants and the Assessor were unable to reach an agreement for each parcel values. You will find for each parcel the following –

- Appellant's Appeal
- Appellant's Documentation at the time of Appeal
- Board of Equalization Presentation

Appeal No. 2021-0413

Appellant: PDC Holdings LLC/Tawna & Paul Curry Location: 8319 Airport Blvd
Parcel No.: 5B1501020210 Type: Commercial – Service/Retail/Warehouse

Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value	Recommended Value
Site: \$193,700	Site: \$290,550	Site: \$290,550
Buildings: \$287,700	Buildings: \$287,700	Buildings: \$287,700
Total: \$481,400	Total: \$578,250	Total: \$578,250

Appeal No. 2021-0334

Appellant: JLC Properties Inc. /Dave Hanna Location: NBN Vista Drive
Parcel No.: 2D040C050074 Type: Vacant

Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value	Recommended Value
Site: \$465,000	Site: \$697,500	Site: \$697,500
Buildings: \$0	Buildings: \$0	Buildings: \$0
Total: \$465,000	Total: \$697,500	Total: \$697,500

Appeal No. 2021-0338

Appellant: JLC Properties Inc. /Dave Hanna Location: 5761 Concrete Way
Parcel No.: 5B1201060191 Type: Commercial/Industrial

Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value	Recommended Value
Site: \$455,350	Site: \$789,600	Site: \$751,350
Buildings: \$104,200	Buildings: \$104,200	Buildings: \$104,200
Total: \$559,550	Total: \$893,800	Total: \$855,550

AGENDA
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA
Thursday, November 18, 2021 at 5:30 PM
Virtual Meeting Only via Zoom Webinar
<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/99741860260>
or call: 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 997 4186 0260

Appeal No. 2021-0365

Appellant: JLC Properties Inc. /Dave Hanna
Parcel No.: 5B1201060201

Location: 5751/5753 Concrete Way
Type: Commercial/Industrial - Vacant

Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value	Recommended Value
Site: \$455,250	Site: \$789,450	Site: \$751,350
Buildings: \$0	Buildings: \$0	Buildings: \$0
Total: \$455,250	Total: \$789,450	Total: \$751,350

The following Appellants 12 Appeals have been grouped together:

Appellant: Bicknell Inc. /Spike Bicknell

Location: Honsinger Drive
Type: Commercial – Vacant

Appeal No.	Parcel No.
2021-0389	5B1401020073
2021-0390	5B1401050020
2021-0391	5B1401050030
2021-0392	5B1401050040
2021-0393	5B1401050050
2021-0394	5B1401050060
2021-0395	5B1401050070
2021-0396	5B1401050080
2021-0397	5B1401050110
2021-0398	5B1401050120
2021-0399	5B1401050130
2021-0400	5B1401050140

Parcel No.	Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value with Deferral	Recommended Value with Deferral
5B1401020073	\$848,184	\$1,055,550	\$1,054,333
5B1401050020	\$30,633	\$43,804	\$842,513
5B1401050030	\$31,493	\$45,035	\$866,182
5B1401050040	\$12,828	\$18,344	\$352,820
5B1401050050	\$25,656	\$36,688	\$705,640
5B1401050060	\$23,082	\$33,007	\$634,846
5B1401050070	\$110,008	\$157,308	\$3,025,609
5B1401050080	\$25,577	\$36,575	\$703,469
5B1401050110	\$12,851	\$18,378	\$353,468
5B1401050120	\$12,865	\$18,397	\$353,840
5B1401050130	\$20,649	\$29,528	\$567,940
5B1401050140	\$16,460	\$23,538	\$452,725

VI. Adjournment

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION ORIENTATION

NOTE: Members are encourage to review, from your training material, the April 19, 2013 Memorandum prepared by former City Attorney John Hartle, for further helpful guidance.

A. Quasi-Judicial Role & Responsibilities - CBJ 15.05.185

1. Be a fair & impartial tribunal - no bias/preconceived ideas; no ex parte contact
 - a. Member may not deliberate or vote on any matter in which member has a personal or financial interest (defined in CBJ 01.45.360); conflict of interest check needed prior to hearing to allow substitution; may call legal advisor
 - b. **Avoid expressing opinions or including commentary in questions to the parties.**
 - c. **Opinions on the evidence/position of parties should await BOE deliberations.**
2. Afford both parties due process - fair notice and opportunity to be heard

Must allow both sides time to review new evidence presented at hearing
3. Decide appeals on *evidence presented* in packet and at hearing.
4. Make record of proceeding that clearly and accurately reflects:
 - a. Taxpayer/Appellant's claim and factual evidence offered to support it
 - b. Assessor's process/position and factual evidence offered to support both
 - c. That each side had adequate opportunity to present relevant evidence/review & rebut other party's evidence
 - d. BOE's thorough deliberations & consideration of the evidence
 - e. BOE's findings of fact & conclusions of law re burden of proof & the evidence relied on as basis of decision
 - f. Rationale & evidentiary basis of BOE's decision, to enable meaningful review by the Superior Court in the event of an appeal

B. Legal Standard for Granting Appeal on Merits for *Error in Valuation*

1. Starting point: under AK law, Assessor's **assessments are presumed to be correct.**
2. **Burden of proof on Appellant to prove error - unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts** that are stated in a valid written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing
3. If and only if Appellant meets burden does burden shift to Assessor to rebut Appellant's evidence of error

4. Law does not bind Assessor to follow a particular formulas, rules or methods of valuation, but grants broad discretion in selecting valuation methods-as long as reasonable basis
5. Technical evidentiary rules don't apply
Relevant evidence admissible if sort relied on by responsible persons
May exclude irrelevant, repetitious evidence
6. **Only grounds for adjustment of assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts**

C. Alternative Actions for Appeals Heard on the Merits

- a. **Deny appeal** because Appellant failed to prove error in valuation with factual evidence.
- b. **Grant appeal & adjust assessment *as requested by Appellant***. (only if Appellant's valuation evidence supports proposed assessment value)
- c. **Grant appeal & *adjust (lower or raise) assessment differently***. (if and only if supported by sufficient evidence of value in record.)
- d. **Grant appeal & *remand to Assessor for reconsideration of value*** (remand is mandatory if error found, but insufficient evidence of value in record.)

D. LATE-FILED APPEALS – Legal Standard for Accepting

1. Potential *merit* of appeal is irrelevant.
2. Jurisdictional authority to hear only *timely-filed appeals*
3. Appeal must be filed w/in 30 days from date assessment notice is mailed
4. Only "accepted" late-filed appeals may proceed to a hearing on the merits.
5. If 30 day deadline missed, RIGHT to appeal CEASES and BOE **cannot accept or hear** appeal, **unless BOE finds that taxpayer was unable to comply due to situation beyond taxpayer's control** (See Hartle memo)
6. Burden to prove inability to comply is on Taxpayer.
7. BOE Action Alternatives: **Deny** Late-file or **Accept, so hearing can be scheduled.**

BOE HEARING GUIDELINE

- I. Call to Order
 - II. Roll Call - Chairs asks clerk to call the roll
 - III. Appeals will be heard first, followed by *Timeliness* Hearings on Late-filed Appeals
 - IV. Introduce first Appeal case for hearing:

We're on the record with respect to 'Petition for Review of Assessed Value' filed by _____ with respect to Parcel Id. No. _____
 - IV. Review Hearing Rules/Procedure (For each appeal, unless all in attendance at beginning)
 - A. Time allocated to each side: approx. 15 min, including BOE questions
 - B. State name for record and speak clearly in to mic, use surnames/maintain decorum
 - C. Appellant taxpayer goes 1st
Has **burden to prove an error—an unequal, excessive, improper or under valuation** based on presented factual evidence
 - D. Assessor - presents Assessor's evidence in response
 - E. Appellant rebuttal, if time reserved
 - F. Hearing closes after presentations
 - G. BOE action/deliberation
 - H. Any questions? Parties ready to proceed?
 - V. Hearing - party presentations & all BOE questioning
 - VI. Close Hearing, move to BOE action
 - A. BOE reviews/discusses evidence presented, or goes directly to B.
 - B. Member makes motion, Chair restates motion
 - C. Members speak to the motion/make findings
 - D. BOE votes/takes action on motion
 - E. Chair announces whether motion carries/fails
 - VII. Call next appeal, repeat IV – VI
 - VIII. Late-Filed Appeals, if any (SEE LATE-FILED APPEALS – PROCESS)
 - IX. Adjourn
-

BOE Action Options:

- 1. **Deny appeal** because Appellant failed to prove error in valuation with factual evidence.
- 2. **Grant appeal & adjust assessment as requested by Appellant.** (if Appellant's evidence supports proposed assessment value)
- 3. **Grant appeal & adjust (lower or raise) assessment differently.** (if and only if supported by sufficient evidence of value in record.)
- 4. **Grant appeal & remand to Assessor for reconsideration of value** (remand is mandatory if error found, but insufficient evidence of value in record.)

SAMPLE MOTIONS

1. To DENY appeal

I MOVE that the Board *GRANT* the appeal and I ASK for a NO VOTE

Because . . .

Appellant didn't prove/provide evidence of error in assessment
and/or

For the evidence/reasons provided by the Assessor . . .

2. To GRANT appeal & ADJUST assessment AS REQUESTED

I MOVE that the Board *GRANT* the appeal and ADJUST the assessment AS REQUESTED BY APPELLANT to \$_____, and I ask for a YES VOTE

Because . . .

Appellant proved there was error . . .

[specify . . . **unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation**]
based on facts

AND

We find requested assessment is supported by sufficient evidence in the record

3. To GRANT appeal & ADJUST assessment OTHERWISE

I MOVE that the Board *GRANT* the appeal and ADJUST the assessment to \$_____, and I ASK FOR A YES VOTE

Because . . .

Appellant proved there was error . . .

[specify . . . **unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation**]
based on facts

AND

We find sufficient evidence of value in record to support this assessment

4. To GRANT appeal & REMAND for RECONSIDERATION of ASSESSMENT

I MOVE that the Board *GRANT* the appeal and REMAND to the ASSESSOR for RECONSIDERATION of the ASSESSMENT, and I ASK FOR A YES VOTE

Because . . .

Appellant proved there was error . . .

[specify . . . **unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation**]
based on facts

AND

We find insufficient evidence of value in the record

**FROM THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
LINKS TO BOE HEARING PACKETS 2021
UPDATED: November 12, 2021 (living document)**

At the request of the Appellants Representative – Attorney at Law Robert Spitzfaden below are links to access the BOE Hearing Packets from previous BOE Hearings to be included as part of the appeal records as well as the recordings of previous hearings. Each packet is quite large so it requires downloading the packet through a file-share program.

Hard copies of BOE packets are available in the City Clerk's Office at City Hall, 155 S. Seward St Room 202. Below are links to the Zend To file-share that will allow you to download the packet to your computer as well as a link to the BOE website with the same links and the Zoom link for BOE Hearings.

For additional needs please contact the City Clerk's Office at 907-586-5278 or city.clerk@juneau.org

BOE HEARING AGENDA PACKET LINKS

Link to November 10, 2021 BOE Hearing Packet (live link until 11/17)

<https://fileshare.ci.juneau.ak.us/pickup.php?claimID=Zy3yED3WDR6mdJx6&claimPasscode=8r6MmzrJvjc5SNZw>

Link to November 9, 2021 BOE Hearing Packet (live link until 11/16)

<https://fileshare.ci.juneau.ak.us/pickup.php?claimID=EZs9qv4fxpFmVgwe&claimPasscode=HkdkPRMg5EkPdbn9>

Link to November 4, 2021 BOE Hearing Packet:

Go to: <https://juneau.org/clerk/boards-committees/boards-master-list/boe> for packet link

Link to November 2, 2021 BOE Hearing Packet & Additional Material:

Go to: <https://juneau.org/clerk/boards-committees/boards-master-list/boe> for packet link

Link to October 28, 2021 BOE Hearing Packet & Additional Material:

Go to: <https://juneau.org/clerk/boards-committees/boards-master-list/boe> for packet link

Link to October 21, 2021 BOE Hearing Packet & Additional Material:

Go to: <https://juneau.org/clerk/boards-committees/boards-master-list/boe> for packet link

Link to October 20, 2021 BOE Hearing Packet & Additional Material:

Go to: <https://juneau.org/clerk/boards-committees/boards-master-list/boe> for packet link

**FROM THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
LINKS TO BOE HEARING PACKETS 2021
UPDATED: November 12, 2021 (living document)**

BOE HEARING ZOOM CLOUD RECORDING LINKS

Zoom Cloud Recording of November 10, 2021 BOE Hearing:

https://juneau.zoom.us/rec/share/EEuOLQ_SjiINy6Sf-oQQf4YYToV9-aymzlEa62od-vwdG0YvkvUwPMiFJyaCr0he_dlsnJi_NkMF_p8j

Access Passcode: A3Lc+&KU

Zoom Cloud Recording of November 9, 2021 BOE Hearing:

<https://juneau.zoom.us/rec/share/q50NOVgUpLR3rNRAPNBIAUD9L5OctdyJxDbn92H0fzFy1S8sejhykF8Pnzu3kwaO.sSdBOzciSCzTpnOG>

Access Passcode: 58UJ+NbC

Zoom Cloud Recording of November 4, 2021 BOE Hearing:

Available from the Clerk's Office on November 5, 2021 – will send link directly to BOE panel & appellants from 11/4 hearing and for 11/10 hearing

Zoom Cloud Recording of November 2, 2021 BOE Hearing:

https://juneau.zoom.us/rec/share/6cw7NPo8IxiZ-k_0FvnL3h8aDIoaWHBImEPMb71NrckJt3pzkV8juDBRW1lXpc26.o1ol8KeNsQsu_ayr

Access Passcode: gg\$2X@Ni

Zoom Cloud Recording of October 28, 2021 BOE Hearing:

https://juneau.zoom.us/rec/share/pTLs5B5uBnPU0fEJ34V_F3P2iaPAvzDwJMIpwnPIVl0cL4JOJTVgZEefXW5nAdk.SVklDOKj4pWf8nW Passcode: +IH1+xmE

Zoom Cloud Recording of October 21, 2021 BOE Hearing:

<https://juneau.zoom.us/rec/share/Hc9toKLCIKRSXMs9lRYBSopOeHGSH9iLswx6T09tGcrbpevzUUxKjQX1u0fjatL9Mf0ITxOBLVBoARv>

Access Passcode: %20&apx%

Zoom Cloud Recording of October 20, 2021 BOE Hearing:

https://juneau.zoom.us/rec/share/u5rwjVBRagO3YJYCvn1VkjVHRjED5a5Gtmc-dBKLxBg_X19tpq6RzRDMk7JAKIYc.SjNY2FAzl0MkhGSy

Access Passcode: 0ZkV3* @*

Zoom Webinar Link for attending BOE Hearings: <https://juneau.zoom.us/j/99741860260> or to call in: 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 997 4186 0260

Board of Equalization webpage: <https://juneau.org/clerk/boards-committees/boards-master-list/boe>

From: [Bob Spitzfaden](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: FW: Motion To Include Documents in the Record
Date: Monday, November 8, 2021 3:59:08 PM
Attachments: [wold report on zoning of 57 properties.pdf](#)

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

In addition to the documents and recordings/transcripts specified in my email of November 8, please add the following for the same reasons:

BOE Hearing training session of July, 2021 found at October 20, 2021 BOE hearing:

Pages 114-16, 21-62,23,47-56, 67-129.

Robert S. Spitzfaden

From: Bob Spitzfaden <spitz@gci.net>
Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 1:43 PM
To: city.clerk@juneau.org
Subject: Motion To Include Documents in the Record

Dear Clerk:

Please ensure the following is provided to the Board of Equalization and that the documents cited are part of their packet for the hearings to be held on November 9 and 10, 17, 18 and 19, and all subsequent hearings for which I am the attorney.

The following documents are relevant to the question of the validity of the ratio study used to increase the assessment for each of the appellants represented by the undersigned, and to preserve the record showing due process violations by the BOE. Those with page numbers have already been filed with the Clerk, and heeding the BOE's concern of excessive pages, are not being filed again. Save for one small document, all these documents have been previously provided to the BOE.

October 20, 2021 hearings:

Pages 7-9: Notification of appellants represented by defendant to whom due process is owed.

Page 316 : Counsel memo to BOE on governing legal principles.

Pages: 317-319: motions made to the BOE to preserve the record that the BOE failed to adhere to due process.

Pages 326-354: First part of the Kim Wold report, addressing failure of ratio study to include representative sample.

Pages 356-360: Bowen email with showing sales deleted, and reasons why, from ratio study.

Pages 361-366: Bowen email providing list of sales keeping certain sales confidential, and stipulation for single hearing.

Pages 368-377: Bowen email providing responses addressing the parameters for the ratio study, and providing Hartle memo on BOE standards and procedures.

Pages 440-485: Balance of Wold report addressing sample concerns and problems with assessments.

Pages 487-497: Dahle analysis of commercial assessments.

Pages 499: Dahle list of sales dated June 2, 499-515.

Pages 523-566: Bowen email and letter of August 3 responding to inquiries regarding commercial assessments with attachments.

November 4, 2021 hearings:

Pages 21-23: Maps locating 53 sales.

Pages 26-42: Assessments Valuations ?summary Report April 2021.

Pages: 44-58: Bowen email of September 30, 2021 with four attachments.

Pages 59-67: Geiger expressing concerns regarding lack of written methods and procedures, sale trends, representativeness of the sample, deleting data.

New document:

Wold zoning analysis of 57 sales – attached.

In addition, motion is made to include in the record of the November 9 and 10, 17, 18 and 19 hearings, and all subsequent hearings for which I am the attorney, the following recordings and transcripts if there are transcripts. The hearings are relevant for the same reasons as the documents referenced above.

The appellants presentation and rebuttal presented at the hearings held on October 20, 21 and 28 as well as November 2 and 4.

Robert S. Spitzaden

From: Kim Wold <kim@reliantadvisory.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 30, 2021 9:20 AM
To: Bob Spitzfaden <spitz@gci.net>
Subject: Use list

Hi Bob,

Here is the list of uses for the sales. I have used the list attached to my letter report. The sales are listed in order 1 through 57.

1. Office condominium
2. Office condominium
3. Boat condominium
4. Office condominium
5. Improved industrial
6. Improved residential -two lots with a 4 plex
7. Apartment building-27 units Mixed Use 2 zoning-Wrong sales price. Should be \$1,600,000
8. NCL purchase vacant. Mixed Use 2
9. Improved industrial shop with an apartment-stimulus funded purchase
10. Vacant-Industrial zoning
11. Industrial condominium -Industrial zoning
12. Vacant-Industrial zoning- Related Party Sale-Below market at \$8.74 per SF
13. Vacant-Industrial zoning
14. Vacant-Industrial zoning
15. Vacant-Industrial zoning
16. Vacant-Industrial zoning
17. Commercial building-Industrial zoning
18. Vacant-Industrial zoning
19. Industrial warehouse-Industrial zoning-Related Party Sale


20. Boat Condominium -Industrial zoning
21. Office Condominium -Light commercial zoning
22. Mixed use/tourism retail and apartments-Mixed use zoning
23. Boathouse-Waterfront commercial zoning
24. Vacant -Industrial zoning
25. Boathouse-Waterfront commercial zoning
26. 4 Plex apartmentD-18 Residential zoning
27. Airplane Hangar-Industrial zoning-Land leased from CBJ
28. Automotive shop-General commercial
29. Tourism retail-Mixed use-Related Party
30. Office condominium-Light Commercial zoning
31. Boathouse-Waterfront commercial zoning
32. Office building -Light commercial-Missing 3 vacant parcels used for parking
33. RV Park-D-18 Residential zoning
34. Boat condominium -Industrial zoning
35. Retail-General commercial zoning-NGO purchase
36. Office condominium - Light Commercial zoning
37. Airplane hangar-Industrial zoned-Land lease from CBJ
38. Office/Warehouse Condominium -Industrial zoning
39. Industrial Shop-Industrial zoning
40. Boat Condominium - Industrial zoning
41. Industrial building-Industrial zoning-Purchase price influenced by CUP for Cannabis Grow Operation
42. Boat Condominium -Industrial zoning
43. Boat Condominium -Industrial zoning

- 44. Office building-General Commercial
- 45. Industrial Shop/Recycling Center-Industrial
- 46. Vacant -Industrial zoning
- 47. Boat Condominium-Industrial zoning
- 48. Boat Condominium -Industrial zoning
- 49. Office building-Light Commercial
- 50. Industrial shop-Industrial zoning
- 51. Fuel Station-Industrial zoning
- 52. Industrial building-Industrial zoning-Related Party Sale
- 53. Office Condominium -General Commercial-No Assessed Values
- 54. Retail-Industrial zoning
- 55. Office building - Mixed Use
- 56. Industrial shop-Industrial zoning
- 57. Office condominium -Light Commercial zoning

Please let me know if there is anything more I can do.

Kim

Kim M. Wold, Senior Appraiser



RELIANT
LLC

Direct: 206.295.9785

Email: kim@reliantadvisory.com
9330 Vanguard Drive, Suite 201, Anchorage Alaska 99507
Fax: 907.929.2260
Website: www.reliantadvisory.com

From: Kim Wold <kim@reliantadvisory.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 30, 2021 9:47 AM
To: Bob Spitzfaden <spitz@gci.net>
Subject: Zoning on first 6 sales

Hi Bob,


I forgot to add the zoning to the first 6 sales. Here they are.

1. Mixed Use
2. Light Commercial
3. Industrial
4. Industrial
5. Industrial
6. D-18 Residential

Kim

Kim M. Wold, Senior Appraiser

Direct: 206.295.9785
Email: kim@reliantadvisory.com
9330 Vanguard Drive, Suite 201, Anchorage Alaska 99507
Fax: 907.929.2260
Website: www.reliantadvisory.com



RELIANT

LLC

From: [Bob Spitzfaden](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Appeals
Date: Thursday, October 7, 2021 5:46:11 PM
Attachments: [list of taxpayers appealing to boe.pdf](#)

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Teresa Bowen indicates I must address the following matters with the City Clerk.

I represent the taxpayers shown on the attached list, all of whom have appealed their 2021 tax assessments, and seek a hearing before the Board of Equalization. Mr. Tripp indicates he will soon notify the Clerk that he is withdrawing his appeal.

As their counsel in the appeals, all documents must be served on me. Failure to do so is a due process violation.

I note that Ms. Bowen was aware of my representation but apparently failed to make the Clerk's office aware of the representation, and hence the Clerk's office has not been serving me with the various notices of hearings.

Please provide to me the notices of hearings for all of my clients. Ms. Bowen sent me notices for Kiwis, Engstrom, Rountree, Coogan Alaska and Tripp. Please resent those notices so I know what I got from Ms. Bowen is what the Clerk's office issued.

Coogan has a number of parcels on appeal as far as I can understand matters, but the notice only references one parcel (tax number ending 40032). What is the status with respect to his other parcels?

Please provide the Board of Equalization's calendar for all BOE hearings concerning 2021 assessments.

Please indicate to me the BOE members assigned to each appeal hearing.

Ms Engstrom and Ms. Mcconnochie (Kiwis) will be out of town on the date and time scheduled for their hearings. Please continue their hearings to another date. Ms. Engstrom is available from October 26 to mid November, while Ms. Mcconnochie is available October 25-27.

In the future, before scheduling hearings, please consult me as to my clients and I's availability.

I will be shortly filing a number of motion to present to the BOE. I will file them with you and assume you will distribute to the BOE and the appropriate City employees. If that is not the case, let me know.

The City has yet to provide the information upon which the assessments were based. Continuing all

hearings until that information is produced is the most expeditious manner in which to proceed, and I request you do so

I note Kiwis, Engstrom, and Rountree appeals are all set for the same date and time. Are these all one common hearing? If not, what will be the order and time of the hearings, so that I can have my clients and witnesses available for those hearings.

I will be calling Mr. Dahle as a witness. Please advise him he must be present at each and every hearings for each of my clients. Please indicate to me that you will be providing him with all of the documents filed with the City Clerk involving these hearings.

I understand the City Clerk will email to me and to my clients any and all documents in the packets provided to the BOE for each of the hearings.

Robert S. Spitzfaden

FIRST	LAST	CORPORATION OWNERSHIP NAME	PARCEL ID #'S
Blue	Bergmann	Alaskan Fudge	1C070B0J0020
Bruce	Abel		4B1601010010 - Krusty Krab Co LLC 4B1601010022 - Gold Creek Properties LLC 1C060K700040 - Gold Creek Properties LLC 5B1501010051 - 8525 Holdings LLC 5B1501010060 - 8525 Holdings LLC 5B1501010070 - 8525 Holdings LLC
Colter	Boehm	Bobcat of Juneau	5B1201000121
Daniel	Glidman	Goldstein Improvement	Bob has them
Dave	Hanna	JLC Properties Inc.	5B1201060201 5B1201060191 2D040C050074
Doug	Trucano	Trucano Family Partnership	6D0601020040
Doug	Trucano	Douglas Trucano	7B0901010010 & 1C070H020120
Doug	Trucano	Nowel Avenue Development, LLC	1D060L010010 & 5B120106081
Doug	Trucano	A&J Building, LLC	1C070I010011
Graham	Rountree	Graham & Janice Rountree	1G070K81020
James	Sidney	West Glacier Dev't	4B1701100040, 4B1701100060, 4B1701100070, 4B1701100100, 4B1701100110, 4B2201020020, 4B2201020030, 4B2201020040, 4B2201020050, 4B2901150050
Jeff	Grant	Jeff Grant	5B21001000030
Hugh & Shari	Grant	DJG Development LLC	5B1201070010, 1D00L050011, 5B1501000010
Hugh & Shari	Grant	FRANKLIN STREET PROPERTIES	1C070A170091, 1C070A170092, 1C070A170093, 1C070A170094, 1C070A170095, 1C070A10070
Hugh & Shari	Grant	Grant Rentals	1D060L020140
Hugh & Shari	Grant	Grant Properties LLC	5B1201000033, 5B1201000052
Hugh & Shari	Grant	GRANT'S PLAZA LLC	5B1201000031, 5B1201000032
Hugh & Shari	Grant	Midway Bus Ctr LLC	5B1201020150, 5B1201020160
Hugh & Shari	Grant	Gastineau MHP	6D0701060000, 6D0701040000
Michael	Tripp	Timberwolf Ventures	1C100I050010
PeggyAnn	McConnochie	Alaskan Kiwis LLC	1C060K630020
Reed	Stoops	Franklin Docks Enterprises, Swope LLC	REVISED: 1C100K830031, 1C100K830040, 1C100K830041, 1C070B0L0010
Richard	Harris	R.H. Rentals L.L.C.	1C070k810010
Russ	Kegler	Perseverance Glass	5B1501010110
Sally	Engstrom	Sally Engstrom	1 C070B0L0020
Scott	Jenkins	R & S Rentals	5B1601210041
Scott	Jenkins	Igloo Construction	5B1201350010
Spike	Bicknell	Bicknell LLC	5B1401020073 5B1401050140 5B1401050130 5B1401050120 5B1401050110 5B1401050090 5B1401050080 5B1401050070 5B1401050060 5B1401050050 5B1401050040 5B1401050030
Tawna & Paul	Curry	PDC Holdings	5B1501020210
Wayne	Coogan	Coogan Alaska LLC	5B1301080000, 5B2101310000, 4B2901150040, 4B2901150060, 1D060L040032

MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Equalization
From: Robert S. Spitzfaden, Attorney
Re: Group appeal of common questions regarding methodology used for 2021 tax assessments
Dated: October 12, 2021

The following principles control the Board of Equalization's consideration of the group appealing the methodology used by the Assessor in determining commercial land assessments as of January 1, 2021.

First there is the question of what must be shown by the taxpayer to overturn an assessment. An early Juneau case laid out the test. "This court [and hence the Board] is concerned with nothing less than fraud or the clear adoption of a fundamentally wrong principle of valuation" *Twentieth Century Inv. Co v City of Juneau*, 359 P2d 783 (Ak 1961).

More recent cases applying that test, indicate the assessor cannot ignore or overlook relevant sales. "The 1992 appraisals of the four lots adopted "a fundamentally wrong principle of valuation" because they did not consider the 1991 subject sales. The objective of an appraisal is the determination of the property's market value. By failing to consider recent sales of the subject property the Municipality ignored directly relevant, albeit not conclusive, evidence of value." *CH Kelly Trust v Municipality of Anchorage Board of Equalization*, 909 p2d 1381 (AK 1996)

Next there is the question of what the Board must do in its decision in resolving an appeal where the assessor's information conflicts with that of the taxpayer on the issue of value. When a party contests the factual basis for an assessor's valuation, a court will "review the assessor's factual findings for substantial evidence," and require "findings of fact sufficient to explain the reasons" for the decision. Thus, the Board must find sufficient facts to explain the reasons for its decision. *Faulk v. Board of Equalization*, 934 P2d 75) (1997) explains what the Board is to do and not d

In particular, the language of the Board's motion does not facilitate review of how the Board addressed the assessor's treatment of the recent price paid by the Faulks for the Property. In *CH Kelly Trust v. Municipality of Anchorage, Bd. of Equalization*, 909 P.2d 1381, 1381-82 (Alaska 1996), we concluded that it was reversible error for a municipal appraiser to fail to consider a seven-month-old sale price of a property when the appraiser valued the property for tax purposes. We noted that "[b]y failing to consider recent sales of the subject property the Municipality ignored directly relevant, albeit not conclusive, evidence of [the property's] value." *Id.* at 1382. We suggested, however, that it would be appropriate for the appraiser to discount or disregard the prior sale price if the appraiser reasonably concluded that the prior sale price did not reflect "prevailing market conditions." See *id.*

In this case, we can only guess how the Board resolved the conflicts between the Borough's and the Faulks' evidence relating to the recent sale price. On the one hand, the Faulks presented uncontradicted evidence that they had purchased the Property approximately thirty days before the assessment in a *bona fide* arm's length transaction in the open market.³ On the other hand, the appraiser opined that, when valued individually, the twelve units would have a total value greater than \$495,000 because the Faulks probably received a bulk discount for purchasing all twelve units of the Property at once. Significantly, however, the appraiser never explained why he stated in his written report that the alleged bulk discount was twenty-five to thirty-five percent but testified that the discount was "anywhere from 30 to 50 per cent."⁴

The Board neither indicated whether it agreed with the appraiser's bulk discount theory nor how, if at all, it resolved the discrepancies between the appraiser's written report and testimony. It also failed to address the Faulks' contention that the poor condition of the Property and lack of comparable condominium complexes demonstrated that the assessed value should have been closer to \$495,000 than to \$1,055,400. Thus, we have an inadequate basis for determining whether the Board reasonably denied the Faulks' appeal.⁵

The taxpayers in these appeals will show the assessor applied fundamentally wrong principles of valuation, including but not limited whether the assessor ignored relevant sales and utilized the wrong sales.

From: [Bob Spitzfaden](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Motions
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 1:41:38 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

To the Clerk: Please ensure the following motions seeking immediate BOE action in the Alaskan Kiwis, Rountree, Engstrom and Coogan appeals.

To The Members of the Board of Equalization

My clients, those shown on the list previously provided to the Clerk's Office, on Thursday October 7, 2021, make the motions set out in this email. The motions are made to the Board of Equalization and must be included in the Board's packet for the hearings for each of my clients.

Facts: My clients each have appealed the assessed values, as of January 1, 2021, assigned by the Assessor to their various properties.

The Assessor held a so called training session with the Board of Equalization in July. During the so-called training, the Assessor presented evidence to the Board that bears on the merits of the issues being appealed to the Board.

In determining the assessed value for the properties under appeal, the Assessor used the same mass assessment technique for each property under appeal, which resulted in the Assessor determining that commercial lands were under assessed, leading to a 50% increase of the land value for each commercial taxpayer. No increase was made in the assessed value of the buildings located on the commercial lands. The Assessor did not use other assessment techniques such as replacement cost, comparable sales or income approach. The Assessor utilized the prices of 56 sales of properties, the sales stretching from 2016 through 2020. These sales prices were used by the Assessor to produce a ratio study, a study that shows the ratio between assessed value and sales prices. The study utilized prices that included both commercial land and building prices combined. Fourteen of the sales used by the Assessor occurred in 2020 (that is 25% of the utilized sale prices), but the City has refused to release the sales prices, or other data, concerning three sales that occurred in December, 2020.

Although starting in June, 2021, my clients requested the sales prices for the 56 sales, the City did not release the sale prices until September 23, 2021 (and still has not released the prices for the three December 2020 sales).

In August, the City Attorney was informed that my clients would all contest the methodology utilized by the Assessor, and it made no sense to have 20 some different hearings for each taxpayer, when the same common methodology questions were present in each appeal. To hold separate hearing would mean that the BOE would have to hold a separate hearing for each taxpayer, and repeat the same evidence in each hearing. The taxpayers estimate each duplicate hearing, would take three days each.

With my email to Teresa Bowen of August 24, my clients requested that the City hold one

hearing for all the taxpayers on the common methodology questions, reserving for each taxpayer a separate hearing if any of the tax payers had issues unique to their property independent of the common methodology questions. For instance, if a taxpayer had wetlands or was in a slide area. The City agreed to that process. Ms. Bowen's email of September 23 on the subject provides:

Finally- moving back to the methodology hearing, I've updated the stipulation submitted last month. I know there were a lot of outstanding questions. I made a few changes- specifically acknowledging that this hearing is only about methodology and individual taxpayers may still have issues with individual aspects of their assessment beyond the methodology question, added some time (I think you suggested 3 hours- but maybe that was just your side? Most of our hearings last 2-3 hours), and amended the methodology question to better reflect your suggestion.

The stipulation attached and referred to my Ms. Bowen in her September 23 email states:

*The Appellants listed in Section 1 are solely appealing the following common issue: **The Assessor's employed a fundamentally flawed or incorrect methodology for AY2021 counter to Alaska State statute, the CBJ Code of Ordinances, and Alaska Supreme Court Precedents.** The parties agree that the BOE's decision on this common issue will be dispositive for the timely filed appeals listed under Section 1. [Coloring is so in the original]*

With Ms. Bowen's Thursday September 23 email, finally came the sales prices for all but three sales. A week later, the City reneged on the one hearing, and started to set individual hearings dates – without consulting with the taxpayer or counsel as to what dates for individual hearing dates the taxpayers and counsel would be available. The representative of Kiwis and Ms. Engstrom, both of whose hearings are set for October 20, are out of town on those dates. The hearings should be continued to a date at which both can consult counsel and attend the hearings.

Based on these facts, my taxpayer clients make the following motions to secure the orders necessary to conduct a fair and impartial hearing.

1. Any member of the Board who attended the July training session, not be included in any panel hearing the appeals of my clients. Due process requires the administrative process afford an impartial decision-maker. *Nash v. Matanuska-Susitna Borough*, 239 P.3d, 699 (Ak. 2010). The taxpayers are entitled to an impartial tribunal to hear this appeal. *AT&T Alascom v. Orchitt*, 161 P3d 1232, 1246, Ak. 2007). Administrative personnel, including the Board members, while presumed honest and impartial, cannot prejudge the case. *Id.* Upon a showing of prejudgment, they must be disqualified. *Id.* The Assessor presented evidence on the merits of the case, not training the Board. The Board viewed this

evidence favorably. Accordingly, the members attending should not hear the taxpayers cases.

2. The hearings for Kiwis and Engstrom be continued to a date while they are in Juneau and can consult with and attend the hearing with counsel. Neither taxpayer was consulted on the hearing date, so they had no opportunity to object to the dates set.
3. The Board should order that the common methodology cases be heard in one hearing. There are over 20 taxpayers. Depending on how cooperative City witnesses are, each hearing could take up to 3 days. It makes no sense to have the same evidence and testimony repeated twenty or more times, when one hearing is sufficient. One hearing is economic and efficient. The Board should not waste its time hearing the same evidence 20 some times.
4. If the Board is unwilling to hold one common hearing, then the Board should allow each taxpayer to submit as evidence the hearing record (both witnesses and documents) from the prior hearings. Each hearing will be recorded. Documents will have been filed with the Clerk. So, after the first hearing, the second taxpayer would submit the record (the recorded hearing and the documents) from the first hearing, After the second hearing, the third taxpayer would submit the record from the first and second hearings. And so. Doing so saves all the necessity of repeating the same hearing over and over.

Robert S. Spitzfaden



9330 Vanguard Drive, Suite 201
Anchorage, Alaska 99507
Phone: (907) 929-2226
Fax: (907) 929-2260
Email: admin@reliantadvisory.com
www.reliantadvisory.com

July 12, 2021

Bob Spitzfadden, Esquire
PO Box 33259
Juneau, AK 99803

Re: Tax Appeal

Dear Mr. Spitzfadden:

I have completed a review of the sales listing used by the assessor to support and establish the 2021 assessed land values for commercial and industrial lands in the City/Borough of Juneau. The sales listed were represented as land sales; however, it was discovered that wasn't the case. The list was predominantly comprised of non-land sales.

The sales list included 57 assessor's parcels; however, there appears to be a duplication of one sale, leaving 56 transactions.

Included in the assessor's sales listing were:

- 7 vacant parcels
- 18 condominiums – no land value
- 16 improved properties – likely biased land value allocation
- 4 related party transactions – non-market
- 3 boat houses – not comparable
- 2 residential
- 1 RV park – improved / residential
- 1 special purpose / cruise dock property
- 2 NGO / Nonprofit – grant / stimulus funded
- 2 City/Borough of Juneau transactions – not arm's length

It is apparent that 53 sales (excluding boat houses) were used to calculate the statistical analysis and the ratio by sales data. Forty-six of the sales are corrupt and should not have been utilized in the analysis. That leaves 7 true sales of vacant land that are indicative of land value.

Reviewing the 7 vacant land sales, 5 were located at the Rock Dump. This is a distinct neighborhood and there is considerable question as to the comparability of these properties to other vacant commercial and industrial lands located in other City/Borough of Juneau neighborhoods. There was one Lemon Creek neighborhood sale. There is no way to determine whether this is a market sale or simply an outlier.



9330 Vanguard Drive, Suite 201
Anchorage, Alaska 99507
Phone: (907) 929-2226
Fax: (907) 929-2260
Email: admin@reliantadvisory.com
www.reliantadvisory.com

There was also a large parcel sale in the Industrial Blvd neighborhood. This sale cannot be analyzed accurately without knowing if the assessor's size adjustment factor is accurate.

The universe of comparable land sales (7) is simply too small to achieve a minimum confidence level in the assessor's statistics model. The minimum data points to achieve a statistically significant sampling is 30. Obviously, the assessor's modeling falls far short of a minimum sampling. Therefore, the statistical output is inherently unreliable as no confidence level could be achieved.

It is my expert opinion that the statistical analyses used by the assessor is "improper" (as set forth in the grounds for an assessment appeal). As such, there is inadequate support for the increase in commercial and industrial land assessed valuations.

Over the past three years, I have appraised in excess of 500,000 acres of land using statistical analyses with over 15 valuation dates. I have never used less than 40 sales per date of valuation and typically utilize 50 to 70 sales in each statistical model.

Please find attached the assessor's listing of sales and the corresponding assessor's summaries of the respective properties.

I would be happy to answer any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kim M. Wold', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kim M. Wold

AY2021 Analysis Sales List

Sale Date	Parcel	Number	Street	Neighborhood
1 12/09/20	1C070A050001	230	SEWARD ST	SOMMERS ON SEWARD_C_24
2 12/07/20	5B15011107E0	2221	JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24
3 12/04/20	4B1701090218	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
4 11/23/20	5B1201060260	5719	CONCRETE WAY	SEAGULLS EDGE C 24
5 11/17/20	4B1701020020	10011	GLACIER HWY	MENDE PENINSULA C
6 11/13/20	1D060L030011	201	CORDOVA ST	WEST JUNEAU C
7 10/30/20	1C060K660110	711	W WILLOUGHBY AVE	DOWNTOWN C
8 10/09/20	1C060K010031	0	EGAN DR	DOWNTOWN C
9 09/24/20	5B1201060160	5740	CONCRETE WAY	LEMON CREEK C
10 09/24/20	5B1201300110	1783	Anka St	
11 08/07/20	5B1501010001	1880	CREST ST	BUILDERS PLAZA C 24
12 03/10/20	1C110K120140	0	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
13 03/10/20	1C110K120051	0	Eastaugh Way	
14 02/28/20	4B1701090056	10009	CRAZY HORSE DR	MENDE PENINSULA C
15 12/24/19	5B1201300110	1783	Anka St	
16 10/25/19	1C110K120130	190	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
17 10/04/19	5B1201000060	5245	GLACIER HWY	LEMON CREEK C
18 10/02/19	1C110K120120	0	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
19 08/02/19	5B1201020100	5452	SHAUNE DR	LEMON CREEK C
20 07/30/19	4B1601050160	2276	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
21 07/16/19	5B1601140043	9309	GLACIER HWY	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
22 07/01/19	1C070B0N0011	259	S FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
23 06/28/19	1C020K01G280	1435	HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
24 04/01/19	1C110K120150	0	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
25 02/28/19	1C020K01G290	1435	HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
26 01/04/19	5B2401610150	4045	DELTA DR	NORTHEAST VALLEY C
27 11/30/18	3B1501040120	1544	CREST ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
28 11/16/18	5B1501040030	8825	MALLARD ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
29 11/02/18	1C070B0J0020	195	S FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
30 08/21/18	5B1601140070	9309	GLACIER HWY	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
31 07/25/18	1C020K01G200	1435	HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
32 07/20/18	1C060U050022	1108	F ST	DOWNTOWN C
33 06/29/18	4B2901020010	10200	MENDENHALL LOOP RD	AUKE MOUNTAIN C
34 03/05/18	4B1601080070	2278	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	P & J BUSINESS C 24
35 02/15/18	5B1601000023	9151	GLACIER HWY	SOUTH VALLEY C
36 12/22/17	5B15011109B0	2231	JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24
37 10/12/17	3B1501020030	1669	CREST ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
38 09/20/17	4B1701103003	2769	SHERWOOD LN	BEAR DEN YACHT CONDO C 24
39 09/19/17	4B1601010040	2450	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	MENDE PENINSULA C
40 07/31/17	4B1601120130	2270	BRANDY LN	BRANDY LANE YACHT C 24
41 07/21/17	5B1201330160	2005	ANKA ST	LEMON CREEK C
42 06/13/17	4B1601050030	2274	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
43 04/24/17	4B1701090226	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
44 04/11/17	7B0901030071	3161	CHANNEL DR	TWIN LAKES C
45 04/05/17	5B1201040052	1721	ANKA ST	LEMON CREEK C
46 03/16/17	1C110K120101	170	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
47 02/14/17	4B1701090223	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
48 01/10/17	4B1701090228	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
49 12/15/16	1C060U040040	800	GLACIER AVE	DOWNTOWN C
50 09/02/16	5B1501020170	8401	AIRPORT BLVD	SOUTH VALLEY C
51 08/02/16	5B1201060061	5631	GLACIER HWY	LEMON CREEK C
52 06/30/16	4B1701100146	2789	SHERWOOD LN	MENDE PENINSULA C
53 06/15/16	5B1501000002	8251	GLACIER HWY	SOUTHEAST INSURANCE C 24
54 06/03/16	5B1201450110	1731	RALPH'S WAY	LEMON CREEK C
55 03/30/16	1C070A030040	100	N FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
56 03/01/16	4B1701100170	10221	GLACIER HWY	MENDE PENINSULA C
57 02/10/16	5B15011107E0	2221	JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24

* These were the sales available to us for our market analysis for assessment year 2021.

** Note that no sales prices are included due the requirement of CBJ ordinance to keep them confidential.

AY 2021 Summary Report - CBJ Commercial Property Valuations

Broad Brush Overview

We are in the process of a major review of the valuation models, the assessed values and the assessment level for all Juneau commercial properties.

A brief background. By State law we are to value properties at market value. Information that is looked at in determining market value includes sales prices, construction costs, income and expenses, lease rates, and capitalization rates.

Commercial property valuations are challenging in Juneau. We are a somewhat isolated market with a limited number of commercial properties available and a fairly low number of sales. Up until late this last year there was no requirement that the sales price be disclosed in real estate transactions. So, besides starting with a low number of sales we only have data on a portion of those.

It would seem that those challenges resulted in assessed values for commercial properties, on a whole, not being increased for the past 10 or more years causing the commercial property assessed values to lag behind the market. This caused a tax shift. A tax shift occurs when the tax burden that should be paid by one party is shifted to being paid by another party. In this case the shift was from commercial properties onto residential properties.

To rectify this tax shift the commercial property assessed values must be brought up to market. This means that commercial properties will see increases that should have occurred in smaller increments for the past 10 plus years being applied in a few years. Because the increases will represent multi-year corrections they may seem to be significant increases.

This first year we are addressing the land component. Next year we will refine the land adjustments and also start making adjustments to the improvement portion of the commercial values.

As a commercial property owner you can help improve the assessed values of Juneau's commercial property!

The more sales, market and lease information we can gather the better our basis for market analysis.

For sales, the primary year we look at is the last year. For property types with fewer sales, which include all commercial property types, we expand the sales data up to 5 years back until we have a large enough sample. For special studies we occasionally go back 10 or more years.

It would be helpful if you would provide information on commercial property sales or purchases that you have made as well as rental, lease and income and expense information.

Thank you for any information you provide.

Assessed Values In The Midst Of A Pandemic

We recognize and are sympathetic to the fact that the past year has been difficult for some businesses in Juneau. Some businesses have seen drastic reductions in revenue, in some cases almost a complete elimination of revenue. At the same time, other businesses had a good year in 2020.

In the midst of that, what State statutes require of us is to determine the market value of the real estate. While a particular business may go out of business the underlying real estate value may decrease, may stay the same, or may even increase.

Compounding Circumstances

Compounding this situation is the fact that it has become recognized and documented that most of the commercial assessed values have not changed in ten plus years while the actual market values have increased during that time. So, we need to take steps to correct that neglect.

Analysis Conclusions

A lot of work was done this year cleaning up the commercial property sales data. There is still more work to be done but good progress was made. That resulted in us having 57 market sales from the past 5 years for which we had sales prices.

Below is a table that summarizes some of the ratios from comparing assessed values to sales. A ratio of 1.00 would be right at market, a ratio under 1.00 indicates that properties are undervalued. This analysis compares 01/01/2020 assessed values to 01/01/2021 market value.

<i>Property Class</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>
Commercial Land	12	0.4095	0.3928
Commercial Improved Properties (Core Types)	35	0.7748	0.8112
Commercial Properties Overall	57	0.7149	0.7411
Residential Properties (for class equity comparison)	1025	0.9629	0.9653

Adjustments To Assessed Values

If we were a larger jurisdiction with thousands of sales and hundreds of sales in particular subsets, then we could make more drastic changes to correct the imbalance between residential and commercial properties more quickly but with limited sales we need to be a little more cautious.

Over the next few years we will work to:

- Bring more uniformity between the commercial and residential property classes
- Bring more uniformity between the commercial subclasses
- Correct the imbalance in the distribution of the value between the land component and the building component(s).

This year will just be a first step. For most properties the increase will be applied to just the land component. For some classes of properties that have no land component or only a token land value, the increase will be applied to the buildings. This will bring all commercial properties closer to market. Next year we will take another step towards parity with residential properties. This will likely involve a further increase in land and, at least in some cases, a reduction in the building component.

The adjustment being applied this year will result in a 50% increase in the land component for most commercial properties. On average this results in a 20% increase to commercial property values. One class of properties, boathouses, will actually see a 20% reduction this year.


Future Refinements

In the coming years we will be:


- Refining the valuation models for all of the commercial property types- retail, office, medical, industrial, etc.
- Refining the locational adjustments
- Refining the value adjustments for things like quality, condition and other attributes.


Charts & Maps

This first chart shows the number of sales per year in two groups- market sales and market sales for which we know the sales price. You can see that the sales volume held steady through 2020 in spite of the pandemic.




The next chart (below) shows the change in total assessed values by classification over the past 8 years. It includes both new construction and market trend increases. You can see that the residential assessed values have been increased each year while the land assessments and commercial assessments have remained flat. Economic data from the same time period would suggest that over the past 8 years the actual market value of residential property, land and commercial property have all actually increased.





This chart shows the ratios based on Assessment Year 2020 (Starting Ratio) and the results of our adjustments for the Assessment Year 2021 (Ending Ratio). Note that the adjustments we made brought the commercial valuations closer to, but not up to, the residential assessment level. Still lagging far behind is commercial land valuations.


The following map shows Market Areas (Neighborhoods) utilized in the Assessment process. Market Areas are one of the adjusting factors.



Market Areas - Borough Wide

The next chart is from the JEDC Economic Indicators Report 2020 and shows the growth in sales over the past 10 years.

Figure 52: Business Sales in Juneau by Business Category (in Millions), 2010– 2019 (Preliminary)



Source: City & Borough of Juneau Sales Tax Office and CBJ Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, July 1, 2018– June 30, 2019, Statistical Section. **Note:** "Other" category includes mineral sales, wholesale equipment, food suppliers, and fuel companies.

Next we have a summary report of the analysis. The first Summary shows the data for commercial properties prior to this years adjustments and the second summary report shows the data after the corrections that were applied this year.

**AY2021- Comm- Set 2- 20210316- No19- All, 5 Yr, 5% Trend
Summary Report**

Statistics

Current

54	Count	(Number of Records with Ratio)
0.1959	Minimum Ratio	
1.1908	Maximum Ratio	
0.9950	Range	
0.6879	Mean	(This is the average ratio for your sample.)
0.7286	Median	(This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)
0.5418	Weighted Mean	
2.3448	Sum of the Square of Deviations	
0.1720	AAD	
0.2103	Standard Deviation	
23.6036	COD	(Good indicator of confidence level.)
30.5772	COV	
1.2696	PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential	
		(PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO)
		(PRD over 1=Regressive)

IAAO Standards for COD

SFR	15.0 or less
SFR-newer/homog	10.0 or less
Income Properties	20.0 or less
Income-Urban area	15.0 or less
Vacant Land	20.0 or less

Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)



Kurtosis	-0.3111
Skewness	-0.2814
Alt.Cyhelsky's Skew	-0.1481
Alt.Pearson's Skew	-0.5808

Trending Factors


0.98 Target Level
1.4246 Factor on Mean
1.3450 Factor on Median
1.8087 Factor on Weighted Mean

Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation

0.0407 Differential Mean to Median
23 Number of data points below the mean.
31 Number of data points above the mean.
*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts.



Histogram of Ratio Frequency



AY2021- Comm- Set 2 Updated AVs Live1- 20210316- No 19- All, 5 Yr, 5% Trend **Summary Report**

Statistics

Current

53	Count	(Number of Records with Ratio)
0.2932	Minimum Ratio	
1.4091	Maximum Ratio	
1.1159	Range	
0.8526	Mean	(This is the average ratio for your sample.)
0.8853	Median	(This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)
0.6981	Weighted Mean	
3.0313	Sum of the Square of Deviations	
0.1908	AAD	
0.2414	Standard Deviation	
21.5490	COD	(Good indicator of confidence level.)
28.3180	COV	
1.2214	PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential	
		(PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO)
		(PRD over 1=Regressive)

IAAO Standards for COD

SFR	15.0 or less
SFR-newer/homog	10.0 or less
Income Properties	20.0 or less
Income-Urban area	15.0 or less
Vacant Land	20.0 or less

Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)



Kurtosis	-0.0245
Skewness	0.0181
Alt.Cyhelsky's Skew	-0.0943
Alt.Pearson's Skew	-0.4059

Trending Factors


0.85	Target Level
0.9969	Factor on Mean
0.9601	Factor on Median
1.2176	Factor on Weighted Mean


Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation

0.0327	Differential Mean to Median
24	Number of data points below the mean.
29	Number of data points above the mean.
*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts.	



Histogram of Ratio Frequency





Assessor's Database

Current Owner

THE SPEAR/KIRKNESS FAMILY TRUST
PO BOX 21861, JUNEAU AK 99802

Parcel #: 1C070A050001

([Map](#))

Address: 230 SEWARD ST

Prev. Owner: BERNARD F
WOSTMANN

Use Code: Commercial
Misc

Site Value: \$5000.00

Exempt: No Data

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

CONDO

Legal Desc. 1: SOMMERS
ON SEWARD
CONDOMINIUMS UNIT 1

Building PV: \$222200.00

Zoning: -Mixed Use-
Residential and
Commercial -5,000 sq.ft.
minimum lot size -60
units per acre

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$227200.00


Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft

Last Trans: 20201209

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

FAMILY PROMISE OF JUNEAU

2221 JORDAN CREEK AVE UNIT 7E, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B15011107E0

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: ALASKA

BELL LLC

Use Code: Commercial

Office

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 2221 JORDAN

AVE

Site Value: \$0.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1983

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: JORDAN

CREEK UNIT 7E

Building PV: \$234498.00

Zoning: Light

Commercial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$234498.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 001254
sqft


Last Trans: 20201207

Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

JEFF CARPENTER & GINA CARPENTER
44818 FROG LEAP ST, TEMECULA CA 92592

Parcel #: 4B1701090218
([Map](#))

Address: 10011 CRAZY
HORSE DR

Legal Desc. 1: SAFE
HARBOR CONDO UNIT
A18

Legal Desc. 2:

Prev. Owner: DARRELL C
BAKER

Site Value: \$5000.00

Building PV: \$140000.00

Total PV: \$145000.00

Use Code: Industrial
No. of Units: 000

Exempt: No Data
Year Built: 2010

Zoning: Industrial

Tax Year: 2021
Gross Liv. Area: 000951
sqft

Garage: No
City Water: Yes
Exempt Land: 0

Garage Area: 000000
City Sewer: Yes
Exempt Building: 0

Lot Size: 0.00


Exempt Total: 0

Last Trans: 20201204
Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

SETH M KOCH

PO BOX 33515, JUNEAU AK 99803

Parcel #: 5B1201060260

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: JAMES

GEORGE WILLIAM

Use Code: Commercial

Office

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: No

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 5719

CONCRETE WAY

Site Value: \$75300.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 2006

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: No

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: SEAGULLS

EDGE UNIT 1

Building PV: \$199000.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 4300.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$274300.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft


Last Trans: 20201123

Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

ALASKA ON POINT PROPERTIES LLC
PO BOX 240122, DOUGLAS AK 99824

Parcel #: 4B1701020020

[\(Map\)](#)

Prev. Owner: VILL

IRREVOCABLE TRU

Use Code: Commercial

Misc

No. of Units: 001

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 10011 GLACIER

HWY

Site Value: \$223500.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1976

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: USS 1041

LT 2

Building PV: \$304200.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 17534.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$527700.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 004160
sqft


Last Trans: 20201117

Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

AWARE INC

PO BOX 20809, JUNEAU AK 99802

Parcel #: 1D060L030011

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: W&B

RENTALS LLC

Use Code: Commercial

Misc

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 201 CORDOVA

ST

Site Value: \$169800.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1962

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: WEST

JUNEAU BL H LT 1A

Building PV: \$147400.00

Zoning: -Multi-Family-
5,000 sq.ft. minimum lot
size -18 units per acre

Lot Size: 9435.10

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$317200.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft


Last Trans: 20201113

Road/No Road: Roaded

RESIDENTIAL
IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

GOLD LODGE LLC

PO BOX 34033, JUNEAU AK 99803

Parcel #: 1C060K660110

([Map](#))

Address: 711 W

WILLOUGHBY AVE

Legal Desc. 1:

TIDELANDS ADDITION BL

66 LT 21

Legal Desc. 2:

Prev. Owner: CAPITOL

BUILDERS INC

Site Value: \$633750.00

Building PV: \$760400.00

Total PV: \$1394150.00

Use Code: Apartment

No. of Units: 027

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1960

Zoning: ONA

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 010752
sqft

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Lot Size: 12802.00

Exempt Total: 0


Last Trans: 20201030

Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

*SPECIAL PURPOSE
CRUISE DOCK*

NCL (BAHAMAS) LTD

7665 CORPORATE CENTER DR, MIAMI FL 33126

Parcel #: 1C060K010031

(Map)

Prev. Owner: ALASKA

MENTAL HEALTH

Use Code: Commercial

Misc

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 0 EGAN DR

Site Value: \$7524300.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: JUNEAU

SUPPORT LT C1

Building PV: \$0.00

Zoning: ONA

Lot Size: 125406.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$7524300.00

Tax Year: 2021


Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft

Last Trans: 20201009

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF TLINGIT & HAIDA INDIAN TRIBES OF
ALASKA

9097 GLACIER HWY, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B1201060160

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: BONNELL

DEVELOPMENT

Use Code: Vacant

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 5740

CONCRETE WAY

Site Value: \$349050.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: JRM LT 10

Building PV: \$2800.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 25718.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$351850.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft


Last Trans: 20200924

Road/No Road: Roaded

NGO
STIMULUS FUNDED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

MICHAEL HULL & ANGELA HULL
PO BOX 34362, JUNEAU AK 99803

Parcel #: 5B1201300110

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: BONNELL
DEVELOPMENT

Use Code: Vacant

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 1783 ANKA ST

Site Value: \$269550.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: GLACIER

INDUSTRIAL LT 11

Building PV: \$0.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 14974.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$269550.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft


Last Trans: 20200924

Road/No Road: Roaded

VACANT

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

VICTOR HUGO MIRAMONTES & TENAYA NICOLE
MIRAMONTES

1880 CREST ST UNIT 112, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B1501010001

Address: 1880 CREST ST

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: HAL R

Site Value: \$131250.00

DAUGHERTY

Use Code: Commercial

Exempt: No Data

Misc

No. of Units: 001

Year Built: 2013

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: BUILDERS

PLAZA II BL J LT 3B UNIT

114

Building PV: \$164600.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 6632.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$295850.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft


Last Trans: 20210224

Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

0 JACOBSON DRIVE JUNEAU LLC
PO BOX 3996, SEATTLE WA 98124

Parcel #: 1C110K150041

([Map](#))

Address: 0 MILL ST

Prev. Owner: ALASKA
MARINE LINES

Use Code: Vacant

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Site Value: \$596550.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

*RELATED
PARTY*

Legal Desc. 1: USMS 642

ALASKA JUNEAU V BL A

LT 4A

Building PV: \$0.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 43308.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$596550.00

Tax Year: 2021


Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft

Last Trans: 20091207

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

EASTAUGH WAY LLC

PO BOX 240005, DOUGLAS AK 99824

Parcel #: 1C110K120051

(Map)

Prev. Owner: JMIS LLC

Use Code: Vacant

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 0 EASTAUGH
WAY

Site Value: \$501300.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: ALASKA
JUNEAU IV-II BL B LT 5A

Building PV: \$0.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 27854.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$501300.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft


Last Trans: 20200310

Road/No Road: Roaded

VACANT

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

VACANT

R & L LEASING INC

PO BOX 32838, JUNEAU AK 99803

Parcel #: 4B1701090056

[\(Map\)](#)

Address: 10009 CRAZY

HORSE DR

Legal Desc. 1:

MENDENHALL VALLEY
INDUSTRIAL PARK 4 LT 3A

Legal Desc. 2:

Prev. Owner: ALASKA
STRIPING & PA

Site Value: \$961350.00

Building PV: \$0.00

Total PV: \$961350.00

Use Code: Industrial

Exempt: No Data

Zoning: Industrial

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 000

Year Built: 1983

Gross Liv. Area: 000816
sqft

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

Lot Size: 195024.00

Last Trans: 20200228

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Total: 0


Road/No Road: Roaded

Exempt Land: 0

Exempt Building: 0

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



DUPLICATE
VACANT

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

MICHAEL HULL & ANGELA HULL
PO BOX 34362, JUNEAU AK 99803

Parcel #: 5B1201300110

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: BONNELL
DEVELOPMENT

Use Code: Vacant

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 1783 ANKA ST

Site Value: \$269550.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: GLACIER

INDUSTRIAL LT 11

Building PV: \$0.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 14974.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$269550.00

Tax Year: 2021


Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft

Last Trans: 20200924

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

BONNELL DEVELOPMENT LLC
PO BOX 21795, JUNEAU AK 99802

Parcel #: 1C110K120130

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: JMIS LLC

Use Code: Commercial

Misc

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 190 MILL ST

Site Value: \$237150.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

VACANT

Legal Desc. 1: ALASKA

JUNEAU V BL B LT 13

Building PV: \$327500.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 17219.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$564650.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000


sqft

Last Trans: 20191025

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

PETRO 49 INC

1813 E 1ST AVE, ANCHORAGE AK 99501

Parcel #: 5B1201000060

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: HPH

HOLDINGS LLC

Use Code: Commercial

Misc

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 5245 GLACIER

HWY

Site Value: \$1849500.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: MIDWAY

TR C

Building PV: \$248614.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 82215.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$2098114.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft

Last Trans: 20191004

Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

Bob Spitzfaden

From: Teresa Bowen <Teresa.Bowen@juneau.org>
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2021 4:36 PM
To: 'Bob Spitzfaden'
Subject: RE: Check-in and update
Attachments: Review of 74 Sales provided by Ken Williamson.pdf

Happy Friday.

As mentioned below, an appellant (who we have since learned may be associated with your group) submitted this list of properties to the Assessor earlier this week, requesting to know which sales were qualified for the ratio study and which were excluded- including the reason for the exclusion. The Assessor sent this back to the Appellant today. This is just additional information for your review.

Teresa Bowen
Assistant Attorney
City and Borough of Juneau Law Department
155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801
Phone: (907)586-5242, ext. 4110

From: Teresa Bowen
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2021 5:15 PM
To: 'Bob Spitzfaden' <spitz@gci.net>
Subject: Check-in and update

Good afternoon, Mr. Spitzfaden.

Following our call on Friday, I talked to the CBJ Assessor and walked through the requirements for confidentiality under CBJ 15.05.105. Your comments regarding our ability to share data that was independently verified through sources other than buyer disclosures is well taken and we agree with that position. The Assessor spent this week going through the records on the sales used for the ratio study and was able to determine that more than half of the sales were verified through independent sources. I'm attaching that list here.

The list has several components. There is some data you've always had: sale date, parcel ID, and street #. This data is always publicly verifiable through recorded deed. However- the second column is sales price as of the date of sale. You will notice there are still some confidential lines- those are the sales where the only source of information was determined to be buyer disclosure.

The third column is the trended sales price. This is explained in FN 8. In essence, when creating a ratio study, the sales price provided in the past is trended to reflect increase in property values.

Finally- there is a AV Total column- which is the assessed value of that property during 2021.

The list is a living document- and it will change over time as sales are qualified or rejected as market sales. As noted in Footnote 3, at least one sale has since been determined as not qualified.

There is also a note on Footnote 3 stating there was a change in directive from the law department that allowed us to add some sales price. This reflects a conversation I had with the Assessor yesterday, further advising them that any buyer who filed an appeal has waived confidentiality to their disclosed sales price and providing for more disclosure of sales prices verified outside the buyer disclosure process.

In addition to the sales list, a separate appellant unassociated with your group submitted a list of properties to the Assessor earlier this week and asked the Assessor to address if the sales were included in the ratio study and the reason

for each. We are working on finalizing that response and will provide it to you when it's complete- but most of the information provided is in the above attachment.

Finally- moving back to the methodology hearing, I've updated the stipulation submitted last month. I know there were a lot of outstanding questions. I made a few changes- specifically acknowledging that this hearing is only about methodology and individual taxpayers may still have issues with individual aspects of their assessment beyond the methodology question, added some time (I think you suggested 3 hours- but maybe that was just your side? Most of our hearings last 2-3 hours), and amended the methodology question to better reflect your suggestion.

I know you asked about placing witnesses under oath. I won't stipulate to that because it has not been part of the BOE process. You may ask the BOE for that, but these are not formal court trials and it hasn't been our practice.

We can of course cross-examine witnesses as well.

Only other thing was dates. I talked to the Clerks about the latter half of October. The current preference appears to be the week of October 18-22 if that works for you- simply because Clerks staff will be back from Anchorage (following the by-mail election) and there will not be any Assembly meetings- which will occur the week after. We can still work on dates if that doesn't work for you, but that is the best available date range that we have right now.

As always- sorry for the lengthy email.

Teresa Bowen
Assistant Attorney
City and Borough of Juneau Law Department
155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801
Phone: (907)586-5242, ext. 4110

For Audit/Review Purposes Only

This is a summary of a review of a list of sales provided by appellant Ken Williamson.

This summary reviews whether or not these sales were included as a qualified market sale in the AY2021 Analysis.

In cases where the sale was excluded the reason is indicated.

sale date	parcel number	address	Inclusion/Exclusion	Reason
9/7/2017	1C020K01E220	Aurora Harbor	not included	boat house- Question on price & what sold
9/7/2017	1C020K01E230	Aurora Harbor	not included	boat house- Question on price & what sold
6/23/2020	1C020K01E300	1435 Harbor Way	not included	boat house; excluded as an outlier
7/25/2018	1C020K01G200	1435 HARBOR WAY	Included In Separate Study	boat house
6/28/2019	1C020K01G280	1435 HARBOR WAY	Included In Separate Study	boat house
2/28/2019	1C020K01G290	1435 HARBOR WAY	Included In Separate Study	boat house
1/30/2017	1c030c280080	712 W 12th	not included	questionable data source sp and mtg same
9/23/2016	1C060C000080	3610 Diston	not included	questionable data source reonomy?
10/9/2020	1C060K010031	0 EGAN DR	Included	
10/30/2020	1C060K660110	711 W WILLOUGHBY AVE	Included	
12/15/2016	1C060U040040	800 GLACIER AVE	Included	
7/20/2018	1C060U050022	1108 F ST	not included	multi parcel sale/ not contiguous/ multiple sale price references
3/30/2016	1C070A030040	100 N FRANKLIN ST	Included	
12/9/2020	1C070A050001	230 SEWARD ST	Included	
11/2/2018	1C070B0J0020	195 S FRANKLIN ST	Included	
7/1/2019	1C070B0N0011	259 S FRANKLIN ST	Included	
12/31/2019	1c070k810090	170 S Franklin	not included	multi parcel sale outside of standards for inclusion
1/9/2018	1C100I070050	549 S Franklin	not included	multi parcel sale/ not enough data/ easement questions
3/10/2020	1C110K120051	0 Eastaugh W ay	Included	
3/16/2017	1C110K120101	170 MILL ST	Included	
10/2/2019	1C110K120120	0 MILL ST	Included	
10/25/2019	1C110K120130	190 MILL ST	Included	
3/10/2020	1C110K120140	0 MILL ST	Included	
4/1/2019	1C110K120150	0 MILL ST	Included	
11/13/2020	1D060L030011	201 CORDOVA ST	Included	
10/12/2017	3B1501020030	1669 CREST ST	Included	
11/30/2018	3B1501040120	1544 CREST ST	Included	
9/19/2017	4B1601010040	2450 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	
6/13/2017	4B1601050030	2274 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	
7/30/2019	4B1601050160	2276 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	

Bob Spitzfaden

From: Teresa Bowen <Teresa.Bowen@juneau.org>
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2021 4:36 PM
To: 'Bob Spitzfaden'
Subject: RE: Check-in and update
Attachments: Review of 74 Sales provided by Ken Williamson.pdf

Happy Friday.

As mentioned below, an appellant (who we have since learned may be associated with your group) submitted this list of properties to the Assessor earlier this week, requesting to know which sales were qualified for the ratio study and which were excluded- including the reason for the exclusion. The Assessor sent this back to the Appellant today. This is just additional information for your review.

Teresa Bowen
Assistant Attorney
City and Borough of Juneau Law Department
155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801
Phone: (907)586-5242, ext. 4110

From: Teresa Bowen
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2021 5:15 PM
To: 'Bob Spitzfaden' <spitz@gci.net>
Subject: Check-in and update

Good afternoon, Mr. Spitzfaden.

Following our call on Friday, I talked to the CBJ Assessor and walked through the requirements for confidentiality under CBJ 15.05.105. Your comments regarding our ability to share data that was independently verified through sources other than buyer disclosures is well taken and we agree with that position. The Assessor spent this week going through the records on the sales used for the ratio study and was able to determine that more than half of the sales were verified through independent sources. I'm attaching that list here.

The list has several components. There is some data you've always had: sale date, parcel ID, and street #. This data is always publicly verifiable through recorded deed. However- the second column is sales price as of the date of sale. You will notice there are still some confidential lines- those are the sales where the only source of information was determined to be buyer disclosure.

The third column is the trended sales price. This is explained in FN 8. In essence, when creating a ratio study, the sales price provided in the past is trended to reflect increase in property values.

Finally- there is a AV Total column- which is the assessed value of that property during 2021.

The list is a living document- and it will change over time as sales are qualified or rejected as market sales. As noted in Footnote 3, at least one sale has since been determined as not qualified.

There is also a note on Footnote 3 stating there was a change in directive from the law department that allowed us to add some sales price. This reflects a conversation I had with the Assessor yesterday, further advising them that any buyer who filed an appeal has waived confidentiality to their disclosed sales price and providing for more disclosure of sales prices verified outside the buyer disclosure process.

In addition to the sales list, a separate appellant unassociated with your group submitted a list of properties to the Assessor earlier this week and asked the Assessor to address if the sales were included in the ratio study and the reason

for each. We are working on finalizing that response and will provide it to you when it's complete- but most of the information provided is in the above attachment.

Finally- moving back to the methodology hearing, I've updated the stipulation submitted last month. I know there were a lot of outstanding questions. I made a few changes- specifically acknowledging that this hearing is only about methodology and individual taxpayers may still have issues with individual aspects of their assessment beyond the methodology question, added some time (I think you suggested 3 hours- but maybe that was just your side? Most of our hearings last 2-3 hours), and amended the methodology question to better reflect your suggestion.

I know you asked about placing witnesses under oath. I won't stipulate to that because it has not been part of the BOE process. You may ask the BOE for that, but these are not formal court trials and it hasn't been our practice.

We can of course cross-examine witnesses as well.

Only other thing was dates. I talked to the Clerks about the latter half of October. The current preference appears to be the week of October 18-22 if that works for you- simply because Clerks staff will be back from Anchorage (following the by-mail election) and there will not be any Assembly meetings- which will occur the week after. We can still work on dates if that doesn't work for you, but that is the best available date range that we have right now.

As always- sorry for the lengthy email.

Teresa Bowen
Assistant Attorney
City and Borough of Juneau Law Department
155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801
Phone: (907)586-5242, ext. 4110

For Audit/Review Purposes Only

This is a summary of a review of a list of sales provided by appellant Ken Williamson.

This summary reviews whether or not these sales were included as a qualified market sale in the AY2021 Analysis.

In cases where the sale was excluded the reason is indicated.

sale date	parcel number	address	Inclusion/Exclusion	Reason
9/7/2017	1C020K01E220	Aurora Harbor	not included	boat house- Question on price & what sold
9/7/2017	1C020K01E230	Aurora Harbor	not included	boat house- Question on price & what sold
6/23/2020	1C020K01E300	1435 Harbor Way	not included	boat house; excluded as an outlier
7/25/2018	1C020K01G200	1435 HARBOR WAY	Included In Separate Study	boat house
6/28/2019	1C020K01G280	1435 HARBOR WAY	Included In Separate Study	boat house
2/28/2019	1C020K01G290	1435 HARBOR WAY	Included In Separate Study	boat house
1/30/2017	1c030c280080	712 W 12th	not included	questionable data source sp and mtg same
9/23/2016	1C060C000080	3610 Diston	not included	questionable data source reonomy?
10/9/2020	1C060K010031	0 EGAN DR	Included	
10/30/2020	1C060K660110	711 W WILLOUGHBY AVE	Included	
12/15/2016	1C060U040040	800 GLACIER AVE	Included	
7/20/2018	1C060U050022	1108 F ST	not included	multi parcel sale/ not contiguous/ multiple sale price references
3/30/2016	1C070A030040	100 N FRANKLIN ST	Included	
12/9/2020	1C070A050001	230 SEWARD ST	Included	
11/2/2018	1C070B0J0020	195 S FRANKLIN ST	Included	
7/1/2019	1C070B0N0011	259 S FRANKLIN ST	Included	
12/31/2019	1c070k810090	170 S Franklin	not included	multi parcel sale outside of standards for inclusion
1/9/2018	1C100I070050	549 S Franklin	not included	multi parcel sale/ not enough data/ easement questions
3/10/2020	1C110K120051	0 Eastaugh W ay	Included	
3/16/2017	1C110K120101	170 MILL ST	Included	
10/2/2019	1C110K120120	0 MILL ST	Included	
10/25/2019	1C110K120130	190 MILL ST	Included	
3/10/2020	1C110K120140	0 MILL ST	Included	
4/1/2019	1C110K120150	0 MILL ST	Included	
11/13/2020	1D060L030011	201 CORDOVA ST	Included	
10/12/2017	3B1501020030	1669 CREST ST	Included	
11/30/2018	3B1501040120	1544 CREST ST	Included	
9/19/2017	4B1601010040	2450 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	
6/13/2017	4B1601050030	2274 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	
7/30/2019	4B1601050160	2276 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	

3/5/2018	4B1601080070	2278 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	
10/29/2018	4B1601090040	Crazy Horse	not included	multi parcel sale/ condo units and land portions
7/31/2017	4B1601120130	2270 BRANDY LN	Included	
11/17/2020	4B1701020020	10011 GLACIER HWY	Included	
2/23/2020	4B1701080020	10012 Crazy Horse	not included	personal property included in sale price; adjustment not determined
2/28/2020	4B1701090056	10009 CRAZY HORSE DR	Included	
12/4/2020	4B1701090218	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	Included	
2/14/2017	4B1701090223	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	Included	
4/24/2017	4B1701090226	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	Included	
1/10/2017	4B1701090228	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	Included	
6/30/2016	4B1701100146	2789 SHERWOOD LN	Included	
3/1/2016	4B1701100170	10221 GLACIER HWY	Included	
9/20/2017	4B1701103003	2769 SHERWOOD LN	Included	
12/31/2019	4b1701104000	2771 Sherwood ln	not included	personal property included in sale price; adjustment not determined
3/26/2019	4b2801050030	3845 Lee Court	not included	vacant land sale in a residential neighborhood, considered to not be commerical land.
6/29/2018	4B2901020010	10200 MENDENHALL RD	Included	
10/4/2019	5B1201000060	5245 GLACIER HWY	Included	
9/3/2019	5b1201010010	1610 Anka	not included	multi parcel sale, not enough info
8/2/2019	5B1201020100	5452 SHAUNE DR	Included	
4/5/2017	5B1201040052	1721 ANKA ST	Included	
8/2/2016	5B1201060061	5631 GLACIER HWY	Included	
1/18/2017	5b1201060140	5720 Concrete Way	not included	Sale price was in question. Further review identified the correct sales price. The sale will be included in the 2022 analysis with the corrected sale price.
9/24/2020	5B1201060160	5740 CONCRETE WAY	Included	
11/23/2020	5B1201060260	5719 CONCRETE WAY	Included	
9/24/2020	5B1201300110	1783 Anka St	Included	
12/24/2019	5B1201300110	1783 Anka St	Included	
7/21/2017	5B1201330160	2005 ANKA ST	Included	
1/29/2018	5B1201450050	5410 Bent Ct	not included	personal property included in sale price; adjustment not determined; questionable data source
6/3/2016	5B1201450110	1731 RALPH'S W AY	Included	
6/15/2016	5B1501000002	8251 GLACIER HWY	Included	
8/7/2020	5B1501010001	1880 CREST ST	Included	

9/2/2016	5B1501020170	8401 AIRPORT BLVD	Included	
11/16/2018	5B1501040030	8825 MALLARD ST	Included	
12/7/2020	5B15011107E0	2221 JORDAN AVE	Included	
2/10/2016	5B15011107EO	2221 Jordan	Included	
12/22/2017	5B15011109B0	2231 JORDAN AVE	Included	
2/15/2018	5B1601000023	9151 GLACIER HWY	Included	
7/16/2019	5B1601140043	9309 GLACIER HWY	Included	
8/21/2018	5B1601140070	9309 GLACIER HWY	Included	
8/10/2016	5b160144000	3039 Clinton	not included	questionable data source/ reonomy/ Low income senior housing
1/4/2019	5B2401610150	4045 DELTA DR	Included	
1/27/2017	6D0701000020	4755 N Douglas Hiway	not included	not enough info
4/11/2017	7B0901030071	3161 CHANNEL DR	Included	
12/30/2016	7B0901040070	1050 Salmon Creek In	not included	questionable data source/ "allocated sale price" noted but meaning of the note was unknown/ low income housing

Bob Spitzfaden

From: Teresa Bowen <Teresa.Bowen@juneau.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 23, 2021 5:15 PM
To: 'Bob Spitzfaden'
Subject: Check-in and update
Attachments: AY2021- Com Sales List 20210923a.pdf; 2021_09_23 Stipulation (UPDATED).docx

Good afternoon, Mr. Spitzfaden.

Following our call on Friday, I talked to the CBJ Assessor and walked through the requirements for confidentiality under CBJ 15.05.105. Your comments regarding our ability to share data that was independently verified through sources other than buyer disclosures is well taken and we agree with that position. The Assessor spent this week going through the records on the sales used for the ratio study and was able to determine that more than half of the sales were verified through independent sources. I'm attaching that list here.

The list has several components. There is some data you've always had: sale date, parcel ID, and street #. This data is always publicly verifiable through recorded deed. However- the second column is sales price as of the date of sale. You will notice there are still some confidential lines- those are the sales where the only source of information was determined to be buyer disclosure.

The third column is the trended sales price. This is explained in FN 8. In essence, when creating a ratio study, the sales price provided in the past is trended to reflect increase in property values.

Finally- there is a AV Total column- which is the assessed value of that property during 2021.

The list is a living document- and it will change over time as sales are qualified or rejected as market sales. As noted in Footnote 3, at least one sale has since been determined as not qualified.

There is also a note on Footnote 3 stating there was a change in directive from the law department that allowed us to add some sales price. This reflects a conversation I had with the Assessor yesterday, further advising them that any buyer who filed an appeal has waived confidentiality to their disclosed sales price and providing for more disclosure of sales prices verified outside the buyer disclosure process.

In addition to the sales list, a separate appellant unassociated with your group submitted a list of properties to the Assessor earlier this week and asked the Assessor to address if the sales were included in the ratio study and the reason for each. We are working on finalizing that response and will provide it to you when it's complete- but most of the information provided is in the above attachment.

Finally- moving back to the methodology hearing, I've updated the stipulation submitted last month. I know there were a lot of outstanding questions. I made a few changes- specifically acknowledging that this hearing is only about methodology and individual taxpayers may still have issues with individual aspects of their assessment beyond the methodology question, added some time (I think you suggested 3 hours- but maybe that was just your side? Most of our hearings last 2-3 hours), and amended the methodology question to better reflect your suggestion.

I know you asked about placing witnesses under oath. I won't stipulate to that because it has not been part of the BOE process. You may ask the BOE for that, but these are not formal court trials and it hasn't been our practice.

We can of course cross-examine witnesses as well.

Only other thing was dates. I talked to the Clerks about the latter half of October. The current preference appears to be the week of October 18-22 if that works for you- simply because Clerks staff will be back from Anchorage (following the

by-mail election) and there will not be any Assembly meetings- which will occur the week after. We can still work on dates if that doesn't work for you, but that is the best available date range that we have right now.

As always- sorry for the lengthy email.

Teresa Bowen
Assistant Attorney
City and Borough of Juneau Law Department
155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801
Phone: (907)586-5242, ext. 4110

Sale Date	Sale Price	Trended SP	AVTotal	Main Parcel	Count	Number Street	Neighborhood
07/25/18	confidential	confidential	27,200	1C020K01G200	1	1435 HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
06/28/19	confidential	confidential	27,200	1C020K01G280	1	1435 HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
02/28/19	confidential	confidential	27,200	1C020K01G290	1	1435 HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
10/09/20	20,000,000	20,235,200	7,524,300	1C060K010031	1	0 EGAN DR	DOWNTOWN C
10/30/20	1,400,000	1,412,348	1,394,150	1C060K660110	1	711 W WILLOUGHBY AVE	DOWNTOWN C
12/15/16	1,100,000	1,327,612	1,457,000	1C060U040040	1	800 GLACIER AVE	DOWNTOWN C
03/30/16	550,000	683,826	963,600	1C070A030040	1	100 N FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
12/09/20	confidential	confidential	190,200	1C070A050001	1	230 SEWARD ST	SOMMERS ON SEWARD_C_24
11/02/18	510,600	567,144	682,450	1C070B0J0020	1	195 S FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
07/01/19	2,200,000	2,369,400	2,164,900	1C070B0N0011	1	259 S FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
03/10/20	612,788	638,268	501,300	1C110K120051	1	0 Eastaugh Way	DOWNTOWN C
03/16/17	716,000	855,033	613,650	1C110K120101	1	170 MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
10/02/19	378,818	403,055	237,150	1C110K120120	1	0 MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
10/25/19	confidential	confidential	237,150	1C110K120130	1	190 MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
03/10/20	378,818	394,569	237,150	1C110K120140	1	0 MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
04/01/19	597,938	651,597	374,400	1C110K120150	1	0 MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
11/13/20	confidential	confidential	445,400	1D060L030011	2	201 CORDOVA ST	WEST JUNEAU C
10/12/17	confidential	confidential	41,200	3B1501020030	1	1669 CREST ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/30/18	168,750	186,776	164,000	3B1501040120	1	1544 CREST ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
09/19/17	750,000	876,000	823,100	4B1601010040	1	2450 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	MENDE PENINSULA C
06/13/17	104,000	122,899	108,800	4B1601050030	1	2274 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
07/30/19	confidential	confidential	83,000	4B1601050160	1	2276 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
03/05/18	73,000	83,557	35,000	4B1601080070	1	2278 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	P & J BUSINESS C 24
07/31/17	112,500	132,188	119,000	4B1601120130	1	2270 BRANDY LN	BRANDY LANE YACHT C 24
11/17/20	confidential	confidential	527,700	4B1701020020	1	10011 GLACIER HWY	MENDE PENINSULA C
02/28/20	confidential	confidential	961,350	4B1701090056	1	10009 CRAZY HORSE DR	MENDE PENINSULA C
12/04/20	confidential	confidential	145,000	4B1701090218	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
02/14/17	confidential	confidential	172,300	4B1701090223	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
04/24/17	130,000	154,534	149,800	4B1701090226	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
01/10/17	confidential	confidential	172,300	4B1701090228	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
06/30/16	501,624	617,218	361,800	4B1701100146	1	2789 SHERWOOD LN	MENDE PENINSULA C
03/01/16	confidential	confidential	813,000	4B1701100170	1	10221 GLACIER HWY	MENDE PENINSULA C
09/20/17	400,000	467,144	336,200	4B1701103003	1	2769 SHERWOOD LN	BEAR DEN YACHT CONDO C 24
06/29/18	950,000	1,071,961	1,045,750	4B2901020010	1	10200 MENDENHALL LOOI	AUKE MOUNTAIN C
10/04/19	2,205,832	2,346,343	1,849,500	5B1201000060	1	5245 GLACIER HWY	LEMON CREEK C
08/02/19	500,000	536,260	746,600	5B1201020100	1	5452 SHAUNE DR	LEMON CREEK C
04/05/17	4,140,000	4,932,313	5,106,550	5B1201040052	2	1721 ANKA ST	LEMON CREEK C
08/02/16	500,000	612,910	704,850	5B1201060061	2	5631 GLACIER HWY	LEMON CREEK C
09/24/20	2,450,000	2,483,957	1,554,550	5B1201060160	2	5740 CONCRETE WAY	LEMON CREEK C
11/23/20	confidential	confidential	274,300	5B1201060260	1	5719 CONCRETE WAY	SEAGULLS EDGE C 24
09/24/20	300,000	304,158	269,550	5B1201300110	1	1783 Anka St	LEMON CREEK C
12/24/19	confidential	confidential	269,550	5B1201300110	1	1783 Anka St	LEMON CREEK C
07/21/17	900,000	1,058,760	632,250	5B1201330160	3	2005 ANKA ST	LEMON CREEK C
06/03/16	1,060,000	1,308,273	1,036,450	5B1201450110	1	1731 RALPH'S WAY	LEMON CREEK C
06/15/16	confidential	confidential	593,500	5B1501000002	1	8251 GLACIER HWY	SOUTHEAST INSURANCE C 24
08/07/20	700,000	714,406	591,700	5B1501010001	2	1880 CREST ST	BUILDERS PLAZA C 24
09/02/16	1,300,000	1,587,924	1,183,050	5B1501020170	1	8401 AIRPORT BLVD	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/16/18	750,000	831,585	837,600	5B1501040030	1	8825 MALLARD ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
12/07/20	confidential	confidential	234,498	5B15011107E0	1	2221 JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24
02/10/16	273,000	341,299	234,498	5B15011107E0	1	2221 JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24
12/22/17	300,000	346,452	230,384	5B15011109B0	1	2231 JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24
02/15/18	968,750	1,111,292	851,400	5B1601000023	1	9151 GLACIER HWY	SOUTH VALLEY C
07/16/19	145,000	155,861	169,350	5B1601140043	1	9309 GLACIER HWY	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
08/21/18	confidential	confidential	308,850	5B1601140070	1	9309 GLACIER HWY	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
01/04/19	672,000	740,490	521,900	5B2401610150	1	4045 DELTA DR	NORTHEAST VALLEY C
04/11/17	confidential	confidential	1,877,700	7B0901030071	1	3161 CHANNEL DR	TWIN LAKES C

- (1) These were the sales available to us for our market analysis for assessment year 2021.
- (2) Some sales prices are confidential, specifically when the only sale source is the buyer.
- (3) Note that this list was updated 08/24/21 to add AV. The original list was 57 sales, however, through the analysis process one sale, 1C060U050022, was eliminated. It was further updated 09/23/21 when a change in directive from the law department allowed us to add some sales prices.
- (4) AV Adj for condition at time of sale - 1C060U040040, 1C070A030040, 4B1701100170, 1C110K120130, 1C110K120101, 4B1701100146, 5B1201060160, 5B1201000060, 7B0901030071
- (5) 5B1201020100 is included on this list, however, it has since been determined not to be a market sale; seller & buyer related. Removal of this sale would further lower the mean and median ratios.
- (6) Note- multi-parcel sales are normally considered non-market, however, with commercial sales they are sometimes included as an economic unit.
- (7) Note that the sale price used in the original study for 5B1201040052, which included 5B1201040051, was \$3,726,000 which was reported by the buyer, however, subsequent information showed the sale price to be \$4,140,000 with the cash distribution reduced for the value of 12 months of continued occupancy by the seller after the execution of the sale. Also, this sale was discovered to be a non-market sale due to duress of the seller. Removal of this sale would lower the mean and median ratios
- (8) The trending applied to bring the sales to 01/01/2021 was 5% per year. The analysis indicates that a trend of 7.5% would be appropriate but to be conservative we selected 5%.

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION FOR THE
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU**

In re:
Appeal of Property Tax Assessments for the
2021 Assessment Year

**STIPULATION ON PROCEDURE FOR CERTAIN AY2021 COMMERCIAL
PROPERTY APPEALS**

In recognition of the number of appellants appealing their AY2021 commercial property assessment based on a single common issue, and in order to create a more streamlined and efficient process for the Board of Equalization (BOE), the CBJ Assessor and the Appellants listed in Section 1 below, stipulate to the following:

- 1. APPELLANTS.** The following Appellants are appealing on a single common issue, identified in Section 5 below, and are subject to this stipulation (this may only be appellants who have timely filed appeals pending before the BOE):

The Appellants may still have specific grounds related to their individual property tax assessment not resolved by the BOE's decision on the single common issue identified in Section 5 below. Those Appellants reserve their right to appeal these individual aspects to the BOE, but waive further argument on the single common issue.

- 2. DATES.** The parties propose the following dates for a consolidated argument on the single common issue regarding the AY2021 property tax appeals: October 18-22, 2021 (Date range).
- 3. RECORD.** The Assessor will prepare the record of the appeals. The record will be narrowed to information responsive to the consolidated argument presented in Section 5 below and the required assessment information under CBJ 15.05.170.

CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Attorney for CBJ Assessor

By: _____

Teresa Bowen
Alaska Bar No. 0610065
Teresa.Bowen@Juneau.org

GRUENING & SPITZFADEN APC
Attorney for Appellants

By: _____

Robert S. Spitzfaden
Alaska Bar No. 7710171
Spitz@gci.net


Robert H. Palmer III
Municipal Attorney

Teresa E. Bowen
Assistant Municipal Attorney

Sherri Layne
Assistant Municipal Attorney

Christopher L. Storz
Assistant Municipal Attorney

Adam R. Gottschalk
Assistant Municipal Attorney



Law Department City & Borough of Juneau

Debbie L. Senn
Office Manager

Audrey Dean
Litigation and Support
Assistant - Criminal

Junnie Chup
Litigation and Support
Assistant - Civil

Leah Haskell-Cummins
Litigation and Support
Assistant - Criminal

August 14, 2021

Robert S. Spitzfaden
Gruening & Spitzfaden
PO Box 332598
Juneau, AK 99083

Delivered to: SPITZ@GCI.NET

Mr. Spitzfaden,

We have reviewed your follow-up to your original letter and will respond accordingly.

1. Regarding your request for model specification and model calibration mentioned in Mr. Dahle's presentation utilized in determining the assessed value for 2021, the CBJ Assessor reiterates that all it did for this assessment year was a ratio study and trend. This does not involve specification and calibration.
2. Regarding the specific sales and sale prices input by Mr. Dahle to the CAMA system to arrive at the assessed values and date of the sales, the CBJ has already supplied the list of sales in its attachment to the letter dated August 3, 2021. For sales price, the CBJ Assembly made the decision to require such information be kept confidential when it enacted CBJ 15.05.105(c) on October 26, 2020 under CBJ ordinance 2020-47(am). There is some information that is publicly available despite the ordinance due to the recording of documents with the State of Alaska such as dates of sale, deeds of trust, and legal description of property. But information such as actual prices received in the sale that are received by the CBJ Assessors are required to be confidential under ordinance. Under CBJ 15.05.105(c), the CBJ Assessor can provide sales price to the property owner of record and authorized agents, and we may publish such sales price in an appeal related to that property. If you are the authorized agent of any property owner on our attached list of sales, we may provide you with that sales price. Your client can decide whether to allow disclosure of their property sales price to other property owners.
3. Regarding any special studies done and utilized in the commercial property assessments, the data and methodology for any special studies, the CBJ did not perform any special studies.
4. Regarding if any commercial sales which were known to the CBJ Assessor were not utilized in determining the "150% increase in commercial land values", the CBJ Assessor used all qualified sales. All sales which are known to the CBJ Assessor are considered. Only market sales with verified sale prices are utilized in normal or typical ratio studies. This was discussed in detail during Mr. Dahle's BOE presentation (starting at 1:39:20). One sale was

removed from the ratio study because the CBJ Assessor determined it did not have enough accurate information to consider it as a qualified sale. There were three boathouses that were considered and analyzed separately from other commercial property sales.

To clarify, there was not a 150% increase in commercial land values. The CBJ Assessor is required to assess property at its full and true value as of January 1. As explained in the BOE presentation for assessment year 2021, that is what the CBJ Assessor is achieving as it moves commercial property values closer to their full and true value.

5. Regarding the data used to determine the cap rate utilized to arrive at the commercial land assessments, particularly the data on cap rates in Juneau, the CBJ Assessor undertook research of publicly available references for this rate. Cap rate data is readily available for your clients, and was explained in the BOE presentation. The CBJ Assessor reiterates that cap rates/income approach were not utilized in determining any increases reflecting the full and true value of commercial properties in assessment year 2021.
6. Regarding market areas for the various commercial property markets in Juneau utilized in the assessments, the CBJ Assessor would need more specifics to understand your request. This request appears to refer to Mr. Dahle's BOE presentation discussing property characteristics (starting at approximately 1:38:30). If a particular property owner has a concern regarding what market area they are in, please encourage them to communicate that concern to the Assessor's Office.
7. Regarding how land values were extracted from sales prices used in the assessment valuation, the CBJ assessor reiterates its response from August 3rd that this does not apply.
8. You state that Mr. Dahle indicated it is necessary to group sales into the appropriate class and subclass, and request we provide the classes and subclasses for the sales used by Mr. Dahle in assessing your clients' properties, and the properties placed in each class and/or subclass. This appears to be a misapplication of the overview information provided in the BOE training. For the purposes of the ratio studies, residential property sales were separated from commercial property sales.
9. You ask what assumptions were put into the CAMA system and if the Assessor's Office or its personnel changed any of the assumptions? This appears to be going to an improper motive. To reiterate, the methodology and CAMA system were described in detail during the BOE training, and personnel opinions were not part of the methodology.
10. Regarding what algorithms were used in the CAMA system, and if the CBJ Assessor's office or its personnel changed any of the algorithms, the CBJ Assessor reiterates that all it did this year for commercial property was a ratio study and trend as presented at the BOE training.
11. Regarding the BOE hearings, we have been working with the CBJ clerks and BOE to set these hearings. Currently, we have at least two commercial property valuations (not on your client list) scheduled for August 25, 2021. We have developed potential calendar dates for commercial property valuation appeals from now through December, although that calendar is currently changing to increase the number of available dates by increasing staff to

Robert S. Spitzfaden
Commercial Property Assessments

Page 3

undertake the clerk's responsibilities during the local elections. The appeal date for your clients will be set after the petition for review process and discussion with the property owners is fully complete and exhausted. This will allow the property owners to determine whether to accept the Assessor's findings and valuation, or to proceed in the appeal process.

12. If a BOE hearing date is set under CBJ 15.05.180, and the property owner has all the information provided by the petition for review, and the BOE has empaneled a hearing board for that date, the CBJ Assessor generally will not agree to a continuance. However, the property owner can still make the request through the CBJ Clerk to the BOE. If you communicate with us early before the BOE date is set, we can try to stipulate to available dates for the hearing.
13. Regarding Mr. Dahle's licenses, this would not be relevant. Licensing is required in fee appraisals, and Mary Hammond, the CBJ Assessor, issues final determinations on all property assessments in the City. Mr. Dahle's background is accurate as supplied in our August 3, 2021 letter.
14. Thank you for your clarification on the standards set forth in Fairbanks Gold Mining, Inc. v. Fairbanks North Star Borough. I summarized for brevity, but you are correct that the full citation does include reference that the court may overturn the assessor's method in cases of "fraud or the clear adoption of a fundamentally wrong principle of valuation." This is still a very high burden to overcome, which is well stated in cases going back to the earliest days of Statehood. Because of the consistency of this standard, the CBJ has not needed to update its legal guidance memo on this topic since an opinion issued eight years ago (which was included in the BOE training, but also attached for convenience). You ask if utilizing the correct standard changes my opinion or the Assessor's assessment. The CBJ Assessor did utilize the correct standard for the 2021 assessment year, a standard well within the Assessor's discretion, and a rather simple standard methodology to understand. Despite our legal requirement to assess property at its full and true value, we still demonstrate an underassessment issue for commercial property assessments and are making a policy call not to raise the assessments to the full value they should be at in 2021 (please refer to Mr. Dahle's BOE presentation starting at 1:46:10). The property owner still bears the burden of proof in these valuation appeals and we have not received any information that demonstrates a fundamentally wrong methodology was utilized. We again encourage your clients to freely share information with the CBJ Assessor to ensure that we have the best and most accurate data available.

Regarding the property owners you presented in your letter dated July 28, 2021, we noticed there appeared to be some discrepancies, provided below:

The following are property owners that do not match-up with a timely filed appeal:

Chinook Apartments Partnership	5B2101320040
Coho Park Apartments Partnership	5B2401030050
D&M Rentals, LLC	4B1701100080
Nowell Avenue Development LLC	1D060L010010
Nowell Avenue Development LLC	5B1201060181

Robert S. Spitzfaden
Commercial Property Assessments

Page 4

Trucano Family Partnership	6D0601020040
Trucano, Douglas J	7B0901010010
Trucano, Douglas J	1C070H020120

We also noticed that there may be some discrepancy in the parcel numbers that may need correction. We are providing the parcel number we have in our records in contrast to the ones provided in your letter:

Property Owner	Provided Parcel ID:	CBJ Assessor ID:
A&J Building LLC	1C0701010011	1C1001070110, 1C1101070010
Coogan Alaska LLC	4B1301080000	5B1301080000
Coogan Alaska LLC	10060L040032	1D060L040032
Franklin Dock Enterprises, LLC	1C00K830030	1C100K830030
Franklin Dock Enterprises, LLC	1C00K830031	1C100K830031
Franklin Dock Enterprises, LLC	1C00K830040	1C100K830040
Franklin Dock Enterprises, LLC	1C00K830041	1C100K830041
Gastineau Mobile Home Park	5D0701040000	6D0701040000
Grant, Jeff	5B21001000030	5B2101000030

Finally, this parcel lists the CBJ as the owner (c/o Franklin Dock Enterprises, LLC), and we do not have records of a current appeal on this property:

Property Owner	Provided Parcel ID:	CBJ Assessor ID:
Franklin Dock Enterprises, LLC	C100K830032	1C100K830032

We understand the above seems relatively minor. We are just trying to avoid clerical errors, ensure we're all discussing the correct property moving forward, and also that we are able to provide full and accurate information to the property owners who have timely filed an appeal.

Sincerely,



Teresa Bowen
Assistant Municipal Attorney
City and Borough of Juneau

CBJ Law Department
MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Equalization
From: John W. Hartle, City Attorney 
Subject: Board of Equalization: Standards and Procedures
Date: April 19, 2013

SUMMARY

- (1) The Board of Equalization functions as a quasi-judicial body, which means that the Board has authority to hear and decide assessment appeals in a manner similar to a court, but less formal than a court.
- (2) The burden of proof is on the appellant property owner.
- (3) The Board should make specific findings in support of its decisions, and should base its decisions on the record.
- (4) To grant an appeal, Board members should make a motion to grant the appeal and vote in the affirmative; to deny an appeal (that is, uphold the assessor's decision), Board members should make a motion to grant the appeal and vote in the negative. The Board may also grant an appeal and make an adjustment to the assessment different from that requested by the appellant.
- (5) The assessment process, the Board's procedures and standards, and property taxation are all governed by Alaska Statute and CBJ Code. AS 29.45.190 - AS 29.45.210 provide the time for filing appeals, procedures before the Board, and the standards to be used by the Board in deciding appeals. The pertinent statutes and code sections are attached to this memorandum for your reference.

Board of Equalization

April 19, 2013

DEADLINE FOR FILING APPEAL

In order to appeal an assessment, a taxpayer must file an appeal within 30 days after the date of mailing of the assessment notice. AS 29.45.190(b); CBJ 15.05.160(a). After this time period, the right of appeal ceases, unless the Board finds that the taxpayer was “unable” to comply with the 30-day filing requirement. The word “unable” as used in this section does not include situations where the taxpayer forgot about or overlooked the assessment notice, was out of town during the period for filing an appeal, or similar situations. Rather, it covers situations that are beyond the control of the taxpayer and, as a practical matter, prevent the taxpayer from recognizing what is at stake and dealing with it. Such situations would include a physical or mental disability serious enough to prevent the person from dealing rationally with his or her private affairs.

There are few situations in which a taxpayer is “unable” to comply with the requirement that an appeal be filed within 30 days of the date of mailing of the notice of assessment. It is common knowledge that real property is subject to assessment and taxation and it is the duty of every property owner to take such steps as are necessary to protect his or her interests in the property. One of the steps that courts generally assume a prudent property owner takes is to have someone either watch or manage the property while the property owner is away from the property for an extended period of time.

It is the responsibility of the property owner to assure that the taxing authority has the correct address to which notices relating to assessments and taxes on the property may be sent in order that the property owner will receive timely notice of assessments and tax levies affecting the property. Failure to receive an assessment notice because it was sent to an old address that the property owner had not corrected, or because the notice was sent to the property owner at the correct address but while the property owner was out of town, are not reasons that make the property owner “unable” to file a timely appeal.

With respect to an appeal filed after expiration of the 30-day appeal period, the Board should consider the oral and written evidence presented by the property owner on the question of whether or not the owner was “unable” to file the appeal within the required 30-day appeal period. If the property owner fails to prove that he or she was “unable” to file the appeal in a timely manner, there is no basis for hearing the appeal, even if the Board believes the assessment should be adjusted.

Board of Equalization

April 19, 2013

ASSESSMENTS THE BOARD CAN CONSIDER

The Board has authority to alter an assessment only when an appeal has been timely filed regarding the particular parcel. AS 29.45.200(b). The Board has no authority to alter the assessment of a parcel that is not before the Board on an appeal. Under state law, an appeal may be filed only by a person whose name appears on the assessment roll or the agent of that person. AS 29.45.190(a); CBJ 15.05.150.

If an appellant fails to appear at the hearing, the Board may proceed with the hearing in the absence of the appellant. AS 29.45.210(a); CBJ 15.05.190(b). The appellant may appear through an agent or representative, and may present written and/or oral testimony or other materials to the Board in support of the appeal.

BASIS FOR ADJUSTMENT AND ASSESSMENT

AS 29.45.210(b) and CBJ 15.05.190 expressly place the burden of proof on the party appealing the assessment. *CH Kelly Trust v. Municipality of Anchorage, Bd. of Equalization*, 909 P.2d 1381 (Alaska 1996) (“the burden is properly placed on the property owners in an assessment challenge”). Before the property owner is entitled to an adjustment, the property owner must prove, based on facts stated in the written appeal or presented at the hearing, that the property is the subject of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation. AS 29.45.210(b); CBJ 15.05.180(c). The appellant may present written evidence, oral testimony, and witnesses at the hearing.

Alaska courts do not disturb valuations set by the assessor if the differences between the appellant and the assessor are merely differences of opinion. Our court applies a “deferential standard of review” when considering an assessor’s property valuations. *Cool Homes, Inc. v. Fairbanks N. Star Borough*, 860 P.2d 1248, 1262 (Alaska 1993); *Fairbanks N. Star Borough v. Golden Heart Utilities, Inc.*, 13 P.3d 263, 267 (Alaska 2000). “AS 29.45.210(b) requires that the taxpayer prove *facts* at the hearing. ... It is not enough merely to argue that the valuation was inadequate or demand a justification from the taxing authority.” *Cool Homes, Inc., at 1263* (emphasis in original).

In *Twentieth Century Investment Co. v. City of Juneau*, 359 P.2d 783, 787 (Alaska 1961), the court, addressing assessment standards under former, similar law (AS 29.53.140), stated:

The valuation and assessment of property for taxes does not contravene [constitutional principles] unless it is plainly demonstrated that there is

Board of Equalization

April 19, 2013

involved, not the exercise of the taxing power, but the exertion of a different and forbidden power, such as the confiscation of property. *Such a demonstration is not made simply by showing overvaluation; there must be something which, in legal effect, is equivalent to an intention or fraudulent purpose to place an excessive valuation on property, and thus violate fundamental principles that safeguard the taxpayer's property rights.*

(Emphasis added.) The court went on to state, at 788:

The City was not bound by any particular formula, rule or method, either by statute or otherwise. Its choice of one recognized method of valuation over another was simply the exercise of a discretion committed to it by law. Whether or not it exercised a wise judgment is not our concern. This court has nothing to do with complaints of that nature. It will not substitute its judgment for the judgment of those upon whom the law confers the authority and duty to assess and levy taxes. *This court is concerned with nothing less than fraud or the clear adoption of a fundamentally wrong principle of valuation.* Neither has been shown here. The actions of the assessor and the Board of Equalization are entirely compatible with a sincere effort to adopt valuations not relatively unjust or unequal; their determinations have not transgressed the bounds of honest judgment.

(Emphasis added.) This principle, that "taxing authorities are to be given broad discretion in selecting valuation methods," was reaffirmed in *CH Kelly Trust*, 909 P.2d at 1382, and *Golden Heart Utilities, Inc.*, 13 P.3d at 267 ("Provided the assessor has a reasonable basis for a valuation method, that method will be allowed 'so long as there was no fraud or clear adoption of a fundamentally wrong principle of valuation.'"). Similarly, in *Cool Homes, Inc.*, 860 P.2d at 1262, the court held:

Taxing authorities are to be accorded broad discretion in deciding among recognized valuation methods. If a reasonable basis for the taxing agency's method exists, the taxpayer must show fraud or the 'clear adoption of a fundamentally wrong principle of valuation.'

Thus, the assessor's valuations should be given substantial weight by the Board, particularly where the appellant offers little more than unsupported opinion that the assessor's value is too high. In order to be considered an unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation, the valuation must be unequivocally excessive, or fundamentally wrong.

Board of Equalization

April 19, 2013

This assumes that the assessor has reviewed the critical facts. Our court requires the assessor to review all “directly relevant” evidence of the property value and “prevailing market conditions.” *Faulk v. Bd. of Equalization, Kenai Peninsula Borough*, 934 P.2d 750, 752 (Alaska 1997). Thus, it is important that the assessor, and the Board, make sure that all relevant evidence is considered.

FINDINGS – BASIS FOR THE BOARD’S DECISIONS

Board of Equalization decisions are subject to judicial review, if an appeal to superior court is filed within 30 days. Consequently, it is important for the Board to either make specific findings (statement of reasons) for its decisions, or otherwise set out sufficient information to enable a reviewing court to ascertain the reasons for the Board’s action. An appeal to superior court of a determination of the Board is heard on the record established at the Board hearing. AS 29.45.210(d). It is important that the record be as clear and complete as possible.

The Alaska Supreme Court outlined the requirements for board of equalization decisions in *Faulk*, 934 P.2d at 751, as follows:

We have previously concluded that “[t]he threshold question in an administrative appeal is whether the record sufficiently reflects the basis for the [agency’s] decision so as to enable meaningful judicial review.” *Fields v. Kodiak City Council*, 628 P.2d 927, 932 (Alaska 1981). In answering that question, “[t]he test of sufficiency is ... a functional one: do the [agency’s] findings facilitate this court’s review, assist the parties and restrain the agency within proper bounds?” *South Anchorage Concerned Coalition, Inc. v. Coffey*, 862 P.2d 168, 175 (Alaska 1993).

The court remanded the case to the borough board of equalization because the board had not provided an adequate basis for the court to determine whether it had reasonably denied the property tax appeal. The court directed: “On remand, the superior court should instruct the Board to state its reasons for rejecting the Faulks’ appeal.” *Id.* at 753.

Accordingly, the Board should take care to state its reasons for granting or denying an appeal, or making an adjustment to the assessment different from that requested by the appellant.

Board of Equalization

April 19, 2013

ACTION BY THE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION


In taking action on appeals, a Board member should move and vote in the affirmative to grant the appeal by the taxpayer. A Board member should vote in the negative to deny the appeal and thereby affirm the assessor's determination.

Sample motions: "I move that the Board grant the appeal and I ask for a 'yes' vote for the reasons provided by the appellant;" OR "I move the Board grant the appeal, and I ask for a 'no' vote for the reasons provided by the Assessor;" OR "I move the Board grant the appeal and I ask for a 'yes' vote to adjust the assessment to \$X for the following reasons [statement of reasons]."

For appeals that are not timely filed, the Board should first vote on whether or not to hear the appeal; if the Board decides to hear the appeal, it should then be heard on its merits.

The Board is required to certify its actions to the assessor within seven days, and, except as to supplementary assessments, the assessor must enter the changes and certify the final roll by June 1. AS 29.45.210(c). The rate of levy must be determined by the Assembly by ordinance before June 15. AS 29.45.240. The CBJ budget must be adopted by May 31. If for any reason the Board hearing is continued to a later date, the date for completing the hearing must be in the near future in order for the final assessment roll to be certified and the rate of levy fixed in accordance with the required statutory time frames.

Attachments



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

GASTINEAU GUIDING PROPERTIES LLC

1330 EASTAUGH WAY STE 2, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 1C110K120120

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: JMIS LLC

Use Code: Vacant

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 0 MILL ST

Site Value: \$237150.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: ALASKA

JUNEAU V BL B LT 12

Building PV: \$0.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 17219.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$237150.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft


Last Trans: 20191002

Road/No Road: Roaded

VACANT

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



RELATED PARTY
IMPROVED

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

ODEX JUNEAU LLC

11400 SE 8TH ST STE 300, BELLEVUE WA 98004

Parcel #: 5B1201020100

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: ODOM

REAL ESTATE PAR

Use Code: Industrial

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 5452 SHAUNE
DR

Site Value: \$324000.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: SSG LT 10

Building PV: \$422600.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 18000.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$746600.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 009600
sqft


Last Trans: 20190802

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

20



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

RONALD B LIND & VALENA LIND
PO BOX 240103, DOUGLAS AK 99824

Parcel #: 4B1601070160

[\(Map\)](#)

Prev. Owner: PATRICK &
MARILYN TA

Use Code: Industrial

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 2276

INDUSTRIAL BLVD

Site Value: \$5000.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: RIVERVIEW

YACHT III UNIT U

Building PV: \$78000.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$83000.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000741
sqft

Last Trans: 20040804


Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

21



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

WATCHTREE JUNEAU LLC

2593 DAVID ST UNIT 9, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B1601140043

([Map](#))

Address: 9309 GLACIER
HWY

Legal Desc. 1:

PROFESSIONAL PLAZA

BLDG A UNIT 102

Building PV: \$86700.00

Zoning: Light

Commercial

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$169350.00

Tax Year: 2021

Prev. Owner: BBS LLC

Use Code: Commercial

Office

No. of Units: 000

Site Value: \$82650.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1979

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Lot Size: 6071.00

Exempt Total: 0

Gross Liv. Area: 000885

sqft


Last Trans: 20190716

Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

RBG HOLDINGS LLC

PO BOX 9024005, SAN JUAN PUERTO RICO 00902

Parcel #: 1C070B0N0011

(Map)

Prev. Owner: GOLD
DIGGERS OF ALAS

Use Code: Commercial
Retail

Address: 259 S FRANKLIN
ST

Site Value: \$1265100.00

Exempt: No Data

No. of Units: 003

Year Built: 1999

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: JUNEAU
TOWNSITE BL N TR A
Building PV: \$899800.00

Zoning: -Mixed Use-
Residential and
Commercial -5,000 sq.ft.
minimum lot size -60
units per acre

Lot Size: 5328.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$2164900.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 006803
sqft


Last Trans: 20190701

Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

REX THOMPSON

2 ABBOTSFORD CT, DALLAS TX 75225

Parcel #: 1C020K01G280

[\(Map\)](#)

Prev. Owner: BARBARA J
KELLER

Use Code: Boathouse

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 1435 HARBOR
WAY

Site Value: \$0.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1973

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: AURORA
BASIN STALL G-28

Building PV: \$27200.00

Zoning: Waterfront -
Commercial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$27200.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000805
sqft


Last Trans: 20190628

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

24



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

M & M TOURS LIMITED

5880 THANE RD, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 1C110K120150

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: JMIS LLC

Use Code: Vacant

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 0 MILL ST

Site Value: \$374400.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: ALASKA

JUNEAU V BL B LT 15

Building PV: \$0.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 27179.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$374400.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft

Last Trans: 20190401


Road/No Road: Roaded

VACANT

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

25



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

BRADLEY S PIERCE & DONNA B PIERCE
3281 NOWELL AVE, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 1C020K01F290

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: RUDY J
RIPLEY

Use Code: Boathouse

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 1435 HARBOR
WAY

Site Value: \$0.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1976

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: AURORA
BASIN STALL F-29

Building PV: \$27200.00

Zoning: Waterfront -
Commercial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$27200.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000748
sqft


Last Trans: 20130827

Road/No Road: Roaded

BOAT HOUSE

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



26

RESIDENTIAL

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

COLIN CONERTON

214 DIXON ST, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B2401610150

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: CHARLES R

MOLINE

Use Code: Apartment

No. of Units: 006

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 4045 DELTA DR

Site Value: \$127500.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1983

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Second Owner

JESSE UMAN

110 SAN ANTONIO ST UNIT 3220, AUSTIN TX 78701

Legal Desc. 1: DELTA

ACRES ADDITION 1 LT 2

Building PV: \$394400.00

Zoning: -Multi-Family-

5,000 sq.ft. minimum lot

size -18 units per acre

Lot Size: 9000.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$521900.00

Tax Year: 2021


Gross Liv. Area: 003696
sqft

Last Trans: 20190104

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU & AIRPORT
9999 NINEMILE CREEK RD, JUNEAU AK 99801

Lessee: JAMES ARTHUR THOMPSON

Parcel #: 3B1501040120

[\(Map\)](#)

Prev. Owner: H CLOUGH

Use Code: City Lease

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 1544 CREST ST

Site Value: \$29200.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: AIRPORT

BL O LT 12

Building PV: \$134800.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 3250.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$164000.00

Tax Year: 2021


Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft

Last Trans: 00000000

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

AFFORDABLE AUTO ENTERPRISES LLC
8825 MALLARD ST, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B1501040030

[\(Map\)](#)

Prev. Owner: STANLEY
AND SONS

Use Code: Commercial
Retail

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 8825 MALLARD
ST

Site Value: \$466200.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: VALLEY
CENTRE BL E LT 9, 10, 11

Building PV: \$371400.00

Zoning: General
Commercial

Lot Size: 25897.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$837600.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft

Last Trans: 20181116


Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

29



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

A & D BERGMANN ALASKA COMMUNITY PROPERTY TRUST &
TRUSTEES ALVIN C BERGMANN

1210 MENDENHALL PENINSULA RD, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 1C070B0J0020
([Map](#))

Address: 195 S FRANKLIN
ST

Legal Desc. 1: JUNEAU
TOWNSITE BL J LT 2 FR &
BL K LT 2

Legal Desc. 2: DEBRA L
BERGMANN

Prev. Owner: ALVIN
BERGMANN

Site Value: \$432750.00

Building PV: \$249700.00

Total PV: \$682450.00

Use Code: Commercial
Misc

Exempt: No Data

Zoning: -Mixed Use-
Residential and
Commercial -5,000 sq.ft.
minimum lot size -60
units per acre

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 000

Year Built: 1932

Gross Liv. Area: 002794
sqft

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

Lot Size: 3205.00

Last Trans: 20200901

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Exempt Building: 0


Exempt Total: 0

Road/No Road: Roaded

RELATED
PARTY

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

RNL LLC

PO BOX 34606, JUNEAU AK 99803

Parcel #: 5B1601140070

[\(Map\)](#)

Address: 9309 GLACIER

HWY

Legal Desc. 1:

PROFESSIONAL PLAZA

UNIT B101

Legal Desc. 2:

Prev. Owner: MARK S

RIEDERER

Site Value: \$176850.00

Building PV: \$132000.00

Total PV: \$308850.00

Use Code: Commercial

Office

Exempt: No Data

Zoning: Light

Commercial

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 000

Year Built: 1982

Gross Liv. Area: 001287
sqft

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

Lot Size: 7968.00

Last Trans: 20180821

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Total: 0

Road/No Road: Roaded


Exempt Land: 0

Exempt Building: 0

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

31



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

WILLIAM J GOERTZEN

PO BOX 211049, AUKE BAY AK 99821

Parcel #: 1C020K01G200

[\(Map\)](#)

Prev. Owner: FREDERICK
KASNICK

Use Code: Boathouse

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 1435 HARBOR
WAY

Site Value: \$0.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1973

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: AURORA

BASIN STALL G-20

Building PV: \$27200.00

Zoning: Waterfront -
Commercial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$27200.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000851
sqft


Last Trans: 20190101

Road/No Road: Roaded

HOUSE BOAT

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



IMPROVED

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

DCI COMMERCIAL LLC

PO BOX 30886, BELLINGHAM WA 98228

Parcel #: 1C060U050022

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: FIRST

NATIONAL BANK

Use Code: Commercial

Misc

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 1108 F ST

Site Value: \$770250.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1976

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: URBAN

RENEWAL BL 5 LT 2

Building PV: \$646000.00

Zoning: Light

Commercial

Lot Size: 21396.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$1416250.00

Tax Year: 2021


Gross Liv. Area: 022130
sqft

Last Trans: 20180720

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

GLACIER NALU LLC

10200 MENDENHALL LOOP RD, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 4B2901020010

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: SPRUCE

MEADOW RV PAR

Use Code: MH Park

Address: 10200

MENDENHALL LOOP RD

Site Value: \$1025550.00

Exempt: No Data

Legal Desc. 1: USS 1796

TR B1

Building PV: \$20200.00

Zoning: -Single Family
and Duplex -36,000 sq.ft
minimum lot size -1 unit
per acre

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$1045750.00

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 000

Year Built: 1982

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Exempt Building: 0

Lot Size: 12.50

Exempt Total: 0

Gross Liv. Area: 000924
sqft

Last Trans: 20180629


Road/No Road: Roaded

RV PARK

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

34



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

MICHAEL J SPALDING

6011 SUNSET ST, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 4B1601080070

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: ROBERT

SAUERTEIG

Use Code: Industrial

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 2278

INDUSTRIAL BLVD

Site Value: \$5000.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1996

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: P & J

BUSINESS UNIT B7

Building PV: \$30000.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$35000.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000300
sqft

Last Trans: 20190927


Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

35



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

ST VINCENT DEPAUL SOCIETY

8617 TEAL ST, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B1601000023

(Map)

Prev. Owner: PILCHER
PROPERTIES L

Use Code: Commercial
Misc

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 851400

Address: 9151 GLACIER
HWY

Site Value: \$447300.00

Exempt: Charitable-Non
Profit

Year Built: 1969

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: USS 381

GLACIER MALL TR A1

Building PV: \$404100.00

Zoning: General
Commercial

Lot Size: 20710.00

Exempt Total: 851400

Legal Desc. 2: DIOCESAN
COUNCIL OF SE ALASKA

Total PV: \$851400.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 006650
sqft

Last Trans: 20180215


Road/No Road: Roaded

NGO
GRANT FUNDED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

36



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

CONDO

TAMAR MARY BOYD

20136 COHEN DR, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B15011109B0

[\(Map\)](#)

Prev. Owner:

CONSTANCE TROLLAN

Use Code: Commercial

Office

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 2231 JORDAN

AVE

Site Value: \$0.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1983

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: JORDAN

CREEK UNIT 9B

Building PV: \$230384.00

Zoning: Light

Commercial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$230384.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 001232


sqft

Last Trans: 20171222

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

IMPROVED

CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU & AIRPORT
306 ISLANDER DR, SITKA AK 99835

Lessee: RICHARD FORST

Parcel #: 3B1501020030
([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: LARRY
DEPUTE

Use Code: City Lease
No. of Units: 000

Garage: No
City Water: Yes
Exempt Land: 0

Address: 1669 CREST ST

Site Value: \$8700.00

Exempt: No Data
Year Built: 1994

Garage Area: 000000
City Sewer: Yes
Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: AIRPORT
BL M LT 3
Building PV: \$32500.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 1179.00
Exempt Total: 0


Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$41200.00

Tax Year: 2021
Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft
Last Trans: 00000000
Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

MICHAEL BLUME

2769 SHERWOOD LN UNIT I, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 4B1701103003

([Map](#))

Address: 2769

SHERWOOD LN

Legal Desc. 1: BEAR DEN

YACHT CONDOS PHASE III

UNIT I

Legal Desc. 2:

Prev. Owner:

Site Value: \$5000.00

Building PV: \$331200.00

Total PV: \$336200.00

Use Code: Industrial

Exempt: No Data

Zoning: Industrial

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 001

Year Built: 2017

Gross Liv. Area: 000000

sqft

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

Lot Size: 0.00

Last Trans: 20180109

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Land: 0


Exempt Building: 0

Exempt Total: 0

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



IMPROVED

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

BAD DOG INVESTMENTS

4508 WOODDUCK AVE, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 4B1601010040

([Map](#))

Address: 2450

INDUSTRIAL BLVD

Legal Desc. 1:

MENDENHALL VALLEY

INDUSTRIAL PARK 3 LT 4

Building PV: \$509000.00

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$823100.00

Prev. Owner: B & K

VENTURES

Site Value: \$314100.00

Use Code: Commercial

Misc

Exempt: No Data

Zoning: Industrial

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 000

Year Built: 1978

Gross Liv. Area: 007380
sqft

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

Lot Size: 34907.00

Last Trans: 20170919

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Land: 0


Exempt Building: 0

Exempt Total: 0

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



40

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

CONDO

ANDREW MILLER

4016 SPRUCE LN, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 4B1601120130

([Map](#))

Address: 2270 BRANDY

LN

Legal Desc. 1: BRANDY

LANE YACHT BLDG A UNIT
13

Legal Desc. 2:

Prev. Owner: JAMES G
WILLIAMS

Site Value: \$5000.00

Building PV: \$114000.00

Total PV: \$119000.00

Use Code: Industrial

Exempt: No Data

Zoning: Industrial

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 000

Year Built: 0

Gross Liv. Area: 001000
sqft

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

Lot Size: 0.00

Last Trans: 20170731

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Total: 0

Road/No Road: Roaded


Exempt Land: 0

Exempt Building: 0

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

41



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

CASEY J WILKINS & NATALIE N WILKINS
PO BOX 240122, DOUGLAS AK 99824

Parcel #: 5B1201330160

[\(Map\)](#)

Prev. Owner: CAROLINE
M PITTS

Use Code: Commercial
Misc

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 2005 ANKA ST

Site Value: \$184350.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 2005

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: RSH III LT
16

Building PV: \$368700.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 12738.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$553050.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 004880
sqft

Last Trans: 20170721


Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

42



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

GREGORY PILCHER; HILARY YOUNG; & ROBERT JEFFRY
PILCHER

PO BOX 20932, JUNEAU AK 99802

Parcel #: 4B1601050030

[\(Map\)](#)

Prev. Owner: HAL R
DAUGHERTY

Use Code: Industrial

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 2274

INDUSTRIAL BLVD

Site Value: \$5000.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1995

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: RIVERVIEW

YACHT UNIT 3

Building PV: \$103800.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$108800.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000924
sqft


Last Trans: 20180619

Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



43

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

PAUL J THOMAS & AMANDA THOMAS
PO BOX 211226, AUKE BAY AK 99821

Parcel #: 4B1701090226

[\(Map\)](#)

Prev. Owner: ALASKA
STRIPING & PA

Use Code: Industrial

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 10011 CRAZY
HORSE DR

Site Value: \$5000.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 2016

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: SAFE

HARBOR CONDO UNIT B6

Building PV: \$144800.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$149800.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 000982
sqft


Last Trans: 20170424

Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



44

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

FRONTIER PROPERTIES LLC

3161 CHANNEL DR STE 2, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 7B0901030071

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: MEDIA
LIMITED

Use Code: Commercial
Office

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 3161 CHANNEL
DR

Site Value: \$1091700.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: USS 1075

FR

Building PV: \$922300.00

Zoning: General
Commercial

Lot Size: 73520.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$2014000.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 008710
sqft


Last Trans: 20170411

Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



45

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

CONSTRUCTION MACHINERY INDUSTRIAL LLC

5400 HOMER DR, ANCHORAGE AK 99518

Parcel #: 5B1201040052

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: CHANNEL
CONSTRUCTION

Use Code: Commercial
Misc

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 1721 ANKA ST

Site Value: \$3509550.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: HORN 2 LT
3

Building PV: \$589900.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 236966.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$4099450.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 008450
sqft

Last Trans: 20170405


Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

46



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

SYSKO SEATTLE INC

1390 ENCLAVE PKWY, HOUSTON TX 77077

Parcel #: 1C110K120101

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: JMIS LLC

Use Code: Industrial

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 170 MILL ST

Site Value: \$613650.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

VACANT

Legal Desc. 1: ALASKA

JUNEAU V BL B LT 10A

Building PV: \$959785.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 34095.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$1573435.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 007854
sqft


Last Trans: 20170316

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

47



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

BENTON AND MEIER MANAGEMENT LLC
PO BOX 74, ELFIN COVE AK 99825

Parcel #: 4B1701090223

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: ALASKA
STRIPING & PA

Use Code: Industrial

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 10011 CRAZY
HORSE DR

Site Value: \$5000.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 2016

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: SAFE

HARBOR CONDO UNIT B3

Building PV: \$167300.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$172300.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 001128
sqft


Last Trans: 20170214

Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

KEENEY MORRIS BUD TRUST & MORRIS BUD KEENEY
PO BOX 85, ELFIN COVE AK 99825

Parcel #: 4B1701090228

(Map)

Prev. Owner: MORRIS B
KENNEY

Use Code: Industrial

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 10011 CRAZY
HORSE DR

Site Value: \$5000.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 2016

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: SAFE

HARBOR CONDO UNIT B8

Building PV: \$167300.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$172300.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 001128
sqft


Last Trans: 20180727

Road/No Road: Roaded

CONDO

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



IMPROVED

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

CAELUM AK LLC

PO BOX 35592, JUNEAU AK 99803

Parcel #: 1C060U040040

([Map](#))

Address: 800 GLACIER
AVE

Legal Desc. 1:

HARBORVIEW 2 URBAN
RENEWAL BL 4 LT 7

Legal Desc. 2:

Building PV: \$732400.00

Total PV: \$1492000.00

Prev. Owner: FORREST
REETZ LLC

Site Value: \$759600.00

Use Code: Commercial
Misc

Exempt: No Data

Zoning: Light
Commercial

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 000

Year Built: 1976

Gross Liv. Area: 010017
sqft

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

Lot Size: 18944.00

Last Trans: 20161215

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Land: 0


Exempt Building: 0

Exempt Total: 0

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



50

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

DCI COMMERCIAL LLC

PO BOX 30920, BELLINGHAM WA 98228

Parcel #: 5B1501020170

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: DCI
PROPERTIES LLC

Use Code: Industrial

No. of Units: 001

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 8401 AIRPORT
BLVD

Site Value: \$766350.00

Exempt: No Data
Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: VALLEY
CENTRE BL M LT 18 - 22

Building PV: \$416700.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 42577.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$1183050.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 006375
sqft


Last Trans: 20161107

Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

GAS N GO LLC

5161 GLACIER HWY, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B1201060061

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: TAKU OIL
SALES INC

Use Code: Commercial
Misc

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 5631 GLACIER
HWY

Site Value: \$311400.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: HILDRE II
LT 1A

Building PV: \$126000.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 17301.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$437400.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 003400
sqft


Last Trans: 20160802

Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



52

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

SRA & G LLC & SAMUEL SMITH MANAGING MEMBER
PO BOX 32173, JUNEAU AK 99803

Parcel #: 4B1701100146

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: SAMUEL P
SMITH

Use Code: Commercial -
Medical

No. of Units: 001

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 2789

SHERWOOD LN

Site Value: \$361800.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 2017

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

RELATED
PARTY

Legal Desc. 1: ANDSOH

LT 1

Building PV: \$787400.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 31329.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$1149200.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 006847
sqft


Last Trans: 20180703

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

53



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

CONDO

SOUTH EAST INSURANCE CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION
8251 GLACIER HWY STE A, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B1501000000

([Map](#))

Address: 8251 GLACIER
HWY

Legal Desc. 1: USS 1195
TR 2A LT 1 [SOUTHEAST
INSURANCE CONDO
LAND)

Legal Desc. 2: ATTN:
COLLEEN SULLIVAN

Prev. Owner: TITLE
INSURANCE AGEN

Site Value: \$0.00

Building PV: \$0.00

Total PV: \$0.00

Use Code: UT Billing

Exempt: No Data

Zoning: General
Commercial

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 000

Year Built: 0

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

Lot Size: 0.00

Last Trans: 20060728

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Exempt Building: 0


Exempt Total: 0

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

54



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

SOUTHEAST FURNITURE WAREHOUSE INC
PO BOX 33783, JUNEAU AK 99803

Parcel #: 5B1201450110

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: BC

LEASING PARTNERSH

Use Code: Commercial
Retail

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 1731 RALPH'S
WAY

Site Value: \$370350.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 0

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: SSG V LT
11

Building PV: \$666100.00

Zoning: Industrial

Lot Size: 16457.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$1036450.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 004480
sqft


Last Trans: 20160603

Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



55

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

SPICKETTS PALACE LLC

PO BOX 023293, JUNEAU AK 99802

Parcel #: 1C070A030040

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: FIRST

NATIONAL BANK

Use Code: Commercial

Misc

Address: 100 N

FRANKLIN ST

Site Value: \$873600.00

Exempt: No Data

Legal Desc. 1: JUNEAU

TOWNSITE BL G LT 3

Building PV:

\$1765700.00

Zoning: -Mixed Use-

Residential and

Commercial -5,000 sq.ft.

minimum lot size -60

units per acre

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$2639300.00

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 006

Year Built: 1900

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Exempt Building: 0

Lot Size: 5943.00

Exempt Total: 0

Gross Liv. Area: 016124

sqft


Last Trans: 20160330

Road/No Road: Roaded

IMPROVED

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).



56

Assessor's Database

Current Owner

C & M RENTALS

PO BOX 32878, JUNEAU AK 99803

Parcel #: 4B1701100170

([Map](#))

Address: 10221 GLACIER
HWY

Legal Desc. 1:

SHERWOOD ESTATES BL
B LT 4 FR

Legal Desc. 2:

Prev. Owner: JAMES L
WHITE

Site Value: \$617400.00

Building PV: \$240600.00

Total PV: \$858000.00

Use Code: Commercial
Misc

Exempt: No Data

Zoning: Industrial

Tax Year: 2021

No. of Units: 000

Year Built: 1972

Gross Liv. Area: 000000
sqft

Garage: No

Garage Area: 000000

Lot Size: 82328.00

Last Trans: 20160301

City Water: Yes

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Total: 0

Road/No Road: Roaded


Exempt Land: 0

Exempt Building: 0

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

57



Assessor's Database

Current Owner

CONDO

FAMILY PROMISE OF JUNEAU

2221 JORDAN CREEK AVE UNIT 7E, JUNEAU AK 99801

Parcel #: 5B15011107E0

([Map](#))

Prev. Owner: ALASKA
BELL LLC

Use Code: Commercial
Office

No. of Units: 000

Garage: No

City Water: Yes

Exempt Land: 0

Address: 2221 JORDAN
AVE

Site Value: \$0.00

Exempt: No Data

Year Built: 1983

Garage Area: 000000

City Sewer: Yes

Exempt Building: 0

Legal Desc. 1: JORDAN
CREEK UNIT 7E

Building PV: \$234498.00

Zoning: Light
Commercial

Lot Size: 0.00

Exempt Total: 0

Legal Desc. 2:

Total PV: \$234498.00

Tax Year: 2021

Gross Liv. Area: 001254
sqft

Last Trans: 20201207

Road/No Road: Roaded

Search the Database

Search the database using the search box below. The field accepts any search parameter (owner's name, address, parcel number, year built, etc.).

Land:

Mean:	0.4095	x	1.5	=	0.61425
Median:	0.3928	x	1.5	=	0.5892

Core Commercial:

Mean:	0.7748	x	0.25	x	1.5	+	0.5811	=	0.87165
Median:	0.8112	x	0.25	x	1.5	+	0.6084	=	0.9126

	0.9653 (Avg Res Assessment)
-	<u>0.5811 (Imp Component of AV)</u>
	0.3842
or	38.40%

	0.9653 (Ave Res Assessment)
-	<u>0.6084 (Imp Component of AV)</u>
	0.3569
or	35.70%

Commercial Overall:

Mean:	0.7149	x	0.25	x	1.5	+	0.536175	=	0.8042625
Median:	0.7411	x	0.25	x	1.5	+	0.555825	=	0.8337375

	0.9653 (Avg Res Assessment)
-	<u>0.536175 (Imp Component of AV)</u>
	0.429125
or	42.90%

	0.9653 (Avg Res Assessment)
-	<u>0.555825 (Imp Component of AV)</u>
	0.409475
or	40.90%

AY2021 Analysis Sales List

Sale Date	Sale Price	Trended SP	AVTotal	Main Parcel	Count	Number Street	Condo	Neighborhood
07/25/18	27,500	30,930	27,200	1C020K01G200	1	1435 HARBOR WAY	NO	AURORA BASIN C 19
06/28/19	25,000	26,936	27,200	1C020K01G280	1	1435 HARBOR WAY	NO	AURORA BASIN C 19
02/28/19	25,000	27,356	27,200	1C020K01G290	1	1435 HARBOR WAY	NO	AURORA BASIN C 19
10/09/20	20,000,000	20,235,200	7,524,300	1C060K010031	1	0 EGAN DR	NO	DOWNTOWN C
10/30/20	1,400,000	1,412,348	1,394,150	1C060K660110	1	711 W WILLOUGHBY AV	NO	DOWNTOWN C
12/15/16	1,100,000	1,327,612	1,457,000	1C060U040040	1	800 GLACIER AVE	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/30/16	550,000	683,826	963,600	1C070A030040	1	100 N FRANKLIN ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
12/09/20	confidential	confidential	190,200	1C070A050001	1	230 SEWARD ST	5K	SOMMERS ON SEWARD_C_24
11/02/18	510,600	567,144	682,450	1C070B0J0020	1	195 S FRANKLIN ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
07/01/19	2,200,000	2,369,400	2,164,900	1C070B0N0011	1	259 S FRANKLIN ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/10/20	612,788	638,268	501,300	1C110K120051	1	0 Eastaugh Way	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/16/17	716,000	855,033	613,650	1C110K120101	1	170 MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
10/02/19	378,818	403,055	237,150	1C110K120120	1	0 MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
10/25/19	378,818	401,835	237,150	1C110K120130	1	190 MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/10/20	378,818	394,569	237,150	1C110K120140	1	0 MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
04/01/19	597,938	651,597	374,400	1C110K120150	1	0 MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
11/13/20	400,000	402,744	445,400	1D060L030011	2	201 CORDOVA ST	NO	WEST JUNEAU C
10/12/17	65,000	75,711	41,200	3B1501020030	1	1669 CREST ST	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/30/18	168,750	186,776	164,000	3B1501040120	1	1544 CREST ST	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
09/19/17	750,000	876,000	823,100	4B1601010040	1	2450 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
06/13/17	104,000	122,899	108,800	4B1601050030	1	2274 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	5K	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
07/30/19	115,000	123,388	83,000	4B1601050160	1	2276 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	5K	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
03/05/18	73,000	83,557	35,000	4B1601080070	1	2278 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	5K	P & J BUSINESS C 24
07/31/17	112,500	132,188	119,000	4B1601120130	1	2270 BRANDY LN	5K	BRANDY LANE YACHT C 24
11/17/20	650,000	654,095	527,700	4B1701020020	1	10011 GLACIER HWY	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
02/28/20	1,567,000	1,634,569	961,350	4B1701090056	1	10009 CRAZY HORSE DR	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
12/04/20	confidential	confidential	145,000	4B1701090218	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
02/14/17	150,000	179,757	172,300	4B1701090223	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
04/24/17	130,000	154,534	149,800	4B1701090226	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
01/10/17	150,000	180,492	172,300	4B1701090228	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
06/30/16	501,624	617,218	361,800	4B1701100146	1	2789 SHERWOOD LN	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
03/01/16	697,000	869,424	813,000	4B1701100170	1	10221 GLACIER HWY	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
09/20/17	400,000	467,144	336,200	4B1701103003	1	2769 SHERWOOD LN	5K	BEAR DEN YACHT CONDO C 24
06/29/18	950,000	1,071,961	1,045,750	4B2901020010	1	10200 MENDENHALL LOO	NO	AUKE MOUNTAIN C
10/04/19	2,205,832	2,346,343	1,849,500	5B1201000060	1	5245 GLACIER HWY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
08/02/19	500,000	536,260	746,600	5B1201020100	1	5452 SHAUNE DR	NO	LEMON CREEK C
04/05/17	4,140,000	4,932,313	5,106,550	5B1201040052	2	1721 ANKA ST	NO	LEMON CREEK C
08/02/16	500,000	612,910	704,850	5B1201060061	2	5631 GLACIER HWY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
09/24/20	2,450,000	2,483,957	1,554,550	5B1201060160	2	5740 CONCRETE WAY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
11/23/20	486,000	488,654	274,300	5B1201060260	1	5719 CONCRETE WAY	APN	SEAGULLS EDGE C 24
09/24/20	300,000	304,158	269,550	5B1201300110	1	1783 Anka St	NO	LEMON CREEK C
12/24/19	205,000	215,734	269,550	5B1201300110	1	1783 Anka St	NO	LEMON CREEK C
07/21/17	900,000	1,058,760	632,250	5B1201330160	3	2005 ANKA ST	NO	LEMON CREEK C
06/03/16	1,060,000	1,308,273	1,036,450	5B1201450110	1	1731 RALPH'S WAY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
06/15/16	637,500	785,744	593,500	5B1501000002	1	8251 GLACIER HWY	APN	SOUTHEAST INSURANCE C 24
08/07/20	700,000	714,406	591,700	5B1501010001	2	1880 CREST ST	APN	BUILDERS PLAZA C 24
09/02/16	1,300,000	1,587,924	1,183,050	5B1501020170	1	8401 AIRPORT BLVD	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/16/18	750,000	831,585	837,600	5B1501040030	1	8825 MALLARD ST	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
12/07/20	confidential	confidential	234,498	5B15011107E0	1	2221 JORDAN AVE	SEP	JORDAN CREEK C 24
02/10/16	273,000	341,299	234,498	5B15011107E0	1	2221 JORDAN AVE	SEP	JORDAN CREEK C 24
12/22/17	300,000	346,452	230,384	5B15011109B0	1	2231 JORDAN AVE	SEP	JORDAN CREEK C 24
02/15/18	968,750	1,111,292	851,400	5B1601000023	1	9151 GLACIER HWY	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
07/16/19	145,000	155,861	169,350	5B1601140043	1	9309 GLACIER HWY	APN	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
08/21/18	240,100	269,142	308,850	5B1601140070	1	9309 GLACIER HWY	APN	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
01/04/19	672,000	740,490	521,900	5B2401610150	1	4045 DELTA DR	NO	NORTHEAST VALLEY C
04/11/17	1,540,000	1,833,432	1,877,700	7B0901030071	1	3161 CHANNEL DR	NO	TWIN LAKES C

(1) These were the sales available to us for our market analysis for assessment year 2021.

(2) Some sales prices are confidential, specifically when the only sale source is the buyer.

(3) Note that this list was updated 08/24/21 to add AV. The original list was 57 sales, however, through the analysis process one sale, 1C060U050022, was eliminated. It was further updated 09/23/21 when a change in directive from the law department allowed us to add some sales prices. Update 9/29/2021 only sales prior to 11/26/2020 confidential.

(4) AV Adj for condition at time of sale - 1C060U040040, 1C070A030040, 4B1701100170, 1C110K120130, 1C110K120101, 4B1701100146, 5B1201060160, 5B1201000060, 7B0901030071

(5) 5B1201020100 is included on this list, however, it has since been determined not to be a market sale; seller & buyer related. Removal of this sale would further lower the mean and median ratios.

(6) Note- multi-parcel sales are normally considered non-market, however, with commercial sales they are sometimes included as an economic unit.

(7) Note that the sale price used in the original study for 5B1201040052, which included 5B1201040051, was \$3,726,000 which was reported by the buyer, however, subsequent information showed the sale price to be \$4,140,000 with the cash distribution reduced for the value of 12 months of continued occupancy by the seller after the execution of the sale. Also, this sale was discovered to be a non-market sale due to duress of the seller. Removal of this sale would lower the mean and median ratios

(8) The trending applied to bring the sales to 01/01/2021 was 5% per year. The analysis indicates that a trend of 7.5% would be appropriate but to be conservative we selected 5%.

(9) Column added to identify condo parcels NO = not condo; APN= apportioned land value; 5K= place holder land value; SEP = land is valued under different parcel.

Sales Not Included in Assessor's List (he had sales prices)

Parcel No.	Bldg Name	Date	Assessment Exceeds SP %
1C070K830040	Pacific Pier	3/13/18	60.70%
1C070K810140	Emporium Mall	12/31/19	38% Involves 2 parcels
1C070A090060	Assembly Building	4/1/19	205.80%
1C070K810010	Miner's Mercantile	9/17/21	36.60%
1C060U060020	Bill Ray Center	7/20/18	46.30% Involves 5 parcels

3 additional pending sales that have AV 19.9% to 36.6% over SP

Downtown sale closed 3/23/21 that has AV 17.5% over SP

2021-11-18 BOE Hearing Packet

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS 2021 ASSESSED LAND VALUES

PROPERTY I.D.	Address	Sq. Footage	assessed land value	land value/s.f	Zoning
DOWNTOWN AREA					
Jack Tripp/ (Kindred Post Bldg)	145 S. Franklin St.	4,694	844,950	180.006 MU	
El Sombrero	157 S. Franklin	2,000	360,000	180 MU	
Ak Hotel	165 S. Franklin	15,146	1,151,100	76 MU	
Ak Hotel	159 S. Franklin	3,872	696,900	179.985 MU	
Senate Building	175 S. Franklin	10,000	1,785,000	178.5 MU	
Fudge Shop	195 S. Franklin	3,205	432,750	135.023 MU	
btween Fudge shop and Brewery depot	207 S. Franklin	6,766	918,300	135.723 MU	
Brewery Depot	219 S. Franklin	7,500	1,062,000	141.6 MU	
Decker Bldg	231 S. Franklin	4,800	878,400	183 MU	
Glory Hall	247 S. Franklin St.	3,196 exempt	exempt	MU	
Filipino Hall	251 S. Franklin	12,831	1,924,650	150 MU	
Gold Diggers of Alaska	257 S. Franklin	5,328	1,265,100	237.444 MU	
Sam Sengul	263 S. Franklin	15,510	1,398,600	90.174 MU	
Terry Hickock (old Dreamland)	289 S. Franklin	10,000	2,362,500	236.25 MU	
	307 S. Franklin	5,000	1,063,200	212.64 MU	
	365 S. Franklin	5,148	1,582,950	307.488 MU	
Hernandez	373 S. Franklin	3,000	1,012,500	337.5 MU	
Garrison Stone/ Caribou Crossing	383-391. S. Franklin	10,000	3,150,000	315 MU	
H& H mgmt.	401 S. Franklin	2,684	1,066,650	397.411 MU	
A&J Bldg	411 S. Franklin St.	8,420	3,094,350	367.5 MU	
Rbg Holdings	431 S. Franklin St.	1,610	633,900	393.727 MU	
Royal Blue Alaska	435 S. Franklin St.	3,625	1,427,400	393.766 MU	
Lazaro Bldg.	445 S. Franklin	1,707	704,100	412.478 MU	
Oswald Bldg	465 S. Franklin	3,900	1,535,700	393.769 MU	
Timberwold Ventures (T shirt shop)	489 S. Franklin	15,420	6,071,700	393.755 MU	
AJT Prop (empty lot)	911 Thane Road	36,728	1,036,728	28.227 MU	
Eagle bluffs (empty lot)	549 S Franklin	2,867	105,150	36.676 MU	
Eagle Bluffs empty lot		4,222	139,350	33.006 MU	
Eagle Bluffs empty lot		5,072	137,400	27.09 MU	
AJT Prop (empty lot)		105,415	408,450	3.875 MU	
AEL&P old line crew building	889 S. Franklin	118,403	2,947,650	24.895 MU	
Franklin Dock	880 S. Franklin	37,250	2,780,850	74.654 WI	
Franklin Dock Bldg	700 S. Franklin	61,554	5,362,500	87.119 WI	
Ak Seafoods parking lot	560 S. Franklin	54,296	5,629,350	103.679 WI	
Ak Seafoods plant & Twisted Fish	550 S. Franklin	73,655	7,466,850	101.376 WI	
Peoples Wharf	432 S. Franklin	4,747	2,349,750	494.997 WC	
Almond Ltd.	418 S. Franklin	4,543	2,194,200	482.985 WC	
Warners Warf	406 S. Franklin	11,211	5,044,950	450 WC	
Archipelago Properties	356 S. Franklin	33,875	10,162,500	300 WC	
Red Dog	278 S. Franklin	6,159	2,078,700	337.506 MU	
old Cop Shop Bldg	206 Admiral Way	8,091	1,577,700	194.994 MU	
Ken Williamson	255-263 Marine Way	6,815	1,063,200	156.009 MU	
Ken Williamson	236 S. Franklin	17,179	2,020,200	117.597 MU	
Marine View	226-232 S. Franklin	20,247	4,403,700	217.499 MU	
Georges Gift Shop	194 S. Franklin	4,855	983,100	202.492 MU	
lucky lady	192 S. Franklin	2,098	374,550	178.527 MU	
Rendezvous Bar	184 S. Franklin	3,550	633,750	178.521 MU	
Emporium Mall	170 S. Franklin	7,665	912,100	118.995 MU	
Young Rentals	158 S. Franklin	4,622	701,250	151.72 MU	
Alaska Cache Licquor	154 S. Franklin	3,101	553,500	178.491 MU	
Narrows Bar	148 & 152 S. Franklin	3,027	540,300	178.494 MU	
Triangle Club	249 Front St.	1,263	222,750	176.366 MU	
Helenthal Bldg (formerly 1st National Bk)	234 Front St.	5,943	873,600	146.996 MU	
Gross Ak Theatre	220-226 Front St.	9,656	1,135,500	117.595 MU	
Merchants Wharf		54,443	3,290,700	60.443 WC	
NCL	SUB PORT LOT	125,406	7,524,300	60 MU	
Seadrome Bldg???	76 Egan Drive	43,947	856,650	19.493 WC	
Goldbelt Hotel	51 Egan Drive	38,786	3,025,350	78.001 MU2	
Prospector Hotel	375 Whittier	31,847	1,622,700	50.953 MU2	
Driftwood Hotel	429 West Willoughby	48,179	2,529,450	52.501 MU2	
Valentine Bldg	109-119 Seward	8,153	1,198,350	146.983 MU	
Viking Bar	214-218 Front St	5,287	777,150	146.993 MU	
Fish and Game Bldg	nxt to Overstreet prk	59,988	3,539,250	58.999 WC	

2021-11-18 BOE Hearing Packet

Old Std. Oil dock	AJT properties	37,392	476,700	12.749 WC
Goldbelt Building (permanent fund)	801 W. 10th St	37,253	2,179,350	58.501 LC
Bill Ray Center		21,396	770,250	36 LC
Bill Ray Parking Lot		38,769	1,046,700	26.998 LC
Voelkers Bldg (where Coppa is)	740 W.9th	7,145	337,650	47.257 LC
Frenchies Flower Bldg	1200 Glacier Hwy	8,040	341,850	42.519 LC
MRV Architects	1420 Glacier Hwy	8,867	333,000	37.555 D18

LEMON CREEK AREA:

R & M Bldg (now Tlingit /Haida)	6205 Alaway	73,181	439,055	6 GC
Harri Plumbing (new Petro gas station)	5245 Glacier Hwy	82,215	1,849,500	22.496 I
Costco	5225 Commercial Blvd	436,036	5,109,000	11.717 I
Home Depot	5201 Commercial Blvd	466,296	5,665,500	12.15 I
Wall Mart	6525 Glacier Hwy	468,270	8,099,550	17.297 GC

VALLEY AREA:

Don Abel Bldg. Supply	9997 Glacier Hwy	227,383	2,308,350	10.152 I
Willies Marine Bldg?	2281 Industrial Blvd.	28,833	259,500	9 I
Sandbar bldg	2525 Industrial Blvd	28,156	278,700	9.898 I
DMV Bldg	2760 Sherwood Lane	62,985	566,850	9 I
Juneau Electric Bldg	2770 Sherwood Lane	77,914	757,350	9.72 I
Carlos Tree Service	2787 Sherwood Ln.	29,283	263,550	9 I
Valley Lumber	8525 Old Dairy Rd.	43,913	988,050	22.5 GC
Valley Paint	8461 Old Dairy Rd	13,224	257,850	19.499 GC
Urgent Care	8505 Old Dairy Rd	19,402	407,400	20.998 GC
Old Carrington Bldg	8465 Old Dairy Rd	53,886	1,050,750	19.499 GC
Alaska Litho Bldg	8420 Airport Blvd	43,562	784,050	17.998 I
Entrance Point Bldg	8390 Airport Blvd	41,958	755,250	18 GC
NC Machinery	8550 Airport Blvd	281,398	3,920,400	13.932 I
Builders Plaza	1900 Crest St.	32,064	577,200	18.001 I
Smith Hall	8619 Teal St.	45,896	693,900	15.119 GC
Northrim Bank	2094 Jordan Ave	54,906	988,350	18.001 GC
Nugget Mall	8745 Jordan Ave	349,235	5,029,050	14.4 GC
McDonalds	2285 Trout St.	43,071	969,150	22.501 LC
Breeze In	2200 Trout St.	22,637	576,900	25.485 LC
Jordan Creek Mall	8800 Glacier Hwy	183,044	4,118,550	22.5 LC
jordan Creek Self Storage	2345 Jordan Ave	92,387	1,662,900	17.999 LC
Jordan Creek Boat Condos	2375 Jordan Ave	45,984 no data		LC
Alaska Rent a Car lot	Jordan Ave.	57,892	868,350	14.999 LC
Alaska Rent a Car lot	Jordan Ave	22,817	410,700	18 LC
Jordan Ave. Condo Building	2359 Jordan Ave	no data		LC
Valley Professional Ctr (Jordan Crk Condos)		152,446	2,515,350	16.5 LC
Safeway	3011 Vintage Blvd	238,262	8,547,450	35.874 LC
First Bank	3075 Vintage Blvd	50,133	1,707,150	34.052 LC
Vintage vacant lot nrt to Safeway	no data	127,336	2,521,350	19.801 LC
Vintage office bldg / Sablefish	3030 Vintage Blvd	87,364	2,162,250	24.75 LC
Vintage offic bldg /Goldbelt	?Clinton Drive	9,107	225,450	24.756 LC
Trillium Landing	3039 Clinton Drive	43,560 no data		MU
True North Fed Credit Union	2777 Postal Way	50,000	1,485,000	29.7 LC
Vintage office bldg / Sablefish	3000 Vintage Blvd	35,908	1,244,250	34.651 LC
Vintage vacant lot nrt to 1st bank		32,689	1,135,800	34.746 LC
Future Transit Center	9114 Mendenhall mall	66,399	1,195,200	18 LC
Former Taco Bell	9116 Mend. Mall Rd	42,847	771,300	18.001 LC
Mendenhall Mall		939,195	9,802,800	10.437 LC

SALMON CREEK AREA

Empire Building	3100 Channel Drive	130538	1997250	15.3 GC
Juneau Radio Center	3159 Channel Dr.	73521	1091700	14.849 GC
Samson Warehouse	3141 Channel Dr.	136192	1500300	11.016 GC
Old AML yard/	3155 Channel Dr.	204732	1060500	5.18 WI
State Dept of Transportation Bldg	3132 Channel Dr.	68050	1145250	16.83 GC
Channel Const	2691 Channel Dr.	30840	321000	10.409 WI
Former Triplette Shop now Cent. Council	2631 Channel Dr.	131543	1154250	8.775 WI
Trucano Lot at end of Channel Dr.	2571 Channel Dr.	36803	393300	10.687 WI
Juneau Bone and Joint Bldg	3200 Hospital Dr.	53077	1554450	29.287 GC

Comments on AY2021 Analysis Sales List

Parcel No.	Comments
1C060K010031	This is the NCL Purchase / #4
5B1201300110	This property was used twice (#41 and #42)
1C110K120051	#13
4B1701090056	#14
1C110K120130	#16
1C110K120120	#18
1C110K120150	#24
4B2901020010	This may be treated as land, but it is an RV park / #34
1C110K150041	This may be a related party transaction / #12
1C110K12101	#46

I can only identify the above sales as vacant. I only get 11 sales. Six of these sales are at the Rock Dump. If these sales are included to arrive at the 41% land assessed value ratio, then the analysis only indicated that the Rock Dump was under valued, not the Borough at large.

The only multi-parcel sale is #32, which is the DCI purchase of the Bill Ray Center. I don't see the issue with including multiple parcels if they were part of a sale. It is fairly common in Juneau for property sales to include two or more land parcels for improved properties. Juneau CD doesn't require lot consolidations for the issuance of building permits. They also permit buildings to be built over lot lines.

Taking another look at the statistical analysis, the time rendering was included originally. It is critical that I see the study to support the time trending adjustment of 5%.

From: Arthur Drown <Arthur.Drown@juneau.org>
Sent: Friday, June 25, 2021 10:48 AM
To: mail@cooganalaska.com
Subject: Commercial Assessment Overview Documents

Wayne,


Please see the attached documents regarding Michael's broad analysis of commercial assessments.

Thank you for your time and I will convey your requests his way,

Arthur Drown
Appraiser II
Assessor's Office
City and Borough of Juneau, AK

(907) 586-5215 Ext. 4038

arthur.drown@juneau.org



2021-11-18 BOE Hearing Packet
AY2021 Analysis Sales List

Sale Date	Parcel	Number	Street	Neighborhood
12/09/20	1C070A050001	230	SEWARD ST	SOMMERS ON SEWARD_C_24
12/07/20	5B15011107E0	2221	JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24
12/04/20	4B1701090218	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
11/23/20	5B1201060260	5719	CONCRETE WAY	SEAGULLS EDGE C 24
11/17/20	4B1701020020	10011	GLACIER HWY	MENDE PENINSULA C
11/13/20	1D060L030011	201	CORDOVA ST	WEST JUNEAU C
10/30/20	1C060K660110	711	W WILLOUGHBY AVE	DOWNTOWN C
10/09/20	1C060K010031	0	EGAN DR	DOWNTOWN C
09/24/20	5B1201060160	5740	CONCRETE WAY	LEMON CREEK C
09/24/20	5B1201300110	1783	Anka St	
08/07/20	5B1501010001	1880	CREST ST	BUILDERS PLAZA C 24
03/10/20	1C110K120140	0	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
03/10/20	1C110K120051	0	Eastough Way	
02/28/20	4B1701090056	10009	CRAZY HORSE DR	MENDE PENINSULA C
12/24/19	5B1201300110	1783	Anka St	
10/25/19	1C110K120130	190	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
10/04/19	5B1201000060	5245	GLACIER HWY	LEMON CREEK C
10/02/19	1C110K120120	0	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
08/02/19	5B1201020100	5452	SHAUNE DR	LEMON CREEK C
07/30/19	4B1601050160	2276	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
07/16/19	5B1601140043	9309	GLACIER HWY	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
07/01/19	1C070B0N0011	259	S FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
06/28/19	1C020K01G280	1435	HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
04/01/19	1C110K120150	0	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
02/28/19	1C020K01G290	1435	HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
01/04/19	5B2401610150	4045	DELTA DR	NORTHEAST VALLEY C
11/30/18	3B1501040120	1544	CREST ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/16/18	5B1501040030	8825	MALLARD ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/02/18	1C070B0J0020	195	S FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
08/21/18	5B1601140070	9309	GLACIER HWY	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
07/25/18	1C020K01G200	1435	HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
07/20/18	1C060U050022	1108	F ST	DOWNTOWN C
06/29/18	4B2901020010	10200	MENDENHALL LOOP RD	AUKE MOUNTAIN C
03/05/18	4B1601080070	2278	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	P & J BUSINESS C 24
02/15/18	5B1601000023	9151	GLACIER HWY	SOUTH VALLEY C
12/22/17	5B15011109B0	2231	JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24
10/12/17	3B1501020030	1669	CREST ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
09/20/17	4B1701103003	2769	SHERWOOD LN	BEAR DEN YACHT CONDO C 24
09/19/17	4B1601010040	2450	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	MENDE PENINSULA C
07/31/17	4B1601120130	2270	BRANDY LN	BRANDY LANE YACHT C 24
07/21/17	5B1201330160	2005	ANKA ST	LEMON CREEK C
06/13/17	4B1601050030	2274	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
04/24/17	4B1701090226	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
04/11/17	7B0901030071	3161	CHANNEL DR	TWIN LAKES C
04/05/17	5B1201040052	1721	ANKA ST	LEMON CREEK C
03/16/17	1C110K120101	170	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
02/14/17	4B1701090223	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
01/10/17	4B1701090228	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
12/15/16	1C060U040040	800	GLACIER AVE	DOWNTOWN C
09/02/16	5B1501020170	8401	AIRPORT BLVD	SOUTH VALLEY C
08/02/16	5B1201060061	5631	GLACIER HWY	LEMON CREEK C
06/30/16	4B1701100146	2789	SHERWOOD LN	MENDE PENINSULA C
06/15/16	5B1501000002	8251	GLACIER HWY	SOUTHEAST INSURANCE C 24
06/03/16	5B1201450110	1731	RALPH'S WAY	LEMON CREEK C
03/30/16	1C070A030040	100	N FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
03/01/16	4B1701100170	10221	GLACIER HWY	MENDE PENINSULA C
02/10/16	5B15011107E0	2221	JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24

* These were the sales available to us for our market analysis for assessment year 2021.

** Note that no sales prices are included due the requirement of CBJ ordinance to keep them confidential.

AY 2021 Summary Report - CBJ Commercial Property Valuations

Broad Brush Overview

We are in the process of a major review of the valuation models, the assessed values and the assessment level for all Juneau commercial properties.

A brief background. By State law we are to value properties at market value. Information that is looked at in determining market value includes sales prices, construction costs, income and expenses, lease rates, and capitalization rates.

Commercial property valuations are challenging in Juneau. We are a somewhat isolated market with a limited number of commercial properties available and a fairly low number of sales. Up until late this last year there was no requirement that the sales price be disclosed in real estate transactions. So, besides starting with a low number of sales we only have data on a portion of those.

It would seem that those challenges resulted in assessed values for commercial properties, on a whole, not being increased for the past 10 or more years causing the commercial property assessed values to lag behind the market. This caused a tax shift. A tax shift occurs when the tax burden that should be paid by one party is shifted to being paid by another party. In this case the shift was from commercial properties onto residential properties.

To rectify this tax shift the commercial property assessed values must be brought up to market. This means that commercial properties will see increases that should have occurred in smaller increments for the past 10 plus years being applied in a few years. Because the increases will represent multi-year corrections they may seem to be significant increases.

This first year we are addressing the land component. Next year we will refine the land adjustments and also start making adjustments to the improvement portion of the commercial values.

As a commercial property owner you can help improve the assessed values of Juneau's commercial property!

The more sales, market and lease information we can gather the better our basis for market analysis.

For sales, the primary year we look at is the last year. For property types with fewer sales, which include all commercial property types, we expand the sales data up to 5 years back until we have a large enough sample. For special studies we occasionally go back 10 or more years.

It would be helpful if you would provide information on commercial property sales or purchases that you have made as well as rental, lease and income and expense information.

Thank you for any information you provide.

Assessed Values In The Midst Of A Pandemic

We recognize and are sympathetic to the fact that the past year has been difficult for some businesses in Juneau. Some businesses have seen drastic reductions in revenue, in some cases almost a complete elimination of revenue. At the same time, other businesses had a good year in 2020.

In the midst of that, what State statutes require of us is to determine the market value of the real estate. While a particular business may go out of business the underlying real estate value may decrease, may stay the same, or may even increase.

Compounding Circumstances

Compounding this situation is the fact that it has become recognized and documented that most of the commercial assessed values have not changed in ten plus years while the actual market values have increased during that time. So, we need to take steps to correct that neglect.

Analysis Conclusions

A lot of work was done this year cleaning up the commercial property sales data. There is still more work to be done but good progress was made. That resulted in us having 57 market sales from the past 5 years for which we had sales prices.

Below is a table that summarizes some of the ratios from comparing assessed values to sales. A ratio of 1.00 would be right at market, a ratio under 1.00 indicates that properties are undervalued. This analysis compares 01/01/2020 assessed values to 01/01/2021 market value.

<i>Property Class</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>
Commercial Land	12	0.4095	0.3928
Commercial Improved Properties (Core Types)	35	0.7748	0.8112
Commercial Properties Overall	57	0.7149	0.7411
Residential Properties (for class equity comparison)	1025	0.9629	0.9653

Adjustments To Assessed Values

If we were a larger jurisdiction with thousands of sales and hundreds of sales in particular subsets, then we could make more drastic changes to correct the imbalance between residential and commercial properties more quickly but with limited sales we need to be a little more cautious.

Over the next few years we will work to:

- Bring more uniformity between the commercial and residential property classes
- Bring more uniformity between the commercial subclasses
- Correct the imbalance in the distribution of the value between the land component and the building component(s).

This year will just be a first step. For most properties the increase will be applied to just the land component. For some classes of properties that have no land component or only a token land value, the increase will be applied to the buildings. This will bring all commercial properties closer to market. Next year we will take another step towards parity with residential properties. This will likely involve a further increase in land and, at least in some cases, a reduction in the building component.

The adjustment being applied this year will result in a 50% increase in the land component for most commercial properties. On average this results in a 20% increase to commercial property values. One class of properties, boathouses, will actually see a 20% reduction this year.


Future Refinements

In the coming years we will be:


- Refining the valuation models for all of the commercial property types- retail, office, medical, industrial, etc.
- Refining the locational adjustments
- Refining the value adjustments for things like quality, condition and other attributes.


Charts & Maps

This first chart shows the number of sales per year in two groups- market sales and market sales for which we know the sales price. You can see that the sales volume held steady through 2020 in spite of the pandemic.




The next chart (below) shows the change in total assessed values by classification over the past 8 years. It includes both new construction and market trend increases. You can see that the residential assessed values have been increased each year while the land assessments and commercial assessments have remained flat. Economic data from the same time period would suggest that over the past 8 years the actual market value of residential property, land and commercial property have all actually increased.






This chart shows the ratios based on Assessment Year 2020 (Starting Ratio) and the results of our adjustments for the Assessment Year 2021 (Ending Ratio). Note that the adjustments we made brought the commercial valuations closer to, but not up to, the residential assessment level. Still lagging far behind is commercial land valuations.

The following map shows Market Areas (Neighborhoods) utilized in the Assessment process. Market Areas are one of the adjusting factors.



Market Areas - Borough Wide

The next chart is from the JEDC Economic Indicators Report 2020 and shows the growth in sales over the past 10 years.



Source: City & Borough of Juneau Sales Tax Office and CBJ Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, July 1, 2018- June 30, 2019, Statistical Section. **Note:** "Other" category includes mineral sales, wholesale equipment, food suppliers, and fuel companies.

Next we have a summary report of the analysis. The first Summary shows the data for commercial properties prior to this years adjustments and the second summary report shows the data after the corrections that were applied this year.

**AY2021- Comm- Set 2- 20210316- No19- All, 5 Yr, 5% Trend
Summary Report**

Statistics

Current

54	Count (Number of Records with Ratio)
0.1959	Minimum Ratio
1.1908	Maximum Ratio
0.9950	Range

0.6879	Mean (This is the average ratio for your sample.)
0.7286	Median (This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)
0.5418	Weighted Mean
2.3448	Sum of the Square of Deviations
0.1720	AAD
0.2103	Standard Deviation

23.6036	COD (Good indicator of confidence level.)
30.5772	COV
1.2696	PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential (PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO) (PRD over 1=Regressive)

IAAO Standards for COD

SFR	15.0 or less
SFR-newer/homog	10.0 or less
Income Properties	20.0 or less
Income-Urban area	15.0 or less
Vacant Land	20.0 or less

Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)


Kurtosis	-0.3111
Skewness	-0.2814
Alt. Cyhelsky's Skew	-0.1481
Alt. Pearson's Skew	-0.5808

Trending Factors


0.98 Target Level
1.4246 Factor on Mean
1.3450 Factor on Median
1.8087 Factor on Weighted Mean

Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation


0.0407 Differential Mean to Median
23 Number of data points below the mean.
31 Number of data points above the mean.
*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts.



Summary



Histogram of Ratio Frequency



AY2021- Comm- Set 2 Updated AVs Live1- 20210316- No 19- All, 5 Yr, 5% Trend

Summary Report

Statistics

Current

53	Count (Number of Records with Ratio)
0.2932	Minimum Ratio
1.4091	Maximum Ratio
1.1159	Range

0.8526	Mean (This is the average ratio for your sample.)
0.8853	Median (This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)
0.6981	Weighted Mean
3.0313	Sum of the Square of Deviations
0.1908	AAD
0.2414	Standard Deviation

21.5490	COD (Good indicator of confidence level.)
28.3180	COV
1.2214	PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential (PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO) (PRD over 1=Regressive)

IAAO Standards for COD

SFR	15.0 or less
SFR-newer/homog	10.0 or less
Income Properties	20.0 or less
Income-Urban area	15.0 or less
Vacant Land	20.0 or less

Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)


Kurtosis	-0.0245
Skewness	0.0181
Alt. Cyhelsky's Skew	-0.0943
Alt. Pearson's Skew	-0.4059

Trending Factors


0.85 Target Level
0.9969 Factor on Mean
0.9601 Factor on Median
1.2176 Factor on Weighted Mean

Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation


0.0327 Differential Mean to Median
24 Number of data points below the mean.
29 Number of data points above the mean.
*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts.



Summary




Histogram of Ratio Frequency




02 June 21

Juneau Sales List



Sale-Date 12/09/2020 AV-AY2020 190,200 PropertyType 24
Parcel 1C070A050001 Address 230 SEWARD ST Count 1
-Seller Bernard Wostmann -Buyer The Spear/Kirkness Family Tr
min-SaleSource Buyers Maket Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 12/07/2020 AV-AY2020 252,940 PropertyType 21
Parcel 5B15011107E0 Address 2221 JORDAN AVE Count 1
-Seller Alaska Bell LLC -Buyer Family Promise of Juneau
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit 0 Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Sale-Date 12/04/2020 AV-AY2020 121,700 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1701090218 Address 10011 CRAZY HORSE DR Count 1
-Seller Darrell & Pauline Baker -Buyer Jeff & Gina Carpenter
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Sale-Date 11/23/2020 AV-AY2020 249,200 PropertyType 21
Parcel 5B1201060260 Address 5719 CONCRETE WAY Count 1
-Seller James George & Arbe Jean W -Buyer Seth Koch
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 4300 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 11/17/2020 AV-AY2020 453,200 PropertyType 24
Parcel 4B1701020020 Address 10011 GLACIER HWY Count 1
-Seller Shannon Sweeny -Buyer Alaska On Point Properties L
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 17534 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue


Juneau Sales List



Sale-Date 11/13/2020 AV-AY2020 388,800 PropertyType 24
Parcel 1D060L030011 Address 201 CORDOVA ST Count 2
-Seller W & B Rentals -Buyer Aware Inc
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode Residential
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Damaged As-Is Prop
Land-Area 9435.1 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 10/30/2020 AV-AY2020 1,182,900 PropertyType 18
Parcel 1C060K660110 Address 711 W WILLOUGHBY A Count 1
-Seller Capitol Builders Inc -Buyer Gold Lodge LLC
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 12802 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 10/09/2020 AV-AY2020 5,016,200 PropertyType 17
Parcel 1C060K010031 Address EGAN DR Count 1
-Seller Alaska Mental Health Trust -Buyer Norwegian Cruise Lines
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 125406 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 09/24/2020 AV-AY2020 486,500 PropertyType 17
Parcel 5B1201060160 Address 5740 CONCRETE WAY Count 2
-Seller Bonnell Development LLC -Buyer Central Council of Tlingit & H
min-SaleSource SELLER MARKET LET -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Multiple Parcel Sale
Land-Area 25718 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 09/24/2020 AV-AY2020 179,700 PropertyType
Parcel 5B1201300110 Address 1783 Anka St Count 1
-Seller Bonnell Development LLC -Buyer Michael & Angela Hull
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List



Sale-Date 08/07/2020 AV-AY2020 681,700 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1501010001 Address 1880 CREST ST Count 2
-Seller Kristan & Tara Stephens -Buyer Hal & Leslie Daugherty
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Multiple Parcel Sale
Land-Area 6632 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 06/23/2020 AV-AY2020 34,000 PropertyType
Parcel 1C020K01E300 Address 1435 Harbor Way Count 1
-Seller Steven Wolf -Buyer Resource Inc
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 03/10/2020 AV-AY2020 334,200 PropertyType
Parcel 1C110K120051 Address Eastaugh Way Count 1
-Seller JMIS LLC -Buyer Eastaugh Way LLC
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 03/10/2020 AV-AY2020 158,100 PropertyType 17
Parcel 1C110K120140 Address MILL ST Count
-Seller JMIS LLC -Buyer Bonnell Development LLC
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 17219 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 02/28/2020 AV-AY2020 640,900 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1701090056 Address 10009 CRAZY HORSE DR Count 1
-Seller Alaska Striping & Painting Inc -Buyer R & L Leasing Inc
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 195024 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue


Juneau Sales List




Sale-Date 02/13/2020 AV-AY2020 444,400 PropertyType 24
Parcel 4B1701080020 Address 10012 CRAZY HORSE DR Count 1
-Seller MCC Rentals -Buyer RPA Investmetns
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Personal Property In
Land-Area 36681 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 12/31/2019 AV-AY2020 1,155,600 PropertyType 24
Parcel 4B1701104000 Address 2771 SHERWOOD LN Count 1
-Seller Building Pros Inc -Buyer DPM Rentals LLC
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 15559 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 12/31/2019 AV-AY2020 1,206,300 PropertyType 20
Parcel 1C070K810090 Address 170 S FRANKLIN ST Count 2
-Seller Mackin Co (Mackinnon) -Buyer The Emporium Mall LLC
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 7665 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 12/24/2019 AV-AY2020 179,700 PropertyType
Parcel 5B1201300110 Address 1783 Anka St Count 1
-Seller Young Rentals LLC -Buyer Bonnell Development LLC
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 10/25/2019 AV-AY2020 158,100 PropertyType 17
Parcel 1C110K120130 Address 190 MILL ST Count 1
-Seller JMIS LLC -Buyer Bonnell Development LLC
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 17219 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List



Sale-Date 10/04/2019 AV-AY2020 1,233,000 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1201000060 Address 5245 GLACIER HWY Count 1
-Seller HPH Holdings LLC -Buyer Petro 49 Inc
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Improvement Chang
Land-Area 82215 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 10/02/2019 AV-AY2020 158,100 PropertyType 17
Parcel 1C110K120120 Address MILL ST Count 1
-Seller JMIS LLC -Buyer Gastineau Guiding Propertie
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 17219 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 09/03/2019 AV-AY2020 1,019,900 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1201010010 Address 1610 ANKA ST Count 2
-Seller National Bank of Alaska -Buyer Odex Juneau LLC
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 39581 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 08/02/2019 AV-AY2020 638,600 PropertyType 30
Parcel 5B1201020100 Address 5452 SHAUNE DR Count 1
-Seller Odom Real Estate Partnershi -Buyer Odex Juneau LLC
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 18000 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 07/30/2019 AV-AY2020 70,000 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1601050160 Address 2276 INDUSTRIAL BLVD Count 1
-Seller William & Susan Martin -Buyer Juneau Interiors Staging LLC
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit 0 Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List




Sale-Date 07/16/2019 AV-AY2020 141,800 PropertyType 21
Parcel 5B1601140043 Address 9309 GLACIER HWY Count 1
-Seller BBS LLC -Buyer Watchtree Juneau LLC
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 6071 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 07/01/2019 AV-AY2020 1,743,200 PropertyType 20
Parcel 1C070B0N0011 Address 259 S FRANKLIN ST Count 1
-Seller Gold Diggers of Alaska Invest -Buyer RBG Holdings LLC
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Sale-AdjReason Personal Property In

Land-Area 5328 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 06/28/2019 AV-AY2020 34,000 PropertyType 19
Parcel 1C020K01G280 Address 1435 HARBOR WAY Count 1
-Seller Barbara Keller -Buyer Rex Thompson
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 04/01/2019 AV-AY2020 249,600 PropertyType 17
Parcel 1C110K120150 Address MILL ST Count 1
-Seller JMIS LLC -Buyer M&M Tours Limited
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 27179 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 03/26/2019 AV-AY2020 849,500 PropertyType 18
Parcel 4B2801050030 Address 3845 LEE CT Count 1
-Seller Charles Adams -Buyer JG Construction LLC
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Improvement Chang

Land-Area 11385 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Handwritten notes and signatures in the bottom right corner of the page.


Juneau Sales List



Sale-Date 02/28/2019 AV-AY2020 34,000 PropertyType 19
Parcel 1C020K01G290 Address 1435 HARBOR WAY Count 1
-Seller Barbara Keller -Buyer Byron Mallott
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 01/04/2019 AV-AY2020 479,400 PropertyType 18
Parcel 5B2401610150 Address 4045 DELTA DR Count 1
-Seller Charles Moline -Buyer Colin Conerton & Jesse Uma
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Residential
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 9000 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 11/30/2018 AV-AY2020 164,000 PropertyType 24
Parcel 3B1501040120 Address 1544 CREST ST Count 1
-Seller CBJ, H Clough & R Young -Buyer James Thompson & Jennifer
min-SaleSource Non Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason Valid
-ConditionCode Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 3250 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 11/16/2018 AV-AY2020 682,200 PropertyType 20
Parcel 5B1501040030 Address 8825 MALLARD ST Count 1
-Seller Stanley and Sons -Buyer Affordable Auto Enterprises
min-SaleSource Non Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 25897 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 11/02/2018 AV-AY2020 538,200 PropertyType 24
Parcel 1C070B0J0020 Address 195 S FRANKLIN ST Count 1
-Seller Ronald & Kathryn Maas -Buyer Alvin & Debra Bergmann
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 3205 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List




Sale-Date 10/29/2018 AV-AY2020 309,800 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1601090040 Address CRAZY HORSE DR Count 3
-Seller Tod D Young -Buyer 55 LLC
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 3888 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 08/21/2018 AV-AY2020 249,900 PropertyType 21
Parcel 5B1601140070 Address 9309 GLACIER HWY Count 1
-Seller Mark Rierderer -Buyer RNL LLC
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 7968 -AreaUnit 0 Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 07/25/2018 AV-AY2020 34,000 PropertyType 19
Parcel 1C020K01G200 Address 1435 HARBOR WAY Count 1
-Seller Michael Duby -Buyer Frederick Kasnick
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 07/20/2018 AV-AY2020 1,857,300 PropertyType 24
Parcel 1C060U050022 Address 1108 F ST Count 5
-Seller First National Bank of Alaska -Buyer DCI Commercial LLC
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Multiple Parcel Sale


Land-Area 21396 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 06/29/2018 AV-AY2020 703,900 PropertyType 31
Parcel 4B2901020010 Address 10200 MENDENHALL LOO Count 1
-Seller Spruce Meadow RV Park LLC -Buyer Glacier Nalu LLC
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Personal Property In

Land-Area 12.5 -AreaUnit a Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List



Sale-Date 03/05/2018 AV-AY2020 30,000 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1601080070 Address 2278 INDUSTRIAL BLVD Count 1
-Seller Mike Pilling & Kerry Kirkpatri -Buyer Robert Sauerteig
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit 0 Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 02/15/2018 AV-AY2020 713,300 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1601000023 Address 9151 GLACIER HWY Count 1
-Seller Pilcher Properties LLC -Buyer St Vincent Depaul Society
min-SaleSource Non Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 20710 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 01/29/2018 AV-AY2020 507,100 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1201450050 Address 5410 BENT CT Count 1
-Seller Michael & Lavina Smith -Buyer Salt Holdings LLC
min-SaleSource Non Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Personal Property In
Land-Area 15283 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 01/09/2018 AV-AY2020 342,600 PropertyType 17
Parcel 1C100I070050 Address 549 S FRANKLIN ST Count 4
-Seller Keen & Harris -Buyer Eagle Bluffs LLC
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Multiple Parcel Sale
Land-Area 3117 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 12/22/2017 AV-AY2020 249,970 PropertyType 21
Parcel 5B15011109B0 Address 2231 JORDAN AVE Count 1
-Seller Constance Trollan -Buyer Tamar Mary Boyd
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason
Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit 0 Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List




Sale-Date 10/12/2017 AV-AY2020 41,200 PropertyType 24
Parcel 3B1501020030 Address 1669 CREST ST Count 1
-Seller CBJ & Larry Depute -Buyer Richard Forst
min-SaleSource -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 1179 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 09/20/2017 AV-AY2020 281,000 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1701103003 Address 2769 SHERWOOD LN Count 1
-Seller Building Pros Inc -Buyer Michael Blume
min-SaleSource Recorder Site - Mtg -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 09/19/2017 AV-AY2020 718,400 PropertyType 24
Parcel 4B1601010040 Address 2450 INDUSTRIAL BLVD Count 1
-Seller B&K Ventures -Buyer Bad Dog Investments
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 34907 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 09/07/2017 AV-AY2020 34,000 PropertyType 19
Parcel 1C020K01E230 Address 1435 HARBOR WAY Count 1
-Seller Richard Shattuck -Buyer Neil Mackinnon
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason


Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 09/07/2017 AV-AY2020 34,000 PropertyType 19
Parcel 1C020K01E220 Address 1435 HARBOR WAY Count 1
-Seller Allen Shattuck -Buyer Neil Mackinnon
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List




Sale-Date 07/31/2017 AV-AY2020 100,000 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1601120130 Address 2270 BRANDY LN Count 1
-Seller James & Arbe Williams -Buyer Andrew Miller
min-SaleSource None Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 07/21/2017 AV-AY2020 524,500 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1201330160 Address 2005 ANKA ST Count 3
-Seller Caroline Pitts -Buyer Casey & Natalie Wilkins
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Multiple Parcel Sale

Land-Area 12738 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 06/13/2017 AV-AY2020 91,500 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1601050030 Address 2274 INDUSTRIAL BLVD Count 1
-Seller Ralph Bennett -Buyer Hal & Leslie Daugherty
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Invalid Sale-AdjReason Improvement Chang

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit 0 Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 04/24/2017 AV-AY2020 125,700 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1701090226 Address 10011 CRAZY HORSE DR Count 1
-Seller Alaska Striping & Painting Inc -Buyer Paul & Wanda Thomas
min-SaleSource Non Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason


Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 04/11/2017 AV-AY2020 1,513,800 PropertyType 21
Parcel 7B0901030071 Address 3161 CHANNEL DR Count 1
-Seller Media Limited -Buyer Frontier Properties LLC
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason


Land-Area 73520 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List




Sale-Date 04/05/2017 AV-AY2020 3,601,000 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1201040052 Address 1721 ANKA ST Count 2
-Seller Channel Construction Inc -Buyer Construction Machinery Ind
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Multiple Parcel Sale

Land-Area 236966 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 03/16/2017 AV-AY2020 409,100 PropertyType 30
Parcel 1C110K120101 Address 170 MILL ST Count 1
-Seller JMIS LLC -Buyer Sysco Seattle, Inc
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Improvement Chang

Land-Area 34095 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 02/14/2017 AV-AY2020 144,400 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1701090223 Address 10011 CRAZY HORSE DR Count 1
-Seller Alaska Striping & Painting -Buyer Benton & Meier Manageme
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 01/30/2017 AV-AY2020 927,600 PropertyType 21
Parcel 1C030C280080 Address 712 W TWELFTH ST Count 1
-Seller Juneau & Pacific Properties L -Buyer 712 W 12th St LLC
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 9628 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 01/27/2017 AV-AY2020 203,300 PropertyType 24
Parcel 6D0701000020 Address 4755 N DOUGLAS HWY Count 2
-Seller Michael Hatch -Buyer Compton-Munro Automotiv
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Multiple Parcel Sale

Land-Area 45390 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List



Sale-Date 01/18/2017 AV-AY2020 1,087,200 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1201060140 Address 5720 CONCRETE WAY Count 1
-Seller Alaska Seafood Holdings Inc -Buyer Alcor Lands LLC
-min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason


Land-Area 32974

-AreaUnit sf

Bldg-SF

dg-Stories

IsdValue



Sale-Date 01/10/2017 AV-AY2020 144,400 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B170109022P Address 10011 CRAZY HORSE DR Count 1
-Seller Alaska Striping & Packing Inc -Buyer Morris Kenney
-min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0

-AreaUnit

Bldg-SF

dg-Stories

IsdValue



Sale-Date 12/30/2016 AV-AY2020 2,647,500 PropertyType 18
Parcel 7B0901040070 Address 1050 SALMON CREEK LN Count 1
-Seller The Salmon Co -Buyer Ak Preservation Spruce LP
-min-SaleSource Non Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Sales w/ Allocated Sa

Land-Area 53622

-AreaUnit sf

Bldg-SF

dg-Stories

IsdValue



Sale-Date 12/15/2016 AV-AY2020 1,203,800 PropertyType 24
Parcel 1C060U040040 Address 800 GLACIER AVE Count 1
-Seller Forrest Reitz LLC -Buyer Carium AK LLC
-min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 15944

-AreaUnit sf

Bldg-SF

dg-Stories

IsdValue



Sale-Date 09/23/2018 AV-AY2020 1,157,400 PropertyType 18
Parcel 1C050C000080 Address 361 DISTIN AVE Count 1
-Seller Sally Engstrom -Buyer Lemont Bluff LLC
-min-SaleSource Non Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 11543


-AreaUnit sf

Bldg-SF

dg-Stories


IsdValue

Juneau Sales List



Sale-Date 01/18/2017 AV-AY2020 1,087,200 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1201060140 Address 5720 CONCRETE WAY Count 1
-Seller Alaska Seafood Holdings Inc -Buyer Alcor Lands LLC
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 32974 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 01/10/2017 AV-AY2020 144,400 PropertyType 30
Parcel 4B1701090228 Address 10011 CRAZY HORSE DR Count 1
-Seller Alaska Striping & Painting Inc -Buyer Morris Kenney
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 12/30/2016 AV-AY2020 2,647,500 PropertyType 18
Parcel 7B0901040070 Address 1050 SALMON CREEK LN Count 1
-Seller The Salmon Co -Buyer Ak Preservation Spruce LP
min-SaleSource Non Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Sales w Allocated Sa

Land-Area 53622 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 12/15/2016 AV-AY2020 1,203,800 PropertyType 24
Parcel 1C060U040040 Address 800 GLACIER AVE Count 1
-Seller Forrest Reetz LLC -Buyer Caelum AK LLC
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason


Land-Area 18944 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 09/23/2016 AV-AY2020 1,157,400 PropertyType 18
Parcel 1C060C000080 Address 361 DISTIN AVE Count 1
-Seller Sally Engstrom -Buyer Lemann Bluff LLC
min-SaleSource Non Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 11543 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List




Sale-Date 09/02/2016 AV-AY2020 927,600 PropertyType 30
Parcel 5B1501020170 Address 8401 AIRPORT BLVD Count 1
-Seller Russell & Caroline Shivers -Buyer DCI Properties LLC
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 42577 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 08/10/2016 AV-AY2020 752,800 PropertyType 36
Parcel 5B1601440000 Address 3039 CLINTON DR Count 6
-Seller William Bauer -Buyer Juneau Senior Housing Partn
min-SaleSource None Sale Appraisal -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Multiple Parcel Sale

Land-Area 43560 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 08/02/2016 AV-AY2020 511,900 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1201060061 Address 5631 GLACIER HWY Count 2
-Seller Taku Oil Sales Inc -Buyer Gas N Go LLC
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Multiple Parcel Sale

Land-Area 17301 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 06/30/2016 AV-AY2020 241,200 PropertyType 22
Parcel 4B1701100146 Address 2789 SHERWOOD LN Count 1
-Seller Cuttingedge Development In -Buyer Samuel Smith
min-SaleSource Appraisal -TransmitCode Vacant Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Improvement Chang


Land-Area 31329 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 06/15/2016 AV-AY2020 515,500 PropertyType 24
Parcel 5B1501000002 Address 8251 GLACIER HWY Count 1
-Seller Spickler Egan Financial Serv -Buyer DCI Properties LLC
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 26000 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

Juneau Sales List




Sale-Date 06/03/2016 AV-AY2020 913,000 PropertyType 20
Parcel 5B1201450110 Address 1731 RALPH'S WAY Count 1
-Seller BC Leasing Partnership -Buyer SE Furniture Warehouse Inc
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 16457 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue




Sale-Date 03/30/2016 AV-AY2020 672,400 PropertyType 24
Parcel 1C070A030040 Address 100 N FRANKLIN ST Count 1
-Seller First National Bank Alaska -Buyer Spicketts Palace LLC
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason Damaged As-Is Prop

Land-Area 5943 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 03/01/2016 AV-AY2020 607,200 PropertyType 24
Parcel 4B1701100170 Address 10221 GLACIER HWY Count 1
-Seller James & Joan White -Buyer C & M Rentals
min-SaleSource Buyer Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 82328 -AreaUnit sf Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue



Sale-Date 02/10/2016 AV-AY2020 252,940 PropertyType 21
Parcel 5B15011107E0 Address 2221 JORDAN AVE Count 1
-Seller Allan Schlict -Buyer Alaska Bell Inc
min-SaleSource Seller Market Letter -TransmitCode Commercial
ValidationCode Qualified -InvalidReason
-ConditionCode Valid Sale-AdjReason

Land-Area 0 -AreaUnit 0 Bldg-SF dg-Stories isedValue

From: [Bob Spitzfaden](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: FW: Initial response to July 28, 2021 letter
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 3:44:09 PM
Attachments: [2021-08-03 Response Letter to Commercial Property Owners.pdf](#)

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

As previously indicated, I am forwarding the Bowen email of August 3 with attachments to be included in the Board packets for Alaskan Kiwi, Rountree, Engstrom and Coogan.

If the email comes without the attachment, please let me know.

Robert S. Spitzfaden

From: Teresa Bowen <Teresa.Bowen@juneau.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 1:26 PM
To: 'spitz@gci.net' <spitz@gci.net>
Subject: Initial response to July 28, 2021 letter

Good afternoon, Mr. Spitzfaden.

We have received your letter regarding the commercial property appeals, dated July 28, 2021. I'm attaching our initial responses to your questions. More information will be forthcoming as we proceed in the appeal process- primarily for the properties who have timely filed their appeals. If you can confirm that you are the designated representative for each of the property owners listed, we can ensure you get that information with the property owner as the Assessor works with them.

Emphasized in the letter is the recent BOE training the State Assessor and CBJ Assessor provided in July this year. Please let us know if you have any trouble accessing that video. It is a wealth of information regarding this year's commercial property assessments:

<https://juneau.org/clerk/boards-committees/boards-master-list/boe>

-> 2021 BOE Agenda Packets

-> "Zoom Cloud Recording to Training Session"

-> passcode: Kuw@btP0

Thank you.

Teresa Bowen
Assistant Attorney
City and Borough of Juneau Law Department
155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801
Phone: (907)586-5242, ext. 4110

Robert H. Palmer III
Municipal Attorney

Teresa E. Bowen
Assistant Municipal Attorney

Sherri Layne
Assistant Municipal Attorney

Christopher L. Storz
Assistant Municipal Attorney

Adam R. Gottschalk
Assistant Municipal Attorney



Law Department City & Borough of Juneau

Debbie L. Senn
Office Manager

Audrey Dean
Litigation and Support
Assistant - Criminal

Junnie Chup
Litigation and Support
Assistant - Civil

Leah Haskell-Cummins
Litigation and Support
Assistant - Criminal

August 3, 2021

Robert S. Spitzfaden
Gruening & Spitzfaden
PO Box 332598
Juneau, AK 99083

Delivered to: SPITZ@GCI.NET

Subject: Response to July 28th Letter Regarding Commercial Assessment Appeals

Dear Mr. Spitzfaden:

This letter provides an initial response to your letter dated July 28, 2021 regarding commercial property assessments in 2021.

The City has a records retention schedule and preserves records regarding its property assessments. You provide a list of commercial property owners that you purport are your clients. Please confirm that you are the designated legal representative for each property owner listed so we may ensure you receive information regarding each parcel. However, we will not be able to discuss merits regarding the property valuation for any property owners who did not timely file an appeal under CBJ 15.05.160 and AS 29.45.190(b).

Reviewing your letter, the 2021 Board of Equalization (BOE) training, provided by the State Assessor and the CBJ, should greatly assist your clients in understanding the commercial property assessments conducted by the CBJ for the 2021 assessment year. In particular, Deputy Assessor Michael Dahle presented at length about the rationale and methodology supporting commercial valuation adjustments made in 2021. His presentation materials are attached to this letter, and the entire training packet and recording of the training is available online at <https://juneau.org/clerk/boards-committees/boards-master-list/boe>. The video is under the 2021 BOE Agenda packet as "Zoom Cloud Recording to Training Session" and the passcode is provided next to the link (Kuw@btP0). The presentation by Michael Dahle begins at 1:16:00 in the video, although you may find the State Assessor's presentation at the start of the video regarding the BOE process informative as well.

In order to timely respond to your letter, we are providing the following initial information. Please keep in mind that the answers are focused exclusively on commercial property values and the specific methodologies applied to these values in the 2021 assessment year. This is not meant to answer all questions related to the nuances and complexities of the appraisal and assessment process.

1. Reevaluation under AS 29.45.150.

The CBJ Assessor did not undertake a systematic reevaluation for the 2021 assessment year. Only the Assembly can order a Reevaluation under AS 29.45.150, and they have not done so. For 2021, the CBJ Assessor conducted a standard annual assessment of full and true value as required by CBJ 15.05.100 & AS 29.45.110 using the same methods as in prior years: Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal (CAMA) adjusted for the outcome of Ratio Studies, in keeping with the standards of the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO).

2. Mass Assessment Method.

The term “mass assessment method” is not entirely accurate. The CBJ Assessor conducts valuation through a mass appraisal methodology, which has been summarized in reports and was presented during the 2021 BOE training (linked above). The assessed values were set through trending as indicated by ratio studies of sales.

3. Comparable sales.

Mass appraisal does not use the direct sales comparison approach that is commonly used for individual private fee appraisals. Commercial property sales were utilized in the Ratio Study and analysis process for the 2021 assessment year. Please refer the Deputy Assessor’s 2021 BOE presentation for additional information regarding the 2021 commercial property methodology. Also, please refer to Question 7 below for additional information about the Ratio Study process and result.

4. Cost Approach Method.

The cost approach was not utilized in setting assessed values for commercial properties for the 2021 assessment year. Please refer the Deputy Assessor’s 2021 BOE presentation for additional information regarding the 2021 commercial property methodology.

5. Income Method.

The income approach was not utilized in setting assessed values for commercial properties for the 2021 assessment year. Please refer the Deputy Assessor’s 2021 BOE presentation for additional information regarding the 2021 commercial property methodology.

6. Combination Method.

As provided in the answers above, this is not applicable to the 2021 assessment year.

While the above-suggested methodologies were not utilized during the 2021 assessment year, we encourage you and your clients to communicate and provide the CBJ Assessor with information regarding current market values. While the 2021 assessment year methodology has been set by a ratio study of sales (please refer to the 2021 BOE presentation provided by Deputy Assessor Michael Dahle), the City is always willing to accept information that will ensure assessments are fair and equitable.

7. Adjustments made for each particular property sale or analysis.

As noted in Question 3 above, the direct sales comparison approach common for private fee appraisals was not utilized in setting individual property values for the 2021 assessment year.

However, known qualified commercial sale prices were compared to assessed values in the ratio study process. That study demonstrated that commercial properties, particularly commercial land,

were substantially under-assessed. As a result of the ratio study, a 50% increase was applied to the base value of commercial land borough-wide. Prior to that increase, the ratio study indicated that the median assessed value of a commercial parcel was 73% of its known sale price. After the increase, the ratio study indicates that the median assessed value of a commercial parcel is 89% of its known sale price. Please refer to the 2021 BOE presentation provided by Deputy Assessor Michael Dahle for additional information.

8. Every sale employed in the mass appraisal method.

Please see the attached .pdf. Under CBJ 15.05.105(c), certain information is not provided as it is required to be kept confidential. Individual property owners may request their data from the City.

9. Name and Resume of each city employee involved in the mass appraisal.

Michael Dahle, Deputy Assessor, is the primary City employee involved with the commercial property assessments. His background summary is attached. Your letter appears to request all current and past personnel files. This request is denied under AS 39.25.080 and AS 40.25.120, requiring personnel records to be kept confidential with limited exception.

For the remainder, the CBJ Assessor and staff appraisers are certified by the AAAO- the Alaska Association of Assessing Officers- as assessment professionals, and they follow the standards of the profession for the assessment process. Notably, the CBJ Assessor follows the Standard on Mass Appraisal and the Standard on Ratio Studies. I encourage you and your clients to carefully review those standards for better understanding of the methodologies employed in mass appraisal.

10. Information for properties under appeal.

We are compiling this information and the CBJ Assessor will provide this information directly to the property owners who proceed to the Board of Equalization. If you confirm your representation of each property owner, we will supply this information to you as well.

11. Land value of sales- separate from improvements- used in mass appraisal method.

The analysis during the 2021 assessment year included review of both vacant land and improved sale properties. No land allocation method was applied to the improved sale properties.

12. Statistical analysis, formulas and methods employed.

Please refer to the presentation provided by Deputy Assessor Michael Dahle at the 2021 BOE training.

13. Information used to determine trends in commercial values.

Please refer to the presentation provided by Deputy Assessor Michael Dahle at the 2021 BOE training. This presentation also referred to COVID impacts. No decrease in commercial values was discernable as a result of COVID, but sales from 2020 were included in the analysis. You also request information addressing impacts of oil prices and decreasing State budgets. This information is not relevant to determining the fair and true value of real property undergoing a local municipal assessment under AS 29.45, and had no impact on the valuation.

14. Market sales employment in the Tax Year 2021 Summary Report.

Please see the attached .pdf. Under CBJ 15.05.105(c), certain information is not provided as it is required to be kept confidential. Further, to reiterate- no land allocation method was applied to valuation methodology.

15. Documentation employed in the mass appraisal method to determine impact.

From your question, you appear to ask if reductions in State of Alaska leasing space has reduced commercial property values. The CBJ Assessor has not received any studies or sales to substantiate this position. Any reduction would be reflected in market data, which would be considered part of the analysis in setting property values. Commercial property owners are encouraged to provide the CBJ Assessor with sales and lease prices.

16. Income Method cap rate.

The income approach was not employed or otherwise utilized in setting assessed values for assessment year 2021. However, if a property owner provides evidence of income and expense information to the Assessor during the review process, a cap rate of 6% will be applied to determine fair market value under the income approach. Please refer to the presentation provided by Deputy Assessor Michael Dahle at the 2021 BOE training.

Process for Appeal

As we move forward in the appeal process, we will be complying with the requirements defined in AS 29.45.190 – 29.45.210, and our local code requirements of CBJ 15.05. In particular, the Assessor prepares a summary of assessment data relating to each assessment that is appealed under AS 29.45.190(d) and CBJ 15.05.170. The work to prepare this information for the BOE, by parcel and by appellant, is ongoing and will be completed before hearings are scheduled for each individual appellant. This information will be timely available to appellants before their hearings.

As a reminder, under AS 29.45.210(b) (and CBJ 15.05.190): “The appellant bears the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in a valid written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing. If a valuation is found to be too low, the board of equalization may raise the assessment.”

Property owners who have timely filed an appeal currently have the opportunity to provide evidence to the CBJ Assessor in the interest of correcting any assessment errors. After review of such documentation, the Assessor could determine that there is sufficient evidence to make an administrative correction to assessed value. If your clients have such information, please provide it to the CBJ Assessor so any correction can be determined prior to the BOE hearings. It benefits both parties when information is provided. It ensures the Assessor has a fair opportunity to correct potential errors and helps the process moving forward.

We strongly encourage you to watch the 2021 BOE training at the link provided above. It will answer many of your clients’ questions and help the commercial property owners understand the Assessor’s legal requirement to assess property at its full and true value. It may also assist your clients in understanding that the valuation is still below market value during the current assessment year. If your argument is that the CBJ Assessor should have used a different methodology in assessing commercial properties during the 2021 assessment year, please keep in mind that Alaska law accords broad discretion in property valuation, which is only questioned in cases of fraud or clear error (Fairbanks Gold Mining, Inc. v. Fairbanks North Star Borough Assessor, 488 P.3d 959, 965

(Alaska 2021)). The CBJ's goal is to ensure that every property is equitably assessed at its true and full value, as required by law.

If your clients proceed in this matter, they will be afforded the same information and process that the City provides every appellant and required by law at the BOE.

Sincerely,



Teresa Bowen
Assistant Municipal Attorney
City and Borough of Juneau

Cc: Jeff Rogers, Finance Director
Mary Hammond, CBJ Assessor
Robert Palmer, City Attorney

Property Assessments

An overview for the Board of Equalization

Presented July 14, 2021

Assessment Basics

- Assessor is required by AS 29.45.110 to determine the fair market value of all taxable properties
- Assessed Values are critical to the equitable distribution of the tax burden
- Value is determined as of January 1st each year
- Three approaches to value are considered: Cost, Sales Comparison, and Income
- CBJ Assessor generally uses a *Market (Sales Comparison) Approach*
- Preferred approaches are usually applied across a property class

Assessment Basics

- Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal (CAMA)
 - Underlying land value is determined from a base rate (price per Sq Ft for example) adjusted for various factors of desirability or usability
 - Improvement value considers size, age, construction method, quality, condition and enhancing features
 - Land and improvements are reviewed for adjustment annually based on comparison to comparable sales through the Ratio Study process

Property Values

- Property values, regardless of what system they come out of or what purpose they are done for, utilize a model, either a formal one put “to paper” or an informal one in someone’s head.
 - You
 - Your neighbor
 - A realtor
 - An appraiser
 - An insurance agent
- It may be a simple general ballpark value, based on price per SF, adjusted for quality, condition or style, or more

Property Values

- The modeling process involves
 - model specification
 - model calibration
- Objectives are to move the commercial properties fully into the mass appraisal process and to get that process migrated into the CAMA system

Mass Appraisal

- We primarily use mass appraisal techniques
 - That is standard for assessment valuations
- Mass appraisal vs single (fee) appraisal
 - Vertical process vs horizontal process
 - Potentially more uniformity from a mass appraisal process

Analysis

- Our analysis process is multifaceted
 - General Market Conditions and Trends
 - Ratio Studies – our assessed values vs the market
 - Special Studies
- Information that we look at includes
 - Sales prices
 - Construction costs
 - Income and expenses
 - Lease rates
 - Capitalization rates
 - Financing and the financial markets

Analysis

- For sales, the primary year we look at is the last year.
- For property types with fewer sales, which include all commercial property types, we expand the sales data up to 5 years back until we have a large enough sample.
- For special studies, such as a paired sale study, we occasionally go back 10 or more years.

Analysis

- The Juneau challenges
 - We are a somewhat isolated market with a limited number of commercial properties available and a fairly low number of sales.
 - Up until late this last year there was no requirement that the sales price be disclosed in real estate transactions. So, besides starting with a low number of sales we only have data on a portion of those.
- Regardless of the challenges and what data we do or don't have assessed values have to be set every year.

Our Staff

- We have
 - An assessment clerk who provides tax payer services and handles administrative tasks
 - A BPP Appraiser who specializes in the Business Personal Property valuations and manufactured home valuations.
 - Three certified staff appraisers who primarily work on residential valuations but may assist with commercial valuations.
 - A Deputy Assessor who is the primary commercial appraiser.
 - The Assessor who oversees the office and the valuation process.

External Appraisals

- How external appraisals relate to our work is often misunderstood.
 - We welcome their submission for review.
 - Sometimes they contain information regarding a property that changes our valuation.

However...

- They are not directly applicable to assessed values.
- They usually were performed for other purposes.
- External appraisals are a separate individuals opinion of value. For example for a lot, which had good comparable sales, the owner recently had appraisals done by three appraisers and their conclusions on value varied by 40%.
- The aspect of uniformity of assessed values is paramount as they are used to calculate an individuals tax burden.

Covid-19

Assessed Values In The Midst Of A Pandemic

- We recognize and are sympathetic to the fact that the past year has been difficult for some businesses in Juneau. Some businesses have seen drastic reductions in revenue, in some cases almost a complete elimination of revenue. At the same time, other businesses had a good year in 2020.
- In the midst of that, what State statutes require of us is to determine the market value of the real estate. While a particular business may go out of business the underlying real estate value may decrease, may stay the same, or may even increase.

Property Characteristics

- There are many factors that effect a properties value.
- Some key factors
 - Property Class
 - Property Attributes
 - Location

Property Characteristics


- Property Classes
 - Major Classification: Residential & Commercial
 - Within Residential
 - SFR
 - Rapt
 - Mimp
 - Zero-Lot
 - Condos & Townhouses
 - Plexes
 - Manufactured Homes
 - Within Commercial
 - Retail
 - Office
 - Medical
 - Hotel
 - Industrial
 - Others

Property Characteristics

- Property Attributes
 - Topography
 - View
 - Waterfront
 - Access
 - Wetlands
 - Flood Zones
 - Others

Property Characteristics

- Location
 - Have currently defined commercial neighborhoods
 - We are looking at further refinements utilizing a market area model that incorporates Regions, Districts and Neighborhoods.




The Market

- Sales volume – held steady in 2020 for commercial properties and remained strong for residential properties
- Sales prices – we specifically studied the market activity for 2020, leading up to the January 1, 2021 valuation date
 - Residential prices continued to increase
 - Commercial prices held steady; there was no indication of an overall decrease in commercial property values
- Limited supply – the Juneau market continues to be effected by a limited supply of both land and improved properties compared to the demand in both the residential and commercial classes

The Market


- This chart shows the number of commercial property sales per year. You can see that the sales volume held steady through 2020 in spite of the pandemic.



Residential Ratio Study 2021

Assessed Values as % of Sales Prices


Prior/After	Lowest	Mean	Median	Highest	COD
Prior to 2021 adjustments	76.11%	96.29%	96.53%	116.91 %	6.00%
After 2021 adjustments	79.40%	97.91%	98.09%	117.45 %	5.43%



Commercial Ratio Study 2021

Assessed Values as % of Sales Prices

Prior/After	Lowest	Mean	Median	Highest	COD
Prior to 2021 adjustments	19.59%	68.79%	72.86%	119.08 %	23.60%
After 2021 adjustments	29.32%	85.26%	88.53%	140.91 %	21.55%



Correcting Commercial Assessments


- Prior to 2021 adjustments
 - Median commercial property was assessed at 72.86% of sales price (68.79% mean)
 - Median improved commercial property was assessed at 78.81% of sales price (78.39% mean)
 - *Median vacant commercial land was assessed at just 39.22% of sales price (38.00% mean)*
- Commercial adjustments made in 2021
 - 50% increase to base commercial land value
 - 20% increase to warehouse condos
 - 20% decrease to boat shelters
- Result: Median commercial assessment ratio moved from 72.86% to 88.53% in 2021
 - CBJ Assessor target for median assessment ratio is 98%
 - Commercial properties in Juneau remain under-assessed by ~10% overall
 - CBJ Assessor will continue to refine the land adjustments and begin adjusting improvement values to reflect market sales in future years

Values for Assessment Year 2021

- Assessed values for commercial properties, on a whole, have not been adjusted for 10 or more years due to
 - The Juneau challenges
 - A CAMA system conversion
 - Other factors
- This has caused
 - Commercial property assessed values to lag behind the market
 - A tax shift. A tax shift occurs when the tax burden that should be paid by one party is shifted to being paid by another party. In this case the shift was from commercial properties onto residential properties.
- To rectify this tax shift the commercial property assessed values must be brought up to market. This means that commercial properties will see increases that should have occurred in smaller increments for the past 10 plus years being applied in a few years. Because the increases will represent multi-year corrections they may seem to be significant increases.

Values for Assessment Year 2021

- The next chart (below) shows the change in total assessed values by classification over the past 8 years.




Values for Assessment Year 2021

- A lot of work was done this year cleaning up the commercial property sales data. There is still more work to be done but good progress was made. That resulted in us having 57 market sales from the past 5 years for which we had sales prices.

Values for Assessment Year 2021

AY2021- Comm- Set 2- 20210316- No19- All, 5 Yr, 5% Trend								
Summary Report								
						IAAO Standards for COD		
<u>Statistics</u>						SFR	15.0 or less	
Current						SFR-newer/homog	10.0 or less	
54	Count	(Number of Records with Ratio)				Income Properties	20.0 or less	
0.1959	Minimum Ratio					Income-Urban area	15.0 or less	
1.1908	Maximum Ratio					Vacant Land	20.0 or less	
0.9950	Range							
0.6879	Mean	(This is the average ratio for your sample.)						
0.7286	Median	(This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)						
0.5418	Weighted Mean							
2.3448	Sum of the Square of Deviations							
0.1720	AAD							
0.2103	Standard Deviation					Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)		
23.6036	COD	(Good indicator of confidence level.)				Kurtosis	-0.3111	
30.5772	COV					Skewness	-0.2814	
1.2696	PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential					Alt.Cyhelsky's Skew	-0.1481	
	(PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO)					Alt.Pearson's Skew	-0.5808	
	(PRD over 1=Regressive)							
<u>Trending Factors</u>				<u>Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation</u>				
0.98 Target Level				0.0407 Differential Mean to Median				
1.4246 Factor on Mean				23 Number of data points below the mean.				
1.3450 Factor on Median				31 Number of data points above the mean.				
1.8087 Factor on Weighted Mean				*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts.				


Values for Assessment Year 2021



Values for Assessment Year 2021


AY2021- Comm- Set 2 Updated AVs Live1- 20210316- No 19- All, 5 Yr, 5% Trend					
Summary Report					
				IAAO Standards for COD	
Statistics				SFR	15.0 or less
Current				SFR-newer/homog	10.0 or less
53	Count	(Number of Records with Ratio)		Income Properties	20.0 or less
0.2932	Minimum Ratio			Income-Urban area	15.0 or less
1.4091	Maximum Ratio			Vacant Land	20.0 or less
1.1159	Range				
0.8526	Mean	(This is the average ratio for your sample.)			
0.8853	Median	(This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)			
0.6981	Weighted Mean				
3.0313	Sum of the Square of Deviations				
0.1908	AAD				
0.2414	Standard Deviation			Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)	
21.5490	COD	(Good indicator of confidence level.)		Kurtosis	-0.0245
28.3180	COV			Skewness	0.0181
1.2214	PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential			Alt.Cyhelsky's Skew	-0.0943
	(PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO)			Alt.Pearson's Skew	-0.4059
	(PRD over 1=Regressive)				
Trending Factors			Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation		
0.85 Target Level			0.0327 Differential Mean to Median		
0.9969 Factor on Mean			24 Number of data points below the mean.		
0.9601 Factor on Median			29 Number of data points above the mean.		
1.2176 Factor on Weighted Mean			*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts.		

Values for Assessment Year 2021



Values for Assessment Year 2021

- This chart shows the ratios based on Assessment Year 2020 (Starting Ratio) and the results of our adjustments for the Assessment Year 2021 (Ending Ratio).



Values for Assessment Year 2021

Over the next few years we will work to:

- Bring more uniformity between the commercial and residential property classes
- Bring more uniformity between the commercial subclasses
- Correct the imbalance between the land component and the building component(s).

Values for Assessment Year 2021

- This year will just be a first step.
- For most properties the increase will be applied to just the land component. For some classes of properties that have no land component or only a token land value, the increase will be applied to the buildings.
- This will bring all commercial properties closer to market.
- Next year we will take another step towards parity with residential properties. This will likely involve a further increase in land and, at least in some cases, a reduction in the building component.

Values for Assessment Year 2021

- The adjustment being applied this year will result in
 - a 50% increase in the land component for most commercial properties
 - On average this results in a 20% increase to commercial property values
 - One class of properties, boathouses, will actually see a 20% reduction this year.

- Future refinements In the coming years we will be:
 - Refining the valuation models for all of the commercial property types- retail, office, medical, industrial, etc.
 - Refining the locational adjustments
 - Refining the value adjustments for things like quality, condition and other attributes.

Upcoming Appeal Hearings

- In our review we readily correct any errors
- Only a portion become actual appeals
- Uniformity is paramount

Upcoming Appeal Hearings

- Cap rates
 - Again, uniformity is critical
 - Other individuals can choose a different cap rate for their purposes
 - We have attempted to be conservative in selecting the cap rate
 - For a given amount of income, if the cap rate goes down the value goes up
 - With the data that we have available we have not been able to substantiate the claim that Juneau is inherently higher risk and therefore should have a higher cap rate than what we are applying
 - If, as we work through the review process, new information comes to light we could alter the cap rates, however, so far the data and tests indicate that our selected cap rates are producing values that are under market

Upcoming Appeal Hearings

- Cap rates
 - We are using 6% overall and 7% for hotels/motels
 - A sampling of cap rates from other sources
 - 4.75 – 5.5 Seattle Class A CBD Summer 2020
 - 5.75 – 6.5 Seattle Class A Suburban Office Rates Summer 2020
 - 4.25 – 4.75 Seattle Multifamily Rates Summer 2020
 - 4.75 – 5.25 Seattle Multifamily Suburban Rates Summer 2020
 - 3.75 – 4.25 Seattle Class A Industrial Rates Summer 2020
 - 4.00 – 5.25 2021 US Real Estate Market
 - 5.96 Anchorage, AK 1-3 floor apartments
 - 5.01 Pierce County, WA 1-3 floor apartments
 - 5.27 Ada County, ID 1-3 floor apartments
 - 4.88 – 5.26 Seattle Multifamily Class A & B Mid & High Rise
 - 5.36 – 5.76 Seattle Retail Class A & B
 - 5.67 – 5.87 Seattle Office Class A & B
 - 6.12 – 6.36 Seattle Industrial Class A & B

Property Assessments – BOE Presentation

Thank you!

AY2021 Analysis Sales List

Sale Date	Parcel	Number	Street	Neighborhood
12/09/20	1C070A050001	230	SEWARD ST	SOMMERS ON SEWARD_C_24
12/07/20	5B15011107E0	2221	JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24
12/04/20	4B1701090218	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
11/23/20	5B1201060260	5719	CONCRETE WAY	SEAGULLS EDGE C 24
11/17/20	4B1701020020	10011	GLACIER HWY	MENDE PENINSULA C
11/13/20	1D060L030011	201	CORDOVA ST	WEST JUNEAU C
10/30/20	1C060K660110	711	W WILLOUGHBY AVE	DOWNTOWN C
10/09/20	1C060K010031	0	EGAN DR	DOWNTOWN C
09/24/20	5B1201060160	5740	CONCRETE WAY	LEMON CREEK C
09/24/20	5B1201300110	1783	Anka St	
08/07/20	5B1501010001	1880	CREST ST	BUILDERS PLAZA C 24
03/10/20	1C110K120140	0	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
03/10/20	1C110K120051	0	Eastaugh Way	
02/28/20	4B1701090056	10009	CRAZY HORSE DR	MENDE PENINSULA C
12/24/19	5B1201300110	1783	Anka St	
10/25/19	1C110K120130	190	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
10/04/19	5B1201000060	5245	GLACIER HWY	LEMON CREEK C
10/02/19	1C110K120120	0	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
08/02/19	5B1201020100	5452	SHAUNE DR	LEMON CREEK C
07/30/19	4B1601050160	2276	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
07/16/19	5B1601140043	9309	GLACIER HWY	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
07/01/19	1C070B0N0011	259	S FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
06/28/19	1C020K01G280	1435	HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
04/01/19	1C110K120150	0	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
02/28/19	1C020K01G290	1435	HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
01/04/19	5B2401610150	4045	DELTA DR	NORTHEAST VALLEY C
11/30/18	3B1501040120	1544	CREST ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/16/18	5B1501040030	8825	MALLARD ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/02/18	1C070B0J0020	195	S FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
08/21/18	5B1601140070	9309	GLACIER HWY	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
07/25/18	1C020K01G200	1435	HARBOR WAY	AURORA BASIN C 19
07/20/18	1C060U050022	1108	F ST	DOWNTOWN C
06/29/18	4B2901020010	10200	MENDENHALL LOOP RD	AUKE MOUNTAIN C
03/05/18	4B1601080070	2278	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	P & J BUSINESS C 24
02/15/18	5B1601000023	9151	GLACIER HWY	SOUTH VALLEY C
12/22/17	5B15011109B0	2231	JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24
10/12/17	3B1501020030	1669	CREST ST	SOUTH VALLEY C
09/20/17	4B1701103003	2769	SHERWOOD LN	BEAR DEN YACHT CONDO C 24
09/19/17	4B1601010040	2450	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	MENDE PENINSULA C
07/31/17	4B1601120130	2270	BRANDY LN	BRANDY LANE YACHT C 24
07/21/17	5B1201330160	2005	ANKA ST	LEMON CREEK C
06/13/17	4B1601050030	2274	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
04/24/17	4B1701090226	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
04/11/17	7B0901030071	3161	CHANNEL DR	TWIN LAKES C
04/05/17	5B1201040052	1721	ANKA ST	LEMON CREEK C
03/16/17	1C110K120101	170	MILL ST	DOWNTOWN C
02/14/17	4B1701090223	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
01/10/17	4B1701090228	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	SAFE HARBOR C 24
12/15/16	1C060U040040	800	GLACIER AVE	DOWNTOWN C
09/02/16	5B1501020170	8401	AIRPORT BLVD	SOUTH VALLEY C
08/02/16	5B1201060061	5631	GLACIER HWY	LEMON CREEK C
06/30/16	4B1701100146	2789	SHERWOOD LN	MENDE PENINSULA C
06/15/16	5B1501000002	8251	GLACIER HWY	SOUTHEAST INSURANCE C 24
06/03/16	5B1201450110	1731	RALPH'S WAY	LEMON CREEK C
03/30/16	1C070A030040	100	N FRANKLIN ST	DOWNTOWN C
03/01/16	4B1701100170	10221	GLACIER HWY	MENDE PENINSULA C
02/10/16	5B15011107E0	2221	JORDAN AVE	JORDAN CREEK C 24

* These were the sales available to us for our market analysis for assessment year 2021.

** Note that no sales prices are included due the requirement of CBJ ordinance to keep them confidential.

Michael Dahle – Background Summary

Background Summary

Michael Dahle has 19 years of experience in appraisal work including private (fee) appraisal work as well as appraisals for ad valorem (tax) purposes. Prior to that were 10 years of experience in market analysis and property valuations for investment purposes and over 10 additional years of business experience in government, non-profit entities and small to large businesses. The business experience includes ownership, management, and accounting including financial reports and budgeting.

Michael Dahle has worked in the assessment profession at the local jurisdictional level as well as the State oversight level. Besides work in analyzing real estate markets and appraising properties (both residential and commercial) Michael Dahle has provided oversight services for the Washington State Department of Revenue Property Tax Division, consultation to Assessor's Offices in all 39 counties in Washington State, evaluation of assessment systems, training for Assessor's Offices and appraisal staff, and directed the establishment of assessment systems.

Education

Assessment related education includes (but is not limited to):

IAAO Webinar- The Impact of COVID-19 on Hotel and Restaurant Values, 2021
IAAO 400- Assessment Administration, 2020
AAAO Winter Conference, 2019
Workshop on BOE Presentations, 2019
Appraising After A Disaster or Traumatic Events, 2019
Valuation of Barndominiums, 2019
Collection, Interpretation and Model Building, 2015
Appraisal Methodology - BOE Section (Taught), 2014
Appraisal Methodology (Developed Course), 2014
WA DOR - Developed & taught courses for DOR, 2009-2013
Field Device Best Practices, 2013
Sketching, 2013
Revaluation Appraisal, 2013
SQL Monitors, 2013
Assessor Roundtable, 2013
Supplemental Tax Rolls Part 1 & 2, 2013
Commercial & Industrial Modeling Concepts, 2012
WPSC IAAO 2012 Spring Seminar - Cost Approach (Taught), 2012
WPSC IAAO 2012 Spring Seminar (Attended), 2012
Using GIS in Property Assessment, 2012
E WA IAAO - Cost Approach (Taught), 2012
Terrascan Users Meeting – Washington, 2011
Valuation of Green Buildings, 2011
Valuation of High-End and Difficult Homes, 2011
Principles of Industrial Valuation, 2010
Current Use – Basic, 2010
Current Use – Advanced, 2010
Ratio Study/Statistical Analysis, 2010
Land Model Development Using SPSS, 2008

IAAO Course 500- Assessment of Personal Property, 2008
IAAO Course 310- Applications of Mass Appraisal, 2008

Education (Cont.)

Fundamentals of the Assessor's Office, 2008
Advanced Personal Property, 2008
Introduction to Personal Property, 2008
USPAP - Update, 2008
GIS & the Assessor's Office, 2008
IAAO Annual Conference- Attended and Co-Presented a Session, 2005
Appraisal Principles, 2003
Appraisal Practices, 2003
USPAP (Full), 2003
Other Related University and Professional Courses

Employment

Employment has included (but is not limited to):

City and Borough of Juneau
Washington Department of Revenue
Wahkiakum County
Lewis County
Private Appraisal Firms

Areas of Expertise

Areas of expertise include (but are not limited to):

Appraisal
Analysis
Assessment Administration
Assessment System Development
GIS / Mapping
Training
Accounting, Budgeting & Finance
Business Consulting
Project Management
Database Administration
Web Development
Computer System Conversions
Technology

Certifications

Include (but are not limited to):


WA Ad Valorem Appraiser Accreditation #1183 since 06/2007
AK Certified Assessor Appraiser #214 in 2003 (in process of renewal)


From: [Bob Spitzfaden](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Maps
Date: Wednesday, October 27, 2021 4:17:13 PM



EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS


Please make part of the record for the October 28 and November 2,4,9 and 10 Board hearings, the following maps. I represent all of the appellants.

Robert S. Spitzfaden









Finance Department
Assessor Division
155 S Seward St.
Juneau AK 99801
(907)586-5215

Assessment Valuations Summary Report

City and Borough of Juneau

For Assessment Year 2021

Assessment Date (Effective Valuation Date): January 1,

2021 Report Date: April, 2021

Table of Contents

Special Note for 2021	Page 4
Scope	
Scope of Work	Page 4
Client & Intended Users	Page 4
Intended Use	Pages 4-5
Effective Date	Page 5
Identification of Property	Page 5
Valuation Summary	
Assessment Process Overview	Pages 5-6
Analysis & Valuations	
Analysis & Valuation Overview	Pages 6-10
Overview, Reconciliation & Conclusion	Page 11
Submarkets, Stratifications & Characteristics Adjustments	Pages 11-17
General Reconciliation & Conclusion Summary	Page 17
Statements & Definitions	
Type and Definition of Value (Interest Being Appraised)	Page 17
Highest & Best Use Definition	Page 17
Statement of Assumptions & Limiting Conditions	Page 18
Certification Statement	Page 18

Special Message for 2021

We are in the process of a major review of the valuation models, the assessed values and the assessment level for all Juneau commercial properties.

Commercial property valuations are challenging in Juneau. We are a somewhat isolated market with a limited number of commercial properties available and a fairly low number of sales. Up until late this last year there was no requirement that the sales price be disclosed in real estate transactions. So, besides starting with a low number of sales we only had data on a portion of those.

It would seem that those challenges resulted in assessed values for commercial properties, on a whole, not being increased for the past 10 or more years causing the commercial property assessed values to lag behind the market. This caused a tax shift. A tax shift occurs when the tax burden that should be paid by one party is shifted to being paid by another party. In this case the shift was from commercial properties onto residential properties.

To rectify this tax shift the commercial property assessed values must be brought up to market. This means that commercial properties will see increases that should have occurred in smaller increments for the past 10 plus years being applied in a few years. Because the increases will represent multi-year corrections they may seem to be significant increases.

This first year we are addressing the land component. Next year we will refine the land adjustments and also start making adjustments to the improvement portion of the commercial values. The more sales, market and lease information we can gather the better our basis for market analysis. For sales, the primary year we look at is the last year. For property types with fewer sales, which include all commercial property types, we expand the sales data up to 5 years back until we have a large enough sample. For special studies we occasionally go back 10 or more years.

Overall residential assessed property values increased 3.16% from 2020 to 2021
Overall commercial assessed property values increased 17.97% from 2020 to 2021
Overall vacant land assessed property value decreased by 12.98% from 2020 to 2021
Business Personal Property Values increased 0.5% from 2020 to 2021
Overall Taxable value increase before appeals 7.00%
Estimated taxable value increase after appeals 6.49%

Scope

Scope of Work

The valuation of all taxable property within the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ).

Client & Intended Users

The intended user(s) of this report are the Borough Assessor's Office.

Intended Use

This report is intended for use by the Assessor's Office in the administration of ad valorem property taxation.

It is not intended to serve as an all encompassing report but as a summary report of the relevant valuations. Additional supporting documentation can be found on the CBJ Assessor webpage at <https://juneau.org/finance/assessor-office>

Effective Date

The effective date of this report and the associated values is January 1, 2021 for all property types.

For ad valorem tax purposes the Assessor is required by law to annually value all property as of January 1st of each year, at one hundred percent of the true and fair market value.

Identification of Property

The subject properties of this report are all taxable real and personal properties within The City and Borough of Juneau.

CBJ 15.05.100 Determination of full and true value:

Property shall be assessed at its full and true value in money, as of January 1 of the assessment year. In determining the full and true value of property in money, the person making the return, or the assessor, as the case may be, shall not adopt a lower or different standard of value because same is to serve as a basis of taxation, nor shall the assessor adopt as a criterion of value the price for which the property would sell at auction, or at a forced sale, either separately or in the aggregate with all of the property in the taxing district, but the assessor shall value the property at a sum which the assessor believes it is fairly worth in money at the time of assessment.

(CBJ Code 1970, § 15.05.100; Serial No. 70-33, § 3, 1971)

State law reference(s)—Full and true value, AS 29.45.110.

Valuation Summary

Assessment Process Overview

Sales Data Procedures

Sales data was gathered and considered through a sales validation and verification process.

Sales utilized for analysis are from the range of January 1, 2016 to December 31, 2020 for commercial property. There were a total of 54 qualified sales with confirmed sale prices for the main analysis set, 53 after eliminating one non-market sale during the analysis.

Sales utilized for analysis are from the range of January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2020 for residential property. There were a total of 1,025 qualified sales of residential properties with confirmed sale prices for the main analysis set, 1,030 after additional sales data was qualified.

Model Specification & Calibration Procedures

Mass appraisal models utilized in generating values have gone through the processes and Specification and Calibration.

Three Approaches to Value

Cost Approach – is calibrated through trends in costs.

Sales Comparison Approach – utilizes market sales.

Income Approach – utilizes industry standard and/or individual property data.

For many classes of properties our CAMA utilizes a model that is a hybrid of the Cost and Sales Comparison approaches; a Market Adjusted Cost Approach.

Analysis and Valuation Overview

Summary of Market Indications

- A lot of work was done this year cleaning up the commercial property sales data. There is still more work to be done but good progress was made. That resulted in us having 57 market sales from the past 5 years for which we had sales prices. Removing the 3 boathouse sales left 54 sales as the main set for analysis. One additional sale was eliminated as non-market while doing the analysis so the final set was 53 sales plus 3 boathouse sales that were dealt with separately.
- Below is a table that summarizes some of the ratios from comparing assessed values to sales. A ratio of 1.00 would be right at market, a ratio under 1.00 indicates that properties are undervalued. This analysis compares 01/01/2020 assessed values to 01/01/2021 market value.

<i>Property Class</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Median</i>
Commercial Land	12	0.4095	0.3928
Commercial Improved Properties (Core Types)	35	0.7748	0.8112
Commercial Properties Overall	57	0.7149	0.7411
Residential Properties (for class equity comparison)	1025	0.9791	0.9809




- The residential market appeared strong in 2020 with growth in single family homes, attached homes, and residential condos.

Property Type	2018 Median Sale Price	2019 Median Sale Price	2020 Median Sale Price
Single Family Homes	420,000	419,900	440,450
Attached Homes	298,500	309,000	325,000
Residential Condos	216,500	230,700	240,000

Summary of Performance Tests and Measures (Statistics) Commercial




This summary report shows statistics from the starting point for assessment year 2021. We had a starting ratio of 0.7839 for the mean and 0.7881 for the median for improved commercial properties and a mean of 0.3800 and median of 0.3922 for vacant commercial properties.

AY2021- Comm- Set 2- 20210316- No19- All, 5 Yr, 5% Trend				
Summary Report				
Statistics		IAAO Standards for COD		
Current	Proposed			
54	54	Count	(Number of Records with Ratio)	
0.1959	0.3419	Minimum Ratio		
1.1908	1.6221	Maximum Ratio		
0.9950	1.2801	Range		
0.6879	0.8989	Mean	(This is the average ratio for your sample.)	
0.7286	0.8375	Median	(This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)	
0.5418	0.7694	Weighted Mean		
2.3448	4.4163	Sum of the Square of Deviations		
0.1720	0.2321	AAD		
0.2103	0.2887	Standard Deviation		
23.6036	27.7094	COD	(Good indicator of confidence level.)	Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)
30.5772	32.1131	COV		Kurtosis -0.3111
1.2696	1.1683	PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential		Skewness -0.2814
		(PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO)		Alt.Cyhelsky's Skew -0.1481
		(PRD over 1=Regressive)		Alt.Pearson's Skew -0.5808
Trending Factors		Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation		
0.98 Target Level		0.0407 Differential Mean to Median		
1.4246 Factor on Mean		23 Number of data points below the mean.		
1.3450 Factor on Median		31 Number of data points above the mean.		
1.8087 Factor on Weighted Mean		*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts.		



This second summary report shows the statistics after calibrating the values. After calibration we had an overall mean of 0.8526 and an overall median of 0.8853 for commercial properties. We had a mean of 0.9142 and median of 0.9228 for improved commercial properties and a mean of 0.6631 and median of 0.5902 for vacant commercial properties.



AY2021- Comm- Set 2 Updated AVs Live1- 20210316- No 19- All, 5 Yr, 5% Trend									
Summary Report									
						IAAO Standards for COD			
Statistics						SFR 15.0 or less			
Current		Proposed				SFR-newer/homog 10.0 or less			
53	53	Count	(Number of Records with Ratio)			Income Properties 20.0 or less			
0.2932	0.2932	Minimum Ratio				Income-Urban area 15.0 or less			
1.4091	1.4091	Maximum Ratio				Vacant Land 20.0 or less			
1.1159	1.1159	Range							
0.8526	0.8526	Mean		(This is the average ratio for your sample.)					
0.8853	0.8853	Median		(This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)					
0.6981	0.6981	Weighted Mean							
3.0313	3.0313	Sum of the Square of Deviations							
0.1908	0.1908	AAD							
0.2414	0.2414	Standard Deviation				Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)			
21.5490	21.5490	COD		(Good indicator of confidence level.)				Kurtosis	-0.0245
28.3180	28.3180	COV						Skewness	0.0181
1.2214	1.2214	PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential						Alt.Cyhelsky's Skew	-0.0943
		(PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO)						Alt.Pearson's Skew	-0.4059
		(PRD over 1=Regressive)							
Trending Factors					Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation				
0.85 Target Level					0.0327 Differential Mean to Median				
0.9969 Factor on Mean					24 Number of data points below the mean.				
0.9601 Factor on Median					29 Number of data points above the mean.				
1.2176 Factor on Weighted Mean					*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts.				



Summary of Performance Tests and Measures (Statistics) Residential



This summary report shows statistics for residential properties from the starting point for assessment year 2021 showing mean and median ratios of 0.96.

AY2021			
Summary Report Before Calibration			
Statistics		IAAO Standards for COD	
Current	1025	Count (Number of Records with Ratio)	SFR 15.0 or less
	0.7611	Minimum Ratio	SFR-newer/homog 10.0 or less
	1.1691	Maximum Ratio	Income Properties 20.0 or less
	0.4080	Range	Income-Urban area 15.0 or less
			Vacant Land 20.0 or less
0.9629	Mean	(This is the average ratio for your sample.)	
0.9653	Median	(This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)	
0.9638	Weighted Mean		
5.8049	Sum of the Square of Deviations		
0.0579	AAD		
0.0753	Standard Deviation	Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)	
5.9992	COD	(Good indicator of confidence level.)	Kurtosis #DIV/0!
7.8193	COV		Skewness #DIV/0!
0.9990	PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential		Alt.Cyhelsky's Skew -0.0263
	(PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO)		Alt.Pearson's Skew -0.0969
	(PRD over 1=Regressive)		
Trending Factors		Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation	
0.85 Target Level		0.0024 Differential Mean to Median	
0.8828 Factor on Mean		499 Number of data points below the mean.	
0.8805 Factor on Median		526 Number of data points above the mean.	
0.8819 Factor on Weighted Mean		*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts.	




This second summary report shows the statistics for residential properties after calibrating the values for assessment year 2021 showing mean and median ratios of 0.98.

AY2021										
Summary Report After Calibration										
								IAAO Standards for COD		
Statistics								SFR		15.0 or less
Current								SFR-newer/homog		10.0 or less
1030		Count	(Number of Records with Ratio)					Income Properties		20.0 or less
0.7940		Minimum Ratio						Income-Urban area		15.0 or less
1.1745		Maximum Ratio						Vacant Land		20.0 or less
0.3805		Range								
0.9791		Mean	(This is the average ratio for your sample.)							
0.9809		Median	(This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)							
0.9756		Weighted Mean								
5.0141		Sum of the Square of Deviations								
0.0533		AAD								
0.0698		Standard Deviation								
5.4347		COD	(Good indicator of confidence level.)							
7.1297		COV								
1.0035		PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential								
		(PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO)								
		(PRD over 1=Regressive)								
Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)										
		Kurtosis							#DIV/0!	
		Skewness							#DIV/0!	
		Alt.Cyhelsky's Skew							-0.0214	
		Alt.Pearson's Skew							-0.0793	
Trending Factors					Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation					
0.85 Target Level					0.0018 Differential Mean to Median					
0.8682 Factor on Mean					504 Number of data points below the mean.					
0.8665 Factor on Median					526 Number of data points above the mean.					
0.8712 Factor on Weighted Mean					*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts					



Histogram of Ratio Frequency



Overview Reconciliation & Conclusions

If we were a larger jurisdiction with thousands of sales and hundreds of sales in particular subsets, then we could make more drastic changes to correct the imbalance between residential and commercial properties more quickly but with limited sales we need to be a little more cautious.

Over the next few years we will work to:

- Bring more uniformity between the commercial and residential property classes
- Bring more uniformity between the commercial subclasses
- Correct the imbalance in the distribution of the value between the land component and the building component(s).

This year will just be a first step. For most properties the increase will be applied to just the land component this year. For some classes of properties that have no land component or only a token land value, the increase will be applied to the buildings. This will bring all commercial properties closer to market. Next year we will take another step towards parity with residential properties. This will likely involve a further increase in land and, at least in some cases, a reduction in the building component.

The adjustment being applied this year will result in a 50% increase in the land component for most commercial properties. One class of properties, boathouses, will actually see a 20% reduction this year.


Submarkets, Stratifications and Characteristics Adjustments

Commercial

In doing the analysis we looked at subtypes or submarkets to determine if any type of property needed to be excluded from the general adjustment of 50% increase in land value. Influences that we looked at included market areas, property types and zoning. The one property type that warranted special treatment was boathouses. They were reduced by 20% on the building value. In addition, Warehouse Condos typically do not have a full land value so most of them saw a 20% increase to the building portion.

In looking at market areas special attention was paid to the downtown area as it would seem that they would be most impacted by the Covid restrictions. Below is a graph of market areas. The ones with arrows are market areas for which we had 5 or more sales. No special treatment was indicated for the downtown area, in fact, downtown was lower than the new overall ratio.


The following charts are from the audit analysis AFTER the calibration adjustments.




- 11 - Downtown Commercial - 12 Sales**
- 16 - Lemon Creek Commercial - 9 Sales**
- 18 - Mendenhall Peninsula Commercial - 5 Sales**
- 30 - South Valley Commercial - 5 Sales**

*** Ratios are from after AY2021 Calibrations.**


Below is a scatter diagram for the 12 downtown sales. Nine indicate assessments below market and only three have a ratio above 1. (Again, this is after the calibration adjustments, not the starting point.)



The chart below shows the ratios for the entire data set after the adjustments. The red horizontal line indicates market. There are two sales right at market. They are bracketed in red. Sales to the right have a ratio above 1. From this chart you can see that even after the adjustments about 80% of the sales have ratios indicating that our assessed values are below market, with an overall assessment level for commercial properties of 0.85.




The bar chart below shows the adjusted sale price in orange and the 2021 assessed value in blue. Here the two at market are bracketed in black. Again, we are below market on about 80% of the sales, with an overall assessment level for commercial properties of 0.85.




General Charts of Commercial Market Information

This first chart shows the number of sales per year in three groups- total transactions, market sales and market sales for which we know the sales price. You can see that the sales volume held steady through 2020 in spite of the pandemic.




The second chart (below) shows the change in total assessed values by classification over the past 8 years. It includes both new construction and market trend increases. You can see that the residential assessed values have been increased each year while the land assessments and commercial assessments have remained flat. Economic data from the same time period would suggest that over the past 8 years the actual market value of residential property, land and commercial property have all actually increased.



The next chart is from the JEDC Economic Indicators Report 2020 and shows the growth in sales for Juneau businesses over the past 10 years.

Figure 52: Business Sales in Juneau by Business Category (in Millions), 2010– 2019 (Preliminary)




Source: City & Borough of Juneau Sales Tax Office and CBJ Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, July 1, 2018- June 30, 2019, Statistical Section. Note: "Other" category includes mineral sales, wholesale equipment, food suppliers, and fuel companies.


Residential

The following charts are from the audit analysis AFTER the calibration adjustments.

This chart shows the average assessed value to sales (a/s) ratio by property type.



- Prior to calibration four plex properties had an a/s ratio of .92 indicating the need for an upward market adjustment to this property type.
- The chart appears to indicate that mobile homes in parks and on fee simple land are undervalued. Additional calibration of the mobile homes model will need to be done before making market adjustments to this property type.
- All other property types appear to be within 5% above or below market value and within 5% of the overall ratio which attests to uniformity and assessment level.



This chart shows sales ratios by neighborhood.

- Care was taken to review neighborhoods with sales ratios above 1 which showed that there was not enough data to make downward adjustments to these property groups.
- Neighborhoods saw adjustments ranging from 0.5% to 26%
- The largest adjustment was for Mountain Meadow Estates which received a 26% increase. This neighborhood had not seen an increase in assessment since 2015. Prior to calibration the neighborhood had a ratio of 0.76.

General Reconciliation & Conclusions Summary

After consideration of the data, the various models, and the performance measurements and tests, we have applied the above outlined submarket valuation “Summaries” and “Reconciliations & Conclusions” to the subject properties.

All three approaches were considered for all properties. Similar appraisal methodologies were applied to similarly classed properties in order to promote equity and uniformity. For some classes of properties one or more of the approaches were not given significant weight. Additional information in this regard can be found in the supporting documentation.

Statements & Definitions

Type and Definition of Value (Interest Being Appraised)

The value being assessed is fee simple ownership interest at 100% of market value as of the effective date. Market value is the amount of money a willing buyer, not obligated to purchase, would pay and a willing seller, not obligated to sell, would accept for a property.

Highest and Best use Definition

A properties use may or may not represent its highest and best use. The highest and best use is the most profitable use given the probable legal, physical, and financial constraints.

Statement of Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

1. This report and the associated assessed values are intended for ad valorem taxation purposes and may not be applicable for any other use.
2. The following are general statements. Records pertaining to individual properties may list specific exceptions.
3. It is assumed that:
 - a. Title is free and clear.
 - b. There are no encroachments.
 - c. There are no hidden defects or conformity issues.
 - d. There is no contamination or hazardous materials present.
4. Property attributes observed upon exterior inspection are assumed to be representative of interior attributes when interior inspections were not feasible.

Certification Statement

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

- The statements of fact contained in this report are true and correct.
- The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and limiting conditions, and are the personal, impartial, and unbiased professional analyses, opinions and conclusions of the Assessor's Office.
- I and the Assessor's Office staff have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report except any personal real estate holdings we may have within the county. No individual inspected their own property.
- We have no bias with respect to any property that is the subject of this report or to the parties involved with this assignment.
- Our engagement in this assignment was not contingent upon developing or reporting predetermined results.
- Our compensation for completing this assignment is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event directly related to the intended use of this appraisal.
- Our analyses, opinions and conclusions were developed, and the report has been prepared, in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.
- We have made a personal inspection of the properties that are the subject of this report as outlined in our revaluation plan.
- The Assessor's Office staff provided significant mass appraisal assistance to the person (the Assessor) signing this certification.



Mary Hammond
City and Borough of Juneau Assessor

Bob Spitzfaden

From: Teresa Bowen <Teresa.Bowen@juneau.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2021 12:02 PM
To: 'Bob Spitzfaden'
Cc: Robert Palmer
Subject: Commercial taxpayer appeals- updated information
Attachments: 2021-09-30 Response to emailed questions.pdf; AY2021- Com Sales List 20210929a.pdf; list of taxpayers appealing to boe.pdf; Agenda_2021_9_1_Meeting(1582).pdf

Good afternoon, Mr. Spitzfaden.

There are four attachments to this email. The first is a compilation of your recent emailed questions with our response included. The second is an updated sales disclosure list showing all sales prices except those received after the effective date of CBJ 15.05.105. The third is the list that you provided of your clients with notes on who have received final determination letters, which are not current appeals, and those whose appeals have concluded. The final attachment is from the 9/9/2021 Assembly Finance Meeting, which was made publicly available as part of the meeting and is well known to your clients. I'm sure you already have it, but I am providing it just in case.

Since receiving your first correspondence on July 28th, the City has consistently responded to your requests for additional information, listened to your arguments and responded favorably when we found merit to your requests, provided your clients information at public meetings, and have sent you additional information as it became available, even if not requested- such as BOE packets. The CBJ Assessor has consistently corresponded with taxpayers during this time as well.

To date, we have not received any information that demonstrates the CBJ employed a fundamentally wrong method of valuation. You do not appear to actually argue that the methodology is fundamentally wrong, as your arguments have been focused on attacking the ratio study rather than proposing a different methodology. You have produced no evidence that the CBJ Assessor was wrong or committed fraud in finding that the full and true value of commercial properties has increased over the past decade.

As you are very well aware, Alaska affords very broad discretion to the Assessor in setting the methodology in determining full and true value. As Alaska has not mandated sales disclosures- and the CBJ has only required it for less than a year- the State assessing standards provide that annual modeling move values in accordance with economic trends in the local real estate market even in absence of qualified sale disclosures. The proposition that the commercial property market in Juneau has stagnated over the past decade and not increased in value is not supported by evidence. The CBJ Assessor has considered all information provided by taxpayers, as well as all relevant evidence concerning market trends, and fully explained the increase at BOE trainings and during contested BOE appeals. The methodology is sound and in line with 50 years of Alaska case law:

Fairbanks Gold Mining, Inc. v. Fairbanks North Star Borough Assessor, 488 P.3d 959 (Alaska 2021)

Kelley v. Municipality of Anchorage, 442 P.3d 725 (Alaska 2019)

Brandner v. Municipality of Anchorage, 327 P.3d 200 (Alaska 2014)

Horan v. Kenai Peninsula Borough, 247 P.3d 990 (Alaska 2011)

Fairbanks North Star Borough Assessor v. Golden Heart Utilities, Inc., 13 P.3d 263 (Alaska 2000)

North Star Alaska Housing Corporation v. Fairbanks North Star Borough, 778 P.2d 1140 (Alaska 1989)

Hoblitt v. Greater Anchorage Borough, 473 P.2d 630 (Alaska 1970)

Twentieth Century Investment Co. v. City of Juneau, 359 P.2d 783 (Alaska 1961)

We have continuously explained and defended this methodology and have not yet received evidence or expert opinion to the contrary. We have defended our methods twice at contested BOE hearings with commercial taxpayers.

Moving to the BOE, it is extremely concerning to the CBJ is that the list of clients you have produced include taxpayers who have not filed an appeal, had late filed appeals already denied, or have apparently signed on after having their appeal denied on the merits. In your taxpayer list, we have highlighted the taxpayers who have not filed an appeal (Doug Trucano and Russ Kegler. Doug Trucano only had one late-filed appeal, which was denied by the BOE in July). Richard Harris already went through a merits appeal at the BOE and had his appeal denied. Some have taxpayers have settled on the value on some of their parcels, and not on others.

While the idea of a consolidated hearing on methodology was attractive based on the theoretical possibility that it can streamline future appeals, it is clear that it's being considered as a way to allow taxpayers to avoid the requirements under code. It is also clear that most taxpayers have individual appeals that will still attack the methodology, negating any benefit of the consolidated hearing. We also have taxpayers who are not represented by you and do not intend to be bound by any decision on the consolidated appeal, which will cause confusion at the BOE.

Therefore, after discussion with City management on process, the City will strictly follow the BOE process outlined in CBJ 15.05. For each taxpayer that has a final determination letter, we will schedule them for the BOE as required by code. They will be allowed to present argument on the methodology at their hearing. If they do not appear at their hearing, the BOE will be allowed to decide their appeal on the merits as provided under CBJ 15.05.180.

These are the same rights afforded to every taxpayer in the CBJ. We are holding to the uniform process that provides your clients their right to due process required by law and code, and will ensure every taxpayer is treated equally and fairly.

Teresa Bowen
Assistant Attorney
City and Borough of Juneau Law Department
155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, Alaska 99801
Phone: (907)586-5242, ext. 4110

Answers to Mr. Spitzfaden's emailed questions dated 9/27 and 9/28

1. If you subtract 18 from 74, you get 56 sales. Are those 56 sales, the sales used by the assessor to conduct the ratio study? But I thought the ratio study included 57 sales? If the 56 are not the sales used for the ratio study, just what 56 sales were used? What needs to be supplied are the sales prices for each sale included in the ratio study, since I understand the ratio study as the basis for determining assessed values. Studies and data collected and utilized by the assessor for the BOE hearing which were collected after the ratio study do not appear to me to be relevant.

This was addressed in a prior email: the 74 properties was a list generated by Ken Williamson, not the CBJ Assessor. The Assessor has not reconciled Mr. Williamson's list to any of the CBJ Assessor's lists- they simply responded to his question. In regards to what sales were used in the ratio study, please see the list of sales previously provided and updated to include all sales disclosed prior to the effective date of CBJ 15.05.105.

2. What does it mean "included in separate study"? Does that mean those 3 sales were not included in the ratio study? Or were they included but also included in some other study? And if some other study, what study?

This was addressed in my a email and in other previous correspondence. Mr. Williamson provided boathouse sales, which were considered separately from the rest of the commercial property types. These sales were used to determine assessed values for boathouses, as was explained in Mr. Dahle's presentation to the BOE.

3. None of the sales prices yet produced, appear to be prices for land sales. That is there is a total price for the sale, but not broken down into component land and improvements. As the issue here is assessed value of commercial land, please provide the land sale prices separate from the improvement price. If the assessor lacked actual land sale prices, but instead made his own determination of the land price of a sale, please provide the method and data on which such a determination was made. Again what my clients are after is the actual land sale prices (or determination if there are not actual land sales) used in the ratio study that resulted in the assessed values

Per the CBJ Assessor, and as has been provided previously and in the BOE training, the study was not a land study and did not include extracted land values from sales of improved properties. It was an overall ratio study in which land sales was one of the subsets analyzed. Land sales that appear in the previously provided AY2021 Analysis Sales List include 1C110K120101, 1C110K120120, 1C110K120140, 1C110K120150, 1C110K120051, 1C060K010031, 4B170110146, 5B1201000060, 1C110K120130, 4B1701090056, and 5B1201300110. These are all believed to have been vacant land at the time of their sales. The ratio study considered the sale price against the assessed value of the land and excluded the value of improvements, which were added after the sale.

The analysis testing and feedback were used to determine that a 50% adjustment to commercial land values was a fair and equitable way to bring overall commercial property values closer to market value.

4. *The ordinance, 15.05.105, only applies prospectively—not retroactively. The rule is that there must be an express declaration of retroactivity for there to be retroactivity. Am Jur 2nd Statutes section 235 pages 463 and 464 (2012); Id. section 237 (presume statute applied prospectively); McQuillen, Municipal Corporations, section 20.73 (3rd ED 2007 revised volume)(at the time of ordinance taking effect, prospective operation is preferred and presumed). By its terms, the ordinance only affords confidentiality to information secured pursuant to the ordinance. Information secured prior to the ordinance's effective date, was not procured pursuant to the ordinance. So 15.05.105 can afford no basis for withholding sales prices secured prior to the effective date of said ordinance in November, 2020. The City asserts no other authority for withholding sale prices secured by the assessor prior to the ordinance's effective date*

CBJ 15.05.105 provides for confidentiality of disclosed sales prices, which we take seriously. Understanding your argument provides a fair reading of the code, we are attaching all disclosed sales prices up until the effective date of Ordinance 2020-47(am), which was November 26, 2020.

5. *Perhaps if there is testimony from the buyer, that the buyer was promised confidentiality, matters might be different, but if that is the case, let us see the testimony from the taxpayer – not -the assessor's office . Disclose the names of the buyers promised confidentiality, so we can contact them.*

The Assessor has not promised confidentiality individually to buyers disclosing sales prices. Confidentiality is a function of city code. There are still certain sales disclosed after CBJ 15.05.105 was enacted. We have provided you the address and sales date for each of those properties if you want to contact those property owners for information.

6. *Alaska law is clear that the BOE's decision must facilitate the court's review, assist the parties, and restrain the agency within proper bounds. Horan v. Kenai Peninsula Borough Board Of Equalization 247 P.3d 990,997, 1001 (AK. 2011)(record did not reflect reasonable certainty as to what board used as comparison properties for its finding that the assessor's valuation was grossly disproportionate compared to similar properties). The Board's decision must be supported by substantial evidence reflected in the administrative record. Button v. Haines Borough, 208 P3d 194, 200-01 (AK 2009)(relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion). If sales data is withheld, which it is claimed was used in the ratio study to establish the assessed values, and that data is not in the record, then the decision would not be supported by substantial evidence; the BOE decision would not facilitate court review or assist the parties or restrain the assessor within proper bounds – because no one would know all the land sale prices the assessor utilized in the ratio study. Only supplying some of the sale price data used, would do no good, because that sales data would not result in the same assessed value – how could it when the data is different.*

Please see our response to #4 above.

7. *Refusal to disclose sale price data claimed by the assessor to have been used in the ratio study and therefore the establishment of assessed value, smacks of spoliation of evidence, entitling the taxpayers to a ruling that the withheld evidence would be favorable to their position – in this case that the evidence withheld would have shown a fundamentally wrong method of valuation. Doubleday v. State, Commercial Fisheries Entry Com’n, 238 P.3d 100, 105-06 (AK 2010)*

There is no spoliation of evidence. The City has preserved all records and data received at the Assessor’s office. The case you cite, which concerns the denial of fishery permits, regarded a claim that the State destroyed or lost records, which has not occurred here. As the court further noted in your cited case, appellants must demonstrate that the absence of records hinder the ability to establish a prima facie case, and that the records are missing through an intentional or negligent act of the adverse party. An appellant must show how the evidence could effect the outcome of a case. In this case, the CBJ Assessor determined the full and true value of commercial properties has appreciated over the past decade and used a simple methodology to demonstrate that case. The taxpayers have not yet demonstrated otherwise.

8. *Perhaps the assessor will assert some or all of the land sale prices used were not actual land sale prices, but instead some sort of extraction of land prices from sales that included both land and improvements, without the sale breaking down the land price and the improvement price. In such event, the extraction method and data need to be disclosed.*

Please see the response to #3 above.

9. *I am unclear about what is meant by the list being a living document. As I understand it, the list of 57 properties are those the assessor used to do the ratio study and establish assessed values of commercial land. Those values were what were used to assess taxes. And it is those 57 sales that are at issue on whether the assessor adopted a fundamentally wrong method of valuation. The document cannot live, it cannot change. it is the basis for the assessments. To change it after assessments were finalized, would mean the original ratio study was wrong because it used improper sales prices, and it must be redone with the revised list, and whatever resulted would then be the assessed value. But if that is the case, and the City wants to go down that road, then the existing administrative process has to stop until a new ratio study is done.*

Let me clarify that prior email. The list of sales prices provided to the City is a living document—as we continually strive to qualify sales or reject sales. The properties used in the ratio study are set for AY2020 and have not changed. As more sales are qualified, this will assist the Assessor in determining full and true value in future assessment years. There is no basis to stop the existing administrative process, nor is such an action justified under Alaska law.

10. *On another matter, I note that there appear to be a number of sales in the list of 57 that are condo sales. Condominiums do not include land. If you want I can supply you numerous documents from City personnel to that effect. Since the ratio study, was only for land values, and condos do not include land, I am at a loss to see how condo sales can be included in the ratio study for commercial land. Please advise if it is correct that the ratio study includes condominium sales.*

There are commercial condos included in the sales list, some of which are office condos which have apportioned land values and some which are warehouse condos which only have a placeholder \$5,000 land value. Please see the response to #3 above. We have also added a condo column to the sales disclosure prices so you may see where land was apportioned or assigned value.

Sale Date	Sale Price	Trended SP	AVTotal	Main Parcel	Count	Number Street	Condo	Neighborhood
07/25/18	27,500	30,930	27,200	1C020K01G200	1	1435 HARBOR WAY	NO	AURORA BASIN C 19
06/28/19	25,000	26,936	27,200	1C020K01G280	1	1435 HARBOR WAY	NO	AURORA BASIN C 19
02/28/19	25,000	27,356	27,200	1C020K01G290	1	1435 HARBOR WAY	NO	AURORA BASIN C 19
10/09/20	20,000,000	20,235,200	7,524,300	1C060K010031	1	0 EGAN DR	NO	DOWNTOWN C
10/30/20	1,400,000	1,412,348	1,394,150	1C060K660110	1	711 W WILLOUGHBY AV	NO	DOWNTOWN C
12/15/16	1,100,000	1,327,612	1,457,000	1C060U040040	1	800 GLACIER AVE	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/30/16	550,000	683,826	963,600	1C070A030040	1	100 N FRANKLIN ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
12/09/20	confidential	confidential	190,200	1C070A050001	1	230 SEWARD ST	5K	SOMMERS ON SEWARD_C_24
11/02/18	510,600	567,144	682,450	1C070B0J0020	1	195 S FRANKLIN ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
07/01/19	2,200,000	2,369,400	2,164,900	1C070B0N0011	1	259 S FRANKLIN ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/10/20	612,788	638,268	501,300	1C110K120051	1	0 Eastaugh Way	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/16/17	716,000	855,033	613,650	1C110K120101	1	170 MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
10/02/19	378,818	403,055	237,150	1C110K120120	1	0 MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
10/25/19	378,818	401,835	237,150	1C110K120130	1	190 MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/10/20	378,818	394,569	237,150	1C110K120140	1	0 MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
04/01/19	597,938	651,597	374,400	1C110K120150	1	0 MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
11/13/20	400,000	402,744	445,400	1D060L030011	2	201 CORDOVA ST	NO	WEST JUNEAU C
10/12/17	65,000	75,711	41,200	3B1501020030	1	1669 CREST ST	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/30/18	168,750	186,776	164,000	3B1501040120	1	1544 CREST ST	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
09/19/17	750,000	876,000	823,100	4B1601010040	1	2450 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
06/13/17	104,000	122,899	108,800	4B1601050030	1	2274 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	5K	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
07/30/19	115,000	123,388	83,000	4B1601050160	1	2276 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	5K	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
03/05/18	73,000	83,557	35,000	4B1601080070	1	2278 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	5K	P & J BUSINESS C 24
07/31/17	112,500	132,188	119,000	4B1601120130	1	2270 BRANDY LN	5K	BRANDY LANE YACHT C 24
11/17/20	650,000	654,095	527,700	4B1701020020	1	10011 GLACIER HWY	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
02/28/20	1,567,000	1,634,569	961,350	4B1701090056	1	10009 CRAZY HORSE DR	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
12/04/20	confidential	confidential	145,000	4B1701090218	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
02/14/17	150,000	179,757	172,300	4B1701090223	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
04/24/17	130,000	154,534	149,800	4B1701090226	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
01/10/17	150,000	180,492	172,300	4B1701090228	1	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
06/30/16	501,624	617,218	361,800	4B1701100146	1	2789 SHERWOOD LN	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
03/01/16	697,000	869,424	813,000	4B1701100170	1	10221 GLACIER HWY	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
09/20/17	400,000	467,144	336,200	4B1701103003	1	2769 SHERWOOD LN	5K	BEAR DEN YACHT CONDO C 24
06/29/18	950,000	1,071,961	1,045,750	4B2901020010	1	10200 MENDENHALL LOO	NO	AUKE MOUNTAIN C
10/04/19	2,205,832	2,346,343	1,849,500	5B1201000060	1	5245 GLACIER HWY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
08/02/19	500,000	536,260	746,600	5B1201020100	1	5452 SHAUNE DR	NO	LEMON CREEK C
04/05/17	4,140,000	4,932,313	5,106,550	5B1201040052	2	1721 ANKA ST	NO	LEMON CREEK C
08/02/16	500,000	612,910	704,850	5B1201060061	2	5631 GLACIER HWY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
09/24/20	2,450,000	2,483,957	1,554,550	5B1201060160	2	5740 CONCRETE WAY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
11/23/20	486,000	488,654	274,300	5B1201060260	1	5719 CONCRETE WAY	APN	SEAGULLS EDGE C 24
09/24/20	300,000	304,158	269,550	5B1201300110	1	1783 Anka St	NO	LEMON CREEK C
12/24/19	205,000	215,734	269,550	5B1201300110	1	1783 Anka St	NO	LEMON CREEK C
07/21/17	900,000	1,058,760	632,250	5B1201330160	3	2005 ANKA ST	NO	LEMON CREEK C
06/03/16	1,060,000	1,308,273	1,036,450	5B1201450110	1	1731 RALPH'S WAY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
06/15/16	637,500	785,744	593,500	5B1501000002	1	8251 GLACIER HWY	APN	SOUTHEAST INSURANCE C 24
08/07/20	700,000	714,406	591,700	5B1501010001	2	1880 CREST ST	APN	BUILDERS PLAZA C 24
09/02/16	1,300,000	1,587,924	1,183,050	5B1501020170	1	8401 AIRPORT BLVD	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/16/18	750,000	831,585	837,600	5B1501040030	1	8825 MALLARD ST	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
12/07/20	confidential	confidential	234,498	5B15011107E0	1	2221 JORDAN AVE	SEP	JORDAN CREEK C 24
02/10/16	273,000	341,299	234,498	5B15011107E0	1	2221 JORDAN AVE	SEP	JORDAN CREEK C 24
12/22/17	300,000	346,452	230,384	5B15011109B0	1	2231 JORDAN AVE	SEP	JORDAN CREEK C 24
02/15/18	968,750	1,111,292	851,400	5B1601000023	1	9151 GLACIER HWY	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
07/16/19	145,000	155,861	169,350	5B1601140043	1	9309 GLACIER HWY	APN	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
08/21/18	240,100	269,142	308,850	5B1601140070	1	9309 GLACIER HWY	APN	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
01/04/19	672,000	740,490	521,900	5B2401610150	1	4045 DELTA DR	NO	NORTHEAST VALLEY C
04/11/17	1,540,000	1,833,432	1,877,700	7B0901030071	1	3161 CHANNEL DR	NO	TWIN LAKES C

(1) These were the sales available to us for our market analysis for assessment year 2021.

(2) Some sales prices are confidential, specifically when the only sale source is the buyer.

(3) Note that this list was updated 08/24/21 to add AV. The original list was 57 sales, however, through the analysis process one sale, 1C060U050022, was eliminated. It was further updated 09/23/21 when a change in directive from the law department allowed us to add some sales prices. Update 9/29/2021 only sales prior to 11/26/2020 confidential.

(4) AV Adj for condition at time of sale - 1C060U040040, 1C070A030040, 4B1701100170, 1C110K120130, 1C110K120101, 4B1701100146, 5B1201060160, 5B1201000060, 7B0901030071

(5) 5B1201020100 is included on this list, however, it has since been determined not to be a market sale; seller & buyer related. Removal of this sale would further lower the mean and median ratios.

(6) Note- multi-parcel sales are normally considered non-market, however, with commercial sales they are sometimes included as an economic unit.


(7) Note that the sale price used in the original study for 5B1201040052, which included 5B1201040051, was \$3,726,000 which was reported by the buyer, however, subsequent information showed the sale price to be \$4,140,000 with the cash distribution reduced for the value of 12 months of continued occupancy by the seller after the execution of the sale. Also, this sale was discovered to be a non-market sale due to duress of the seller. Removal of this sale would lower the mean and median ratios

(8) The trending applied to bring the sales to 01/01/2021 was 5% per year. The analysis indicates that a trend of 7.5% would be appropriate but to be conservative we selected 5%.

(9) Column added to identify condo parcels NO = not condo; APN= apportioned land value; 5K= place holder land value; SEP = land is valued under different parcel.

FIRST	LAST	CORPORATION OWNERSHIP NAME	PARCEL ID #'S
Blue	Bergmann	Alaskan Fudge	1C070B0J0020 Still pending final determination
			4B1601010010 - Krusty Krab Co LLC
			4B1601010022 - Gold Creek Properties LLC
Bruce	Abel		1C060K700040 - Gold Creek Properties LLC
			5B1501010051 - 8525 Holdings LLC Has final determination letter
			5B1501010060 - 8525 Holdings LLC and submitted additional
			5B1501010070 - 8525 Holdings LLC documentation for consideration
Colter	Boehm	Bobcat of Juneau	5B1201000121 Still has evidence being reviewed
Daniel	Glidman	Goldstein Improvement	Bob has them Has final determination letter
Dave	Hanna	JLC Properties Inc.	5B1201060201 5B1201060191 2D040C050074 Receiving final determination this week
Doug	Trucano	Trucano Family Partnership	6D0601020040 No appeal filed.
Doug	Trucano	Douglas Trucano	7B0901010010 & 1C070H020120 Late-file request by Trucano
Doug	Trucano	Nowel Avenue Development, LLC	1D060L010010 & 5B120106081 Construction on different property denied by BOE on 7/29/2020.
Doug	Trucano	A&J Building, LLC	1C070I010011
Graham	Rountree	Graham & Janice Rountree	1G070K81020 Has final determination letter and received Assessor's BOE record previously
			4B1701100040, 4B1701100060, 4B1701100070, 4B1701100100, 4B1701100110, 4B2201020020, 4B2201020030, 4B2201020040, 4B2201020050, 4B2901150050 Receiving final determination this week
James	Sidney	West Glacier Dev't	
Jeff	Grant	Jeff Grant	5B21001000030 Has final determination letter
Hugh & Shari	Grant	DJG Development LLC	5B1201070010, 1D00L050011, 5B1501000010
Hugh & Shari	Grant	FRANKLIN STREET PROPERTIES	1C070A170091, 1C070A170092, 1C070A170093, 1C070A170094, 1C070A170095, 1C070A10070
Hugh & Shari	Grant	Grant Rentals	1D060L020140
Hugh & Shari	Grant	Grant Properties LLC	5B1201000033, 5B1201000052 6D0701060000 resolved. Final determination letter out on rest.
Hugh & Shari	Grant	GRANT'S PLAZA LLC	5B1201000031, 5B1201000032
Hugh & Shari	Grant	Midway Bus Ctr LLC	5B1201020150, 5B1201020160
Hugh & Shari	Grant	Gastineau MHP	6D0701060000, 6D0701040000
Michael	Tripp	Timberwolf Ventures	1C100I050010 Has final determination letter
PeggyAnn	McConnochie	Alaskan Kiwis LLC	1C060K630020 Has final determination letter
Reed	Stoops	Franklin Docks Enterprises, Swope LLC	REVISED: 1C100K830031, 1C100K830040, 1C100K830041, 1C070B0L0010 Still reviewing evidence
Richard	Harris	R.H. Rentals L.L.C.	1C070K810010 Appeal denied by BOE on 9/14/2021
Russ	Kegler	Perseverance Glass	5B1501010110 No appeal filed.
Sally	Engstrom	Sally Engstrom	1 C070B0L0020
Scott	Jenkins	R & S Rentals	5B1601210041 Has final determination letter
Scott	Jenkins	Igloo Construction	5B1201350010 Still reviewing evidence
			5B1401020073
			5B1401050140
			5B1401050130 Still reviewing submitted evidence
			5B1401050120
			5B1401050110
Spike	Bicknell	Bicknell LLC	5B1401050090
			5B1401050080
			5B1401050070
			5B1401050060
			5B1401050050
			5B1401050040
			5B1401050030
Tawna & Paul	Curry	PDC Holdings	5B1501020210 Still reviewing submitted evidence
Wayne	Coogan	Coogan Alaska LLC	5B1301080000, 5B2101310000, 4B2901150040, 4B2901150060, 1D060L040032 Has final determination letter

MEMORANDUM



DATE: August 27, 2021
TO: Assembly Finance Committee
FROM: Jeff Rogers, Finance Director
SUBJECT: Update on Commercial Assessment Appeals

155 Municipal Way
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907) 586-5215
Fax: (907) 586-0358

As part of the annual determination of full-and-true value required by AS 29.45.110, the CBJ Assessor identified through a Ratio Study process that commercial land assessments were significantly lower than known qualified sales prices. As a result of this statistical analysis, the Assessor increased the base land assessment of all commercial parcels by 50%. This increase resulted in 207 commercial appeals, which are now being reviewed by the Assessor, and the Board of Equalization process is underway.

For information about the assessment process and adjustments made in the 2021 assessment year, I recommend you to the following resources:

- A. 2021 Assessment Presentation, presented to the AFC on April 21, 2021
- B. 2021 Assessment Value Summary Report, presented to the AFC on April 21, 2021
- C. Board of Equalization 2021 Training Packet and Recorded Video

At a summary level, I believe these are three primary takeaways for the Assembly:

1. 2021 commercial assessment changes are intended to correct a *systemic economic inequity*
2. CBJ is following the appeal process defined in state and local law
3. Information is key, and *disclosure of sales prices* would significantly improve assessment equity

#1 Correcting Systemic Economic Inequity

Commercial land assessments remained generally flat from 2011 to 2021 while residential assessments inched upward with market conditions. For example, if someone bought a \$300,000 home in 2011, they saw their assessed value march upward by as much as 5% per year. Someone else who bought a \$300,000 parcel of vacant land in 2011 has likely seen no increase in assessed value, even though the market value of the parcel has almost certainly appreciated. In that example, in 2020, the homeowner might have paid property tax on over \$400,000 of assessed value while the commercial landowner was still paying property tax on the \$300,000 assessment from a decade ago. In that narrow example, the residential homeowner could be paying 33% more property tax than the commercial landowner, even though their parcels were assessed similarly ten years ago and could have more similar market values today. Over time, this failure to keep commercial property assessments in line with market prices shifted the property tax burden from commercial landowners to residential homeowners. As a result, commercial landowners simply have not paid their fair share of property tax over the past decade. This tax shift represents a *systemic economic inequity* that the 2021 assessments are intended to correct.

#2 Appeal Process is Defined by State and Local Law

Property tax assessments and appeals are subject to a process that is highly defined in the law under AS 29.45.190 – 29.45.210 and code requirements of CBJ 15.05. If a property owner believes their property is improperly assessed, they have recourse to the Assessor and then to the Board of Equalization (BOE). For each appeal, the law requires the Assessor to produce summary of assessment data relating to each assessment that is appealed under AS 29.45.190(d) and CBJ 15.05.170. The work to prepare this information for the BOE, by parcel and by appellant, is ongoing and will be completed before hearings are scheduled for each individual appellant. This information will be timely available to appellants before their hearings. The law further allows appellants and the Assessor to appeal decisions of the BOE to superior court. CBJ is following that defined process. All commercial appellants are encouraged to share information with the Assessor that will assist with equitably determining the

full-and-true value of their parcels. As a reminder, under AS 29.45.210(b) (and CBJ 15.05.190): “The appellant bears the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of value are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in a valid written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing. If a valuation is found to be too low, the board of equalization may raise the value.”

#3 How Can We Do It Better?: More Disclosed Sales Prices

The most significant factor that would improve the accuracy of all assessments is *disclosure of sales prices*. As reported to the Assembly Finance Committee on June 2, 2021, the ordinance requiring disclosure of sales prices has not significantly changed behavior—the Assessor receives approximately the same number of disclosures today as they did before the law required them. Many current commercial appellants have taken issue with the relatively small sample (53 sales) used in the commercial ratio study. Indeed, the Assessor could draw better conclusions from the analysis of a larger sample size, which can only be achieved by the disclosure of a greater number of sales prices. That said, we can’t simply wish for more or better data, because that is exactly why commercial land assessments haven’t increased for the past decade. The Assessor had to act on the sales data that was available and qualified—and that sales data pointed to significant undervaluing of commercial land borough-wide.

The Universe of Commercial Appeals and the History of their Land Assessment

Attached you’ll find a report of 188 commercial appeals. This list represents all of the active (open, unresolved) appeals at the time the data was pulled from the system—some appeals on the list may have been corrected or withdrawn since the time this data was run. It’s a lot of data, but we have attempted to demonstrate the land valuation history of these 188 appealed parcels over the past ten years. In the columns on the left hand side, you’ll see the land assessment for each parcel from 2011 to 2021—ten years. In the columns on the right hand side, you’ll see the *cumulative* land assessment increase/decrease of those parcels since 2011.

These commercial appeals have been sorted from greatest-to-least *cumulative* land assessment increase/decrease since 2011. Here is a brief summary:

1 st Page	48 appealed parcels	<i>Cumulative increases</i> in land assessment from 2011 to 2020
2 nd Page	47 appealed parcels	<i>No cumulative change</i> in land assessment from 2011 to 2020
3 rd – 4 th Page	61 appealed parcels	<i>Cumulative decreases</i> in land assessment from 2011 to 2020
4 th Page	16 appealed parcels	<i>Cumulative decreases</i> in land assessment, even after 50% increase in 2021
4 th Page	16 appealed parcels	Brand new parcels in the 2021 assessment year

Every one of these appeals will be handled with equal professional rigor and integrity by the Assessor. However, this report helps to demonstrate that less than one-quarter of these appealed commercial land parcels has seen any land valuation increase in the past decade. Speaking generally, parcels nearer to the top of the list (1st page) may be somewhat more likely to be over-assessed as a result of the 50% increase because they had some level of land assessment increase in the past decade. These parcels may be more likely to receive a correction to their land assessment through the Assessor’s process of review upon appeal. Conversely, parcels on the remaining three pages are less likely to be over-assessed in 2021 because the 50% increase is correcting a decade of no appreciation in land assessment. In fact, many parcels that had cumulative land assessment decreases from 2011 to 2020 may still be under-assessed even after the 50% increase in 2021.

This report gives the Assembly Finance Committee a snapshot of the problem that the Assessor confronted in 2021—most commercial land assessments had not increased in a decade or more. This failure to keep pace with market values created a *systemic economic inequity* by shifting the property tax burden from commercial landowners to residential homeowners. CBJ has and will continue to closely follow the law in the administration of valuation appeals. And the single most important thing for improving the equity of assessments going forward is the disclosure of sales prices.

Summary

There are approximately 14,000 properties in the borough to be assessed each year. More than 98% of those

property owners did not appeal their 2021 assessments. While no one wishes for more appeals than absolutely necessary, this year's appeals are the direct consequence of inadequate information and inadequate adjustment over the last decade.

Because of public feedback from appellants, we have discussed this topic frequently with the public and with the Assembly. State statutes and local ordinances create a process for assessing properties and hearing appeals that is outside the domain of elected officials and their Managers—the tax valuation assessment process has been intentionally designed to be free from the influence of elected officials and their direct employees.

The Assembly and the Manager should remain neutral on the Assessor's valuations. The Assessor has made her best judgements in the face of a decade of stagnated values and a dearth of qualified sales information. The Assessor will always strive for accuracy and equity, and they must ensure public faith in the process. Likewise, appellants may be justified in their appeals. Both parties will have the chance to make their case. As proscribed by law, all commercial appellants are being afforded a legitimate opportunity to provide corrective information to the Assessor and to the BOE.

No action by the Assembly is appropriate at this time.

Cumulative Increase in Assessed Land Values since 2011
Active 2021 Commercial Assessment Appeals Only

Parcel	Assessed Land Value										
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
5B1601020110	\$ 191,300	\$ 191,300	\$ 597,900	\$ 597,900	\$ 597,900	\$ 645,800	\$ 645,800	\$ 645,800	\$ 688,800	\$ 688,800	\$ 1,033,200
5B1201060201	\$ 146,900	\$ 146,900	\$ 500,800	\$ 500,800	\$ 500,800	\$ 500,800	\$ 526,000	\$ 526,300	\$ 500,900	\$ 526,300	\$ 789,450
5B1201060191	\$ 241,500	\$ 241,500	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 526,400	\$ 789,600
4B2901150060	\$ 115,600	\$ 115,600	\$ 247,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 251,800	\$ 251,800	\$ 377,700
1C070A170093	\$ 67,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 163,500
1C070A170094	\$ 67,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 163,500
1C070A170095	\$ 67,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 163,500
1C070A170092	\$ 30,000	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 72,600
1C070A170091	\$ 18,000	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 42,450
5B1601020171	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 2,261,250
4B2201020050	\$ 110,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 72,900	\$ 72,900	\$ 73,629	\$ 40,000	\$ 163,500	\$ 172,400	\$ 162,000	\$ 162,000	\$ 243,000
2D040T200010	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 131,900	\$ 131,900	\$ 131,900	\$ 131,900	\$ 197,850
4B1701030180	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 45,600	\$ 53,200	\$ 57,500	\$ 57,500	\$ 79,800
4B1701030170	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 37,000	\$ 43,200	\$ 46,600	\$ 46,600	\$ 64,800
4B1701030160	\$ 49,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 54,400	\$ 63,500	\$ 68,500	\$ 68,500	\$ 95,250
5B1501000010	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 720,700
4B2201020040	\$ 115,000	\$ 115,000	\$ 63,900	\$ 63,900	\$ 63,900	\$ 64,100	\$ 145,100	\$ 145,100	\$ 145,100	\$ 145,100	\$ 217,650
4B2201020030	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 130,100	\$ 130,100	\$ 130,100	\$ 47,300	\$ 167,200	\$ 167,200	\$ 167,200	\$ 167,200	\$ 250,800
1D060L020140	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,800	\$ 30,800	\$ 32,300	\$ 32,300	\$ 55,000
4B2201020020	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 122,700	\$ 122,700	\$ 123,927	\$ 44,500	\$ 180,000	\$ 189,600	\$ 164,900	\$ 164,900	\$ 247,350
7B0901010062	\$ 93,400	\$ 93,400	\$ 101,900	\$ 99,800	\$ 99,800	\$ 116,600	\$ 116,600	\$ 112,300	\$ 112,300	\$ 112,300	\$ 168,450
5B1501060041						\$ 522,500	\$ 627,000	\$ 627,000	\$ 670,800	\$ 670,800	\$ 940,500
4B1701100040	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 44,700	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 39,200	\$ 79,600	\$ 86,400	\$ 93,300	\$ 93,300	\$ 139,950
1C110K120021	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 468,800	\$ 468,800	\$ 468,800	\$ 703,200
1C100I070110	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 93,300	\$ 93,300	\$ 93,300	\$ 139,950
3R0401000040	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 34,200
1C070K820022				\$ 625,500	\$ 681,500	\$ 681,500	\$ 681,500	\$ 654,200	\$ 654,200	\$ 708,800	\$ 1,063,200
5B2101310000	\$ 2,546,000	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 4,298,850
5B1201040051	\$ 601,200	\$ 601,200	\$ 601,200	\$ 601,200	\$ 601,200	\$ 601,200	\$ 471,000	\$ 471,000	\$ 671,400	\$ 671,400	\$ 1,007,100
1C070A040020	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 245,700	\$ 245,700	\$ 270,200	\$ 405,300
5B1201390020	\$ 177,200	\$ 177,200	\$ 177,200	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 289,950
5B1501010051	\$ 467,400	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 764,700
5B1501100020	\$ 721,400	\$ 721,400	\$ 832,400	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 1,165,350
4B1701030081	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 520,900	\$ 562,500	\$ 562,500	\$ 781,350
4B1701040052	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 581,700	\$ 581,700	\$ 581,700	\$ 872,550
5B1301080000	\$ 1,958,000	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 3,123,900
5B1601020170	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,628,400	\$ 1,628,400	\$ 2,442,600
1C070K810010	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 949,200	\$ 949,200	\$ 1,423,800
2D040T040020	\$ 300,000	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 314,000	\$ 314,000	\$ 471,000
1C110K120012	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 283,100	\$ 283,100	\$ 283,100	\$ 424,650
5B1201070010	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 28,050
1C070A020043	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 827,400	\$ 827,400	\$ 1,241,100
1C100I070081	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 506,300	\$ 506,300	\$ 506,300	\$ 759,450
5B1201000033	\$ 1,458,300	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,485,600	\$ 1,485,600	\$ 1,485,600	\$ 2,228,400
1C060K580052	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 1,264,200
1C100K830030	\$ 3,530,500	\$ 3,530,500	\$ 3,530,500	\$ 3,530,500	\$ 3,530,500	\$ 3,540,000	\$ 3,540,000	\$ 3,575,000	\$ 3,575,000	\$ 3,575,000	\$ 5,362,500
1C100K830040	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,450,500	\$ 3,450,500	\$ 3,450,500	\$ 5,175,750
1C100K830025	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,752,900	\$ 3,752,900	\$ 3,752,900	\$ 5,629,350

Cumulative % Change in Assessed Land Value Since 2011										
2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	
0%	213%	213%	213%	238%	238%	238%	260%	260%	440%	
0%	241%	241%	241%	241%	258%	258%	241%	258%	437%	
0%	107%	107%	107%	107%	107%	107%	107%	107%	118%	227%
0%	114%	114%	114%	114%	114%	114%	118%	118%	227%	
63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	144%
63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	144%
63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	144%
61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	142%
57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	136%
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	125%
0%	-34%	-34%	-33%	-64%	49%	57%	47%	47%	121%	
0%	26%	26%	26%	26%	32%	32%	32%	32%	98%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	30%	40%	40%	95%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	30%	40%	40%	95%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	30%	40%	40%	94%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	94%	
0%	-44%	-44%	-44%	-44%	26%	26%	26%	26%	89%	
0%	-4%	-4%	-4%	-65%	24%	24%	24%	24%	86%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	3%	8%	8%	83%	
0%	-9%	-9%	-8%	-67%	33%	40%	22%	22%	83%	
0%	9%	7%	7%	25%	25%	20%	20%	20%	80%	
				0%	20%	20%	28%	28%	80%	
0%	-44%	0%	0%	-51%	-1%	8%	17%	17%	75%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16%	16%	16%	74%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	14%	14%	72%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	71%	
		0%	9%	9%	9%	5%	5%	13%	70%	
13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	69%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-22%	-22%	12%	12%	68%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	10%	65%	
0%	0%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	64%	
9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	64%	
0%	15%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	62%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	16%	16%	61%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	7%	7%	61%	
6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	60%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	6%	58%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	58%	
16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	5%	5%	57%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	5%	57%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	57%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	56%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	4%	55%	
1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	53%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	52%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	52%	
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	52%	

Cumulative Increase in Assessed Land Values since 2011
Active 2021 Commercial Assessment Appeals Only

Parcel	Assessed Land Value											Cumulative % Change in Assessed Land Value Since 2011										
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	
Parcels below this line experienced no increase in land value from 2011 to 2020																						
1C060K580053	\$ 181,000	\$ 181,000	\$ 181,000	\$ 181,000	\$ 181,000	\$ 181,000	\$ 181,000	\$ 181,400	\$ 181,400	\$ 181,400	\$ 272,100	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
180301020021				\$ 604,800	\$ 604,800	\$ 604,800	\$ 604,800	\$ 604,800	\$ 604,800	\$ 604,800	\$ 907,200			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
180301050100	\$ 36,600	\$ 36,600	\$ 36,600	\$ 36,600	\$ 36,600	\$ 36,600	\$ 36,600	\$ 36,600	\$ 36,600	\$ 36,600	\$ 54,900	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
180301050110	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 150,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
180301100040	\$ 552,600	\$ 552,600	\$ 552,600	\$ 552,600	\$ 552,600	\$ 552,600	\$ 552,600	\$ 552,600	\$ 552,600	\$ 552,600	\$ 828,900	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C060K580054	\$ 181,600	\$ 181,600	\$ 181,600	\$ 181,600	\$ 181,600	\$ 181,600	\$ 181,600	\$ 181,600	\$ 181,600	\$ 181,600	\$ 272,400	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C060K580055	\$ 206,600	\$ 206,600	\$ 206,600	\$ 206,600	\$ 206,600	\$ 206,600	\$ 206,600	\$ 206,600	\$ 206,600	\$ 206,600	\$ 309,900	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C060K600080	\$ 187,200	\$ 187,200	\$ 187,200	\$ 187,200	\$ 187,200	\$ 187,200	\$ 187,200	\$ 187,200	\$ 187,200	\$ 187,200	\$ 280,800	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C070A090040	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 367,500	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C070A100011	\$ 504,000	\$ 504,000	\$ 504,000	\$ 504,000	\$ 504,000	\$ 504,000	\$ 504,000	\$ 504,000	\$ 504,000	\$ 504,000	\$ 756,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C070A160040	\$ 655,500	\$ 655,500	\$ 655,500	\$ 655,500	\$ 655,500	\$ 655,500	\$ 655,500	\$ 655,500	\$ 655,500	\$ 655,500	\$ 983,250	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C070B0J0010	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,190,000	\$ 1,785,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C070B0L0020	\$ 585,600	\$ 585,600	\$ 585,600	\$ 585,600	\$ 585,600	\$ 585,600	\$ 585,600	\$ 585,600	\$ 585,600	\$ 585,600	\$ 878,400	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C070H030010	\$ 1,055,300	\$ 1,055,300	\$ 1,055,300	\$ 1,055,300	\$ 1,055,300	\$ 1,055,300	\$ 1,055,300	\$ 1,055,300	\$ 1,055,300	\$ 1,055,300	\$ 1,582,950	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C070H040010	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 64,000	\$ 96,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C070K820010	\$ 2,935,800	\$ 2,935,800	\$ 2,935,800	\$ 2,935,800	\$ 2,935,800	\$ 2,935,800	\$ 2,935,800	\$ 2,935,800	\$ 2,935,800	\$ 2,935,800	\$ 4,403,700	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C110I070010	\$ 71,900	\$ 71,900	\$ 71,900	\$ 71,900	\$ 71,900	\$ 71,900	\$ 71,900	\$ 71,900	\$ 71,900	\$ 71,900	\$ 107,850	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1D060L400032					\$ 255,300	\$ 255,300	\$ 255,300	\$ 255,300	\$ 255,300	\$ 255,300	\$ 382,950				0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
2D0301020050	\$ 76,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 114,750	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
2D040T320111	\$ 125,100	\$ 125,100	\$ 125,100	\$ 93,800	\$ 125,100	\$ 125,100	\$ 125,100	\$ 125,100	\$ 125,100	\$ 125,100	\$ 187,650	0%	0%	-25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
3C030M010010	\$ 76,600	\$ 76,600	\$ 76,600	\$ 76,600	\$ 76,600	\$ 76,600	\$ 76,600	\$ 76,600	\$ 76,600	\$ 76,600	\$ 114,900	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
3M0000MSU01	\$ 412,000	\$ 412,000	\$ 412,000	\$ 412,000	\$ 412,000	\$ 412,000	\$ 412,000	\$ 412,000	\$ 412,000	\$ 412,000	\$ 618,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
4B170I050091	\$ 86,900	\$ 86,900	\$ 86,900	\$ 86,900	\$ 86,900	\$ 86,900	\$ 86,900	\$ 86,900	\$ 86,900	\$ 86,900	\$ 130,350	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
4B170I050131	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 125,400	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
4B170I100060	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 59,600	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 24,100	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 202,500	0%	-56%	0%	0%	-82%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
4B170I100100	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 59,600	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 202,500	0%	-56%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
4B290I150040	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,125,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B120I000052	\$ 495,000	\$ 495,000	\$ 495,000	\$ 495,000	\$ 495,000	\$ 495,000	\$ 495,000	\$ 495,000	\$ 495,000	\$ 495,000	\$ 742,500	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B120I000121								\$ 1,169,100	\$ 1,169,100	\$ 1,169,100	\$ 1,753,650						0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B120I020021	\$ 152,200	\$ 152,200	\$ 152,200	\$ 152,200	\$ 152,200	\$ 152,200	\$ 152,200	\$ 152,200	\$ 152,200	\$ 152,200	\$ 228,300	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B120I020022	\$ 108,600	\$ 108,600	\$ 108,600	\$ 108,600	\$ 108,600	\$ 108,600	\$ 108,600	\$ 108,600	\$ 108,600	\$ 108,600	\$ 162,900	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B120I020023	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 199,500	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B120I020030	\$ 196,900	\$ 196,900	\$ 196,900	\$ 196,900	\$ 196,900	\$ 196,900	\$ 196,900	\$ 196,900	\$ 196,900	\$ 196,900	\$ 295,350	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B120I060152	\$ 289,700	\$ 289,700	\$ 289,700	\$ 289,700	\$ 289,700	\$ 289,700	\$ 289,700	\$ 289,700	\$ 289,700	\$ 289,700	\$ 434,550	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B120I390010	\$ 290,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 435,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B130I070035	\$ 374,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 374,000	\$ 561,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B150I010014	\$ 503,500	\$ 503,500	\$ 503,500	\$ 503,500	\$ 503,500	\$ 503,500	\$ 503,500	\$ 503,500	\$ 503,500	\$ 503,500	\$ 755,250	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B150I010060	\$ 198,100	\$ 198,100	\$ 198,100	\$ 198,100	\$ 198,100	\$ 198,100	\$ 198,100	\$ 198,100	\$ 198,100	\$ 198,100	\$ 297,150	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B150I010070	\$ 658,700	\$ 658,700	\$ 658,700	\$ 658,700	\$ 658,700	\$ 658,700	\$ 658,700	\$ 658,700	\$ 658,700	\$ 658,700	\$ 988,050	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B150I020210	\$ 193,700	\$ 193,700	\$ 193,700	\$ 193,700	\$ 193,700	\$ 193,700	\$ 193,700	\$ 193,700	\$ 193,700	\$ 193,700	\$ 290,550	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B150I060030	\$ 91,200	\$ 91,200	\$ 91,200	\$ 91,200	\$ 91,200	\$ 91,200	\$ 91,200	\$ 91,200	\$ 91,200	\$ 91,200	\$ 136,800	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B160I020180	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 784,050	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B160I020190	\$ 261,400	\$ 261,400	\$ 261,400	\$ 261,400	\$ 261,400	\$ 261,400	\$ 261,400	\$ 261,400	\$ 261,400	\$ 261,400	\$ 392,100	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B160I210041	\$ 537,500	\$ 537,500	\$ 537,500	\$ 537,500	\$ 537,500	\$ 537,500	\$ 537,500	\$ 537,500	\$ 537,500	\$ 537,500	\$ 806,250	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
5B210I030000	\$ 1,309,000	\$ 1,309,000	\$ 1,309,000	\$ 1,309,000	\$ 1,309,000	\$ 1,309,000	\$ 1,309,000	\$ 1,309,000	\$ 1,309,000	\$ 1,309,000	\$ 1,963,500	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
1C060K630020	\$ 309,000	\$ 309,000	\$ 309,000	\$ 309,000	\$ 309,000	\$ 309,000	\$ 309,000	\$ 308,700	\$ 308,700	\$ 308,700	\$ 463,050	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	
2D040C050074							\$ 465,500	\$ 465,500	\$ 465,500	\$ 465,000	\$ 697,500						0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	

2021-11-04 BOE Hearing Page 14

Cumulative Increase in Assessed Land Values since 2011
Active 2021 Commercial Assessment Appeals Only

Parcel	Assessed Land Value											Cumulative % Change in Assessed Land Value Since 2011										
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	
	Parcels below this line experienced a decrease in land value from 2011 to 2020																					
5B1601380020	\$ 550,200	\$ 550,200	\$ 550,200	\$ 550,200	\$ 550,200	\$ 550,200	\$ 518,900	\$ 518,900	\$ 575,100	\$ 575,100	\$ 821,700	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-6%	-6%	5%	5%	49%	
5B1201060220	\$ 168,900	\$ 168,900	\$ 168,900	\$ 168,900	\$ 168,900	\$ 167,800	\$ 167,800	\$ 167,800	\$ 167,800	\$ 167,800	\$ 251,700	0%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	49%	
1B0301050030	\$ 41,600	\$ 41,600	\$ 41,600	\$ 41,600	\$ 41,600	\$ 41,600	\$ 41,300	\$ 41,300	\$ 41,300	\$ 41,300	\$ 61,950	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	49%	
1C1007070091	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,965,100	\$ 1,965,100	\$ 1,965,100	\$ 2,947,650	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-2%	-2%	-2%	47%	
1C100K830031	\$ 1,888,200	\$ 1,888,200	\$ 1,888,200	\$ 1,888,200	\$ 1,888,200	\$ 1,888,200	\$ 1,888,200	\$ 1,853,900	\$ 1,853,900	\$ 1,853,900	\$ 2,780,850	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-2%	-2%	-2%	47%	
1C070A020030	\$ 671,800	\$ 671,800	\$ 671,800	\$ 671,800	\$ 671,800	\$ 671,800	\$ 671,800	\$ 671,800	\$ 671,800	\$ 658,400	\$ 987,600	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-2%	47%	
1C070A020011	\$ 1,087,900	\$ 1,087,900	\$ 1,087,900	\$ 1,087,900	\$ 1,087,900	\$ 1,087,900	\$ 1,087,900	\$ 1,087,900	\$ 1,087,900	\$ 1,066,100	\$ 1,599,150	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-2%	47%	
1C070H030031	\$ 2,150,000	\$ 2,150,000	\$ 2,150,000	\$ 2,150,000	\$ 2,150,000	\$ 2,150,000	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 3,150,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-2%	-2%	-2%	47%	
1C060U040010	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,490,100	\$ 1,452,900	\$ 2,179,350		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-2%	-2%	47%	
1C060U040050	\$ 1,400,400	\$ 1,400,400	\$ 1,400,400	\$ 1,400,400	\$ 1,400,400	\$ 1,400,400	\$ 1,400,400	\$ 1,400,400	\$ 1,400,400	\$ 1,365,400	\$ 2,048,100	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-2%	46%	
5B1201000032	\$ 402,400	\$ 393,700	\$ 393,700	\$ 393,700	\$ 393,700	\$ 392,000	\$ 392,000	\$ 392,000	\$ 392,000	\$ 392,000	\$ 588,000	-2%	-2%	-2%	-2%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-3%	46%	
5B1201020150	\$ 445,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 432,000	\$ 432,000	\$ 432,000	\$ 432,000	\$ 648,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-3%	46%	
5B1201020160	\$ 445,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 445,000	\$ 432,000	\$ 432,000	\$ 432,000	\$ 432,000	\$ 648,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-3%	46%	
1C060K010033							\$ 1,778,600	\$ 1,778,600	\$ 1,723,300	\$ 2,584,950								0%	0%	-3%	45%	
5B1201020010	\$ 483,400	\$ 483,400	\$ 483,400	\$ 483,400	\$ 483,400	\$ 483,400	\$ 467,900	\$ 467,900	\$ 467,900	\$ 467,900	\$ 701,850	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-3%	-3%	-3%	-3%	45%	
5B1601430016	\$ 784,500	\$ 784,500	\$ 784,500	\$ 784,500	\$ 784,500	\$ 784,500	\$ 784,500	\$ 757,200	\$ 757,200	\$ 1,135,800		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-3%	-3%	45%	
1C100K830041	\$ 1,241,800	\$ 1,241,800	\$ 1,241,800	\$ 1,241,800	\$ 1,241,800	\$ 1,241,800	\$ 1,241,800	\$ 1,197,000	\$ 1,197,000	\$ 1,197,000	\$ 1,795,500	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-4%	-4%	-4%	45%	
4B1601010010	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,538,900	\$ 1,538,900	\$ 1,538,900	\$ 1,538,900	\$ 2,308,350	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-4%	-4%	-4%	-4%	44%	
5B1201000031	\$ 2,472,000	\$ 2,374,000	\$ 2,374,000	\$ 2,374,000	\$ 2,374,000	\$ 2,374,000	\$ 2,374,000	\$ 2,374,000	\$ 2,374,000	\$ 2,374,000	\$ 3,561,000	-4%	-4%	-4%	-4%	-4%	-4%	-4%	-4%	-4%	44%	
1C070A040010	\$ 614,100	\$ 614,100	\$ 614,100	\$ 614,100	\$ 614,100	\$ 614,100	\$ 614,100	\$ 614,100	\$ 614,100	\$ 589,500	\$ 884,250	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-4%	44%	
1C070A100070	\$ 159,000	\$ 159,000	\$ 159,000	\$ 159,000	\$ 159,000	\$ 159,000	\$ 159,000	\$ 159,000	\$ 159,000	\$ 152,600	\$ 228,900	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-4%	44%	
1C100I050010	\$ 4,240,500	\$ 4,240,500	\$ 4,240,500	\$ 4,240,500	\$ 4,240,500	\$ 4,240,500	\$ 4,240,500	\$ 4,047,800	\$ 4,047,800	\$ 4,047,800	\$ 6,071,700	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-5%	-5%	-5%	43%	
1C070K810070	\$ 387,600	\$ 387,600	\$ 387,600	\$ 387,600	\$ 387,600	\$ 387,600	\$ 387,600	\$ 372,100	\$ 372,100	\$ 369,000	\$ 553,500	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-4%	-4%	-5%	43%	
1C070K810120	\$ 690,000	\$ 690,000	\$ 690,000	\$ 690,000	\$ 690,000	\$ 690,000	\$ 690,000	\$ 699,100	\$ 699,100	\$ 655,400	\$ 983,100	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	-5%	-5%	42%	
4B1701030140	\$ 53,600	\$ 53,600	\$ 53,600	\$ 53,600	\$ 53,600	\$ 53,600	\$ 53,600	\$ 50,900	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 76,350	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-5%	3%	3%	42%		
4B2901150050	\$ 1,008,600	\$ 1,008,600	\$ 957,400	\$ 957,400	\$ 957,400	\$ 957,400	\$ 957,400	\$ 957,400	\$ 957,400	\$ 957,400	\$ 1,436,100	0%	-5%	-5%	-5%	-5%	-5%	-5%	-5%	-5%	42%	
4B1701030150	\$ 54,700	\$ 54,700	\$ 54,700	\$ 54,700	\$ 54,700	\$ 54,700	\$ 54,700	\$ 51,900	\$ 56,100	\$ 56,100	\$ 77,850	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-5%	3%	3%	42%	
1C060K700040	\$ 457,400	\$ 457,400	\$ 457,400	\$ 457,400	\$ 457,400	\$ 457,400	\$ 457,400	\$ 457,400	\$ 457,400	\$ 431,200	\$ 646,800	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-6%	41%	
4B1701100110	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 59,600	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 117,200	\$ 117,200	\$ 126,600	\$ 126,600	\$ 189,900	0%	-56%	0%	0%	0%	-13%	-13%	-6%	-6%	41%	
5B1201010060	\$ 278,800	\$ 278,800	\$ 304,100	\$ 228,100	\$ 228,100	\$ 228,100	\$ 258,500	\$ 258,500	\$ 258,500	\$ 258,500	\$ 387,750	0%	9%	-18%	-18%	-18%	-7%	-7%	-7%	-7%	39%	
5B1201350010	\$ 234,300	\$ 234,300	\$ 216,300	\$ 216,300	\$ 216,300	\$ 216,300	\$ 216,300	\$ 216,300	\$ 216,300	\$ 216,300	\$ 324,450	0%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	38%	
5B1501010030	\$ 566,300	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 522,700	\$ 784,050	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	38%	
4B1601010022	\$ 382,300	\$ 382,300	\$ 382,300	\$ 382,300	\$ 382,300	\$ 382,300	\$ 352,300	\$ 352,300	\$ 352,300	\$ 352,300	\$ 528,450	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-8%	-8%	-8%	-8%	38%	
4B2901010050						\$ 548,900	\$ 500,800	\$ 500,800	\$ 500,800	\$ 500,800	\$ 751,200					0%	-9%	-9%	-9%	-9%	37%	
1C070K830040	\$ 3,699,600	\$ 3,363,300	\$ 3,363,300	\$ 3,363,300	\$ 3,363,300	\$ 3,363,300	\$ 3,363,300	\$ 3,363,300	\$ 3,321,100	\$ 3,363,300	\$ 5,044,950	-9%	-9%	-9%	-9%	-9%	-9%	-9%	-10%	-9%	36%	
4B1701080039	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 75,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-9%	-9%	-9%	-9%	36%	
1C070H020010	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 1,575,000	\$ 1,575,000	\$ 1,575,000	\$ 2,362,500	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-10%	-10%	-10%	35%	
1C060U060040	\$ 266,000	\$ 266,000	\$ 266,000	\$ 266,000	\$ 266,000	\$ 266,000	\$ 266,000	\$ 265,800	\$ 265,800	\$ 239,200	\$ 358,800	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-10%	35%	
1C070A140030	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 71,200	\$ 71,200	\$ 71,200	\$ 71,200	\$ 71,200	\$ 71,200	\$ 71,200	\$ 71,200	\$ 106,800	0%	-11%	-11%	-11%	-11%	-11%	-11%	-11%	-11%	34%	
1C070A090050	\$ 268,700	\$ 268,700	\$ 268,700	\$ 268,700	\$ 268,700	\$ 268,700	\$ 268,700	\$ 268,700	\$ 268,700	\$ 236,500	\$ 354,750	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-12%	32%	
1C070K820021			\$ 1,531,500	\$ 1,531,500	\$ 1,392,000	\$ 1,392,000	\$ 1,340,000	\$ 1,340,000	\$ 1,340,000	\$ 1,346,800	\$ 2,020,200			0%	-1%	-9%	-9%	-13%	-13%	-12%	32%	
4B1701100070	\$ 104,500	\$ 104,500	\$ 104,500	\$ 104,500	\$ 104,500	\$ 104,500	\$ 88,200	\$ 90,500	\$ 90,500	\$ 90,500	\$ 135,750	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-16%	-13%	-13%	-13%	30%	
6D0701060000	\$ 400,000	\$ 344,800	\$ 344,800	\$ 344,800	\$ 344,800	\$ 344,800	\$ 344,800	\$ 344,800	\$ 344,800	\$ 344,800	\$ 517,200	-14%	-14%	-14%	-14%	-14%	-14%	-14%	-14%	-14%	29%	
7B0901020022	\$ 397,000	\$ 397,000	\$ 397,000	\$ 397,000	\$ 397,000	\$ 397,000																

Cumulative Increase in Assessed Land Values since 2011
Active 2021 Commercial Assessment Appeals Only

Parcel	Assessed Land Value											Cumulative % Change in Assessed Land Value Since 2011									
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
5B1201040052	\$ 2,843,600	\$ 2,843,600	\$ 2,843,600	\$ 2,843,600	\$ 2,843,600	\$ 2,843,600	\$ 2,339,700	\$ 2,339,700	\$ 2,339,700	\$ 2,339,700	\$ 3,509,550	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-18%	-18%	-18%	-18%	23%
3R0401000050	\$ 62,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 62,000	\$ 75,200	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	21%
1C060K700052	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 67,500	\$ 101,250	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-21%	19%
4B1701030110	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 85,200	\$ 65,500	\$ 65,500	\$ 70,700	\$ 70,700	\$ 98,250	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-23%	-23%	-17%	-17%	15%
5B2101000030	\$ 1,155,600	\$ 1,155,600	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,900	\$ 834,400	\$ 834,400	\$ 917,300	\$ 917,300	\$ 1,310,550	0%	-31%	-31%	-31%	-31%	-28%	-28%	-21%	-21%	13%
1C07080L0010	\$ 945,000	\$ 945,000	\$ 945,000	\$ 945,000	\$ 945,000	\$ 945,000	\$ 945,000	\$ 708,000	\$ 708,000	\$ 708,000	\$ 1,062,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-25%	-25%	-25%	12%
1C07080J0020	\$ 400,600	\$ 400,600	\$ 400,600	\$ 400,600	\$ 400,600	\$ 400,600	\$ 400,600	\$ 288,500	\$ 288,500	\$ 288,500	\$ 432,750	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-28%	-28%	-28%	8%
5B1601420020	\$ 639,600	\$ 639,600	\$ 639,600	\$ 639,600	\$ 639,600	\$ 639,600	\$ 639,600	\$ 439,700	\$ 452,900	\$ 452,900	\$ 679,350	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-31%	-29%	-29%	6%
5B1601420040	\$ 468,900	\$ 468,900	\$ 468,900	\$ 468,900	\$ 468,900	\$ 468,900	\$ 468,900	\$ 322,300	\$ 332,000	\$ 332,000	\$ 498,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-31%	-29%	-29%	6%
4B1701110110	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Parcels below this line have a lower land value in 2021 than in 2011, even with the 50% increase in 2021																					
1C070A520080	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 43,100	\$ 43,100	\$ 43,100	\$ 43,100	\$ 43,100	\$ 43,100	\$ 43,100	\$ 43,100	\$ 64,650	0%	-34%	-34%	-34%	-34%	-34%	-34%	-34%	-34%	-1%
5B1601430017	\$ 2,546,700	\$ 2,546,700	\$ 2,546,700	\$ 2,546,700	\$ 2,546,700	\$ 2,546,700	\$ 2,546,700	\$ 1,680,800	\$ 1,680,900	\$ 1,680,900	\$ 2,521,350	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-34%	-34%	-34%	-1%
1C1001070050	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 93,500	\$ 93,500	\$ 93,500	\$ 70,100	\$ 70,100	\$ 105,150	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-14%	-14%	-14%	-36%	-4%
1C1001070030	\$ 142,500	\$ 142,500	\$ 142,500	\$ 142,500	\$ 142,500	\$ 122,100	\$ 122,100	\$ 122,100	\$ 91,600	\$ 91,600	\$ 137,400	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-14%	-14%	-14%	-36%	-4%
1C1001070040	\$ 144,600	\$ 144,600	\$ 144,600	\$ 144,600	\$ 144,600	\$ 123,900	\$ 123,900	\$ 123,900	\$ 92,900	\$ 92,900	\$ 139,350	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-14%	-14%	-14%	-36%	-4%
4B1701030090	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 50,700	\$ 54,700	\$ 54,700	\$ 76,050	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-25%	-37%	-32%	-32%	-5%
5B1601440082				\$ 966,600	\$ 805,500	\$ 805,500	\$ 805,500	\$ 598,100	\$ 598,100	\$ 598,100	\$ 897,150			0%	-17%	-17%	-38%	-38%	-38%	-38%	-7%
7B0901020010	\$ 1,464,800	\$ 1,464,800	\$ 1,464,800	\$ 1,464,800	\$ 1,464,800	\$ 1,464,800	\$ 868,400	\$ 868,400	\$ 868,400	\$ 868,400	\$ 1,302,600	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-41%	-41%	-41%	-11%
4B1701030100	\$ 124,100	\$ 124,100	\$ 124,100	\$ 124,100	\$ 124,100	\$ 124,100	\$ 85,900	\$ 72,600	\$ 78,400	\$ 78,400	\$ 108,900	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	-31%	-41%	-37%	-37%	-12%
5B1601020121	\$ 2,161,000	\$ 2,161,000	\$ 1,080,500	\$ 1,080,500	\$ 1,080,500	\$ 1,080,500	\$ 1,080,500	\$ 1,080,500	\$ 1,188,600	\$ 1,188,600	\$ 1,782,900	0%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-45%	-45%	-17%
5B1301070036	\$ 574,000	\$ 574,000	\$ 574,000	\$ 287,000	\$ 287,000	\$ 287,000	\$ 287,000	\$ 287,000	\$ 287,000	\$ 287,000	\$ 430,500	0%	0%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-25%
5B1601000040	\$ 2,548,800	\$ 2,548,800	\$ 1,274,400	\$ 1,274,400	\$ 1,274,400	\$ 1,274,400	\$ 1,274,400	\$ 1,274,400	\$ 1,274,400	\$ 1,274,400	\$ 1,911,600	0%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-25%
5B1201060112	\$ 533,200	\$ 533,200	\$ 533,200	\$ 533,200	\$ 226,600	\$ 226,600	\$ 226,600	\$ 226,600	\$ 226,600	\$ 226,600	\$ 339,900	0%	0%	0%	-58%	-58%	-58%	-58%	-58%	-58%	-36%
1C1001070020	\$ 234,700	\$ 234,700	\$ 234,700	\$ 234,700	\$ 234,700	\$ 117,300	\$ 117,300	\$ 117,300	\$ 88,000	\$ 88,000	\$ 132,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-63%	-63%	-44%
5B2101320021						\$ 849,000	\$ 599,100	\$ 269,800	\$ 269,800	\$ 269,800	\$ 404,700		0%	0%	0%	0%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-63%	-63%
1C1001070060	\$ 1,475,800	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 265,000	\$ 272,300	\$ 272,300	\$ 272,300	\$ 408,450	-82%	-82%	-82%	-82%	-82%	-82%	-82%	-82%	-82%	-72%
Parcels below this line were new in assessment year 2021																					
1C070K770012											\$ 2,322,000										0%
5B1401020073											\$ 1,055,550										0%
5B1401050020											\$ 936,150										0%
5B1401050030											\$ 962,400										0%
5B1401050040											\$ 391,950										0%
5B1401050050											\$ 784,050										0%
5B1401050060											\$ 705,450										0%
5B1401050070											\$ 3,361,800										0%
5B1401050080											\$ 781,650										0%
5B1401050090											\$ 784,050										0%
5B1401050110											\$ 392,700										0%
5B1401050120											\$ 393,150										0%
5B1401050130											\$ 631,050										0%
5B1401050140											\$ 503,100										0%
5B1601380034											\$ 771,300										0%
5B1601380036											\$ 9,802,800										0%

2021-11-04 BOE Hearing



October 25, 2021

Robert S. Spitzfaden Esq.
217 2nd St
Ste 204
Juneau, Alaska 99801-9801

Re: Reaction to the Board of Equalization appeals

Dear Mr. Spitzfaden,

As of today, here are some of my impressions from the hearings of the appeals before the Board of Equalization that you are handling for commercial property owners. First, let me say that I have no stake in the outcome of this analysis—I own no commercial property and I have not asked for compensation to provide this letter. These are just my personal opinions and not opinions formed as a paid advocate.

After reviewing the summary report, board training video, and appeal hearings, I still do not fully understand the methods, assumptions, and logic behind the adjustments to the 2021 assessed values commercial properties. Almost no explanations have been written down by the assessor's office. There is no written record of the statistical methods that I could find. Statistics have not been clearly labeled and explained, and figures and tables have no accompanying captions and explanations. Indeed, some statistics have only been labeled with cryptic unexplained acronyms. I have tried to find written descriptions of the methods, and I have tried to talk to staff at the assessor's office about these, but I have been unsuccessful. Please see my section on *My attempts to understand the methods*, below, for more information on this. After now hearing staff from the assessor's office testify at the appeal hearings, I believe I have some general understanding of what they did and why they did it. Most importantly, I heard Mr. Michael Dahle state repeatedly that the methods in question are a response to an upward trend the value of commercial real estate in Juneau. I had a look at this hypothesis using the data that I have available. Using the 53 real estate sales values (cited below) that made up the sample that was used to develop the adjustments, I cannot detect such a trend. See my section on *Trend in commercial real estate sales*, below, for more on this. Finally, I want to stress that I have strong reservations about the representativeness of the sample (again, cited below) that was used to underpin the analysis and reach the conclusion that the assessments should be raised. See more about this in the section on *Representativeness of the sample of 53 sales*.

My attempts to understand the methods

While I was at sea this summer bringing up a boat from Tacoma, I was asked for help interpreting the last two pages of assessor's report that does not seem to have a title, date

published, and author, although the words “AV 2021 Summary Report – CBJ Commercial Property Valuations” appear at the top of the first page. My ability to comment was somewhat limited by the fact I was at sea, but my first response was that I had no idea what these various statistics mean, as, again, there were no written methods, there was inadequate labeling of the statistics and graphics, and some of the statistics were referred to by confusing acronyms that were not defined. The person who asked my advice then provided me a video of Board of Equalization training in hopes that this would allow me to understand the methods. I was able to watch that video when we were in port and had internet access. Unfortunately, that video also did not provide a clear and detailed explanation of the methods.

Without some explanation of the statistical methods, without some clear description of what the statistics are and what they mean, without an explanation of what the graphics and tables mean, the new assessments are essentially just random numbers to a taxpayer trying to make sense of why the taxes went up. Without some ability to follow the logic and understand the process, a taxpayer cannot tell the difference between an assessment increase due to a fair and equitable process versus an increase due to vindictiveness, personal animus, or just whimsy.

When I returned to Juneau, I contacted Michael Dahle’s office several times to try to better understand the reasoning behind the new assessments. On some occasions, but not all occasions, I noted the date and time of the communication. On August 17, I left a voicemail describing what I wanted to discuss with Mr. Dahle. At 4:00 pm on that same day I called again and this time I spoke to a person who said she would have Michael Dahle call me. On August 18, at 2:18 pm I called again and spoke to someone named Jillian Olson. I explained what that I would like to go over the methods and she said that she would have Mr. Dahle give me a call. At 2:46 pm that same day I received an e-mail from Ms. Olson. In it she noted that I had not filed an appeal, and she stated that Mr. Dahle was too busy to talk to me. However, late in the day, on August 20th, I believe it was, Mr. Dahle did call me. I pointed out that I was driving, and that I was about to go into a meeting, and I asked if we could speak on the phone the following Monday. He said that he would give me a call on that day. When I did not hear from him on that Monday, I called near the end of the day. I could not reach him, and I left another message. I never detected any further attempt by Mr. Dahle to contact me.

Trend in commercial real estate sales

You supplied me with a spreadsheet titled “sept 30 sale list.xlsx.” This appears to be the exact information I also have on a paper page with the words “AY2021 Analysis Sales List” in the upper left-hand corner. I note this page has the notation “AY2021 – Com Sales List20210928a. MktData: 9/29/2021 @ 12:59 PM, Page1” at the bottom of the page. If we were to accept for the moment that this sample is a representative of all commercial properties in Juneau, which I believe is a questionable assumption—but one that does appear to be a necessary for the assessor’s analysis—then an annual trend in sales prices should be obvious in this sample of 53 sales, as it contains sales from 2016 through the end of 2020. I note that the median sale price in 2016 was \$786 thousand, in 2017 it was \$346 thousand, in 2018 it was \$418 thousand, in 2019 it was \$402 thousand, and in 2020 it was \$654 thousand. For there to be an upward trend in sale



prices, the annual median sale price should tend to move upward year after year—maybe not every year, but at least in most years.

Note that there are four occurrences in which we can see a year-to-year change in this record. From 2016 to 2017 the median decreased (substantially), from 2017 to 2018 it increased slightly, from 2018 to 2019 the median again decreased (slightly), and then from 2019 to 2020 it again increased. During this period the medians twice decreased and twice increased: this is not indicative of an upward trend. Also, note that at the end of the series the median value was lower than at the median value at the beginning of the series. Again, this supports the notion there was no upward trend.

Let's try looking at all of the sales in a series. If we plot all of the sales one after another in time order we find that there are two outliers that dominate the graph (a \$4 million sale in 2017 and a \$20 million sale in 2020). So conventional methods for estimating trend are unsuitable because these methods will be very influenced by outliers. However, if there is a trend in the whole sales series, then we would expect the number of times a sale price is followed by a sale of larger size to occur more often than what you would get by chance. In other words, if we think having a sale followed by a sale of larger size as like getting a "heads" when we flip a coin, and a "tails" otherwise, then we can use probability to test whether we have more sales followed by higher priced sales than we would expect to see by chance in 53-1 flips of a coin. It turns out there 24 occurrences of a sale is followed by a sale of larger size—very, very close to half of the time. If we were to formalize this into a statistical test we would say that there is no statistically detectable trend (at the conventional significance level of 0.05) using this method.

Let's look at this another way. If we divide the series into two groups, with the first 26 sales in the first half, the last 26 in the second half, with the 27th sale deleted so that we have the same number sales in both the early and late groups. It turns out the median price is just about the same in both groups. Indeed, the median price is slightly higher in the earlier group, but not by very much. If anything, this analysis provides very weak support for the idea prices went down. Again, I just don't see support for the idea there was an upward—or really any—trend in prices.

I assume that the assessor's office has information that I don't have access to, and maybe some of that information contains evidence of a trend. However, they have not yet presented any evidence that supports the hypothesis that there was an upward trend in sale prices that I have seen in the Board of Equalization hearings.

Or if the assessor's office has presented this evidence, it was not presented clearly and it was not well explained. Indeed, this has been a huge problem with trying to understand the whole analysis. Again, almost no explanations have been written down. Statistics have not been clearly labeled and explained, and figures and tables have no accompanying captions and explanations.

If the assessor's office does have other evidence that sales prices trended upwards, then this might be highly noteworthy, and certainly relevant to the question of whether this sample of 53 sales is representative of the larger population of commercial properties. I note that this assumption that sale prices have been trending upwards is central to the logic of how the



assessments were adjusted upward in 2021 and it is certainly central to the whole idea that there needed to be an adjustment at all.

Representativeness of the sample of 53 sales

The idea you can just take a small sample and use that to represent some kind of larger population is based on the idea that the sample is *representative* of the population, in some sense. The field of scientific sampling has been developing for over 100 years, and we rely on these methods for many useful things in our lives. Your doctor does not have to drain all the blood out of your body to know your blood cholesterol level. Small blood samples have been repeatedly tested and shown by evidence to be adequate for the purpose by professional associations of clinical pathologists. Sampling for quality control in manufacturing process saves enormous amounts of money and ensures the safety of drugs, foods, air transportation, and on and on.

However, it should be obvious that not just any sample will capture the essential characteristics of the entire population under study. A sample of 100 people at a single political party's convention would not be suitable to make an accurate prediction about the outcome of an election with candidates from more than one party. A sample of 50 people at a sexually transmitted disease clinic would not be a good sample to use to estimate the incidence of syphilis in some larger population of people in a city. There is a well-developed theory about how to sample. Central to this theory is the idea of a *random sample*. With random sampling, the sample size controls what is called the *precision*—which is a mathematical description of how well, in some sense, the sample matches the population. I want to emphasize that here *random sample* is a term of art, and it does not mean what it means in common, colloquial speech. A *random sample*, in the scientific sense, is a sample that can be shown mathematically to be representative of the population for many purposes if the sample size is large enough.

If you will let me get a little technical, to produce a random sample of size n , the first requirement is that someone be able to carefully define what the population is and what it is not, so that someone else could know for sure if a sampling unit is either in or is outside the population. For example, if we are sampling land use with a satellite image, the population might be a set of one-kilometers square rectangles with some vegetation on them in Wisconsin. Then, for example, we will know that a specific farm in Minnesota or parts of Lake Mendota are not in the population. The next step is to uniquely label each of the N things in that make up the population. Then someone, at least in principle, will need to take those labels to produce a list of every possible combination of n labels taken out of the population of N labels. So, this list of combinations—that is, list of possible samples—would be very long. Finally, the last step would be to choose one of those combinations of n labels by a process that is really random, in the mathematical sense of the word. Often something other than a random sample is simply assumed to be a random sample. Sometimes this is appropriate and other times not. From some of the things Mr. Dahle has said in testimony I infer that he is treating the sample of 53 sales as both a representative sample, and more restrictively as a random sample from some kind of hypothetical population that has yet to be described, at least to me.



Obviously, a sample might not be representative of a larger population if too few sampling units from the population were included in the sample. If you take a coin that comes up "heads" with the same frequency as "tails," and you flip it 4 times, you don't necessarily get half heads and half tails. In fact, with just four tosses most of the time you won't get half heads and half tails. However, if you flip it 40,000 times you will get almost exactly half of the coin tosses to come up "heads." I think there are very good reasons to suspect that this of sample 53 commercial properties is far too small for the intended purpose. I also suspect that it is highly non-representative of all commercial properties because the sales look like they might be clustered in locations where property sold for one reason or another.

I heard Mr. Dahle tell the Board of Equalization that what he calls the C.O.V., or what is usually called the coefficient of variation, is a measure of the "confidence" in the analysis. That is true for a random sample, but that would certainly not be true if one was using a highly non-representative sample from a population. Again, a somewhat related problem is that I have never heard the assessor's office exactly define the population they are sampling. So, it is impossible to know if a sample is representative of the population if one cannot understand what is in the population and what is not.

Though I am not an expert in real estate, even I understand that commercial properties on Thane Road have different forces shaping their value those in the tourist-affected downtown, the downtown business area, the hospital-Twin Lakes area, the Costco-Lemon Creek area, and so on. This adds to my suspicion that a small sample of 53 sales cannot really be even marginally representative of all commercial properties in Juneau. I have not done it, but you might want to carefully look for spatial clustering in the sample of 53 sales. Such clustering would be strong evidence that the sample is not representative.

The issue of deleting values that are not favorable

After I heard Mr. Dahle's training session for the Board of Equalization, I inferred from what I thought I heard him say, that he—perhaps well-meaningly—deleted observations that he thought were not representative of some hypothetical population that he was thinking of. I attempted to contact Mr. Dahle last summer to clear this up, as I mentioned elsewhere, above. I have now heard Mr. Dahle testify that he did not do that. If observations were what is colloquially called "cherry picked" to support this analysis, this would certainly disqualify this analysis from being anything that could be considered a valid statistical analysis. Now that I have heard Mr. Dahle testify that he did not do this, I am somewhat comforted. However, as a matter of due diligence you might want to try and calculate some of the ratios of the 74 sales that were not included in the analysis to ensure that these don't disproportionately have high ratios of assessed value to adjusted sales values.

To be clear, the idea of choosing data points to delete based on professional judgement, or personal opinion, or to get a more favorable result—which leads to invalid inference—is completely different from deleting points because of a procedure or policy established well ahead of time to ensure outliers don't have undue influence on the analysis. I infer from what Mr. Dahle has said that the assessor's office does have some kind of procedures and set of rules



Spitzfaden Letter

Page 6

Board of Equalization Appeals


for classifying data points as outliers—and want to be clear that I am definitely not trying to criticize that practice.

In conclusion

I have worked professionally in scientific sampling, statistics, and biostatistics since 1980, when I was hired as a mathematical statistician by the United States Government. In 1982 I moved to Juneau to work as a biometrician (the word the State of Alaska uses for someone with expertise in statistics and biomathematics) with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and in the 1990s I served as Chief Biometrician for the Division of Commercial Fisheries. From 2007 until 2020 I operated biostatistical consulting firm in Juneau. I have a master's degree in statistics from Oregon State University and PhD from the College of Fisheries and Oceans at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. I have published papers on scientific sampling and statistics in the peer-reviewed scientific literature, and I have served two terms as president of the Alaska chapter of the American Statistical Association. My C.V. is available on request.

As I said, I have no opinion as to whether commercial property assessed values should go up or go down, and I have no stake in the outcome of the appeals. However, I am interested this process just as an example of a very public and important use of statistical methods in my community. I certainly have tried to appreciate the enormity of the charge that the assessor's office has been given, and I certainly have tried to appreciate that in order to be effective in their very necessary and important work they will definitely make some people very unhappy. Further, I appreciate that it is completely impossible for the assessor's office to perfectly develop assessments in such a way that there can be no room for any criticism. But with all that said, I am struck by the lack of strong evidence that there has been an upward trend in commercial property sales values—the idea that is central to the logic that the assessments needed to be raised.

Best regards,



Hal Geiger, PhD
Chief Scientist



Dr. Harold J. Geiger
7655 North Douglas Hwy.
Juneau, Alaska 99801
(907)723-3234
geiger@ak.net

October 2021

EMPLOYMENT

Currently retired.

October 2007 – September 2020: Chief scientist for the St. Hubert Research Group, a small business in Southeast Alaska assisting with scientific writing; assisting with the planning and analysis of scientific sampling studies; and assisting with problems in statistics, fisheries, and environmental science.

July 2001 – July 2007: Salmon stock assessment research supervisor for the Southeast Region of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Division.

May 1997 – July 2001: Chief biometrician, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Division.

March 1988 – May 1997: Statewide salmon biometrician, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Fisheries Division.

December 1982 – March 1988: Biometrician, Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game, FRED Division.

Sept. 1980 – December 1982: Mathematical statistician, Statistical Reporting Service of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Madison Wisconsin.

September 1978 – June 1980: Teaching assistant, Department of Statistics, and research assistant, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Oregon State University.

EDUCATION

Ph.D. (fisheries), University of Alaska Fairbanks.

M.S. (statistics), Oregon State University.

B.S. (mathematics), Oregon State University.

OTHER

Member of the Alaska Board of Veterinary Examiners. Appointed in 2016 and reappointed in 2019.

Member of the Board of Directors of Bartlett Regional Hospital in Juneau, Alaska. Appointed 2021.

Board of directors of the Foundation for End of Life Care—a nonprofit foundation dedicated to supporting hospice care. Joined the Board in 2007. Previously served as board president and secretary.

Board member and treasurer of Palliative Care Alaska Network. Served from 2018 to 2020.

Member from 2018 to 2021 of the board of directors of Haven House, a reentry service in Juneau, Alaska for women leaving prison.

Chair of an invited panel to review Stock Assessment and Operational Models for San Francisco Bay Herring, October 10 and 11, 2016, Santa Rosa, California. Organized by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Invited panel member for an independent review of the research leading up to the proposed Pebble Bay Mine, October of 2012 in Anchorage, Alaska. Organized by the Keystone Center, a non-profit research group.

Received the American Fisheries Society's Stevan R. Phelps Award for best genetics paper in an American Fisheries Society Journal in 2007: "Geiger, H.J., I. Wang, P. Malecha, K. Hebert, W. W. Smoker, and A.J. Gharrett. 2007. What causes variability in pink salmon family size? Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 136(6): 1688-1698."

The 2005 President of the Alaska Chapter of the American Fisheries Society.

Board of directors of Juneau Jazz and Classics—a nonprofit organization that brings music to Southeast Alaska—from 2003 to 2015.

Convenor of the 1997 Alaska Riverine Sonar Workshop—an international symposium on the use of river-based sonar. Co-convenor (together with Dr. Peter Dahl, of the University of Washington) of the 1999 Riverine Sonar Workshop held at the University of Washington.

Awarded Chapter Service Recognition Award in 1996 by the national Council of Chapters of the American Statistical Association, "...in recognition of service to the Alaska Chapter."

Two-term president of the Alaskan Chapter of the American Statistical Association: 1986 and 1993.

Technical advisor to the U.S. section of North Pacific Anadromous Fishery Commission, an international treaty commission, from its origin in 1992 to 2000.

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS

Short, J.W., **H.J. Geiger**, L.W. Fritz, and J.J. Warrenchuk, 2021. First-Year Survival of Northern Fur Seals (*Callorhinus ursinus*) Can Be Explained by Pollock (*Gadus chalcogrammus*) Catches in the Eastern Bering Sea. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, 9(9), p.975.

Short, J.W., **H.J. Geiger**, J.C. Haney, C.M. Voss, M.L. Vozzo, V. Guillory, and C.H. Peterson. 2017. Anomalous High Recruitment of the 2010 Gulf Menhaden (*Brevoortia patronus*) Year Class: Evidence of Indirect Effects from the Deepwater Horizon Blowout in the Gulf of Mexico. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*. doi: 10.1007/s00244-017-0374-0

Shaul, L.D., and **H.J. Geiger**. 2016. Effects of climate and competition for offshore prey on growth, survival, and reproductive potential of Coho salmon in Southeast Alaska. *North Pacific Anadromous Fisheries Commission Bulletin* 6: 329–347.

Haney, J.C., **H.J. Geiger**, and J.W. Short. 2014. Bird mortality from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. I. Exposure in the offshore Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 513: 225-237.

Haney, J.C., **H.J. Geiger**, and J.W. Short. 2014. Bird mortality from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. II. Carcass sampling and exposure probability in the coastal Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 513: 239–252.

Portley, N. and **H.J. Geiger**. 2014. Limit Reference Points for Pacific Salmon Fisheries. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 34(2): 401-410.

Ishida, Y., A. Yamada, H. Adachi, I. Yagisawa, K. Tadokoro, and **H.J. Geiger**. 2009. Salmon distribution in Northern Japan during the Jomon Period, 2,000–8,000 years ago, and its implications for future global warming. *North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission Bulletin No. 5*: 287-292.

Geiger, H.J., I. Wang, P. Malecha, K. Hebert, W. W. Smoker, and A.J. Gharrett. 2007. What causes variability in pink salmon family size? *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 136(6): 1688-1698.

Geiger, H.J., T. Perry, M. Fukuwaka, and V. Radchenko. 2002. Status of salmon stocks and fisheries in the North Pacific Ocean. *In* The Proceedings of the Joint Meeting on Causes of Marine Mortality of Salmon in the North Pacific and North Atlantic Oceans and in the Baltic Sea. North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission Technical Report Number 4.

Geiger, H.J., W.W. Smoker, L.A. Zhivitovsky, and A.J. Gharrett. 1997. Variability of family size in pink salmon has implications for conservation biology and human use. *The Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* Vol. 54(11): 2684–2690.

Geiger, H.J., B.G. Bue, S. Sharr, A.C. Wertheimer, and T.M. Willette. 1996. A life history approach to estimating damage to Prince William Sound pink salmon from the Exxon Valdez oil spill. pp. 487–489. *In* S.D. Rice, R.B. Spies, D.A. Wolfe, and B.A. Wright, [eds.], *Proceedings of the 1993 Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Symposium*. American Fisheries Society Symposium 18.

Michael Dahle research.

Rorie,

Here is a synopsis of the research I have done on Michael Dahle.

A month or more ago I did a quick search on Mr. Dahle. I turned up a court decision where he appears to have filed a fraudulent unemployment claim with the state. In the judges decision it speaks about the veracity of everybody's testimony. I gave a copy of the judges ruling to the Mayor and advised her that perhaps a better background check should be done on him.

Once we had the response from the City with Mr. Dahle's resume with no dates of employment etc. I did some computer searching and then made some phone calls.

Mr. Rogers stated in an interview with the Dan Zigmund of the Empire on august 6th that Dahle "holds the highest level of credential available to government assessors"

This appears to be a very serious misstatement

I searched the International Association of Assessors database and then made some phone calls as Mr. Dahles' resume says he teaches their classes. He is not listed as an instructor. I contacted a couple folks at IAAO and finally had Erin Eads? at 1-816-701-8101 confirm that Dahle is not certified to teach their classes and she could find no records of him ever holding any of their certifications teaching or otherwise

I subsequently searched and made some phone calls and finally got in contact with Debra Rippey who is the current president of the Alaska Association of Assessors. 1-907-486-9355.

She stated that over 15 years ago Dahle held a level one certificate. This appears to be a training certificate that allowed him to work under Jim Canary at the CBJ assessors office. It expired in 2005. She stated that in December of 2020 he requested a level 5 certification. She stated that Ivar Havarsen, the president at that time rejected it for no supervisory experience and no proof of qualifications and asked him to show proof. She said that they have had no word back from him as of last week.

As an aside, one of the members of our group has spoke with Mr. Canary who stated that he had to release Mr. Dahle. I think you should speak with Jim.

I made numerous phone calls and emails to Washington Department of revenue where he worked twice. All I have received so far is confirmation that his basic certification has expired.

I made contacted with Dianne Dorey, his supervisor at Lewis County assessors office. 1-360-740-1392. I introduced my self and said I was in an awkward position but that the City had hired a new assessor and we were experiencing difficulties with him. She immediately asked " would you be talking about a Mr. Michael Dahle?" I affirmed this and said I realized that she probably couldn't say much but she could tell me he was eligible for rehire and the immediate response

indicated no. She said that while she really couldn't say much that she "strongly suggested I talk to his previous employers at Wahkiakum County and the Washington Department of Revenue. We had a general conversation about the situation where it sounded like there was a pattern. When I said that some folks don't realize that when you have dug yourself into a hole the first thing you need to do is stop digging she said, " he never knows when to stop digging" At this point she suddenly said she had an assessor working in he office that used to work with Dahle at Washington Department of Revenue and as a coworker he could say things a supervisor couldn't. She gave me his name, number, and when to call him.

Later that day I did call him. Arcie ? at 1-360-740-1398. He immediately launched into an assessment of Dahle. He doubted his claims of expertise and experience and stated unequivocally that he felt Dahle violated the rules of statistical analysis and used only the data he liked. He stated that he heard that Dahle was later refused employment at revenue.

I then managed to make contact with his supervisor at Wahkiakum County assessors 1-360-795-3791. His name is Bill Coons. Mr. Coons was fairly forthcoming and stated that Dahle was pretty smart and taught him some things about using the CAMAS program but that "had his own system" and like to arbitrarily cut the top and bottom off the data to "cut to the core." Coons said that this was violating the rules of analysis and that he repeatedly had to stop him from doing it. He suspected that Coons constantly "riding herd on him led to his decision to leave" and seek employment in Alaska. He went on to state that small data sets like Dahle is using here do not allow the use of Dahles' system. Let alone mixing different types of comparables.

All these conversations point to the fact that Dahle seems to have a habit of rejecting data he doesn't like in order to reach a value he wants. You will be given many examples of sales that were far below assessment. Properties that were on market for years and finally sold vastly under assessment. It appears that Dahle rejected these stating that " those guys stole it" Properties that are not at all similar and that appraisers state" violate every rule of Appraisal.

I have dealt with the assessor's office many times in the past and have always been impressed with the transparency and willingness to share data and methodology. And they have always been very courteous. And professional. Now we only seem to be getting smoke and mirrors from Mr. Dahle and when we do get answers, they are full of holes. We have industry experts ready to testify. You may have already heard some of it but there are reams of information that have not been provided yet.

I encourage you to confirm what I have found. I could say more but it would not be very professional. At this point I think that you and the Assembly have enough information to conclude that Dahle did violate state statute and did make substantive changes to the CBJ assessment protocols, that an Assembly resolution should have been made in order for this sweeping change to take place. Thus the commercial assessments could be invalidated. All we want is a fair, open, transparent assessment process. We willingly pay what's fair and equitable.

Bicknell Incorporated

Honsinger Subdivision - Phase I Construction Improvements

April 22, 2020
Construction Cost Estimate

Item No.	Pay Item Description	Pay Unit	Approximate Quantity	Unit Price		Amount	
				Dollars	Cents	Dollars	Cents
1505.1	Mobilization	Lump Sum	All Req'd	\$120,000	00	\$ 120,000	00
1570.1	Erosion and Sediment Control	Lump Sum	All Req'd	\$ 10,000	00	\$ 10,000	00
2201.1	Clearing and Grubbing	Lump Sum	All Req'd	\$ 5,000	00	\$ 5,000	00
2202.1	Excavation	CY	4,053	\$ 5	00	\$ 20,265	00
2202.2	Sideslopes and Ditch Grading	Lump Sum	All Req'd	\$ 5,000	00	\$ 5,000	00
2202.4	Shot Rock Borrow	CY	3,100	\$ 35	00	\$ 108,500	00
2204.1	2-Inch Minus Shot Rock with Base Course	CY	1,387	\$ 55	00	\$ 76,285	00
2204.2	Base Course, Grading D-1 for Driveways	Ton	110	\$ 45	00	\$ 4,950	00
2401.1	Sanitary Sewer Pipe, 8-Inch PVC	LF	1,319	\$ 65	00	\$ 85,735	00
2401.2	Sanitary Sewer Service, 6-Inch PVC	Each	14	\$ 1,500	00	\$ 21,000	00
2401.3	Connect to Existing Sanitary Sewer Manhole	Each	1	\$ 2,500	00	\$ 2,500	00
2401.4	2-Inch HDPE, SDR 17, Force Main Sewer Service	LF	278	\$ 40	00	\$ 11,120	00
2401.5	4-Inch HDPE, SDR 17, Force Main Sewer	LF	1,138	\$ 60	00	\$ 68,280	00
2401.6	Egan Drive Force Main Sewer Utility Boring	LF	210	\$ 300	00	\$ 63,000	00
2402.1	Sanitary Sewer Manhole, Type I	Each	6	\$ 5,500	00	\$ 33,000	00
2403.1	Sanitary Sewer Lift Station	Lump Sum	All Req'd	\$300,000	00	\$ 300,000	00
2501.1	4 & 6-Inch Pipe Culvert	LF	97	\$ 28	00	\$ 2,716	00
2500.2	12-Inch Pipe Culvert	LF	609	\$ 40	00	\$ 24,360	00
2501.3	12-Inch (HP) Pipe Culvert	LF	173	\$ 60	00	\$ 10,380	00
2500.4	18-Inch Pipe Culvert	LF	856	\$ 50	00	\$ 42,800	00
2501.5	18-Inch (HP) Pipe Culvert	LF	31	\$ 70	00	\$ 2,170	00
2500.6	24-Inch Pipe Culvert	LF	386	\$ 65	00	\$ 25,090	00
2501.7	24-Inch (HP) Pipe Culvert	LF	40	\$ 75	00	\$ 3,000	00
2501.8	6-Inch Underdrain	LF	155	\$ 45	00	\$ 6,975	00
2502.1	Storm Drain Manhole, Type I	Each	2	\$ 5,000	00	\$ 10,000	00
2502.2	Catch Basin, Type III	Each	1	\$ 2,000	00	\$ 2,000	00
2502.3	Catch Basin, Type IV	Each	4	\$ 2,200	00	\$ 8,800	00
2601.1	10-Inch HDPE Water Pipe	LF	1,956	\$ 75	00	\$ 146,700	00
2601.2	Connect to Existing 10-Inch DI Water Pipe	Each	1	\$ 2,500	00	\$ 2,500	00
2601.3	2-Inch Water Blow-Off	Each	1	\$ 3,000	00	\$ 3,000	00
2601.4	Corrosion Protection	Each	5	\$ 1,000	00	\$ 5,000	00
2602.1	10-Inch Gate Valve	Each	8	\$ 2,800	00	\$ 22,400	00
2603.2	Fire Hydrant Assembly with Access Pad	Each	4	\$ 6,500	00	\$ 26,000	00
2605.1	8-Inch HDPE Water Services w/Valve	Each	14	\$ 5,000	00	\$ 70,000	00
2607.1	Pipe Insulation	Board	100	\$ 35	00	\$ 3,500	00
2702.1	Construction Surveying	Lump Sum	All Req'd	\$ 60,000	00	\$ 60,000	00
2707.1	Remove and Reset Chain Link Fence	LF	20	\$ 60	00	\$ 1,200	00
2709.1	Topsoil	CY	270	\$ 90	00	\$ 24,300	00
2709.2	Topsoil Finish Grading	MH	75	\$ 100	00	\$ 7,500	00
2710.1	Seeding, Hydraulic Method, Type III	SU	3	\$ 1,500	00	\$ 4,500	00
2718.1	Sign Assembly	Each	3	\$ 400	00	\$ 1,200	00
2801.1	A.C. Pavement, Type II-A, Class B	Ton	1,040	\$ 195	00	\$ 202,800	00
2801.2	A.C. Pavement for Sidewalk and Hydrant Pads	Ton	166	\$ 240	00	\$ 39,840	00
2806.1	Remove Existing Asphalt Surfacing	SY	27	\$ 10	00	\$ 270	00
3302.1	Concrete Headwall	Each	28	\$ 800	00	\$ 22,400	00
3302.2	Concrete Area Drains	Each	1	\$ 800	00	\$ 800	00
3303.1	Concrete Curb and Gutter, Type I	LF	1,818	\$ 38	00	\$ 69,084	00
16000.1	Street Lighting System Complete and Utility Coordination	Lump Sum	All Req'd	\$130,000	00	\$ 130,000	00
16000.2	Lift Station Electrical Complete	Lump Sum	All Req'd	\$ 15,000	00	\$ 15,000	00

Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate Subtotal	\$ 1,930,920 00
Design, Survey, Subdivision Platting and Permitting	\$ 100,000 00
Inspection/Construction Administration	\$ 175,000 00
5% Construction Contingency	\$ 96,546 00
2% Bonding	\$ 38,618 00
Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate Total	\$ 2,341,084 00

MEMORANDUM



DATE: August 27, 2021

TO: Assembly Finance Committee

FROM: Jeff Rogers, Finance Director

SUBJECT: Update on Commercial Assessment Appeals

155 Municipal Way
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907) 586-5215
Fax: (907) 586-0358

As part of the annual determination of full-and-true value required by AS 29.45.110, the CBJ Assessor identified through a Ratio Study process that commercial land assessments were significantly lower than known qualified sales prices. As a result of this statistical analysis, the Assessor increased the base land assessment of all commercial parcels by 50%. This increase resulted in 207 commercial appeals, which are now being reviewed by the Assessor, and the Board of Equalization process is underway.

For information about the assessment process and adjustments made in the 2021 assessment year, I recommend you to the following resources:

- A. 2021 Assessment Presentation, presented to the AFC on April 21, 2021
- B. 2021 Assessment Value Summary Report, presented to the AFC on April 21, 2021
- C. Board of Equalization 2021 Training Packet and Recorded Video

At a summary level, I believe these are three primary takeaways for the Assembly:

1. 2021 commercial assessment changes are intended to correct a *systemic economic inequity*
2. CBJ is following the appeal process defined in state and local law
3. Information is key, and *disclosure of sales prices* would significantly improve assessment equity

#1 Correcting Systemic Economic Inequity

Commercial land assessments remained generally flat from 2011 to 2021 while residential assessments inched upward with market conditions. For example, if someone bought a \$300,000 home in 2011, they saw their assessed value march upward by as much as 5% per year. Someone else who bought a \$300,000 parcel of vacant land in 2011 has likely seen no increase in assessed value, even though the market value of the parcel has almost certainly appreciated. In that example, in 2020, the homeowner might have paid property tax on over \$400,000 of assessed value while the commercial landowner was still paying property tax on the \$300,000 assessment from a decade ago. In that narrow example, the residential homeowner could be paying 33% more property tax than the commercial landowner, even though their parcels were assessed similarly ten years ago and could have more similar market values today. Over time, this failure to keep commercial property assessments in line with market prices shifted the property tax burden from commercial landowners to residential homeowners. As a result, commercial landowners simply have not paid their fair share of property tax over the past decade. This tax shift represents a *systemic economic inequity* that the 2021 assessments are intended to correct.

#2 Appeal Process is Defined by State and Local Law

Property tax assessments and appeals are subject to a process that is highly defined in the law under AS 29.45.190 – 29.45.210 and code requirements of CBJ 15.05. If a property owner believes their property is improperly assessed, they have recourse to the Assessor and then to the Board of Equalization (BOE). For each appeal, the law requires the Assessor to produce summary of assessment data relating to each assessment that is appealed under AS 29.45.190(d) and CBJ 15.05.170. The work to prepare this information for the BOE, by parcel and by appellant, is ongoing and will be completed before hearings are scheduled for each individual appellant. This information will be timely available to appellants before their hearings. The law further allows appellants and the Assessor to appeal decisions of the BOE to superior court. CBJ is following that defined process. All commercial appellants are encouraged to share information with the Assessor that will assist with equitably determining the

full-and-true value of their parcels. As a reminder, under AS 29.45.210(b) (and CBJ 15.05.190): “The appellant bears the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of value are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in a valid written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing. If a valuation is found to be too low, the board of equalization may raise the value.”

#3 How Can We Do It Better?: More Disclosed Sales Prices

The most significant factor that would improve the accuracy of all assessments is *disclosure of sales prices*. As reported to the Assembly Finance Committee on June 2, 2021, the ordinance requiring disclosure of sales prices has not significantly changed behavior—the Assessor receives approximately the same number of disclosures today as they did before the law required them. Many current commercial appellants have taken issue with the relatively small sample (53 sales) used in the commercial ratio study. Indeed, the Assessor could draw better conclusions from the analysis of a larger sample size, which can only be achieved by the disclosure of a greater number of sales prices. That said, we can’t simply wish for more or better data, because that is exactly why commercial land assessments haven’t increased for the past decade. The Assessor had to act on the sales data that was available and qualified—and that sales data pointed to significant undervaluing of commercial land borough-wide.

The Universe of Commercial Appeals and the History of their Land Assessment

Attached you’ll find a report of 188 commercial appeals. This list represents all of the active (open, unresolved) appeals at the time the data was pulled from the system—some appeals on the list may have been corrected or withdrawn since the time this data was run. It’s a lot of data, but we have attempted to demonstrate the land valuation history of these 188 appealed parcels over the past ten years. In the columns on the left hand side, you’ll see the land assessment for each parcel from 2011 to 2021—ten years. In the columns on the right hand side, you’ll see the *cumulative* land assessment increase/decrease of those parcels since 2011.

These commercial appeals have been sorted from greatest-to-least *cumulative* land assessment increase/decrease since 2011. Here is a brief summary:

1 st Page	48 appealed parcels	<i>Cumulative increases</i> in land assessment from 2011 to 2020
2 nd Page	47 appealed parcels	<i>No cumulative change</i> in land assessment from 2011 to 2020
3 rd – 4 th Page	61 appealed parcels	<i>Cumulative decreases</i> in land assessment from 2011 to 2020
4 th Page	16 appealed parcels	<i>Cumulative decreases</i> in land assessment, even after 50% increase in 2021
4 th Page	16 appealed parcels	Brand new parcels in the 2021 assessment year

Every one of these appeals will be handled with equal professional rigor and integrity by the Assessor. However, this report helps to demonstrate that less than one-quarter of these appealed commercial land parcels has seen any land valuation increase in the past decade. Speaking generally, parcels nearer to the top of the list (1st page) may be somewhat more likely to be over-assessed as a result of the 50% increase because they had some level of land assessment increase in the past decade. These parcels may be more likely to receive a correction to their land assessment through the Assessor’s process of review upon appeal. Conversely, parcels on the remaining three pages are less likely to be over-assessed in 2021 because the 50% increase is correcting a decade of no appreciation in land assessment. In fact, many parcels that had cumulative land assessment decreases from 2011 to 2020 may still be under-assessed even after the 50% increase in 2021.

This report gives the Assembly Finance Committee a snapshot of the problem that the Assessor confronted in 2021—most commercial land assessments had not increased in a decade or more. This failure to keep pace with market values created a *systemic economic inequity* by shifting the property tax burden from commercial landowners to residential homeowners. CBJ has and will continue to closely follow the law in the administration of valuation appeals. And the single most important thing for improving the equity of assessments going forward is the disclosure of sales prices.

Summary

There are approximately 14,000 properties in the borough to be assessed each year. More than 98% of those

property owners did not appeal their 2021 assessments. While no one wishes for more appeals than absolutely necessary, this year's appeals are the direct consequence of inadequate information and inadequate adjustment over the last decade.

Because of public feedback from appellants, we have discussed this topic frequently with the public and with the Assembly. State statutes and local ordinances create a process for assessing properties and hearing appeals that is outside the domain of elected officials and their Managers—the tax valuation assessment process has been intentionally designed to be free from the influence of elected officials and their direct employees.

The Assembly and the Manager should remain neutral on the Assessor's valuations. The Assessor has made her best judgements in the face of a decade of stagnated values and a dearth of qualified sales information. The Assessor will always strive for accuracy and equity, and they must ensure public faith in the process. Likewise, appellants may be justified in their appeals. Both parties will have the chance to make their case. As proscribed by law, all commercial appellants are being afforded a legitimate opportunity to provide corrective information to the Assessor and to the BOE.

No action by the Assembly is appropriate at this time.

Cumulative Increase in Assessed Land Values since 2011
Active 2021 Commercial Assessment Appeals Only

Parcel	Assessed Land Value											Cumulative % Change in Assessed Land Value Since 2011									
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
5B1601020110	\$ 191,300	\$ 191,300	\$ 597,900	\$ 597,900	\$ 597,900	\$ 645,800	\$ 645,800	\$ 645,800	\$ 688,800	\$ 688,800	\$ 1,033,200	0%	213%	213%	213%	213%	213%	213%	213%	213%	213%
5B1201060201	\$ 146,900	\$ 146,900	\$ 500,800	\$ 500,800	\$ 500,800	\$ 500,800	\$ 526,000	\$ 526,300	\$ 500,900	\$ 526,300	\$ 789,450	0%	241%	241%	241%	241%	241%	241%	241%	241%	241%
5B1201060191	\$ 241,500	\$ 241,500	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 500,900	\$ 526,400	\$ 789,600	0%	107%	107%	107%	107%	107%	107%	107%	107%	107%
4B2901150060	\$ 115,600	\$ 115,600	\$ 247,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 247,000	\$ 251,800	\$ 251,800	\$ 377,700	0%	114%	114%	114%	114%	114%	114%	114%	114%	114%
1C070A170093	\$ 67,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 163,500	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	144%
1C070A170094	\$ 67,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 163,500	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	144%
1C070A170095	\$ 67,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 109,000	\$ 163,500	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	63%	144%
1C070A170092	\$ 30,000	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 48,400	\$ 72,600	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	61%	142%
1C070A170091	\$ 18,000	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 28,300	\$ 42,450	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%	136%
5B1601020171	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 1,005,000	\$ 2,261,250	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	125%
4B2201020050	\$ 110,000	\$ 110,000	\$ 72,900	\$ 72,900	\$ 73,629	\$ 40,000	\$ 163,500	\$ 172,400	\$ 162,000	\$ 162,000	\$ 243,000	0%	34%	34%	34%	49%	57%	47%	47%	47%	121%
2D040T200010	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 126,000	\$ 131,900	\$ 131,900	\$ 131,900	\$ 131,900	\$ 197,850	0%	26%	26%	26%	32%	32%	32%	32%	32%	98%
4B1701030180	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 41,000	\$ 45,600	\$ 53,200	\$ 57,500	\$ 57,500	\$ 79,800	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	30%	40%	40%	40%	95%
4B1701030170	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 33,300	\$ 37,000	\$ 43,200	\$ 46,600	\$ 46,600	\$ 64,800	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	30%	40%	40%	40%	95%
4B1701030160	\$ 49,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 49,000	\$ 54,400	\$ 63,500	\$ 68,500	\$ 68,500	\$ 95,250	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	30%	40%	40%	40%	94%
5B1501000010	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 372,000	\$ 720,700	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	94%
4B2201020040	\$ 115,000	\$ 115,000	\$ 63,900	\$ 63,900	\$ 63,900	\$ 64,100	\$ 145,100	\$ 145,100	\$ 145,100	\$ 145,100	\$ 217,650	0%	44%	44%	44%	26%	26%	26%	26%	26%	89%
4B2201020030	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 130,100	\$ 130,100	\$ 130,100	\$ 47,300	\$ 167,200	\$ 167,200	\$ 167,200	\$ 167,200	\$ 250,800	0%	-4%	-4%	-4%	24%	24%	24%	24%	24%	86%
1D0601020140	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,800	\$ 30,800	\$ 32,300	\$ 32,300	\$ 55,000	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	3%	8%	8%	8%	83%
4B2201020020	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 122,700	\$ 122,700	\$ 123,927	\$ 44,500	\$ 180,000	\$ 189,600	\$ 164,900	\$ 164,900	\$ 247,350	0%	-9%	-9%	-8%	33%	40%	22%	22%	22%	83%
7B0901010062	\$ 93,400	\$ 93,400	\$ 101,900	\$ 99,800	\$ 99,800	\$ 116,600	\$ 116,600	\$ 112,300	\$ 112,300	\$ 112,300	\$ 168,450	0%	9%	7%	7%	25%	20%	20%	20%	20%	80%
5B1501060041						\$ 522,500	\$ 627,000	\$ 627,000	\$ 670,800	\$ 670,800	\$ 940,500	0%	44%	0%	0%	0%	20%	20%	28%	28%	80%
4B1701100040	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 44,700	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 39,200	\$ 79,600	\$ 86,400	\$ 93,300	\$ 93,300	\$ 139,950	0%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	8%	17%	17%	17%	75%
1C110K120021	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 403,600	\$ 468,800	\$ 468,800	\$ 468,800	\$ 703,200	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16%	16%	16%	16%	74%
1C1001070110	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 81,600	\$ 93,300	\$ 93,300	\$ 93,300	\$ 139,950	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	14%	14%	14%	72%
3R0401000040	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 34,200	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	71%
1C070K820022			\$ 625,500	\$ 681,500	\$ 681,500	\$ 681,500	\$ 681,500	\$ 654,200	\$ 654,200	\$ 708,800	\$ 1,063,200	0%	0%	0%	9%	9%	5%	5%	13%	13%	70%
5B2101310000	\$ 2,546,000	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 2,865,900	\$ 4,298,850	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%	69%
5B1201040051	\$ 601,200	\$ 601,200	\$ 601,200	\$ 601,200	\$ 601,200	\$ 601,200	\$ 471,000	\$ 471,000	\$ 671,400	\$ 671,400	\$ 1,007,100	0%	0%	0%	0%	22%	22%	12%	12%	12%	68%
1C070A040020	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 246,000	\$ 245,700	\$ 245,700	\$ 270,200	\$ 405,300	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	65%
5B1201390020	\$ 177,200	\$ 177,200	\$ 177,200	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 193,300	\$ 289,950	0%	0%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	64%
5B1501010051	\$ 467,400	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 509,800	\$ 764,700	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	64%
5B1501100020	\$ 721,400	\$ 721,400	\$ 832,400	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 776,900	\$ 1,165,350	0%	15%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	62%
4B1701030081	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 486,100	\$ 520,900	\$ 562,500	\$ 562,500	\$ 781,350	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	16%	16%	16%	61%
4B1701040052	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 581,700	\$ 581,700	\$ 581,700	\$ 872,550	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	7%	7%	7%	61%
5B1301080000	\$ 1,958,000	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 2,082,600	\$ 3,123,900	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%	60%
5B1601020170	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,542,100	\$ 1,628,400	\$ 1,628,400	\$ 2,442,600	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	6%	6%	58%
1C070K810010	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 904,000	\$ 949,200	\$ 1,423,800	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	58%
2D040T040020	\$ 300,000	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 348,900	\$ 314,000	\$ 314,000	\$ 471,000	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	5%	5%	5%	57%
1C110K120012	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 270,800	\$ 283,100	\$ 283,100	\$ 283,100	\$ 424,650	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	5%	5%	57%
5B1201070010	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 17,900	\$ 28,050	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	57%
1C070A020043	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 795,600	\$ 827,400	\$ 1,241,100	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	56%
1C1001070081	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 488,800	\$ 506,300	\$ 506,300	\$ 506,300	\$ 759,450	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	56%
5B1201000033	\$ 1,458,300	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,476,000	\$ 1,485,600	\$ 1,485,600	\$ 1,485,600	\$ 2,228,400	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	4%	4%	4%	4%	55%
1C060K580052	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 832,300	\$ 1,264,200	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	53%
1C100K830030	\$ 3,530,500	\$ 3,530,500	\$ 3,530,500	\$ 3,530,500	\$ 3,530,500	\$ 3,540,000	\$ 3,540,000	\$ 3,575,000	\$ 3,575,000	\$ 3,575,000	\$ 5,362,500	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	52%
1C100K830040	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,407,900	\$ 3,450,500	\$ 3,450,500	\$ 3,450,500	\$ 5,175,750	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	52%
1C100K830025	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,709,500	\$ 3,752,900	\$ 3,752,900	\$ 3,752,900	\$ 5,629,350	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	52%

Hi Bob,

Here are sales that were not included on the Assessor's list that Dahle was told the sales price.

1C070K830040. Pacific Pier Building. 60.7% over assessed

1C070K810140. Emporium Mall. 23.1% over assessed. Involves two parcels. Giving the Assessor the benefit, this sale closed in 9/17/21 but Harris lost his appeal.

1C070A090060. Assembly Building. 205,8% over assessed

1C070K810010. Miner's Mercantile. 36.6% over assessed

1C060U060020. Bill Ray Center. 46,3% over assessed. Involves 5 parcels.

I have 3 additional pending sales that sold with over assessments ranging from 19.9% to 36.6%.

I have another downtown sale that closed on 3/23/2021 that is 17.5% over assessed.

Do you see a pattern?

Kim

Outlier & Non-Market Sale Trim Procedure

0 Count #REF! Mean Ratio

<-- See Instructions Line 23.

Outlier Identification

	Percentile	Position	Value Below	Value Above	Quartile Point Range	
			Percentile Position	Percentile Position		
First Quartile	25%	0.25	Ratio	0.0000	#VALUE!	#VALUE!
Third Quartile	75%	0.75	Ratio	0.0000	#VALUE!	

Outlier Ranges	(Lower Boundary) (Upper Boundary)	
	Below	Above
Standard Outliers	#VALUE!	#VALUE!
Extreme Outliers	#VALUE!	#VALUE!

<--(These can take a few minutes if you have a large data set. Please be patient.)

1900	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
------	---------	---------	---	---	---	---	---	---------

Proposed Assessed Values

Rank	Yearof Sale	Ratio	DeviationFr omMedian	Assessed Value	AdjSalePrice	PAVLand	PAVImp	PAVTotal	PAVRatio
------	----------------	-------	-------------------------	-------------------	--------------	---------	--------	----------	----------

- 17 **To analyze data:**
- 18
- 19 * Open the master copy.
- 20 * Immediately do a "Save As" and change the name so that you can tell what subset that workbook deals with (All, Land, Residential, SFR, Condos, etc.)
- 21 * Go to the Cover sheet/page and add to your description in cell A14 to further define this working copy.
- 22 * Go to the Trim worksheet.
- 23 * If you are going to analyze the entire data set you can skip this step and the next step (line 24). If the purpose of this copy is to analyze a portion or subset of the data then you will want to complete these steps. (For example: if your data set is all residential sales and you want to look at them as a whole then skip these 2 steps. However, if your data is all residential sales and you only want to analyze SFR residences and not condos, etc, then follow these steps to eliminate the records that you want to exclude.) Sort by the filter or subset characteristic that you wish to analyze. (Make sure you select all rows and columns of data. You might want to use the shift-ctrl-end function.)
- 24 * Once you have completed the sort described above, delete all of the records that do not fall within your desired subset. To do this select all of the rows that have data that you do NOT want and then click on the "Delete Rows" button near the top of the Trim page. (Note- You do not have to select all of the columns, just the appropriate cells in one column will work fine.) (For example: If your data includes all residential sales and you want to look at just SFRs you may need to eliminate Condos, Townhouses, Duplexes, etc.)
- 25 * Insert formulas into columns B through J by clicking on the "Insert Formulas" button.
- 26 * Sort the records by ratio by clicking on the "Sort by Ratio" button. Or, you can sort manually by selecting the data and using the sort command. (Make sure you select all rows and columns of data. You might want to use the shift-ctrl-end function.) (On the trim sheet select the cell immediately under the rank or the year of sale heading, push shift-ctrl-end, all of your data should now be highlighted, select Data/Sort and select ratio as the sort key and ascending as the order.)
- 27 * Insert a record order number in the "Rank" column by clicking on the "Add Rank" button. (Note if you have a large sample size it may take several minutes for this macro to run. Please be patient.)
- 28 * This step is part of identifying the outliers. The percentile positions and the lower and upper boundaries for Standard and Extreme Outliers (per IAAO standards) should now be indicated in F7, F8, G7, and G8 and E12, E13, F12 and F13 respectively. (Note: if you want something other than the first and third quartiles enter the percentages into D7 and D8.) **(Even though this step is automated we highly encourage you to take the time to review and understand these outlier indicators.)**
- 29 * Click on the "Highlight Outliers" button to add highlight shading to the outliers so they are easier to see. Resave the workbook.
- 30 * Review the outliers to see if adjustments or corrections can be identified.
- 31 * Determine if you are going to include all records, eliminate Extreme Outliers only or eliminate both Extreme and Standard Outliers. In making this determination consider the purpose of your study, the sample size, the minimum, maximum and range of ratios and other considerations. Once you have made that determination, document the decision in the Notations box on the Statistics page.

Department of Revenue Property Tax Division

STARS

(Statistical Tool for Analytics and Ratio Studies)

A statistical template and analytic tool for market study, assessment analysis and ratio studies.

Statistics, Analytics and Ratio Study for

With Valuation Date or Analysis Effective Date of:

(Please start by reviewing the instructions page and the attributes definitions page.)

This version is for use in Excel 2007

Template Revised

4/5/2011

* Developed by Michael Dahle, WA DOR *

(Customized for Lewis County 07/27/2011.)





Arthur Drown <Arthur.Drown@juneau.org>

Mon, May 10, 4:27 PM

to Dave

Dave,

Somehow this parcel was mixed into the commercial land adjustments, I have corrected this issue and propose the following adjustment, one of these years we will not have to go through this r

2021 Assessment: Site: \$697,500 Improvements: \$0 Total: \$697,500

2021 Proposed: Site: \$465,500 Improvements: \$0 Total: \$465,500

If you would like to accept this proposed change, please respond by email stating so. Upon receipt of your acceptance I will take this to the Assessor for approval, at which point a letter of correction will be issued. these proposed changes, I will schedule the case for the next available Board of Equalization and you will be notified of the date.

Thanks,

Arthur Drown

Appraiser II

Assessor's Office

City and Borough of Juneau, AK

(907) 586-5215 Ext. 4038

arthur.drown@juneau.org

9/17/2021

Page 251

2021 Appeal - 2D040C050074 - Undeveloped Vista Dr Lot - thedavehanna@gmail.com - Gmail

2021-11-18 BOE Hearing Packet



Arthur Drown

Sep 3, 2021, 2:47 PM

to Mary, Dave

Dave,

I am responding with the Assessor CC'ed on here as the process I was involved with stopped with her and I have no good response for you unfortunately. Hopefully Mary can provide some clarification.

Best of luck,

Arthur Drown

Appraiser II

Assessor's Office

City and Borough of Juneau, AK

(907) 586-5215 Ext. 4038

arthur.drown@juneau.org

**Dave Hanna** <alaskaconcretecasting@pci.net>

Sep 7, 2021, 10:08 AM (10 days)

to Mary

Mary,

Thank you for taking my call the other day. It was a good chat on all the various topics but I guess we never did really resolve the Vista Drive issue. I need to know if your office is going to increase assessment so I can let our attorneys know whether or not to keep it included in our group appeal. It's been very confusing with the assessment basically changing 3 times.

Thanks,

Dave Hanna

JLC properties Inc.

**Mary Hammond**

Sep 7, 2021, 10:16 AM (10 days)

to Dave

Dave,

This parcel is still under review. I hope to come to a conclusion today.

Mary Hammond she/ her

Assessor

City & Borough of Juneau

(907) 586-5215 ext. 4033

9/17/2021

Page 253

2021 Appeal - 2D040C050074 - Undeveloped Vista Dr Lot - thedavehanna@gmail.com - Gmail

2021-11-18 BOE Hearing Packet



Mary Hammond <mary.hammond@juneau.org>

Fri, Sep 3, 3:32 PM

to Arthur, Dave

Hi Dave,


This appeal has been looped in with the commercial property appeals. I'm interested in discussing this with you if you have time. I can be reached at the number below until about 6:00 t evening.

Mary Hammond she/ her

Assessor

City & Borough of Juneau

(907) 586-5215 ext. 4033



Get Directions History

ing Tour

re 3D Buildings

checked

replacement.kmz

Places

Polygon

Polygon

Database

ncements

s and Labels

s

and Transportation

ildings

er

y



Google Earth

Imagery Date: 4/1/2020 58°21'08.63" N 134°30'13.39" W elev 25 ft eye alt 1618 ft

1985



6:54 PM

Monday

Disable Parcel Detail | Hide Control Panel

- ☒ Street Map
- ☒ World Street Map
- ☒ 2013 Aerial Layers
 - ☒ 2013 - June 11
 - ☐ 2013 - May 28
 - ☐ 2006 - June 9
 - ☐ specialty imagery
- ☐ Labels
- ☒ Properties
 - ☐ condominiums
 - ☐ manufactured homes, etc
 - ☐ cell phone towers
 - ☒ parcels (light lines)
 - ☐ parcels (dark lines)
- ☐ Contours - 20ft
- ☐ Departments


Tools

Search

Output







155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520

9/13/2021

Lemon Creek Development LLC
PO Box 33766
Juneau AK 99801

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1201060152
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 9/20/2021

PARCEL: 5B1201060152
PHYSICAL LOCATION: 5734 Concrete Way

Lemon Creek Development LLC,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property value is excessive & My property value is unequal to similar properties & My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1201060152**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action:	Change
2021 Initial valuation:	\$434,550
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$320,000
2021 Final determination:	\$357,900

Appellant parcel was reviewed for equity purposes, the Assessor Office found that in 2016 a new site valuation model was applied to the neighborhood but due to oversight this property was missed. The proposed adjustment will bring this site value into equity with other parcels within the neighborhood.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. (*INITIAL ONE*)

_____ **YES**, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

_____ **NO**, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.

Appellant signature

Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **9/20/2021**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1501020210

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

CBJ-Assessor's Office

MAY 03 2021

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1501020210		
Owner Name	PDC Holdings LLC	Name of Applicant	Paul Curry
Primary Phone #	907-463-6303	Email Address	paul@seextinguisher.com
Physical Address	8319 Airport Blvd	Mailing Address	8319 Airport Blvd Juneau, AK 99801

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE **NOT** GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

The 2021 Assessment raised the land value by 50 percent, evidently as a result of the April 2021 Valuations Summary stemming from a study of commercial transactions. See attached.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$ 290,550.00	Building	\$ 287,700.00	Total	\$ 578,250.00
------	---------------	----------	---------------	-------	---------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$ 193,700.00	Building	\$ 287,700.00	Total	\$ 481,400.00
------	---------------	----------	---------------	-------	---------------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$	Purchase Date	
-------	----	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$	Days on Market	
---------------	----	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)

Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature

Date 05/03/2021

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801

Step 1 – Administrative Review

Appraiser to fill out					
Appraiser				Date of Review	
Comments:					
Post Review Assessment					
Site	\$	Building	\$	Total	\$
Exemptions	\$				
Total Taxable Value	\$				
APPELLANT RESPONSE TO ACTION BY ASSESSOR					
My acceptance or rejection of the assessment valuation in the amount of \$_____ is indicated below.					
☐ Accept New Assessed Value ☐ Close Review (Assessment Remains Unchanged) ☐ Reject and Appeal					
If appealed, appellant will be scheduled before the Board of Equalization and will be advised of the date & time to appear.					
Appellant's Signature _____ Date: _____					

Appellant Accept Value	☐ Yes	☐ No	<i>(if no skip to Board of Equalization)</i>
Govern Updated	☐ Yes	☐ No	
Spreadsheet Updated	☐ Yes	☐ No	
Corrected Notice of Assessed Value Sent	☐ Yes	☐ No	

Step 2 – Appeal

Appeal # _____

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION					
Scheduled BOE Date	☐ Yes ☐ No				
10-Day Letter Sent	☐ Yes ☐ No				
The Board of Equalization certifies its decision, based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law contained within the recorded hearing and record on appeal, and concludes that the appellant ☐ Met ☐ Did not meet the burden of proof that the assessment was unequal, excessive, improper or under/overvalued. Notes:					
Site	\$	Building	\$	Total	\$
Exemptions	\$				
Total Taxable Value	\$				

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office			
Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801

The April 2021 study appears to conclude that there was an increase in commercial values and that justifies an increase from one end of the borough to the other. This is not fair. Once my public record request is filled I will be able to supply more documentation.

OFFICIAL PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST

FROM: Paul Curry

8319 Airport Blvd,
Juneau, Alaska 99801

TO: Assessor's Office

City & Borough of Juneau
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, Alaska 99901

RE: 5B1501020210 This is an Official Public Records Request for copies of all record of Data Sources and Methods including

all Work Papers used to calculate including all written and electronic correspondence for both the 2021 original assessed value and the 2021 adjusted assessed value for CBJ identification number 5B1501020210.


This letter is also officially asking you preserve all records of Data Sources and Methods including all Work Papers used to calculate including all written and electronic correspondence for both the 2021 original assessed value and the 2021 adjusted assessed value for CBJ identification number 5B1501020210.

Per Alaska Administrative Code 2 AAC 96.325 you have 10 (ten) days to respond.

Sincerely,

Paul Curry

 5-3-21



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

10/07/21

PDC Holdings LLC
8319 Airport Blvd
Juneau AK 99801

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1501020210
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1501020210
PHYSICAL LOCATION: 8319 Airport Blvd

PDC Holdings LLC,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1501020210**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$578,250
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$481,400
2021 Final determination:	\$578,250

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. (INITIAL ONE)




YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10/11/21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

PDC HOLDINGS LLC
8319 AIRPORT BLVD
JUNEAU AK 99801

**Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and
Presentation of Real Property Appeal**

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 5, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1501020210
Property Location	8319 AIRPORT BLVD
Appeal No.	APL20210413
Sent to Email Address:	paul@seextinguisher.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



ASSESSOR OFFICE

APPEAL #2021-0413

2021 REAL PROPERTY APPEAL PACKET

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION November 18, 2021

Appellant: PDC Holdings LLC

Location: 8319 Airport Blvd

Parcel No.: 5B1501020210

Property Type: Commercial – Service/Retail/Warehouse

Appellant's basis for appeal: My property was valued improperly/incorrectly

	Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value	Recommended Value
Site:	\$ 193,700	\$ 290,550	\$ 290,550
Buildings:	\$ 287,700	\$ 287,700	\$ 287,700
Total:	\$ 481,400	\$ 578,250	\$ 578,250

Subject Photo



Table of Contents

OVERVIEW.....	3
SUBJECT PHOTOS	3
AREA MAP & AERIAL	5
ASSESSED VALUES	6
LAND	6
BUILDING(S)	8
COST REPORT	9
INCOME APPROACH.....	9
COMMERCIAL MARKET & ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS.....	10
SUBJECT ASSESSMENT HISTORY	10
SUMMARY	11
CONCLUSION.....	11

OVERVIEW

The subject is a one-story commercial building with shop, retail, office and classroom spaces. The building formerly housed a carwash.

Subject Characteristics:

- Land
 - 16,140 SF lot
 - Level, developed corner lot
 - Located within the Airport commercial area
- Building
 - 3,822 SF GBA Commercial/Industrial warehouse w/ Retail front

SUBJECT PHOTOS



Front

Rear




Right






Left

AREA MAP & AERIAL





ASSESSED VALUES

Remember that the total assessed value is the primary test against market. The distribution of that value between the Land Component and the Building Component is secondary and can vary from one model to another. The total assessed value is tested against market indicators (sales, lease rates, etc.) and is adjusted to market value by application of market area and feature adjustments.


All three approaches to value (Cost, Sales Comparison and Income) are considered for commercial properties

LAND

Land values are developed on a market area basis. The land is examined to understand the typical land characteristics in the market area. These characteristics include size, slope, view, water frontage, significant wetlands and others. The characteristics are used to develop a market area land valuation model. This model is tested and refined in consideration of sales of both vacant and developed parcels. The resulting model is then applied to all of the land in the market area to establish assessed site values.

The subject site features are a level, developed lot located in the Airport commercial area. The subject parcel's land value is equitable and is not excessive.

Land Values



BUILDING(S)


The building component may be based on market adjusted cost tables, residual from sales after extraction of the land value or other appropriate means.

Ratio studies are performed to determine market adjustments.

Building Characteristics:

- 3,822 SF GBA Commercial/Industrial warehouse

Sketch of Improvements:



COST REPORT

The cost report below was utilized in the review process in response to the filing of the Petition for Review by the appellant.

7959		Record	1	
Parcel Code Number	5B1501020210	Number of Stories (Building)	01	
Owner Name	PDC HOLDINGS LLC	Number of Sections	1	
Parcel Address	8319 AIRPORT BLVD	Perimeter	344	
Effective Year Built	2011	Class	D	
Year Built	1983	Height	14	
Building Model	C- 14 Garages, Industrials, Lofts, Warehouses	Rank	Average	
Building Type	Storage Warehouse	Total Area	3,822.00	

Section 1	Description	Units	Percent	Cost	+/-	Total
	Base Cost	3822		36.50		139,503
	Exterior Wall	3822		9.54		36,462
	Heating & Cooling	3822		606.00		606
	Heating & Cooling	3822		11.20		42,806
	Architect Fee	3822		6.50		24,843
	Sub Total					\$244,220.28
	Local Multiplier		1.43	[X]		\$349,235.00
	Current Multiplier		1.05	[X]		\$366,697.00
	Neighborhood Multiplier			[X]		\$366,697.00
	Depreciation - Physical		11.00	[-]		\$40,337.00
	Depreciation - Functional			[-]		\$0.00
	Depreciation - Economic			[-]		\$0.00
	Percent Complete		100.00	[-]		\$326,360.00
	Cost to Cure					
	Neighborhood Adjustment					
	Replacement Cost less Depreciation					\$326,360
	Miscellaneous Improvements					
	Canopy				[+]	2,900
	Total Improvement Value					\$329,300

The cost report indicates that the building component with an assessed value of \$287,700 is not overvalued.

INCOME APPROACH

The income approach was not the basis for setting the assessed value for 2021. The appellant did not submit P&L information for the Review process.

COMMERCIAL MARKET & ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

The 2021 sales analysis for commercial properties included 57 qualified sales from 5 years of sales covering January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020. The sales volume for the commercial market remained steady through 2020 and there was no indication of declining prices.

- Assessment Year 2021 Summary for Commercial Properties
 - Level of Assessment – 85% overall, 60% for vacant land, and 91% for improved properties
 - Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) – 22% for the combined group, 20% for vacant land, and 17% for improved properties (For these types of property groups the Standard that we work towards would be 20% or less for the subsets of land and improved properties. The combined set would be expected to have a higher COD.)
 - Applied Time Trend for Sales Analysis – 5% per year (0.42% per month)

SUBJECT ASSESSMENT HISTORY

City and Borough of Juneau Assessment History Report				
5B1501020210 PDC HOLDINGS LLC 8319 AIRPORT BLVD VALLEY CENTRE BL M LT 23 TR B3				
<u>YEAR ID</u>	<u>LAND VALUE</u>	<u>MISC VALUE</u>	<u>BLDG VALUE</u>	<u>CAMA VALUE</u>
2021	\$290,550.00		\$287,700.00	\$578,250.00
2020	\$193,700.00		\$287,700.00	\$481,400.00
2019	\$193,700.00		\$287,700.00	\$481,400.00
2018	\$193,700.00		\$287,700.00	\$481,400.00
2017	\$193,700.00		\$287,700.00	\$481,400.00
2016	\$193,700.00		\$284,500.00	\$478,200.00
2015	\$193,700.00		\$289,000.00	\$482,700.00
2014	\$193,700.00		\$289,000.00	\$482,700.00
2013	\$193,700.00		\$289,000.00	\$482,700.00
2012	\$193,700.00	\$0.00	\$289,000.00	\$482,700.00
2011	\$193,700.00	\$0.00	\$289,000.00	\$482,700.00
2010	\$193,700.00	\$0.00	\$289,000.00	\$482,700.00

SUMMARY

State statute requires the Assessor to value property at “full and true value”. According to appraisal standards and practices set by the Alaska Association of Assessing Officers, the State of Alaska Office of the State Assessor, and the International Association of Assessing Officers, correct procedures of assessment were followed for the subject. These standards and practices include consideration of any market value increase or decrease as determined by analysis of sales.

The assessed value was reviewed in response to the Petition for Review. Our findings are as follows.

The land and buildings are valued using the same methods and standards as all other properties in the Borough.

Additional Details:

- The appellant states that property was valued improperly/incorrectly.
 - The property was valued using proper methodology.
- The appellant states that the April 2021 study appears to conclude that there was an increase in commercial values and that justifies an increase from one end of the borough to the other. This is not fair.
 - We find that the value is equitable and that, based on analysis of market sales, it is not excessive. This is addressed in the land, building, cost report, commercial market and assessment analysis, summary and conclusion sections as well as in the AY2021 Property Assessment Guide located in the packet.
 - In reviewing locational subgroups, property type subgroups and property characteristic subgroups in the analysis we did not see evidence that any location or other subgroup should be treated differently from the rest with the exception of the boathouses.

CONCLUSION

The 2021 Assessed values were based on a simple methodology, analysis through ratio studies and subsequent trending of values based on the analysis findings. Underlying this standard compliant trending are the locational and feature influenced specific models that have been applied to Juneau commercial properties for many years. The ratio studies indicate that after our adjustments to values the level of assessment for commercial properties was 85% overall, 60% for vacant land, and 91% for improved properties.

For the subject property:

- The percentage change from 2020 to 2021 was an increase of 20.1%.

We find that no change to the 2021 assessed value of \$578,250 is warranted and ask that the BOE uphold the assessed value.



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	2D040C050074

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION – DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	2D040C050074		
Owner Name	JLC Properties, Inc	Name of Applicant	Dave Hanna
Primary Phone #	907-723-1902	Email Address	thedavehanna@gmail.com
Physical Address	Vista Drive Juneau, AK 99801	Mailing Address	PO Box 20834 Juneau, AK 99802

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

See attached letter.

Have you attached additional information or documentation?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$697,500.00	Building	\$0.00	Total	\$697,500.00
------	--------------	----------	--------	-------	--------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$465,000.00	Building	\$0.00	Total	\$465,000.00
------	--------------	----------	--------	-------	--------------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$	Purchase Date	
-------	----	---------------	--


Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$	Days on Market	
---------------	----	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)

Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature  Date 4-30-21

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801

Step 1 – Administrative Review

Appraiser to fill out			
Appraiser		Date of Review	
Comments:			
Post Review Assessment			
Site	\$	Building	\$
Exemptions		\$	
Total Taxable Value		\$	
APPELLANT RESPONSE TO ACTION BY ASSESSOR			
My acceptance or rejection of the assessment valuation in the amount of \$_____ is indicated below.			
☐ Accept New Assessed Value ☐ Close Review (Assessment Remains Unchanged) ☐ Reject and Appeal			
If appealed, appellant will be scheduled before the Board of Equalization and will be advised of the date & time to appear.			
Appellant's Signature _____		Date: _____	

Appellant Accept Value	☐ Yes ☐ No (if no skip to Board of Equalization)
Govern Updated	☐ Yes ☐ No
Spreadsheet Updated	☐ Yes ☐ No
Corrected Notice of Assessed Value Sent	☐ Yes ☐ No

Step 2 – Appeal

Appeal # _____

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION			
Scheduled BOE Date	☐ Yes	☐ No	
10-Day Letter Sent	☐ Yes	☐ No	
The Board of Equalization certifies its decision, based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law contained within the recorded hearing and record on appeal, and concludes that the appellant ☐ Met ☐ Did not meet the burden of proof that the assessment was unequal, excessive, improper or under/overvalued. Notes:			
Site	\$	Building	\$
Exemptions		\$	
Total Taxable Value		\$	

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office			
Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



JLC Properties

P.O. Box 20834 Juneau, AK 99802

(907) 723-1902

April 29, 2021

City & Borough of Juneau
Office of the Assessor
155 S. Seward St.
Juneau, AK 99801

RE: Parcel 2D040C050074

I am writing to appeal the assessment of our undeveloped residential Vista Drive property. The first assessment you sent us was unchanged from last year which we felt was a little high. A few days later we received an amended assessment which increased our assessment 50%. There appears to be no justification for this increase.

There have been several comparable properties on the market in the West Juneau area for three to four years with no offers made. I confirmed this with ReMax. Several years ago, I had our property listed and received no offers. Until there is some uptick in the market for raw land, the assessment should remain at the previous level.

Please feel free to call me to discuss this.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dave Hanna", written over the printed name.

Dave Hanna
JLC properties



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

JLC PROPERTIES INC
PO BOX 20834
JUNEAU AK 99802-0834

**Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and
Presentation of Real Property Appeal**

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	2D040C050074
Property Location	VISTA DR
Appeal No.	APL20210147
Sent to Email Address:	thedavehanna@gmail.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



APPEAL #2021-0334

2021 REAL PROPERTY APPEAL PACKET

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION November 18, 2021

ASSESSOR OFFICE

Appellant: JLC Properties Inc

Location: NBN Vista Dr

Parcel No.: 2D040C050074

Property Type: Vacant

Appellant's basis for appeal: My property was valued improperly/incorrectly

	Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value	Recommended Value
Site:	\$ 465,000	\$ 697,500	\$ 697,500
Buildings:	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total:	\$ 465,000	\$ 697,500	\$ 697,500

Subject Photo



Table of Contents

OVERVIEW.....	3
SUBJECT PHOTOS	3
AREA MAP & AERIAL	8
ASSESSED VALUES.....	9
LAND	10
BUILDING(S)	12
COST REPORT	12
INCOME APPROACH.....	12
COMMERCIAL MARKET & ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS.....	12
SUBJECT ASSESSMENT HISTORY	13
SUMMARY.....	14
CONCLUSION.....	14

OVERVIEW

The subject is an undeveloped, partially cleared 27.88 acre parcel located along Lawson Creek on Douglas Island. Development is limited along Lawson Creek by a 50' setback as measured from the center.

Subject Characteristics:

- Land
 - 27.88 AC = 1,214,183 SF lot
 - Benched with varying degrees of slope.
- Building
 - None

SUBJECT PHOTOS



Gate at Access Road from John Street

Access Road through CBJ Parcel





Edge of Subject Parcel





Partially Cleared Portion of Parcel



View



AREA MAP & AERIAL



Imagery from July 2020 shows parcels below as developed and the partially cleared portion of the subject parcel.



ASSESSED VALUES

Remember that the total assessed value is the primary test against market. The distribution of that value between the Land Component and the Building Component is secondary and can vary from one model to another. The total assessed value is tested against market indicators (sales, lease rates, etc.) and is adjusted to market value by application of market area and feature adjustments.

All three approaches to value (Cost, Sales Comparison and Income) are considered for commercial properties

LAND


Land values are developed on a market area basis. The land is examined to understand the typical land characteristics in the market area. These characteristics include size, slope, view, water frontage, significant wetlands and others. The characteristics are used to develop a market area land valuation model. This model is tested and refined in consideration of sales of both vacant and developed parcels. The resulting model is then applied to all of the land in the market area to establish assessed site values.

The subject site features are varying levels of slope. The subject parcel's land value is equitable and is not excessive.

Land Characteristics:

- 27.88 AC = 1,214,183 SF lot
- Benched with varying levels of slope

Contours at 20ft



Land Values



BUILDING(S)

The building component may be based on market adjusted cost tables, residual from sales after extraction of the land value or other appropriate means.

Ratio studies are performed to determine market adjustments.

Building Characteristics:

- None

COST REPORT

The cost was not developed for this appeal because there are no buildings on the property.

INCOME APPROACH

The income approach was not the basis for setting the assessed value for 2021. The appellant did not submit P&L information for the Review process.

COMMERCIAL MARKET & ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

The 2021 sales analysis for commercial properties included 57 qualified sales from 5 years of sales covering January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020. The sales volume for the commercial market remained steady through 2020 and there was no indication of declining prices.

- Assessment Year 2021 Summary for Commercial Properties
 - Level of Assessment – 85% overall, 60% for vacant land, and 91% for improved properties
 - Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) – 22% for the combined group, 20% for vacant land, and 17% for improved properties (For these types of property groups the Standard that we work towards would be 20% or less for the subsets of land and improved properties. The combined set would be expected to have a higher COD.)
 - Applied Time Trend for Sales Analysis – 5% per year (0.42% per month)

SUBJECT ASSESSMENT HISTORY

(parcel was platted in 2016, first valued in 2017)

City and Borough of Juneau Assessment History Report

2D040C050074
JLC PROPERTIES INC
VISTA DR

<u>YEAR ID</u>	<u>LAND VALUE</u>	<u>MISC VALUE</u>	<u>BLDG VALUE</u>	<u>CAMA VALUE</u>
2021	\$697,500.00			\$697,500.00
2020	\$465,000.00			\$465,000.00
2019	\$465,500.00			\$465,500.00
2018	\$465,500.00			\$465,500.00
2017	\$465,500.00			\$465,500.00

SUMMARY

State statute requires the Assessor to value property at “full and true value”. According to appraisal standards and practices set by the Alaska Association of Assessing Officers, the State of Alaska Office of the State Assessor, and the International Association of Assessing Officers, correct procedures of assessment were followed for the subject. These standards and practices include consideration of any market value increase or decrease as determined by analysis of sales.

The assessed value was reviewed in response to the Petition for Review. Our findings are as follows.

The land and buildings are valued using the same methods and standards as all other properties in the Borough.

Additional Details:

- The appellant states that the property was valued improperly/incorrectly.
 - The parcel was valued using proper methodology.
- The appellant states that there have been several comparable properties on the market in the West Juneau area for three or four years with no offers made. The appellant states that they confirmed this with ReMax. The appellant states that several years ago, they had their property listed and received no offers. The appellant states that until there is some uptick in the market for raw land, the assessment should remain at the previous level.
 - The subject parcel is the remainder of a previously larger parcel which was subdivided into three parcels in 2016. There were two other parcels created which were sold by the appellant for around \$400,000 each. There is a cleared portion of the subject parcel, which appears to be larger than the size of the sold parcels. The remaining 20 plus acres appears to contain developable land as well.
 - In reviewing locational subgroups, property type subgroups and property characteristic subgroups in the analysis we did not see evidence that any location or other subgroup should be treated differently from the rest with the exception of the boathouses.
 - We find that the value is equitable and that, based on analysis of market sales, it is not excessive. This is addressed in the land, commercial market and assessment analysis, summary and conclusion sections as well as in the AY2021 Property Assessment Guide located in the packet.

CONCLUSION

The 2021 Assessed values were based on a simple methodology, analysis through ratio studies and subsequent trending of values based on the analysis findings. Underlying this standard compliant trending are the locational and feature influenced specific models that have been applied to Juneau commercial properties for many years. The ratio studies indicate that after our adjustments to values the level of assessment for commercial properties was 85% overall, 60% for vacant land, and 91% for improved properties.

For the subject property:

- The percentage change from 2020 to 2021 was 50%.

We find that no change to the 2021 assessed value of \$697,500 is warranted and ask that the BOE uphold the assessed value.



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1201060191

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1201060191		
Owner Name	JLC Properties, Inc.	Name of Applicant	Dave Hanna
Primary Phone #	907-723-1902	Email Address	thedavehanna@gmail.com
Physical Address	5761 Concrete Way Juneau, AK 99801	Mailing Address	PO Box 20834 Juneau, AK 99802

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above.

See attached letter.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$789,600.00	Building	\$104,200.00	Total	\$893800.00
------	--------------	----------	--------------	-------	-------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$455,350.00	Building	\$104,200.00	Total	\$559,550.00
------	--------------	----------	--------------	-------	--------------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$	Purchase Date	
-------	----	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$	Days on Market	
---------------	----	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)

Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature 	Date 4-30-21
---------------	-----------------

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801

Step 1 – Administrative Review

Appraiser to fill out			
Appraiser		Date of Review	
Comments:			
Post Review Assessment			
Site	\$	Building	\$
Exemptions		\$	
Total Taxable Value		\$	
APPELLANT RESPONSE TO ACTION BY ASSESSOR			
My acceptance or rejection of the assessment valuation in the amount of \$_____ is indicated below.			
☐ Accept New Assessed Value ☐ Close Review (Assessment Remains Unchanged) ☐ Reject and Appeal			
If appealed, appellant will be scheduled before the Board of Equalization and will be advised of the date & time to appear.			
Appellant's Signature _____		Date: _____	

Appellant Accept Value	☐ Yes ☐ No (if no skip to Board of Equalization)
Govern Updated	☐ Yes ☐ No
Spreadsheet Updated	☐ Yes ☐ No
Corrected Notice of Assessed Value Sent	☐ Yes ☐ No

Step 2 – Appeal

Appeal # _____

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION			
Scheduled BOE Date	☐ Yes	☐ No	
10-Day Letter Sent	☐ Yes	☐ No	
The Board of Equalization certifies its decision, based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law contained within the recorded hearing and record on appeal, and concludes that the appellant ☐ Met ☐ Did not meet the burden of proof that the assessment was unequal, excessive, improper or under/overvalued.			
Notes:			
Site	\$	Building	\$
Exemptions		\$	
Total Taxable Value		\$	

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office			
Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



JLC Properties

P.O. Box 20834 Juneau, AK 99802

(907) 723-1902

April 29, 2021

City & Borough of Juneau
Office of the Assessor
155 S. Seward St.
Juneau, AK 99801


RE: Parcel 5B1201060191
Parcel 5B1201060201

I am writing regarding the newly assessed values for our properties located at 5761 and 5753 Concrete Way. The value of these properties has been arbitrarily increased to approximately \$18.00 per square foot or a 50% increase. Before deciding this is a true and fair assessment, please consider the following facts:

1. The land that abuts mine is assessed at \$1.20 per foot. Adjusting for usable area, it would be about \$2.00 per foot. Same quality of land on the same street.
2. The neighborhood is not desirable. The stench from the dump is overwhelming. This smell did not exist when I first moved to the property. I tried for two years to sell the back acre of my land and I was turned down multiple times due to the smell. I eventually ended up selling for about \$10 per foot. Please note that Waste Management has tried extremely hard to be a good neighbor. Their manager is doing his best to alleviate the situation but to no avail.
3. Access to the properties is difficult to say least. Making a left turn into or out of Concrete Way is nearly impossible as truck traffic is extremely heavy. This is due to the fact the only asphalt plant, the only concrete plant and the largest crushing operation in Juneau are all located at the end of the street. In addition, there is only one way in and out of Concrete Way. That along with the truck traffic makes the dirt and dust unbearable.
4. Comparable properties on Industrial Blvd have two streets in and out, no heavy truck traffic, minimal dust and dirt, no landfill stench and are noticeably quiet. These properties are assessed between \$8.00 - \$10.00 per square foot and I would gladly exchange land with them to be in a nicer neighborhood. Furthermore, Costco and Home Depot properties are assessed at approximately \$12.00 per square foot. We obviously do not have parity.

Until we have better access and have eliminated the smell from the landfill, I believe our assessments should be no more than the \$10.00 per square foot. To the best of my knowledge the only recent sale in our neighborhood was to Central Council and was not based on true business decisions but on immediate need to disperse funds. I would postulate that anyone looking to purchase industrial land would look everywhere else before buying in our neighborhood.

Please feel free to call me to discuss this.


Dave Hanna

President JLC Properties



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

JLC PROPERTIES INC
PO BOX 20834
JUNEAU AK 99802-0834

**Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and
Presentation of Real Property Appeal**

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1201060191
Property Location	5761 CONCRETE WAY
Appeal No.	APL20210338
Sent to Email Address:	thedavehanna@gmail.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



ASSESSOR OFFICE

APPEAL #2021-0338

2021 REAL PROPERTY APPEAL PACKET

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION November 18, 2021

Appellant: JLC Properties Inc

Location: 5761 Concrete Way

Parcel No.: 5B1201060191

Property Type: Commercial/Industrial

Appellant's basis for appeal: My property was valued improperly/ incorrectly

	Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value	Recommended Value
Site:	\$ 455,350	\$ 789,600	\$ 751,350
Buildings:	\$ 104,200	\$ 104,200	\$ 104,200
Total:	\$ 559,550	\$ 893,800	\$ 855,550

Subject Photo



Table of Contents

OVERVIEW	3
SUBJECT PHOTOS	3
AREA MAP & AERIAL	4
ASSESSED VALUES	5
LAND	5
BUILDING(S)	6
COST REPORT	7
INCOME APPROACH.....	7
COMMERCIAL MARKET & ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS.....	8
SUBJECT ASSESSMENT HISTORY	8
SUMMARY	9
CONCLUSION.....	10

OVERVIEW

The subject is an industrial/commercial property that currently houses a shop/warehouse located in Lemon Creek.

Subject Characteristics:


- Land
 - 45,535 SF lot
 - Level, developed lot
- Building
 - 3,520 SF GBA
 - 1,200 SF Covered Storage Area

SUBJECT PHOTOS



Front

AREA MAP & AERIAL



ASSESSED VALUES

Remember that the total assessed value is the primary test against market. The distribution of that value between the Land Component and the Building Component is secondary and can vary from one model to another. The total assessed value is tested against market indicators (sales, lease rates, etc.) and is adjusted to market value by application of market area and feature adjustments.

All three approaches to value (Cost, Sales Comparison and Income) are considered for commercial properties

LAND


Land values are developed on a market area basis. The land is examined to understand the typical land characteristics in the market area. These characteristics include size, slope, view, water frontage, significant wetlands and others. The characteristics are used to develop a market area land valuation model. This model is tested and refined in consideration of sales of both vacant and developed parcels. The resulting model is then applied to all of the land in the market area to establish assessed site values.

The subject site features a level developed lot. The subject parcel's land value is equitable and is not excessive.

Land Characteristics:

- 45,535 SF lot
- Level, developed lot

Land Values



BUILDING(S)


The building component may be based on market adjusted cost tables, residual from sales after extraction of the land value or other appropriate means.

Ratio studies are performed to determine market adjustments.

Building Characteristics:

- 3,520 SF GBA
- 1,200 SF Covered Storage Area

Sketch of Improvements:



COST REPORT

The cost report below was utilized in the review process in response to the filing of the Petition for Review by the appellant. The cost report indicates that the building component is not overvalued.

43623		Record		1	
Parcel Code Number	5B1201060191	Number of Stories (Building)		01	
Owner Name	JLC PROPERTIES INC	Number of Sections		1	
Parcel Address	5761 CONCRETE WAY	Perimeter		256	
Effective Year Built	2001	Class		D	
Year Built	0	Height		20	
Building Model	C- 14 Garages, Industrials, Lofts, Warehouses	Rank		Average	
Building Type	Storage Garage	Total Area		3,520.00	

Section 1	Description	Units	Percent	Cost	+/-	Total
	Base Cost	3520		48.50		170,720
	Exterior Wall	3520		11.05		38,885
	Heating & Cooling	3520		606.00		606
	Heating & Cooling	3520		2.30		8,096
	Architect Fee	3520		6.30		22,176
	Sub Total					\$240,482.56
	Local Multiplier		1.43	[X]		\$343,890.00
	Current Multiplier		1.05	[X]		\$361,085.00
	Neighborhood Multiplier			[X]		\$361,085.00
	Depreciation - Physical		39.00	[-]		\$140,823.00
	Depreciation - Functional			[-]		\$0.00
	Depreciation - Economic			[-]		\$0.00
	Percent Complete		100.00	[-]		\$220,262.00
	Cost to Cure					
	Neighborhood Adjustment					
Replacement Cost less Depreciation		# of Units 1.00				\$220,262
Miscellaneous Improvements						
Det Carport/Snow Roof		Covered Storage Area			[+]	19,200
Total Improvement Value						
						\$239,500

INCOME APPROACH

The income approach was not the basis for setting the assessed value for 2021. The appellant did not submit P&L information for the Review process.

COMMERCIAL MARKET & ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

The 2021 sales analysis for commercial properties included 57 qualified sales from 5 years of sales covering January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020. The sales volume for the commercial market remained steady through 2020 and there was no indication of declining prices.

- Assessment Year 2021 Summary for Commercial Properties
 - Level of Assessment – 85% overall, 60% for vacant land, and 91% for improved properties
 - Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) – 22% for the combined group, 20% for vacant land, and 17% for improved properties (For these types of property groups the Standard that we work towards would be 20% or less for the subsets of land and improved properties. The combined set would be expected to have a higher COD.)
 - Applied Time Trend for Sales Analysis – 5% per year (0.42% per month)

SUBJECT ASSESSMENT HISTORY

City and Borough of Juneau Assessment History Report				
5B1201060191 JLC PROPERTIES INC 5761 CONCRETE WAY JRM II LT 3				
<u>YEAR ID</u>	<u>LAND VALUE</u>	<u>MISC VALUE</u>	<u>BLDG VALUE</u>	<u>CAMA VALUE</u>
2021	\$789,600.00		\$104,200.00	\$893,800.00
2020	\$526,400.00		\$104,200.00	\$630,600.00
2019	\$500,900.00		\$104,200.00	\$605,100.00
2018	\$500,900.00		\$104,200.00	\$605,100.00
2017	\$500,900.00		\$104,200.00	\$605,100.00
2016	\$500,900.00		\$104,200.00	\$605,100.00
2015	\$500,900.00		\$104,200.00	\$605,100.00
2014	\$500,900.00		\$104,200.00	\$605,100.00
2013	\$500,900.00		\$104,200.00	\$605,100.00
2012	\$241,500.00	\$0.00	\$104,200.00	\$345,700.00
2011	\$241,500.00	\$0.00	\$104,200.00	\$345,700.00
2010	\$241,500.00	\$0.00	\$104,200.00	\$345,700.00

SUMMARY

State statute requires the Assessor to value property at “full and true value”. According to appraisal standards and practices set by the Alaska Association of Assessing Officers, the State of Alaska Office of the State Assessor, and the International Association of Assessing Officers, correct procedures of assessment were followed for the subject. These standards and practices include consideration of any market value increase or decrease as determined by analysis of sales.

The assessed value was reviewed in response to the Petition for Review. Our findings are as follows.

The land and buildings are valued using the same methods and standards as all other properties in the Borough.

Additional Details:

- The appellant states that their property was valued improperly/incorrectly.
 - During the review process we discovered that the site value increased in 2020 in error. The original assessed value reflected the 2020 assessment with normal trending of 50%. The site value for 2021 was corrected to reflect the site value from 2019 adjusted with normal trending of 50%. This is reflected in our recommended value.
 - The property was valued using proper methodology.
 - In reviewing locational subgroups, property type subgroups and property characteristic subgroups in the analysis we did not see evidence that any location or other subgroup should be treated differently from the rest with the exception of the boathouses.
- The appellant states that the value of this property has been arbitrarily increased to approximately \$18.00 per square foot or a 50% increase. Before deciding this is a true and fair assessment, please consider the following facts:
 - The land that abuts mine is assessed at \$1.20/sf. Adjusting for usable area, it would be about \$2.00/sf, same quality of land on the same street.
 - The neighborhood is not desirable due to the proximity to the landfill and the accompanying stench.
 - Access to the property is difficult. Truck traffic on this road is incredibly high.
 - Comparable properties on Industrial Blvd have better access and less undesirable attributes. These properties are assessed between \$8-\$10/sf. Furthermore, Costco and Home Depot are assessed at approximately \$12/sf.
 - Until we have better access and have eliminated the smell from the landfill, assessments should be no more than \$10/sf. The only other sale I can think was not based upon true business decisions but on immediate need to disperse funds.
 - This parcel was valued based on location and other characteristics.
 - Sales in the vicinity of the landfill indicate that the assessed values are not excessive in this neighborhood.
 - The appellant did not provide evidence of loss in value.
 - We find that the corrected value is equitable and that, based on analysis of market sales, it is not excessive. This is addressed in the land, building, cost report, commercial market and assessment analysis, summary and conclusion sections as well as in the AY2021 Property Assessment Guide located in the packet.

CONCLUSION

The 2021 Assessed values were based on a simple methodology, analysis through ratio studies and subsequent trending of values based on the analysis findings. Underlying this standard compliant trending are the locational and feature influenced specific models that have been applied to Juneau commercial properties for many years. The ratio studies indicate that after our adjustments to values the level of assessment for commercial properties was 85% overall, 60% for vacant land, and 91% for improved properties.

For the subject property:

- The percentage change from 2020 to 2021 was an increase of 35.7%.

We recommend that the assessed value be decreased to \$855,550.



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1201060201

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B120100201		
Owner Name	JLC Properties	Name of Applicant	Dave Hanna
Primary Phone #	907-723-1902	Email Address	thedavehanna@gmail.com
Physical Address	5753 Concrete Way Juneau, AK 99801	Mailing Address	PO Box 20834 Juneau, AK 99802

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

See attached letter.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$789,450.00	Building	\$0.00	Total	\$789,450.00
------	--------------	----------	--------	-------	--------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$455,250.00	Building	\$0.00	Total	\$455,250.00
------	--------------	----------	--------	-------	--------------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$	Purchase Date	
-------	----	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$	Days on Market	
---------------	----	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)

Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature

Date

4-30-21

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801

Step 1 – Administrative Review

Appraiser to fill out			
Appraiser		Date of Review	
Comments:			
Post Review Assessment			
Site	\$	Building	\$
Exemptions		\$	
Total Taxable Value		\$	
APPELLANT RESPONSE TO ACTION BY ASSESSOR			
My acceptance or rejection of the assessment valuation in the amount of \$_____ is indicated below.			
☐ Accept New Assessed Value ☐ Close Review (Assessment Remains Unchanged) ☐ Reject and Appeal			
If appealed, appellant will be scheduled before the Board of Equalization and will be advised of the date & time to appear.			
Appellant's Signature _____		Date: _____	

Appellant Accept Value	☐ Yes	☐ No	<i>(if no skip to Board of Equalization)</i>
Govern Updated	☐ Yes	☐ No	
Spreadsheet Updated	☐ Yes	☐ No	
Corrected Notice of Assessed Value Sent	☐ Yes	☐ No	

Step 2 – Appeal

Appeal # _____

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION			
Scheduled BOE Date	☐ Yes	☐ No	
10-Day Letter Sent	☐ Yes	☐ No	
The Board of Equalization certifies its decision, based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law contained within the recorded hearing and record on appeal, and concludes that the appellant ☐ Met ☐ Did not meet the burden of proof that the assessment was unequal, excessive, improper or under/overvalued.			
Notes:			
Site	\$	Building	\$
Exemptions		\$	
Total Taxable Value		\$	

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office			
Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



JLC Properties

P.O. Box 20834 Juneau, AK 99802

(907) 723-1902

April 29, 2021

City & Borough of Juneau
Office of the Assessor
155 S. Seward St.
Juneau, AK 99801

RE: Parcel 5B1201060191
Parcel 5B1201060201

I am writing regarding the newly assessed values for our properties located at 5761 and 5753 Concrete Way. The value of these properties has been arbitrarily increased to approximately \$18.00 per square foot or a 50% increase. Before deciding this is a true and fair assessment, please consider the following facts:

1. The land that abuts mine is assessed at \$1.20 per foot. Adjusting for usable area, it would be about \$2.00 per foot. Same quality of land on the same street.
2. The neighborhood is not desirable. The stench from the dump is overwhelming. This smell did not exist when I first moved to the property. I tried for two years to sell the back acre of my land and I was turned down multiple times due to the smell. I eventually ended up selling for about \$10 per foot. Please note that Waste Management has tried extremely hard to be a good neighbor. Their manager is doing his best to alleviate the situation but to no avail.
3. Access to the properties is difficult to say least. Making a left turn into or out of Concrete Way is nearly impossible as truck traffic is extremely heavy. This is due to the fact the only asphalt plant, the only concrete plant and the largest crushing operation in Juneau are all located at the end of the street. In addition, there is only one way in and out of Concrete Way. That along with the truck traffic makes the dirt and dust unbearable.
4. Comparable properties on Industrial Blvd have two streets in and out, no heavy truck traffic, minimal dust and dirt, no landfill stench and are noticeably quiet. These properties are assessed between \$8.00 - \$10.00 per square foot and I would gladly exchange land with them to be in a nicer neighborhood. Furthermore, Costco and Home Depot properties are assessed at approximately \$12.00 per square foot. We obviously do not have parity.

Until we have better access and have eliminated the smell from the landfill, I believe our assessments should be no more than the \$10.00 per square foot. To the best of my knowledge the only recent sale in our neighborhood was to Central Council and was not based on true business decisions but on immediate need to disperse funds. I would postulate that anyone looking to purchase industrial land would look everywhere else before buying in our neighborhood.

Please feel free to call me to discuss this.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Dave Hanna', is written over the typed name.

Dave Hanna
President JLC Properties



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

JLC PROPERTIES INC
PO BOX 20834
JUNEAU AK 99802-0834

**Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and
Presentation of Real Property Appeal**

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1201060201
Property Location	5753 CONCRETE WAY
Appeal No.	APL20210365
Sent to Email Address:	thedavehanna@gmail.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



APPEAL #2021-0365

2021 REAL PROPERTY APPEAL PACKET

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION November 18, 2021

ASSESSOR OFFICE

Appellant: JLC Properties Inc

Location: 5751/5753 Concrete Way

Parcel No.: 5B1201060201

Property Type: Commercial/Industrial - Vacant

Appellant's basis for appeal: (Reasons as stated on Petition for Review form)

	Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value	Recommended Value
Site:	\$ 455,250	\$ 789,450	\$ 751,350
Buildings:	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total:	\$ 455,250	\$ 789,450	\$ 751,350

Subject Photo



Table of Contents

OVERVIEW	3
SUBJECT PHOTOS	3
AREA MAP & AERIAL	4
ASSESSED VALUES	5
LAND	5
BUILDING(S)	6
COST REPORT	6
INCOME APPROACH.....	6
COMMERCIAL MARKET & ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS.....	6
SUBJECT ASSESSMENT HISTORY	7
SUMMARY	8
CONCLUSION.....	9

OVERVIEW

The subject is a vacant industrial/commercial property located in Lemon Creek

Subject Characteristics:



- Land
 - 45,525 SF lot
 - Level, developable lot
- Building
 - None

SUBJECT PHOTOS



Front

AREA MAP & AERIAL



ASSESSED VALUES

Remember that the total assessed value is the primary test against market. The distribution of that value between the Land Component and the Building Component is secondary and can vary from one model to another. The total assessed value is tested against market indicators (sales, lease rates, etc.) and is adjusted to market value by application of market area and feature adjustments.

All three approaches to value (Cost, Sales Comparison and Income) are considered for commercial properties

LAND


Land values are developed on a market area basis. The land is examined to understand the typical land characteristics in the market area. These characteristics include size, slope, view, water frontage, significant wetlands and others. The characteristics are used to develop a market area land valuation model. This model is tested and refined in consideration of sales of both vacant and developed parcels. The resulting model is then applied to all of the land in the market area to establish assessed site values.

The subject site features a level, developable lot. The subject parcel's land value is equitable and is not excessive.

Land Characteristics:

- 45,525 SF lot
- Level, developable lot

Land Values



BUILDING(S)

The building component may be based on market adjusted cost tables, residual from sales after extraction of the land value or other appropriate means.

Ratio studies are performed to determine market adjustments.

Building Characteristics:

- None

COST REPORT

The cost report was not developed for this appeal because there are no buildings on the parcel.

INCOME APPROACH

The income approach was not the basis for setting the assessed value for 2021. The appellant did not submit P&L information for the Review process.

COMMERCIAL MARKET & ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

The 2021 sales analysis for commercial properties included 57 qualified sales from 5 years of sales covering January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020. The sales volume for the commercial market remained steady through 2020 and there was no indication of declining prices.

- Assessment Year 2021 Summary for Commercial Properties
 - Level of Assessment – 85% overall, 60% for vacant land, and 91% for improved properties
 - Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) – 22% for the combined group, 20% for vacant land, and 17% for improved properties (For these types of property groups the Standard that we work towards would be 20% or less for the subsets of land and improved properties. The combined set would be expected to have a higher COD.)
 - Applied Time Trend for Sales Analysis – 5% per year (0.42% per month)

SUBJECT ASSESSMENT HISTORY

City and Borough of Juneau Assessment History Report

5B1201060201
JLC PROPERTIES INC
5753 CONCRETE WAY
JRM II LT 2

<u>YEAR ID</u>	<u>LAND VALUE</u>	<u>MISC VALUE</u>	<u>BLDG VALUE</u>	<u>CAMA VALUE</u>
2021	\$789,450.00			\$789,450.00
2020	\$526,300.00			\$526,300.00
2019	\$500,900.00			\$500,900.00
2018	\$526,300.00			\$526,300.00
2017	\$526,000.00			\$526,000.00
2016	\$500,800.00			\$500,800.00
2015	\$500,800.00			\$500,800.00
2014	\$500,800.00			\$500,800.00
2013	\$500,800.00			\$500,800.00
2012	\$146,900.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$146,900.00
2011	\$146,900.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$146,900.00
2010	\$146,900.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$146,900.00

SUMMARY

State statute requires the Assessor to value property at “full and true value”. According to appraisal standards and practices set by the Alaska Association of Assessing Officers, the State of Alaska Office of the State Assessor, and the International Association of Assessing Officers, correct procedures of assessment were followed for the subject. These standards and practices include consideration of any market value increase or decrease as determined by analysis of sales.

The assessed value was reviewed in response to the Petition for Review. Our findings are as follows.

The land and buildings are valued using the same methods and standards as all other properties in the Borough.

Additional Details:

- The appellant states that their property was valued improperly/incorrectly.
 - During the review process we discovered that the site value increased in 2020 in error. The original assessed value reflected the 2020 assessment with normal trending of 50%. The site value for 2021 was corrected to reflect the site value from 2019 adjusted with normal trending of 50%. This is reflected in our recommended value.
 - The property was valued using proper methodology.
 - In reviewing locational subgroups, property type subgroups and property characteristic subgroups in the analysis we did not see evidence that any location or other subgroup should be treated differently from the rest with the exception of the boathouses.
- The appellant states that the value of this property has been arbitrarily increased to approximately \$18.00 per square foot or a 50% increase. Before deciding this is a true and fair assessment, please consider the following facts:
 - The land that abuts mine is assessed at \$1.20/sf. Adjusting for usable area, it would be about \$2.00/sf, same quality of land on the same street.
 - The neighborhood is not desirable due to the proximity to the landfill and the accompanying stench.
 - Access to the property is difficult. Truck traffic on this road is incredibly high.
 - Comparable properties on Industrial Blvd have better access and less undesirable attributes. These properties are assessed between \$8-\$10/sf. Furthermore, Costco and Home Depot are assessed at approximately \$12/sf.
 - Until we have better access and have eliminated the smell from the landfill, assessments should be no more than \$10/sf. The only other sale I can think was not based upon true business decisions but on immediate need to disperse funds.
 - This parcel was valued based on location and other characteristics.
 - Sales in the vicinity of the landfill indicate that the assessed values are not excessive in this neighborhood.
 - The appellant did not provide evidence of loss in value.
 - We find that the corrected value is equitable and that, based on analysis of market sales, it is not excessive. This is addressed in the land, commercial market and assessment analysis, summary and conclusion sections as well as in the AY2021 Property Assessment Guide located in the packet.


CONCLUSION

The 2021 Assessed values were based on a simple methodology, analysis through ratio studies and subsequent trending of values based on the analysis findings. Underlying this standard compliant trending are the locational and feature influenced specific models that have been applied to Juneau commercial properties for many years. The ratio studies indicate that after our adjustments to values the level of assessment for commercial properties was 85% overall, 60% for vacant land, and 91% for improved properties.

For the subject property:

- The percentage change from 2020 to 2021 was an increase of 42.7%.

We recommend that the assessed value be decreased to \$751,350.



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

9/28/2021

JLC Properties, Inc.
PO Box 20834
Juneau AK 99802

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1201060201
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/5/2021

PARCEL: 5B1201060201
PHYSICAL LOCATION: 5753 Concrete Way

JLC Properties, Inc.,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property value is excessive & My property value is unequal to similar properties & My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1201060201**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$789,450
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$455,250
2021 Final determination:	\$751,350

Original trending was done against 2020 value which was out of equity with similarly situated parcels on Concrete Way. Trending against 2019 value was fair and equitable.

The Assessor Office recommends a REDUCTION to the 2021 assessed value due to a correction based on review of the subject parcel and surrounding properties . The Assessor Office recommends a change as indicated.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. (*INITIAL ONE*)

_____ **YES**, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

_____ **NO**, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.

Appellant signature

Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/5/2021**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

9/28/2021

JLC Properties, Inc.
PO Box 20834
Juneau AK 99802

CBJ-Assessor's Office
OCT 05 2021

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 2D040C050074
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/5/2021

PARCEL: 2D040C050074
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Vista Drive

JLC Properties, Inc.,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property value is excessive & My property value is unequal to similar properties & My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **2D040C050074**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$697,500
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$465,000
2021 Final determination:	\$697,500

The lower portion of this parcel which has been cleared is estimated to be similar in the size of the parcels previously sold for more than the assessed value of the subject parcel. Access to the cleared portion is in place.

Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above. The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. (INITIAL ONE)

 X

YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor


*I AM PART OF THE GROUP APPEAL ON METHODOLOGY.
AFTER THAT WE CAN SCHEDULE MY HEARING ON SPECIFICS.*

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.

Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10-5-21
Date


CBJ-Assessor's Office
OCT 05 2021

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/5/2021**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

9/28/2021

JLC Properties, Inc.
PO Box 20834
Juneau AK 99802

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1201060201

RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/5/2021

PARCEL: 5B1201060201
PHYSICAL LOCATION: 5753 Concrete Way

CBJ-Assessor's Office
OCT 05 2021

JLC Properties, Inc.,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property value is excessive & My property value is unequal to similar properties & My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1201060201**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action:	Change
2021 Initial valuation:	\$789,450
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$455,250
2021 Final determination:	\$751,350

Original trending was done against 2020 value which was out of equity with similarly situated parcels on Concrete Way. Trending against 2019 value was fair and equitable.

The Assessor Office recommends a REDUCTION to the 2021 assessed value due to a correction based on review of the subject parcel and surrounding properties. The Assessor Office recommends a change as indicated.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW


Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. (INITIAL ONE)

X

YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor
I AM PART OF THE GROUP APPEAL ON METHODOLOGY.
AFTER THAT WE CAN SCHEDULE MY HEARING ON SPECIFICS.
NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10-5-21
Date


CBJ-Assessor's Office
OCT 05 2021

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/5/2021**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

9/28/2021

JLC Properties, Inc.
PO Box 20834
Juneau AK 99802

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1201060191

RESPONSE DEADLINE:

10/5/2021

PARCEL:

5B1201060191

PHYSICAL LOCATION:

5761 Concrete Way

JLC Properties, Inc.,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property value is excessive & My property value is unequal to similar properties & My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1201060191**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$893,800
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$559,550
2021 Final determination:	\$855,550

Original trending was done against 2020 value which was out of equity with similarly situated parcels on Concrete Way. Trending against 2019 value was fair and equitable.

The Assessor Office recommends a REDUCTION to the 2021 assessed value due to a correction based on review of the subject parcel and surrounding properties. The Assessor Office recommends a change as indicated.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. (INITIAL ONE)


YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

*I AM PART OF THE GROUP APPEAL ON THE
METHODOLOGY. AFTER THAT WE CAN SCHEDULE SPECIFICS.*

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.



Appellant signature

10-5-21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/5/2021**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401020073

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION – DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401020073		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$ 1,055,550	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 1,055,550
------	--------------	----------	------	-------	--------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$ 828,184	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 828,184
------	------------	----------	------	-------	------------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price \$N/A has been subdivided Purchase Date

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price \$ Days on Market

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)

Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature

Date

5/3/21

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and Presentation of Real Property Appeal

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401020073
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210389
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.


Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33517
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401020073
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401020073
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401020073**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$1,055,550
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$828,184
2021 Final determination:	\$1,055,550

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. *(INITIAL ONE)*



YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.



Appellant signature

10/14/21

Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

**Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and
Presentation of Real Property Appeal**

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050020
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210390
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401050020

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION – DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050020		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$ 936,150	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 936,150
------	------------	----------	------	-------	------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$ 30,633	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 30,633
------	-----------	----------	------	-------	-----------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$N/A has been subdivided	Purchase Date	
-------	---------------------------	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$ N/A	Days on Market	
---------------	--------	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)


Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature  Date 5/3/21

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33517
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050020
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050020
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050020**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$936,150
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$30,633
2021 Final determination:	\$936,150

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. *(INITIAL ONE)*


YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

 _____

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10/14/21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year 2021

Parcel ID Number 5B1401050030

For Office Use:

Review #

Appeal #

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION – DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050030		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803
Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.			
☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued ☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties ☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly ☐ My property has been undervalued ☐ My exemption(s) was not applied		THE FOLLOWING ARE <u>NOT</u> GROUNDS FOR APPEAL • Your taxes are too high • Your value changed too much in one year. • You can't afford the taxes	
Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:			
The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.			
Have you attached additional information or documentation?		☒ Yes ☐ No	
Values on Assessment Notice:			
Site	\$962,400	Building	\$ 0
Total	\$962,400		
Owner's Estimate of Value:			
Site	\$ 31,493	Building	\$ 0
Total	\$ 31,493		
Purchase Price of Property:			
Price	\$N/A has been subdivided		Purchase Date
Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes complete next line)			
Listing Price	\$ N/A		Days on Market
Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)			
Certification:			
I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.			
Signature		Date 5/3/21	

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and Presentation of Real Property Appeal

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050030
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210391
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.


Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33517
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050030
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050030
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050030**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$962,400
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$31,493
2021 Final determination:	\$962,400

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. (*INITIAL ONE*)

YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

 _____

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.

 _____
Appellant signature

10-14-21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and Presentation of Real Property Appeal

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050040
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210392
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401050040

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3


Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050040		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803
Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.			
☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued ☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties ☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly ☐ My property has been undervalued ☐ My exemption(s) was not applied		THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL • Your taxes are too high • Your value changed too much in one year. • You can't afford the taxes	
Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:			
The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.			
Have you attached additional information or documentation?		☒ Yes ☐ No	
Values on Assessment Notice:			
Site	\$391,950	Building	\$0
Total	\$391,950		
Owner's Estimate of Value:			
Site	\$12,828	Building	\$0
Total	\$12,828		
Purchase Price of Property:			
Price	\$N/A has been subdivided		Purchase Date
Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes complete next line)			
Listing Price	\$ N/A		Days on Market
Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)			
Certification:			
I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.			
Signature		Date 5/3/21	

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33517
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050040
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050040
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050040**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$391,950
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$12,828
2021 Final determination:	\$391,950

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. (INITIAL ONE)

YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

DB

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.



Appellant signature

10-14-21

Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401050050

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION – DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050050		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$ 784,050	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 784,050
------	------------	----------	------	-------	------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$ 25,656.	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 25,656
------	------------	----------	------	-------	-----------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$N/A has been subdivided	Purchase Date	
-------	---------------------------	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$ N/A	Days on Market	
---------------	--------	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)

Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature	Date 5/13/21
-----------	--------------

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and Presentation of Real Property Appeal

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050050
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210393
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.


Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33517
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050050
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050050
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050050**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$784,050
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$25,656
2021 Final determination:	\$784,050

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. *(INITIAL ONE)*



YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10-14-21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

**Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and
Presentation of Real Property Appeal**

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050060
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210394
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401050060

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050060		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$705,450	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 705,450
------	-----------	----------	------	-------	------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$23,082	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 23,082
------	----------	----------	------	-------	-----------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$N/A has been subdivided	Purchase Date	
-------	---------------------------	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$ N/A	Days on Market	
---------------	--------	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)

Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.


Signature

Date

5/3/21

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33517
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050060
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050060
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050060**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$705,450
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$23,082
2021 Final determination:	\$705,450

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. (*INITIAL ONE*)

YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

DB

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10-14-21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and Presentation of Real Property Appeal

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050070
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210395
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value

Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401050070

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050070		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$3,361,800	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$3,361,800
------	-------------	----------	------	-------	-------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$110,008	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$110,008
------	-----------	----------	------	-------	-----------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$N/A has been subdivided	Purchase Date	
-------	---------------------------	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$ N/A	Days on Market	
---------------	--------	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)


Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature	Date 5/3/21
-----------	-------------

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33517
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050070
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050070
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050070**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$3,361,800
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$110,008
2021 Final determination:	\$3,361,800

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. *(INITIAL ONE)*

YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

 _____

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10-14-21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and Presentation of Real Property Appeal

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050080
Property Location	7805 HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210396
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401050080

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050080		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$ 781,650	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 781,650
------	------------	----------	------	-------	------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$ 25,577	Building	\$	Total	\$ 25,577
------	-----------	----------	----	-------	-----------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$N/A has been subdivided	Purchase Date	
-------	---------------------------	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$ N/A	Days on Market	
---------------	--------	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)

Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.


Signature

Date

5/3/21

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33517
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050080
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050080
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050080**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation: **\$781,650**
2021 Owner estimate of value: **\$25,577**
2021 Final determination: **\$781,650**

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. *(INITIAL ONE)*



YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10-14-21

Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and Presentation of Real Property Appeal

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050110
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210397
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401050110

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050110		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued ☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties ☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly ☐ My property has been undervalued ☐ My exemption(s) was not applied	THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL • Your taxes are too high • Your value changed too much in one year. • You can't afford the taxes
--	---

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$ 392,700	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 392,700
------	------------	----------	------	-------	------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$ 12,851	Building	\$	Total	\$ 12,851
------	-----------	----------	----	-------	-----------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$N/A has been subdivided	Purchase Date	
-------	---------------------------	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$ N/A	Days on Market	
---------------	--------	----------------	--


Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)

Certification:
I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature		Date	5/3/21
-----------	--	------	--------

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33519
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050110
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050110
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050110**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$392,700
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$12,851
2021 Final determination:	\$392,700

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. *(INITIAL ONE)*

YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

 _____

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10/14/21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and Presentation of Real Property Appeal

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050120
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210398
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401050120

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3


Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050120		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803
Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.			
☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued ☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties ☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly ☐ My property has been undervalued ☐ My exemption(s) was not applied		THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL • Your taxes are too high • Your value changed too much in one year. • You can't afford the taxes	
Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:			
The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot, I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.			
Have you attached additional information or documentation?		☒ Yes ☐ No	
Values on Assessment Notice:			
Site	\$ 393,150	Building	\$ 0
Total	\$ 393,150		
Owner's Estimate of Value:			
Site	\$ 12,865	Building	\$
Total	\$ 12,865		
Purchase Price of Property:			
Price	\$N/A has been subdivided		Purchase Date
Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes complete next line)			
Listing Price	\$ N/A		Days on Market
Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)			
Certification:			
I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.			
Signature		Date 5/3/21	

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33520
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050120
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050120
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050120**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation: **\$393,150**
2021 Owner estimate of value: **\$12,865**
2021 Final determination: **\$393,150**

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. *(INITIAL ONE)*


YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

OB

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10-14-21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and Presentation of Real Property Appeal

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050130
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210399
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401050130

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050130		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$ 631,050	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 631,050
------	------------	----------	------	-------	------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$ 20,649	Building	\$	Total	\$ 20,649
------	-----------	----------	----	-------	-----------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$N/A has been subdivided	Purchase Date	
-------	---------------------------	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☐ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$ N/A	Days on Market	
---------------	--------	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)


Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature  Date 5/3/21

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33521
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050130
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050130
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050130**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$631,050
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$20,649
2021 Final determination:	\$631,050

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. *(INITIAL ONE)*




YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.


Appellant signature

10/14/21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



**Office Of The Assessor
155 South Seward Street
Juneau, AK 99801**

BICKNELL INC
PO BOX 33517
JUNEAU AK 99803-3517

**Meeting of Board of Equalization (BOE) and
Presentation of Real Property Appeal**

Date of BOE	Thursday, November 18, 2021
Location of BOE	Via ZOOM Webinar
Time of BOE	5:30 pm
Mailing Date of Notice	November 4, 2021
Parcel Identification	5B1401050140
Property Location	HONSINGER DR
Appeal No.	APL20210400
Sent to Email Address:	dblommer@bicknellinc.com

ATTENTION OWNER

Under Alaska Statutes and CBJ Code, you, as the appellant, bear the burden of proof. The only grounds for adjustment of an assessment are proof of unequal, excessive, improper, or under valuation based on facts that are stated in your written appeal or proven at the appeal hearing.

Any evidence or materials you would like to include in your appeal must be submitted to the City Clerk's Office {preferred method via email to city.clerk@juneau.org Attn.: Assessment Appeal} by **4:00 PM Wednesday, November 10, 2021** and will be included in the packets for the Board so the members have an opportunity to review the materials before the hearing.

Your Board of Equalization packet will be ready for you to pick up in the Clerk's office after **2:00 PM Friday, November 12, 2021** or it will be emailed and/or mailed to the above address(es) on this notice.

You or your representative may be present at the hearing {via Zoom Webinar, participation/log in information will be listed on the agenda packet you receive for the hearing your appeal is scheduled for}. If you choose not to be present or be represented, the Board of Equalization will proceed in the absence of the appellant.

It should be noted that, between the date of this letter and the Board hearing date, your appeal may be resolved between you and the Assessor. If your appeal is resolved, you will not need to appear before the Board.

If you have any questions please contact the Assessor's Office.

Attachment: CBJ Law Department Memorandum April 19, 2013.

CONTACT US: CBJ Assessor's Office

Phone	Email	Website	Physical Location
Phone (907) 586-5215 Fax (907) 586-4520	assessor.office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance/	155 South Seward St Room 114

PROPERTY TAX BILLS MAILED JULY 1

PROPERTY TAXES DUE SEPTEMBER 30



Office of the Assessor
155 S Seward Street
Juneau AK 99801

Petition for Review / Correction of Assessed Value
Real Property

Assessment Year	2021
Parcel ID Number	5B1401050140

For Office Use:	Review #	Appeal #
-----------------	----------	----------

2021 Filing Deadline: MONDAY, MAY 3

Please attach all supporting documentation

ASSESSOR'S FILES ARE PUBLIC INFORMATION - DOCUMENTS FILED WITH AN APPEAL BECOME PUBLIC INFORMATION

Parcel ID Number	5B1401050140		
Owner Name	Bicknell Inc	Name of Applicant	David Blommer
Primary Phone #	907-789-5727	Email Address	dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Physical Address	Honsinger Dr	Mailing Address	Bicknell Inc
			PO Box 33517
			Juneau, AK 99803

Why are you appealing your value? Check box and provide a detailed explanation below for your appeal to be valid.

- ☐ My property value is excessive/overvalued
☐ My property value is unequal to similar properties
☒ My property was valued improperly/incorrectly
☐ My property has been undervalued
☐ My exemption(s) was not applied

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

- Your taxes are too high
- Your value changed too much in one year.
- You can't afford the taxes

Provide specific reasons and provide evidence supporting the item(s) checked above:

The property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also, the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this will effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last years assessment.

Have you attached additional information or documentation? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Values on Assessment Notice:

Site	\$ 503,100	Building	\$ 0	Total	\$ 503,100
------	------------	----------	------	-------	------------

Owner's Estimate of Value:

Site	\$ 16,460	Building	\$	Total	\$ 16,460
------	-----------	----------	----	-------	-----------

Purchase Price of Property:

Price	\$N/A has been subdivided	Purchase Date	
-------	---------------------------	---------------	--

Has the property been listed for sale? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes complete next line)

Listing Price	\$ N/A	Days on Market	
---------------	--------	----------------	--

Was the property appraised by a licensed appraiser within the last year? ☐ Yes ☒ No (if yes provide copy of appraisal)


Certification:

I hereby affirm that the foregoing information is true and correct, I understand that I bear the burden of proof and I must provide evidence supporting my appeal, and that I am the owner (or owner's authorized agent) of the property described above.

Signature		Date	5/3/21
-----------	--	------	--------

Contact Us: CBJ Assessors Office

Phone/Fax	Email	Website	Mailing Address
Phone: (907)586-5215 Fax: (907)586-4520	Assessor.Office@juneau.org	http://www.juneau.org/finance	155 South Seward St. Juneau AK 99801



155 S. Seward St. Rm. 114
Juneau, AK 99801
Phone: (907)586-5215
Fax: (907)586-4520
Assessor.Office@juneau.org

OFFICE OF THE ASSESSOR

10/07/21

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer
PO Box 33517
Juneau AK 99803

RE: FINAL DETERMINATION -- 2021 Property value Petition for Review -- 5B1401050040
RESPONSE DEADLINE: 10/14/21

PARCEL: 5B1401050040
PHYSICAL LOCATION: Honsinger Dr

Bicknell Inc / David Blommer,

This letter is in response to the 2021 Petition for Review that you filed regarding the above indicated parcel. The basis for appealing as indicated on the Petition for Review form is: **My property was valued improperly**

- Excessive – grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments
- Unequal – treated differently than other properties in the same property class
- Improper – valuation methodology was improper
- Undervalued – valued less than market or disproportionately lower than other assessments

State statute requires that the burden of proof is upon the appellant to provide evidence that one of the above conditions has been met (AS 29.45.210).

Based upon the evidence that you provided we have made the following determination regarding 2021 assessment valuation of **5B1401050040**:

VALUE DETERMINATION

Recommended Action: **No Change**

2021 Initial valuation:	\$391,950
2021 Owner estimate of value:	\$12,828
2021 Final determination:	\$391,950

The basis for the 2021 assessed values is a market analysis based upon available sales data which adhered to IAAO assessment standards. Appellant failed to provide evidence which satisfies the appeal criteria as laid out above.

The Assessor Office recommends NO CHANGE to the 2021 assessed value as the appellant failed to meet the burden of proof as required by state statute. The Assessor Office sees no basis for change.

APPELLANT RESPONSE FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2021 PETITION FOR REVIEW

Please indicate if you accept the recommended value or wish to have your Petition for Review heard by the Board of Equalization. (INITIAL ONE)

YES, I accept the recommended value determination provided by the Assessor

DB

NO, I do not accept the recommended valuation provided by the Assessor.
Please schedule my Petition for Review for the Board of Equalization.

I understand that I will be expected to provide specific evidence to the Board which clearly illustrates that my parcel valuation is: excessive, unequal, valued with improper methodology or is less than market value.

Be advised that if you choose to proceed to the Board of Equalization, they may, in accordance with law, apply an increase of the assessed value to full market value.



Appellant signature

10-14-21
Date

If we do not receive a response from you by **10/14/21**, the Petition for Review will be scheduled for the Board of Equalization where you will be expected to present **specific evidence** as to why your parcel is not valued correctly.

Sincerely,



Mary Hammond
Assessor
City & Borough of Juneau



ASSESSOR OFFICE

APPEAL #See Chart Below

2021 REAL PROPERTY APPEAL PACKET

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION November 18, 2021

Appellant: Bicknell Inc

Location: Honsinger Dr

Property Type: Commercial - Vacant

Appeal Number	Parcel Number
2021-0389	5B1401020073
2021-0390	5B1401050020
2021-0391	5B1401050030
2021-0392	5B1401050040
2021-0393	5B1401050050
2021-0394	5B1401050060
2021-0395	5B1401050070
2021-0396	5B1401050080
2021-0397	5B1401050110
2021-0398	5B1401050120
2021-0399	5B1401050130
2021-0400	5B1401050140

Appellant's basis for appeal: My property was valued improperly/ incorrectly

	Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value with Deferral	Recommended Value with Deferral
5B1401020073	\$848,184	\$1,055,550	\$1,054,333
5B1401050020	\$30,633	\$43,804	\$842,513
5B1401050030	\$31,493	\$45,035	\$866,182
5B1401050040	\$12,828	\$18,344	\$352,820
5B1401050050	\$25,656	\$36,688	\$705,640
5B1401050060	\$23,082	\$33,007	\$634,846
5B1401050070	\$110,008	\$157,308	\$3,025,609
5B1401050080	\$25,577	\$36,575	\$703,469
5B1401050110	\$12,851	\$18,378	\$353,468
5B1401050120	\$12,865	\$18,397	\$353,840
5B1401050130	\$20,649	\$29,528	\$567,940
5B1401050140	\$16,460	\$23,538	\$452,725

Subject Photo




Table of Contents

OVERVIEW	4
SUBJECT PHOTOS	4
AREA MAP & AERIAL	5
ASSESSED VALUES	6
LAND	6
BUILDING(S)	8
COST REPORT	8
INCOME APPROACH.....	8
COMMERCIAL MARKET & ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS.....	8
SUBJECT ASSESSMENT HISTORY	9
SUMMARY	11
CONCLUSION.....	12

Under appeal are multiple vacant parcels, located in the Airport area and subject to a subdivision development deferral. The parcels were subdivided from a larger parcel after substantial grading and filling.

Subject Characteristics:

- Land
 - Level, developable



- Building
 - None

SUBJECT PHOTOS



Front



Others

[illegible]



ASSESSED VALUES

Remember that the total assessed value is the primary test against market. The distribution of that value between the Land Component and the Building Component is secondary and can vary from one model to another. The total assessed value is tested against market indicators (sales, lease rates, etc.) and is adjusted to market value by application of market area and feature adjustments.

All three approaches to value (Cost, Sales Comparison and Income) are considered for commercial properties

LAND

Land values are developed on a market area basis. The land is examined to understand the typical land characteristics in the market area. These characteristics include size, slope, view, water frontage, significant wetlands and others. The characteristics are used to develop a market area land valuation model. This model is tested and refined in consideration of sales of both vacant and developed parcels. The resulting model is then applied to all of the land in the market area to establish assessed site values.

Each of the parcels are level and developable. The subject parcels land values are equitable and are not excessive.


Land Characteristics:

This chart shows square footage for each parcel

PCN	LandArea(SF)
5B1401020073	1,406,044
5B1401050020	52,007
5B1401050030	53,468
5B1401050040	21,779
5B1401050050	43,558
5B1401050060	39,188
5B1401050070	186,766
5B1401050080	43,424
5B1401050110	21,819
5B1401050120	21,842
5B1401050130	35,058
5B1401050140	27,946

Land Values

(The price per square foot values in the map below indicate market value for these parcels. Their assessed value is based on apportionment of the parent parcel)



(This map shows price per square foot values for nearby parcels)



BUILDING(S)

The building component may be based on market adjusted cost tables, residual from sales after extraction of the land value or other appropriate means.

Ratio studies are performed to determine market adjustments.

Building Characteristics:

- None

COST REPORT

The cost report was not produced for these parcels because there are no buildings presently located on any of the parcels.

INCOME APPROACH

The income approach was not the basis for setting the assessed value for 2021. The appellant did not submit P&L information for the Review process.

COMMERCIAL MARKET & ASSESSMENT ANALYSIS

The 2021 sales analysis for commercial properties included 57 qualified sales from 5 years of sales covering January 1, 2016 through December 31, 2020. The sales volume for the commercial market remained steady through 2020 and there was no indication of declining prices.

- Assessment Year 2021 Summary for Commercial Properties
 - Level of Assessment – 85% overall, 60% for vacant land, and 91% for improved properties
 - Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) – 22% for the combined group, 20% for vacant land, and 17% for improved properties (For these types of property groups the Standard that we work towards would be 20% or less for the subsets of land and improved properties. The combined set would be expected to have a higher COD.)
 - Applied Time Trend for Sales Analysis – 5% per year (0.42% per month)

SUBJECT ASSESSMENT HISTORY

Parcel 5B1401050071 was subdivided in 2020 into 15 parcels (5B1401050073, 5B1401050010 – 0140). As the result of a Subdivision Deferral exemption the parcels under appeal were assessed at an apportioned value rather than market value. The chart below shows the 2021 assessed value for parcels 5B1401050073 and 5B1401050010 – 0140 as calculated as part of the exemption. Note that two of the parcels on this chart did not receive the exemption (5B1401050010 and 5B1401050100) because they were sold before January 1, 2021 and were therefore not qualified for the exemption.

The 2020 assessed value for the parent parcel (5B1401050071) was \$1,178,600.

The 2021 assessed value for the parent parcel (5B1401050071) if not divided would have been \$1,767,900.

This is a 50% increase.

(The chart below shows how the value was apportioned, the value without deferral, and the deferral amount)

Parcel	Size	Per Foot	2021 Value if not divided		Value Without Deferral	Deferral Amount		
5B1401020071	2,201,056	0.842273	1,767,900					
5B1401050010	80726		67,993.00	sold	1,453,050	-	SOLD	
5B1401050020	52007		43,804.00		936,150	892,346.00	x	
5B1401050030	53468		45,035.00		962,400	917,365.00	x	
5B1401050040	21779		18,344.00		391,950	373,606.00	x	
5B1401050050	43558		36,688.00		784,050	747,362.00	x	
5B1401050060	39188		33,007.00		705,450	672,443.00	x	
5B1401050070	186766		157,308.00		3,361,800	3,204,492.00	x	
5B1401050080	43424		36,575.00		781,650	745,075.00	x	
5B1401050090	43558		36,688.00		784,050	747,362.00	x	
5B1401050100	21779		18,344.00	sold	391,950	-	SOLD	
5B1401050110	21819		18,378.00		392,700	374,322.00	x	
5B1401050120	21842		18,397.00		393,150	374,753.00	x	
5B1401050130	35058		29,528.00		631,050	601,522.00	x	
5B1401050140	27946		23,538.00		503,100	479,562.00		
5B1401020073	1406044		1,184,274.00		1,055,550	came value lower than apportioned value		
	2,098,962							
		Totals:	1,767,901.00		13,528,050	10,130,210.00		

The following table represents recommended changes to the deferral amounts for all parcels that were part of the subdivision. Only some of these parcels are under appeal. The parcels that are not under appeal were sold, two of which were not eligible for deferral.

Parcel Number	Square Feet	Price per foot	Appportioned Value of Each		Value Without Deferral	Deferral Amount
5B1401050010	80726	16.2	1,307,761		1,453,050	145,289
5B1401050020	52007	16.2	842,513		936,150	93,637
5B1401050030	53468	16.2	866,182		962,400	96,218
5B1401050040	21779	16.2	352,820		391,950	39,130
5B1401050050	43558	16.2	705,640		784,050	78,410
5B1401050060	39188	16.2	634,846		705,450	70,604
5B1401050070	186766	16.2	3,025,609		3,361,800	336,191
5B1401050080	43424	16.2	703,469		781,650	78,181
5B1401050090	43558	16.2	705,640		784,050	78,410
5B1401050100	21779	16.2	352,820		391,950	39,130
5B1401050110	21819	16.2	353,468		392,700	39,232
5B1401050120	21842	16.2	353,840		393,150	39,310
5B1401050130	35058	16.2	567,940		631,050	63,110
5B1401050140	27946	16.2	452,725		503,100	50,375
5B1401020073	1406044	0.75	1,054,533		1,055,550	1,017
Totals	692918		12,279,805		13,528,050	1,248,245

SUMMARY

State statute requires the Assessor to value property at "full and true value". According to appraisal standards and practices set by the Alaska Association of Assessing Officers, the State of Alaska Office of the State Assessor, and the International Association of Assessing Officers, correct procedures of assessment were followed for the subject. These standards and practices include consideration of any market value increase or decrease as determined by analysis of sales.

The assessed value was reviewed in response to the Petition for Review. Our findings are as follows.

The land and buildings are valued using the same methods and standards as all other properties in the Borough.

The AY2021 Property Assessment Guide included in the packet is incorporated in our response.

Additional Details:

- The appellant states that their property was valued improperly/ incorrectly.
 - The property was valued using proper methodology.
- The appellant states that the property was assessed as Industrial zoning and it is Rural Reserve. Property was not officially rezoned until Feb. or March of this year. Also the lot is two zones. Lot 15, is still Rural reserve. Since each lot is still based on the original lot before it was subdivided, this well effect each lot. I was told over the phone that the property was assessed as commercial property and the value was increased by 1.5 times last year's assessment.
 - Zoning was taken into consideration.
 - These parcels are subject to the Subdivision Deferral the taxable value for each is based on an apportioned value of the original parcel.
 - Normal trending was appropriate for the original parcel.
 - In reviewing locational subgroups, property type subgroups and property characteristic subgroups in the analysis we did not see evidence that any location or other subgroup should be treated differently from the rest with the exception of the boathouses.

If the BOE makes no changes the corrections will be reflected in the 2022 deferral calculations are as follows:

- A correction will be made to reflect the substantial grading and fill.
- As of January 1, 2021 the filled land represents 692,918 sf (15.9 acres) and the pond area represents 1,406,044 sf (32.3 acres) which will be reflected in the deferral values for assessment year 2022.
- Zoning was changed to Industrial on March 1, 2021. Changes in zoning will be considered in 2022 taxable values.

CONCLUSION

The 2021 Assessed values were based on a simple methodology, analysis through ratio studies and subsequent trending of values based on the analysis findings. Underlying this standard compliant trending are the locational and feature influenced specific models that have been applied to Juneau commercial properties for many years. The ratio studies indicate that after our adjustments to values the level of assessment for commercial properties was 85% overall, 60% for vacant land, and 91% for improved properties.

For the subject property:

- The base land value for 2020 for parcel number 5B1401050071 was trended by the 50% to arrive at the base 2021 value. This value was then apportioned to all of the new parcels. Those still owned by the appellant as of January 1, 2021 received apportioned values per the subdivision deferral. The two parcels which were sold prior to January 1, 2021 received market value assessments.
- Based on the changes that were made to the property prior to January 1, 2021 as outlined above we recommend that the assessed values be increased according to the table below.

	Appellant's Estimate of Value	Original Assessed Value with Deferral	Recommended Value with Deferral
5B1401020073	\$848,184	\$1,055,550	\$1,054,333
5B1401050020	\$30,633	\$43,804	\$842,513
5B1401050030	\$31,493	\$45,035	\$866,182
5B1401050040	\$12,828	\$18,344	\$352,820
5B1401050050	\$25,656	\$36,688	\$705,640
5B1401050060	\$23,082	\$33,007	\$634,846
5B1401050070	\$110,008	\$157,308	\$3,025,609
5B1401050080	\$25,577	\$36,575	\$703,469
5B1401050110	\$12,851	\$18,378	\$353,468
5B1401050120	\$12,865	\$18,397	\$353,840
5B1401050130	\$20,649	\$29,528	\$567,940
5B1401050140	\$16,460	\$23,538	\$452,725

Hi David,

Apologies for not responding yesterday. The rezone does not need further action by the commission or assembly. We need to put a letter to file stating the access requirement has been met, and work with Assessor's to update the system. We'll get to work on this today.

Jill


From: Jill Maclean
Sent: Monday, March 1, 2021 9:55 AM
To: 'dblommer@bicknellinc.com' <dblommer@bicknellinc.com>
Subject: rezone

Hi David,

I heard your voicemail and I'm looking into the rezone this morning. I'll get back to you today.

Best,

Jill M. Maclean, AICP | Director
Community Development Department | City & Borough of Juneau, AK
Location: 230 S. Franklin Street, 4th Floor Marine View Building
Office: 907.586.0757



Fostering excellence in development for this generation and the next.

dblommer@bicknellinc.com

From: Jill Maclean <Jill.Maclean@juneau.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2021 3:12 PM
To: 'dblommer@bicknellinc.com'
Subject: RE: rezone

My pleasure, and Quinn already finished the work, so it's good to go

From: dblommer@bicknellinc.com <dblommer@bicknellinc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 2:34 PM
To: Jill Maclean <Jill.Maclean@juneau.org>
Cc: Quinn Tracy <Quinn.Tracy@juneau.org>; Alexandra Pierce <Alexandra.Pierce@juneau.org>
Subject: RE: rezone

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Sounds good. Thank you

From: Jill Maclean <Jill.Maclean@juneau.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2021 1:42 PM
To: 'dblommer@bicknellinc.com' <dblommer@bicknellinc.com>
Cc: Quinn Tracy <Quinn.Tracy@juneau.org>; Alexandra Pierce <Alexandra.Pierce@juneau.org>
Subject: RE: rezone

Hi David,

It's all set to go. Quinn is working to update our systems, which should happened shortly. In the meantime, should someone come in with an application, we'll have it noted that the zoning is Industrial, so that there won't any delay.

Best,

Jill

From: dblommer@bicknellinc.com <dblommer@bicknellinc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 10:14 AM
To: Jill Maclean <Jill.Maclean@juneau.org>
Cc: Quinn Tracy <Quinn.Tracy@juneau.org>; Alexandra Pierce <Alexandra.Pierce@juneau.org>
Subject: RE: rezone

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Thank you. Is there a timeframe as to when this will happen? Or, if someone came in today for a permit, would it be considered industrial?

From: Jill Maclean <Jill.Maclean@juneau.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2021 10:01 AM
To: 'dblommer@bicknellinc.com' <dblommer@bicknellinc.com>
Cc: Quinn Tracy <Quinn.Tracy@juneau.org>; Alexandra Pierce <Alexandra.Pierce@juneau.org>
Subject: RE: rezone

Sec. 29.45.051. Tax deferral for certain subdivided property.

(a) A municipality may by ordinance permit deferral of payment of taxes on all or a portion of the increase in assessed value directly attributable to

(1) the subdivision of a single parcel of property into three or more parcels;
and

(2) any improvements made to the property necessitated by its subdivision.

(b) A deferral from taxation allowed under (a) of this section shall be limited to a maximum period of five years. A municipality may by ordinance provide for the deferral of payment of taxes permitted under (a) of this section to be of a shorter duration.

(c) Subject to (b) of this section, a municipality may also by ordinance provide that

(1) the deferral is terminated when

(A) a lot in the subdivision is sold; or

(B) a residential or commercial building is built on a lot in the subdivision; or

(2) the deferral continues for the unsold lots in the subdivision after

(A) a lot in the subdivision is sold; or

(B) a residential or commercial building is constructed on a lot in the subdivision.

Mary Hammond she/ her

Assessor

City & Borough of Juneau

(907) 586-5215

Please notice that our phone number has changed. All finance department calls must go to (907)586-5215. After May 3, my desk phone number will change to 586-5215 ext. 4033

Mary Hammond she/ her

Assessor

City & Borough of Juneau

(907) 586-5215

Please notice that our phone number has changed. All finance department calls must go to (907)586-5215. After May 3, my desk phone number will change to 586-5215 ext. 4033

From: dblommer@bicknellinc.com <dblommer@bicknellinc.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 1:28 PM

To: Mary Hammond <mary.hammond@juneau.org>

Subject: RE: Subdivision Deferral

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Hi Mary,

Could you send me the value that was used to calculate the exemption? I think it would just be the overall value of the original lot as assessed this year.

Also, do I need to file appeals for each property or can I do one appeal that includes all of them?

Thanks,

David

From: dblommer@bicknellinc.com <dblommer@bicknellinc.com>

Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 3:53 PM

To: 'Mary Hammond' <mary.hammond@juneau.org>

Subject: RE: Subdivision Deferral

Hi Mary,

Thanks for sending that over. I'll go over it and let you know if I have any questions.

Thanks,

David

From: Mary Hammond <mary.hammond@juneau.org>

Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 11:41 AM

To: 'dblommer@bicknellinc.com' <dblommer@bicknellinc.com>

Subject: Subdivision Deferral

David,

Please see the state statute below, which allows CBJ to provide the subdivision deferral. The intention is clear that the exemption is meant to defer the increase in assessed value "directly attributable to the subdivision..." This is also mentioned in CBJ 69.10.022 (f)(1) I have attached a copy of this code for your reference.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

dblommer@bicknellinc.com

From: dblommer@bicknellinc.com
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 4:34 PM
To: 'Spike Bicknell'
Subject: FW: Subdivision Deferral

From: Mary Hammond <mary.hammond@juneau.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 4:29 PM
To: 'dblommer@bicknellinc.com' <dblommer@bicknellinc.com>
Subject: RE: Subdivision Deferral

Hi David,

The overall value of the original lot, had there not been a subdivision, would have been \$1,767,900. Last year's value was \$1,178,600.

Here is the breakdown for your reference:

Honsinger Pond						
Parcel	Size	Per Foot	2021 Value if not divided		CAMA Value	Exemption amount
5B1401020071	2,201,056	0.842273	1,767,900			
5B1401050010	80726		67,993.00	sold	1,453,050	-
5B1401050020	52007		43,804.00		936,150	892,346.00 x
5B1401050030	53468		45,035.00		962,400	917,365.00 x
5B1401050040	21779		18,344.00		391,950	373,606.00 x
5B1401050050	43558		36,688.00		784,050	747,362.00 x
5B1401050060	39188		33,007.00		705,450	672,443.00 x
5B1401050070	186766		157,308.00		3,361,800	3,204,492.00 x
5B1401050080	43424		36,575.00		781,650	745,075.00 x
5B1401050090	43558		36,688.00		784,050	747,362.00 x
5B1401050100	21779		18,344.00	sold	391,950	-
5B1401050110	21819		18,378.00		392,700	374,322.00 x
5B1401050120	21842		18,397.00		393,150	374,753.00 x
5B1401050130	35058		29,528.00		631,050	601,522.00 x
5B1401050140	27946		23,538.00		503,100	479,562.00
5B1401020073	1406044		1,184,274.00		1,055,550	cama value lower than apportioned value

Here are the links for the reports I mentioned regarding commercial land values. There is some redundancy in the reports but both are helpful to review.

[2021 CBJ Commercial Property Valuations](#)

[2021 Summary Report Commercial](#)

If you wish to appeal, please submit a [Petition for Review](#) for each property.



AY2021 Property Assessment Guide

Updated: 2021-11-10

Contents

Assessment Overview.....	2
Property Taxes.....	2
Property Assessments	2
Assessed Values versus Taxes	2
Sales Validation (Also see the “Market Sales” topic for more specifics on Market Sales).....	3
Market Sales (this topic is closely tied to the “Sales Validation” topic).....	5
Analysis Process.....	6
Model Specification.....	7
Model Calibration.....	7
Approaches and Methodologies	7
Review & Appeal Processes.....	7
AY2021 Commercial Property Assessment Particulars	9
AY 2021 Commercial Property Analysis & Appraisal Summary.....	11
AY2021 Notes Regarding Spitzfaden, Wold & Geiger Submissions and Testimony.....	20
Questions & Answers	22
An Example.....	23

Assessment Overview

Property Taxes

- Property taxes represent about half of the locally generated CBJ revenue.
- Property taxes fund general government services, police, fire, schools, parks, streets and other services.
- If we did not have property taxes there would have to be some other form of taxes.

Property Assessments

- The Assessor's Office strives to keep the taxes fair and equitable by ensuring that the assessed values are uniform.
- There is no one, absolute, precise market value for any given property. Appraisal Judgement is a necessary part of setting assessed values.
- While the concept of setting assessed values for every parcel in Juneau may sound simple there are many complexities to actually making it happen.

Assessed Values versus Taxes

- Most tax increases are due to a budget increase, passed either by the assembly or by the taxpayers.
- An increase in assessed value does not mean an increase in taxes.
- The budget determines the amount of taxes to be collected. The budget is set by the Borough Assembly. The assessed values determine how that tax burden is distributed.
- The Assessor's Office does not have an active role in budgeting or the taxes. We are focused on the assessed values.


Examples:

- If everyone's assessed values doubled but the budget stayed the same your taxes would not change.
- If everyone's assessed values doubled and the budget increased by 10% your taxes would go up by 10%.
- If the budget stayed the same and one type of property was going up while all the others were not, owners of that type of property would see a higher tax bill and everyone else would see a lower tax bill.
- If your assessed value went up and everyone else's stayed the same, you would see an increase in your taxes even if the budget stayed the same.

In the following example you can see that with the assessed values doubling and the budget staying the same the actual taxes did not change.

Assessed Value -vs- Amount of Tax

\$50,000	\$50,000	Example Taxing District Budget
\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	Total Assessed Values
0.050	0.025	Rate
\$100,000	\$200,000	Property Assessed Value
\$5,000	\$5,000	Taxes



Sales Validation (Also see the “Market Sales” topic for more specifics on Market Sales)

- Sales validation is critical. Sales data is foundational to everything that we do.
- All sales are considered.
- Only some sales are deemed to be a market sale.
- Of those that are market sales we only have prices on some of them. While a mandatory disclosure ordinance took effect in November 2020, we have, so far, not seen much of an increase in the disclosure rate.
- Generally we get sales prices on about 35 to 40% of the commercial sales.
- The word “considered” is also sometimes used to refer to the sales that were “included” in the ratio studies as a market sale.

- The guidelines for sales validation and the validation processes are critical. Maintaining standards in the sales validation process is critical.
- All of what we do in the area of valuations is dependent on the quality and accuracy of the sales data. Having good, clean, accurate sales data is critical.
- The sales validation and verification processes are continual and ongoing.

Market Sales (this topic is closely tied to the “Sales Validation” topic)

- To be a Market sale, a sale must meet these criteria at a minimum
 - Arms length transaction
 - No Duress
 - Marketed (see below)
 - Reasonable exposure time (see below)
- Invalid Sales- With rare exceptions, the following conditions make a sale an invalid (non-market) sale:
 - Multi-Parcel sales are invalid – an exception would be if they clearly are an economic unit that will always sell together
 - Family sale
 - Related party sale/transfer- one corporation sells to a parent corporation
 - Sale between parties that have pre-existing relationship (is non-arms-length)
 - Estate sale
 - Bankruptcy sale
 - Sheriff sale / tax auction
 - Tax Deed
 - Gifts
 - Transfer of interest
 - Trade / Exchange
 - Partial interests
 - Forced sales- Transfers in lieu of foreclosure, condemnation or liquidation
 - Easement or Right of Way (although these can be used for special studies on easements or Right of Ways)
 - Fulfillment of Contract
 - Plottage/Assemblage/Adjacent (This is referring to situations where a land owner purchases property next door or adjacent to the property he already owns. Or where a number of separate parcels are bought for the purpose of consolidating them into one larger parcel. An alternate use of the word plottage refers to the increase in value due to bringing the properties under the same ownership.)
 - Lease assignment or option
- Sales are not thrown out because of their ratio.
- To be a market sale the property has to have had exposure to a broad market and to have been actively marketed for a reasonable period of time
- In The Appraisal Institutes Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal part of the definition of the requirements for a sale to be considered a market sale is that there was ***“reasonable exposure in a competitive market, under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, with the buyer and seller each acting prudently, knowledgeably, and for self-interest, and assuming that neither is under undue duress.”*** [Emphasis added] If a property is sold under duress, which needing to sell quickly would fall under, it is to be considered not a market sale. Under the market sale guidelines a sale that occurs in less than usual market time is also suspect. One of the aspects that is to be inspected besides exposure is marketing time. It should be noted that the typical marketing time for commercial properties is substantially longer than for residential properties.

Analysis Process

- The work that we do is not a controlled laboratory environment
- We will likely never have thousands of data points for commercial properties in Juneau.
- We work with the best data that we have available at the time.
- It is normal that subsequent to an analysis being done additional information comes to light that changes the validation or verification conclusions of a few sales. This does not invalidate the analysis and ratio studies. This reality is mitigated by the testing for outliers, the focus in the analysis on central tendencies rather than the fringes, and the review of different data groupings and subsets. The mitigation of any potential effect is one of the advantages of mass appraisal. For an example of the limited effect of removing a few sales please see the “AY 2021 Commercial Property Analysis & Appraisal Summary” section below.
- There are multiple facets to the analysis process. It usually includes the review of many ratio studies, starting from before any changes are made to the results after the final changes, but it also involves much more than that. Here is a partial list:
 - The sales validation and verification process is highly integrated with the analysis.
 - With each ratio study the decision of whether to include standard and/or extreme outliers
 - A study of the outliers
 - The relativeness of the sample
 - The uniformity and/or variance within the total set and all of the various subsets
 - The uniformity and/or variance between the total set and all of the various subsets
 - Market area uniformity and/or variance evaluated at Region, District and Neighborhood levels
 - The confidence level – this is a factor on all the decisions made and all aspects of the analysis and can vary greatly from one part of the analysis to another
 - The adjustments that need to be made and the best mechanism for applying them
- Data Sets- typical analysis structures will have a primary data set and then major type division data sets
 - For assessment work the primary data set is all of the property sales within the Borough.
 - A typical first level or major type division of the data set would be land, residential and commercial properties. All properties are placed into one of those three subsets based on appraisal judgement.
- Subsets- from the primary and the major type sets you typically have many subsets that are analyzed corresponding to things such as location, zoning, property type, and property characteristics
- The analysis should have an established structure. This often encompasses looking at the total primary set first, then doing land value analysis and adjustment, next incorporating the new land values into your analysis of building values, followed by a neighborhood factor analysis off of the new values which then leads to your final values.
- The data quality is critical to the analysis process.
- The analysis process is critical to the uniformity of your values.
- Analysis options / Mass Appraisal Techniques
 - Adaptive Estimation Procedure (AEP or Feedback)- most frequent method used by smaller jurisdictions
 - Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA)- requires a larger set of sales data
 - Nonlinear Regression Analysis- requires a larger set of sales data
 - Spatial Model Analysis (uses GIS)
- **Regardless of the number of sales, we are required to set assessed values each year. In setting assessed values we must do so for all taxable properties in the Borough.**

Model Specification

- Model specification is the process whereby you choose which property characteristics you feel effect value.
- Model Types- Additive, multiplicative, hybrid

Model Calibration

- Model calibration is the process whereby you determine by how much each characteristic effects value.

Approaches and Methodologies

- All three approaches- the sales comparison, cost and income approaches- are considered.
- New calculations versus trending
 - There are advantages to both and which is best to use is situational.
- In trending the assessed values the underlying considerations such as the 3 approaches to value and locational, property type and property characteristic adjustments are all accounted for in the original models and incorporated and carried forward into the new assessed values. That is one of the advantages of making a correction to assessed values through trending.
- Your CAMA (Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal) system will play a role in which options are available for setting and adjusting values.

Review & Appeal Processes

- Valid Reasons for Appeal
 - Value is excessive/overvalued – To show that an assessment is excessive, an appellant must show that the assessment is more than just overvalued. It must be shown that the assessment is grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments (or, it can be shown that there is an intentional or fraudulent purpose to place an excessive valuation on the property.)
 - Value is unequal – To show that an assessment is unequal, the appellant must show that there are other properties in the same class as the property being appealed and that there is no basis that would justify different valuations of the property.
 - Valued improperly – To show that an assessment is improper, it must be shown that the assessor used an improper method of valuation, which amounts to fraud or a clear adoption of a wrong principle of valuation.
 - Undervalued – To show that an assessment is undervalued, an appellant must show that the assessment is more than just undervalued. It must be shown that the assessment is grossly disproportionate when compared to other assessments (or, it can be shown that there is an intentional or fraudulent purpose to place an undervaluation on the property.)
- Reasons that are NOT Valid
 - Taxes are too high
 - Value changed too much in one year
 - Can't afford the taxes
- In response to a Petition for Review, we review the assessed values for each appeal and if there is an error or an indication of the property's assessed value being excessive, inequitable, and improper we make the appropriate corrections.

- The appellant has the opportunity to submit information to the Assessor and once we have reached a conclusion, to accept our findings or to continue to a BOE hearing.

AY2021 Commercial Property Assessment Particulars

- We strive to treat all properties equitably.
- We have done our work with the highest of ethical standards.
- We have followed the applicable assessment standards.
- The basis for the 2021 commercial property assessed values is a market analysis based upon available actual sales data of commercial property sales. The analysis adhered to assessment standards.
- Trending was the best option for our circumstances.
- There have been questions about the historic valuation model. Actually, more correctly it is models, as in a plural. For instance there is a model specific to S Franklin St properties while there is a separate model specific to Concrete Way, another one for land in the Vintage area and at least one applicable to the core downtown business district. Some of these models we have had opportunity to inspect and, while in some cases our appraisal judgement would suggest a slightly different approach to the adjustments, the models certainly appear reasonable. The basis and time frame for the various models of course differs. As an example, the S Franklin St model was done in 2010 and adjusted slightly in 2011 and appears to be based on a study of sales in the area. The Concrete Way model was updated in 2013. Another test of those models is what happens when we apply trending. The fact that the trending tended to improve the COD and COV would suggest that the models are reasonable and still are representative of the market.
- The correction to commercial properties was applied mainly, but not exclusively, through the land segment does not make this a land study. The land segment adjustment was the mechanism by which increases could be applied within the CAMA system while maintaining uniformity in land values of improved and vacant land and moving all commercial properties closer to market value.
- One of the advantages of mass appraisal and of the analysis work that the Assessor's Office does is that we do not focus on one sale (low or high) but instead look at all of the sales. We then set values based off of the mean and median indicators for all of the sales. That way we are not isolating to the lowest sale or the highest sale in determining what the market value is. Within this process we look at the overall market as well as indicators for sub-groups such as locational factors, property features, types of property, etc. (Please see the AY 2021 Commercial Property Analysis & Appraisal Summary section for additional review of these sales.)
- Others have focused on one sale that was a market sale (the NCL/sub-port sale), claiming it is inappropriately skewing the results. That is not true. It is a market sale. It also does not qualify as an outlier per IAAO standards. (Again, please see the AY 2021 Commercial Property Analysis & Appraisal Summary section for additional review.)
- While the inclusions and exclusions that were made were appropriate, we analyzed whether or not changing the inclusion or exclusion of these sales would have had any impact on the valuations. Making those changes did not significantly change the ratios and would not have resulted in any different action in setting the assessed values. (see the AY 2021 Commercial Property Analysis & Appraisal Summary section.)

- The values for 2021 were set based on market analysis. As a result of the analysis a trending was applied to the assessed values. In trending the assessed values the underlying considerations such as the 3 approaches to value and locational, property type and property characteristic adjustments are all accounted for in the original models and incorporated and carried forward into the new assessed values. That is one of the advantages of making an initial correction to this undervaluation through trending. Most commercial properties have seen no significant change to their assessed values for 10 plus years. Because there was not a wealth of sales data for the subgroups an overall trending was applied. It should be noted that in reviewing locational subgroups, property type subgroups and property characteristic subgroups in the analysis we did not see compelling evidence that any location or other subgroup should be treated differently from the rest with the exception of the boathouses.
- This adjustment does not represent one year of market change but change over many years.
- Each of the appellants were encouraged to submit specific evidence of an incorrect value through initial phone calls early in the process, through a letter dated 06/18/2021 and through follow up phone calls to the letter as a minimum. Each appellant has been given opportunity to discuss our findings with the Assessor's Office.
- Our review of assessed values has consistently indicated that in spite of the corrections applied this year the fact remains that we are still undervalued for commercial properties. This is born out through the sales analysis, the cost approach and the income approach. Normally, at the BOE level we would be proposing increases to value when appropriate, however, in an effort to maintain uniformity, this year we have only been doing so when errors cause a property to be further undervalued.
- Two primary reasons cited for the appeals are that our assessed values are excessive and that our trending was not proper.

○

For perspective on those issues I would like to note some information from a source outside of the Assessor's Office. We have had the opportunity to read two commercial appraisals, both for one particular property on Salmon Creek Ln near the hospital. One has a valuation date of April 05, 2013 and the other a valuation date of August 11, 2021. Both appraisals are done by Mr. Wold who has been presented as an expert witness in many of the hearings.

Mr. Wold indicates that the land value in 2013 was \$330,000. Our land value for that year was just \$229,800.

Mr. Wold indicates that the land value in 2021 is \$570,000. Our land value for this year is just \$392,100 which happens to be less than 69% of his stated value which puts the ratio close to our median ratio.

The land value indicated in the appraisals increases by 73% over an 8 year period. Our increase this year was 50% over an 11 year period. In percentages Mr. Wold's increase of 9.1% per year is double ours which is 4.5% per year.

AY 2021 Commercial Property Analysis & Appraisal Summary

The population or universe of properties to be assessed is all taxable properties in the Borough of Juneau. Those properties are divided into two primary classifications: residential and commercial. The focus here is on the commercial properties. So, our universe of properties for this part of the analysis is all commercial properties within the Borough. Correspondingly, the sales population is all sales that occurred for commercial properties within the Borough. Those sales then go through both validation and verification processes. In the validation process sales are classified by other transactions vs sales, then market sales vs non-market sales, then market sales for which we have a sales price. The market sales with sales price are the sales utilized in the ratio studies and analysis.

The following page includes a summary report for the 2021 Assessed Values based on the sales information at the time of the analysis. Because this is a dataset that includes all commercial types (vacant and improved) other than boathouses a COD of 21.5490 is a good COD that indicates good uniformity in the assessed values across the varied types and locations of the properties. The scatter diagram indicates that a more aggressive trending of sales prices would have been appropriate. If that had been applied it would result in an indication of the assessed value ratios being even lower than stated. These ratios and statistics are based on AY2021 values after the adjustments to values were made.

**AY2021- Comm- Set 2 Updated AVs Live1- 20210316- No 19- All, 5 Yr, 5% Trend
Summary Report**

Statistics

Current Proposed

53	53	Count	(Number of Records with Ratio)
0.2932	0.2932	Minimum Ratio	
1.4091	1.4091	Maximum Ratio	
1.1159	1.1159	Range	

0.8526 0.8526 Mean (This is the average ratio for your sample.)

0.8853 0.8853 Median (This is the mid-point value for your sample. Preferred measure of central tendency.)

0.6981 0.6981 Weighted Mean

3.0313 3.0313 Sum of the Square of Deviations

0.1908 0.1908 AAD

0.2414 0.2414 Standard Deviation

21.5490 21.5490 COD (Good indicator of confidence level.)

28.3180 28.3180 COV

1.2214 1.2214 PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential
(PRD s/b between 0.98 & 1.03, IAAO)
(PRD over 1=Regressive)

IAAO Standards for COD

SFR	15.0 or less
SFR-newer/homog	10.0 or less
Income Properties	20.0 or less
Income-Urban area	15.0 or less
Vacant Land	20.0 or less

Coefficients (0=Normal Distribution)



Kurtosis	-0.0245
Skewness	0.0181
Alt.Cyhel'sky's Skew	-0.0943
Alt.Pearson's Skew	-0.4059

Trending Factors


0.85	Target Level
0.9969	Factor on Mean
0.9601	Factor on Median
1.2176	Factor on Weighted Mean

Normal / Skewed Distribution Evaluation

0.0327	Differential Mean to Median
24	Number of data points below the mean.
29	Number of data points above the mean.
*Note- # below/above works on data sets up to 5,000 pts.	



Histogram of Ratio Frequency



Ratio Study Notations

- Note that the scatter diagram indicates that a higher rate of time/market trending of sales prices was in order for the ratio studies. If that higher rate were applied it would show that we are even more undervalued than these statistics indicate.
- Regarding the histogram, it is normal to have ratios above 1.00. In fact, if your level of assessment were set based on the median and right at market (1.00) half of your data points would be below 1.00 and half would be above 1.00.
- If you reviewed many histograms from many different jurisdictions you would typically find a larger percentage of ratios over 1.00 and that the top ratios would be far above 1.50.
- It was noted by an appellant that the ratios for 23% of the adjusted sales prices were above 1.00. That would mean that 77% are below 1.00 indicating that we are still undervalued.
- It is normal that subsequent to an analysis being done additional information comes to light that changes the validation or verification conclusions of a few sales. This does not invalidate the analysis and ratio studies. This reality is mitigated by the testing for outliers, the focus in the analysis on central tendencies rather than the fringes, and the review of different data groupings and subsets. The mitigation of any potential effect is one of the advantages of mass appraisal.
- Regarding the COD and COV: the numbers listed in the box at the top of the ratio study summary report are guidelines. The COD and COV and associated guidelines help guide your analysis of the market, the valuation models, confidence levels in adjusting values, effects of adjustments and other considerations. They are an indicator of central tendency and not an absolute criteria or test that a study has to meet to be valid. The image below is of the actual table from the IAAO Standard on Ratio Studies-2013.

Table 1-3. Ratio Study Uniformity Standards indicating acceptable general quality*

Type of property—General	Type of property—Specific	COD Range**
Single-family residential (including residential condominiums)	Newer or more homogeneous areas	5.0 to 10.0
Single-family residential	Older or more heterogeneous areas	5.0 to 15.0
Other residential	Rural, seasonal, recreational, manufactured housing, 2–4 unit family housing	5.0 to 20.0
Income-producing properties	Larger areas represented by large samples	5.0 to 15.0
Income-producing properties	Smaller areas represented by smaller samples	5.0 to 20.0
Vacant land		5.0 to 25.0
Other real and personal property		Varies with local conditions

- If your ratio study involves a mix of property types it is typical that your CODs and COVs will be higher.

Sales List

This is a list of the market sales that we had available for our analysis data set.

AY2021 Analysis Sales List									
Sale Date	Sale Price	Trended SP	AVTotal	Main Parcel	Count	Number	Street	Condo	Neighborhood
07/25/18	27,500	30,930	27,200	1C020K01G200	1	1435	HARBOR WAY	NO	AURORA BASIN C 19
06/28/19	25,000	26,936	27,200	1C020K01G280	1	1435	HARBOR WAY	NO	AURORA BASIN C 19
02/28/19	25,000	27,356	27,200	1C020K01G290	1	1435	HARBOR WAY	NO	AURORA BASIN C 19
10/09/20	20,000,000	20,235,200	7,524,300	1C060K010031	1	0	EGAN DR	NO	DOWNTOWN C
10/30/20	1,400,000	1,412,348	1,394,150	1C060K660110	1	711	W WILLOUGHBY AV	NO	DOWNTOWN C
12/15/16	1,100,000	1,327,612	1,457,000	1C060U040040	1	800	GLACIER AVE	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/30/16	550,000	683,826	963,600	1C070A030040	1	100	N FRANKLIN ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
12/09/20	confidential	confidential	190,200	1C070A050001	1	230	SEWARD ST	5K	SOMMERS ON SEWARD_C_24
11/02/18	510,600	567,144	682,450	1C070B0J0020	1	195	S FRANKLIN ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
07/01/19	2,200,000	2,369,400	2,164,900	1C070B0N0011	1	259	S FRANKLIN ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/10/20	612,788	638,268	501,300	1C110K120051	1	0	Eastaugh Way	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/16/17	716,000	855,033	613,650	1C110K120101	1	170	MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
10/02/19	378,818	403,055	237,150	1C110K120120	1	0	MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
10/25/19	378,818	401,835	237,150	1C110K120130	1	190	MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
03/10/20	378,818	394,569	237,150	1C110K120140	1	0	MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
04/01/19	597,938	651,597	374,400	1C110K120150	1	0	MILL ST	NO	DOWNTOWN C
11/13/20	400,000	402,744	445,400	1D060L030011	2	201	CORDOVA ST	NO	WEST JUNEAU C
10/12/17	65,000	75,711	41,200	3B1501020030	1	1669	CREST ST	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/30/18	168,750	186,776	164,000	3B1501040120	1	1544	CREST ST	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
09/19/17	750,000	876,000	823,100	4B1601010040	1	2450	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
06/13/17	104,000	122,899	108,800	4B1601050030	1	2274	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	5K	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
07/30/19	115,000	123,388	83,000	4B1601050160	1	2276	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	5K	RIVERVIEW YACHT C 24
03/05/18	73,000	83,557	35,000	4B1601080070	1	2278	INDUSTRIAL BLVD	5K	P & J BUSINESS C 24
07/31/17	112,500	132,188	119,000	4B1601120130	1	2270	BRANDY LN	5K	BRANDY LANE YACHT C 24
11/17/20	650,000	654,095	527,700	4B1701020020	1	10011	GLACIER HWY	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
02/28/20	1,567,000	1,634,569	961,350	4B1701090056	1	10009	CRAZY HORSE DR	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
12/04/20	confidential	confidential	145,000	4B1701090218	1	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
02/14/17	150,000	179,757	172,300	4B1701090223	1	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
04/24/17	130,000	154,534	149,800	4B1701090226	1	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
01/10/17	150,000	180,492	172,300	4B1701090228	1	10011	CRAZY HORSE DR	5K	SAFE HARBOR C 24
06/30/16	501,624	617,218	361,800	4B1701100146	1	2789	SHERWOOD LN	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
03/01/16	697,000	869,424	813,000	4B1701100170	1	10221	GLACIER HWY	NO	MENDE PENINSULA C
09/20/17	400,000	467,144	336,200	4B1701103003	1	2769	SHERWOOD LN	5K	BEAR DEN YACHT CONDO C 24
06/29/18	950,000	1,071,961	1,045,750	4B2901020010	1	10200	MENDENHALL LOOP	NO	AUKE MOUNTAIN C
10/04/19	2,205,832	2,346,343	1,849,500	5B1201000060	1	5245	GLACIER HWY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
08/02/19	500,000	536,260	746,600	5B1201020100	1	5452	SHAUNE DR	NO	LEMON CREEK C
04/05/17	4,140,000	4,932,313	5,106,550	5B1201040052	2	1721	ANKA ST	NO	LEMON CREEK C
08/02/16	500,000	612,910	704,850	5B1201060061	2	5631	GLACIER HWY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
09/24/20	2,450,000	2,483,957	1,554,550	5B1201060160	2	5740	CONCRETE WAY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
11/23/20	486,000	488,654	274,300	5B1201060260	1	5719	CONCRETE WAY	APN	SEAGULLS EDGE C 24
09/24/20	300,000	304,158	269,550	5B1201300110	1	1783	Anka St	NO	LEMON CREEK C
12/24/19	205,000	215,734	269,550	5B1201300110	1	1783	Anka St	NO	LEMON CREEK C
07/21/17	900,000	1,058,760	632,250	5B1201330160	3	2005	ANKA ST	NO	LEMON CREEK C
06/03/16	1,060,000	1,308,273	1,036,450	5B1201450110	1	1731	RALPH'S WAY	NO	LEMON CREEK C
06/15/16	637,500	785,744	593,500	5B1501000002	1	8251	GLACIER HWY	APN	SOUTHEAST INSURANCE C 24
08/07/20	700,000	714,406	591,700	5B1501010001	2	1880	CREST ST	APN	BUILDERS PLAZA C 24
09/02/16	1,300,000	1,587,924	1,183,050	5B1501020170	1	8401	AIRPORT BLVD	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
11/16/18	750,000	831,585	837,600	5B1501040030	1	8825	MALLARD ST	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
12/07/20	confidential	confidential	234,498	5B15011107E0	1	2221	JORDAN AVE	SEP	JORDAN CREEK C 24
02/10/16	273,000	341,299	234,498	5B15011107E0	1	2221	JORDAN AVE	SEP	JORDAN CREEK C 24
12/22/17	300,000	346,452	230,384	5B15011109B0	1	2231	JORDAN AVE	SEP	JORDAN CREEK C 24
02/15/18	968,750	1,111,292	851,400	5B1601000023	1	9151	GLACIER HWY	NO	SOUTH VALLEY C
07/16/19	145,000	155,861	169,350	5B1601140043	1	9309	GLACIER HWY	APN	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
08/21/18	240,100	269,142	308,850	5B1601140070	1	9309	GLACIER HWY	APN	PROFESSIONAL PLAZA C 24
01/04/19	672,000	740,490	521,900	5B2401610150	1	4045	DELTA DR	NO	NORTHEAST VALLEY C
04/11/17	1,540,000	1,833,432	1,877,700	7B0901030071	1	3161	CHANNEL DR	NO	TWIN LAKES C
(1) These were the sales available to us for our market analysis for assessment year 2021.									
(2) Some sales prices are confidential, specifically when the only sale source is the buyer.									
(3) Note that this list was updated 08/24/21 to add AV. The original list was 57 sales, however, through the analysis process one sale, 1C060U050022, was eliminated. It was further updated 09/23/21 when a change in directive from the law department allowed us to add some sales prices. Update 9/29/2021 only sales prior to 11/26/2020 confidential.									
(4) AV Adj for condition at time of sale - 1C060U040040, 1C070A030040, 4B1701100170, 1C110K120130, 1C110K120101, 4B1701100146, 5B1201060160, 5B1201000060, 7B0901030071									
(5) 5B1201020100 is included on this list, however, it has since been determined not to be a market sale; seller & buyer related. Removal of this sale would further lower the mean and median ratios.									
(6) Note - multi-parcel sales are normally considered non-market, however, with commercial sales they are sometimes included as an economic unit.									
(7) Note that the sale price used in the original study for 5B1201040052, which included 5B1201040051, was \$3,726,000 which was reported by the buyer, however, subsequent information showed the sale price to be \$4,140,000 with the cash distribution reduced for the value of 12 months of continued occupancy by the seller after the execution of the sale. Also, this sale was discovered to be a non-market sale due to duress of the seller. Removal of this sale would lower the mean and median ratios									
(8) The trending applied to bring the sales to 01/01/2021 was 5% per year. The analysis indicates that a trend of 7.5% would be appropriate but to be conservative we selected 5%.									
(9) Column added to identify condo parcels NO = not condo; APN= apportioned land value; 5K= place holder land value; SEP = land is valued under different parcel.									

In the sales list you will notice that there is a column that indicates whether or not the parcel is a condo. The properties that are labeled condo are not residential condos but commercial condos which could include retail spaces, offices and mini-warehouses. The reason that they are noted on the list is because the mechanism for increasing their values was different from other commercial property types. In the analysis they were treated as a separate subset.

Review of Particular Sales

In response to questions raised by appellants we did additional review regarding four sales and their inclusion in or exclusion from the ratio study. We found that the original inclusion or exclusions were appropriate. We then went one step further and analyzed the hypothetical assumptions regarding the inclusion and exclusion of these sales.

The sales were:

1. The Emporium Mall, 1C070K810090 & 0140 – This sale is a multi-parcel that does not qualify as a market sale.
2. The Assembly Building, 1C070A090060 – We did not and still do not have a verified sale price for this sale.
3. The Pacific Pier, 1C070K830040 – This may be a market sale, however, we did not have the sale price at the time of the analysis.
4. The AMHT/NCL land sale, 1C060K010031 – This is a market sale and was included in the analysis.

In regards to the NCL sale, two items of note. First, it does not meet the criteria to be considered to be an outlier. Second, it's inclusion in the analysis did not cause it to have undue influence on the results.

We have reviewed the assertions and find them to be without merit and find that the sales qualification designations are consistent with standards. The distinctions of what is and is not a market sale are important in keeping your data clean which leads to more accurate findings. In spite of there being no merit to the argument for changing which sales were included and which were excluded, just for review purposes, we looked during the review process at whether inclusion and exclusion of these sales would have made any substantial difference. The finding was that the changes in mean and median ratios was minimal and would not have led to any difference in our decisions in the setting of the assessed values and the bringing of the commercial values closer to market.

Again, I need to stress that the exclusion and inclusion, as done in the analysis, was proper and this was just done for comparative and informational purposes during the review process. The statistics below are for 3 sequential steps applying the hypothetical assumptions. The first step added the 2 sales, the next step then corrected an included sale and the third step then removed the NCL sale from consideration. You will see from the results below that even after applying these hypotheticals that after our changes to the assessed values that commercial properties remain undervalued. After applying the hypothetical assumptions the median changed by one thousandth of a percent and the mean increased by 3.2% but remained lower than the median.

<u>Review of Impact of Including and Excluding Particular Sales</u>				
	Original	2 Sales Added	Sale Correction	Remove NCL
Count	53	55	55	54
Minimum Ratio	0.2932	0.2932	0.3718	0.4189
Maximum Ratio	1.4091	1.4091	1.4091	1.4091
Range	1.1159	1.1159	1.0373	0.9903
Mean	0.8526	0.8692	0.8753	0.8846
Median	0.8853	0.8862	0.8862	0.8863
COD	21.5490	22.4051	21.6607	20.9181
COV	28.3180	29.0248	27.6491	26.4636
PRD- Price-Related or Factor Differential	1.2214	1.1463	1.1359	0.9396

In general, the mean is the preferred measure if your sample is symmetrical and the median is preferred if your sample is skewed or includes outliers. The COD is based on the median and the COV is based on the mean.

Beyond the above sales there were a number of sales that were included in early sales reports and counts of possible qualified market sales that were not included in the analysis set due to legitimate questions not being able to be resolved by the time that the study was done. This would include things such as unresolved questions as to whether a sale was a market sale or not, questions as to the accuracy of the sales price, lack of information as to the value of personal property included in the sale and other questions. It is normal for the sales validation information to be refined during the analysis process. A ratio study done on these excluded sales shows a mean and median ratio virtually identical to the analysis set. A list of sales (provided by appellant Ken Williamson) and their status as to inclusion in the analysis follows.

For Audit/Review Purposes Only

This is a summary of a review of a list of sales provided by appellant Ken Williamson.

This summary reviews whether or not these sales were included as a qualified market sale in the AY2021 Analysis.

In cases where the sale was excluded the reason is indicated.

sale date	parcel number	address	Inclusion/Exclusion	Reason
9/7/2017	1C020K01E220	Aurora Harbor	not included	boat house- Question on price & what sold
9/7/2017	1C020K01E230	Aurora Harbor	not included	boat house- Question on price & what sold
6/23/2020	1C020K01E300	1435 Harbor Way	not included	boat house; excluded as an outlier
7/25/2018	1C020K01G200	1435 HARBOR WAY	Included In Separate Study	boat house
6/28/2019	1C020K01G280	1435 HARBOR WAY	Included In Separate Study	boat house
2/28/2019	1C020K01G290	1435 HARBOR WAY	Included In Separate Study	boat house
1/30/2017	1c030c280080	712 W 12th	not included	questionable data source sp and mtg same
9/23/2016	1C060C000080	3610 Diston	not included	questionable data source reonomy?
10/9/2020	1C060K010031	0 EGAN DR	Included	
10/30/2020	1C060K660110	711 W WILLOUGHBY AVE	Included	
12/15/2016	1C060U040040	800 GLACIER AVE	Included	
7/20/2018	1C060U050022	1108 F ST	not included	multi parcel sale/ not contiguous/ multiple sale price references
3/30/2016	1C070A030040	100 N FRANKLIN ST	Included	
12/9/2020	1C070A050001	230 SEWARD ST	Included	
11/2/2018	1C070B0J0020	195 S FRANKLIN ST	Included	
7/1/2019	1C070B0N0011	259 S FRANKLIN ST	Included	
12/31/2019	1c070k810090	170 S Franklin	not included	multi parcel sale outside of standards for inclusion
1/9/2018	1C100I070050	549 S Franklin	not included	multi parcel sale/ not enough data/ easement questions
3/10/2020	1C110K120051	0 Eastaugh W ay	Included	
3/16/2017	1C110K120101	170 MILL ST	Included	
10/2/2019	1C110K120120	0 MILL ST	Included	
10/25/2019	1C110K120130	190 MILL ST	Included	
3/10/2020	1C110K120140	0 MILL ST	Included	
4/1/2019	1C110K120150	0 MILL ST	Included	
11/13/2020	1D060L030011	201 CORDOVA ST	Included	
10/12/2017	3B1501020030	1669 CREST ST	Included	
11/30/2018	3B1501040120	1544 CREST ST	Included	
9/19/2017	4B1601010040	2450 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	
6/13/2017	4B1601050030	2274 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	
7/30/2019	4B1601050160	2276 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	

3/5/2018	4B1601080070	2278 INDUSTRIAL BLVD	Included	
10/29/2018	4B1601090040	Crazy Horse	not included	multi parcel sale/ condo units and land portions
7/31/2017	4B1601120130	2270 BRANDY LN	Included	
11/17/2020	4B1701020020	10011 GLACIER HWY	Included	
2/23/2020	4B1701080020	10012 Crazy Horse	not included	personal property included in sale price; adjustment not determined
2/28/2020	4B1701090056	10009 CRAZY HORSE DR	Included	
12/4/2020	4B1701090218	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	Included	
2/14/2017	4B1701090223	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	Included	
4/24/2017	4B1701090226	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	Included	
1/10/2017	4B1701090228	10011 CRAZY HORSE DR	Included	
6/30/2016	4B1701100146	2789 SHERWOOD LN	Included	
3/1/2016	4B1701100170	10221 GLACIER HWY	Included	
9/20/2017	4B1701103003	2769 SHERWOOD LN	Included	
12/31/2019	4b1701104000	2771 Sherwood ln	not included	personal property included in sale price; adjustment not determined
3/26/2019	4b2801050030	3845 Lee Court	not included	vacant land sale in a residential neighborhood, considered to not be commerical land.
6/29/2018	4B2901020010	10200 MENDENHALL RD	Included	
10/4/2019	5B1201000060	5245 GLACIER HWY	Included	
9/3/2019	5b1201010010	1610 Anka	not included	multi parcel sale, not enough info
8/2/2019	5B1201020100	5452 SHAUNE DR	Included	
4/5/2017	5B1201040052	1721 ANKA ST	Included	
8/2/2016	5B1201060061	5631 GLACIER HWY	Included	
1/18/2017	5b1201060140	5720 Concrete Way	not included	Sale price was in question. Further review identified the correct sales price. The sale will be included in the 2022 analysis with the corrected sale price.
9/24/2020	5B1201060160	5740 CONCRETE WAY	Included	
11/23/2020	5B1201060260	5719 CONCRETE WAY	Included	
9/24/2020	5B1201300110	1783 Anka St	Included	
12/24/2019	5B1201300110	1783 Anka St	Included	
7/21/2017	5B1201330160	2005 ANKA ST	Included	
1/29/2018	5B1201450050	5410 Bent Ct	not included	personal property included in sale price; adjustment not determined; questionable data source
6/3/2016	5B1201450110	1731 RALPH'S W AY	Included	
6/15/2016	5B1501000002	8251 GLACIER HWY	Included	
8/7/2020	5B1501010001	1880 CREST ST	Included	

9/2/2016	5B1501020170	8401 AIRPORT BLVD	Included	
11/16/2018	5B1501040030	8825 MALLARD ST	Included	
12/7/2020	5B15011107E0	2221 JORDAN AVE	Included	
2/10/2016	5B15011107EO	2221 Jordan	Included	
12/22/2017	5B15011109B0	2231 JORDAN AVE	Included	
2/15/2018	5B1601000023	9151 GLACIER HWY	Included	
7/16/2019	5B1601140043	9309 GLACIER HWY	Included	
8/21/2018	5B1601140070	9309 GLACIER HWY	Included	
8/10/2016	5b160144000	3039 Clinton	not included	questionable data source/ reonomy/ Low income senior housing
1/4/2019	5B2401610150	4045 DELTA DR	Included	
1/27/2017	6D0701000020	4755 N Douglas Hiway	not included	not enough info
4/11/2017	7B0901030071	3161 CHANNEL DR	Included	
12/30/2016	7B0901040070	1050 Salmon Creek ln	not included	questionable data source/ "allocated sale price" noted but meaning of the note was unknown/ low income housing

The claim has also been made that our methodology was improper because we did not include sales that we had prices for and should have included, the insinuation being that we were cherry picking sales. See the table below regarding these claims and why they were not included.

Pacific Pier	We received sales data on this sale after the analysis. It will be considered for next year, however, indications are that it was purchased by a tenant which would make it a non-arms-length transaction and likely will not qualify as a market sale.
Emporium (this was already addressed above)	This sale was considered. It was excluded because it was a multi-parcel sale. It is clear that it does not qualify as an economic unit as part of it was sold one year later.
Assembly Building (this was already addressed above)	We did not and still do not have a confirmed sale price for this building. We have heard "street talk" about what it may have been but that does not qualify as a confirmed price.
Miner's Merchantile	This sale is from 09/17/2021 which is well after the 01/01/2021 cut off. It will be considered for next year, however, indications are that it was a non-arms-length transaction and likely will not qualify as a market sale.
Bill Ray Center (this was already addressed above)	We considered this sale. This is a multi-parcel sale with one of the parcels across the street. It does not clearly fit the economic unit definition. There also was questions as to the purchase and sale motivations of the short term property owner.

AY2021 Notes Regarding Spitzfaden, Wold & Geiger Submissions and Testimony

Notes Regarding Spitzfaden Submission and Wold Testimony

Notes Regarding Particular Sales

The Kim Wold letter indicated that some of the sales used in the analysis were not appropriate. We have identified and addressed those sales below.

- 5B1201300110
 - The letter includes a note indicating this sale was a duplicate.
 - Please note that this is not a duplicate.
 - It is a property that sold twice in the 5 year period, often referred to as a paired sale.
- 1C110K150041
 - The letter includes a note indicating this was a related party sale.
 - This is not in our list of sales.
 - The last sale we show in the CAMA system for this parcel is 12/07/2009. This was a related party sale and was not included in our analysis.
 - If he means 1C110K120140 (He has applied sale “numbers” to the list and refers to that number) – to our knowledge JMIS LLC and Bonnell Development LLC are not related but we could research this further. To our knowledge JMIS sold at least 6 parcels in that area to 5 different buyers. That said, removing one sale is not going to change the results of the ratio study and we do the analysis and ratio studies with the best information that we have at the time. It is normal that the sales data continually gets refined. For instance, next year there may be sales from 2020 that we could not use because we did not have sales prices at the time that we got sales prices for subsequent to the AY2021 analysis that will be used in AY2022.
- 5B1201020100
 - The letter includes a note indicating this was a related party sale.
 - The 08/02/2019 sale was included in the market sales. It was subsequently discovered that the seller (Odom Real Estate Partners) and the buyer (Odex Juneau LLC) had similar or overlapping principles. It was marked as a non-market transaction and will not be used for future market analysis.
 - Being that the ratio for this sale was above 1.00 (1.3922, the second highest ratio) removing it will potentially lower the mean and median ratios thus indicating that we are further undervalued.
 - Note that new information or refinements to the sales data does not invalidate a study which was done with the best information available at the time. It is normal that the sales data continually gets refined.
- 1D060L030011
 - The letter includes a note indicating this was a residential sale.
 - This property was marketed as available for commercial purposes.
 - It was purchased for commercial purposes.
 - Being that the ratio for this sale was above 1.00 (1.1059) removing it will potentially lower the mean and median ratios thus indicating that we are further undervalued.

- 1C070B0J0020
 - The letter includes a note indicating this was a related party sale.
 - There were 2 sales for this property.
 - The 09/01/2020 “sale” was recognized as being a transfer to a trust and was not included in the list of market sales.
 - The 11/02/2018 sale was included in the market sales. It was subsequently discovered that the purchaser was a long time tenant of the building. It was removed from the market sales list and will not be used for future market analysis.
 - Being that the ratio for this sale was above 1.00 (1.2033, the fourth highest ratio) removing it will potentially lower the mean and median ratios thus indicating that we are further undervalued.
- 4B1701100146
 - The letter includes a note indicating this was a related party sale. He does not indicate which of the two sales is purportedly a related party sale.
 - There were 2 sales for this property.
 - The sale from 05/25/2016 from Andosh Associates LLC to Cuttingedge Development Inc was not used as we do not have a sales price for this sale.
 - The second sale from 06/30/2016 from Cuttingedge Development Inc to SRA&G LLC was used. We do not have an indication that these parties are related but we can research this further.
 - Again, data refinement is normal and as documented in Addendum B, removing one sale is not usually going to alter the ratios in any significant way.
- 5B2401610150
 - The letter includes a note indicating this property is a residential property
 - It is a 6 Plex, a property type which we generally value with the commercial properties
 - It is an income producing property
- 4B2901020010
 - The letter includes a note indicating that this property is a Residential property
 - It is a RV Park
 - This property is an income producing property
- “3 additional pending sales”- These are only pending and are all after 01/01/2021.
- “Downtown sales closed 03/23/2021”- This sale is after 01/01/2021.

Questions & Answers

- Grandfathered Uses – Do they end with the sale of a property?
 - Not necessarily. The rights to a non-conforming use usually transfer with the sale. If a continued use is not permitted it is often considered a “taking” and the property owner must be compensated.
- Highest & Best Use
 - This is a key principle
 - The four “tests” are physical, legal, financial and maximal
 - While some aspects involve legal definitions or financial comparison the interpretation of all of the factors is often very subjective.
- Is there a set format and cap rate for an income approach?
 - There is no one set format when it comes to income approaches. It is common, when used for property tax assessment purposes, that the following expenses are excluded: property taxes, depreciation, debt service, income taxes, capital improvements, owner business expenses and replacement reserves. Those factors can vary considerably from one investor or property owner to another. Excluding them produces a more consistent model that reflects the market overall. Note that items such as the cap rate need to be developed or calibrated for each specific model structure. Different models may arrive at different NOI amounts, different cap rates, different standard expense percentages, etc. due to what income or expenses are included or excluded.
 - For the income approach our model uses a cap rate of 6% for AY2021. Our research indicated that an appropriate cap rate would have been 5%. Testing that against local sales and market information that we had available, we found that the 5% would bring us to market and that using 6% produced values in line with the 85% to 90% level of valuation that we were achieving with the ratio study and trending.
 - Remember that the cap rate is an inverse number to the value so a higher cap rate results in a lower indicated property value.
- Can a comparable sale be from a different location?
 - Some questions have been asked about Comparables in appraisal and assessed valuation work. First, in utilizing mass appraisal you do not have specifically identified comparables as you would in a classic sales comparison methodology, rather you are looking at all of the sales. That said, there is far more latitude in comparables than is being recognized. Comparable selection is highly subjective and each appraiser will have their own opinion as to which sales are the best comparables. Adjustments are then made to those comparables to “bring them” to the subject’s characteristics. While a residential appraisal for financing, which is the appraisal application that you are probably most familiar with, usually has fairly tight parameters, there actually can be great latitude in the comparable selection. There are many cases where, due to lack of sales, appraisers utilize different types of properties and properties from different neighborhoods, different cities and even different states. The adjustments become even more critical in these cases. Can a property from the valley be utilized in an appraisal for a downtown property? Absolutely, if the appraiser feels that that is the best comparable available. In such a case the locational adjustment would be more critical than if you have a comparable that is only a block away.

An Example

- Consider a scenario- State law and assessment standards indicate that you should assess all classes of property at similar levels. You are setting assessed values for all commercial property types including retail, offices, and warehouses. All non-commercial property types are at market (100%). You have 50+ sales from all commercial types, clustered fairly tightly, showing an overall ratio for all commercial type properties as being 70%. You have 12 sales of retail properties that are not a real tight cluster but showing that you are 70% of market. You have 6 sales of warehouses that are tightly clustered. They also show that you are at 70% of market. You have no office building sales. All of the subgroups that you have sales for have ratios close to the 70%. State law says that you must place a value on all of these properties. What are you going to do with assessed values for retail properties? What are you going to do with warehouse values? What are you going to do with office building values? Are you going to ignore the evidence and leave the values the same or are you going to apply the best correction that you can? Are you going to change some and not others just because there are fewer sales or no sales for that particular type? If so, what is your justification for treating them differently?

Excerpts from October 25, 2021 Letter from Hal Geiger to Robert Spitzfaden

Please see Assessor response to Mr. Geiger's letter.

Geiger Letter	Assessor Response
As of today, here are some of my impressions from the hearings of the appeals before the Board of Equalization that you are handling for commercial property owners. First, let me say that I have no stake in the outcome of this analysis-I own no commercial property and I have not asked for compensation to provide this letter. These are just my personal opinions and not opinions formed as a paid advocate.	Please see Assessor response to Mr. Geiger's letter.
After reviewing the summary report, board training video, and appeal hearings, I still do not fully understand the methods, assumptions, and logic behind the adjustments to the 2021 assessed values commercial properties.	The work we did was based on mass appraisal of real estate.
Almost no explanations have been written down by the assessor's office. There is no written record of the statistical methods that I could find. Statistics have not been clearly labeled and explained, and figures and tables have no accompanying captions and explanations. Indeed, some statistics have only been labeled with cryptic unexplained acronyms. I have tried to find written descriptions of the methods, and I have tried to talk to staff at the assessor's office about these, but I have been unsuccessful.	The report that was reviewed by Mr. Geiger was the first produced by this office in many years. It was a summary report written with the intention to help the taxpayer understand the assessment process, not how to assess property using mass appraisal. We intend on refining and simplifying the language and explanations in the future.
After now hearing staff from the assessor's office testify at the appeal hearings, I believe I have some general understanding of what they did and why they did it. Most importantly, I heard Mr. Michael Dahle state repeatedly that the methods in question are a response to an upward trend the value of commercial real estate in Juneau. I had a look at this hypothesis using the data that I have available. Using the 53 real estate sales values (cited below) that made up the sample that was used to develop the adjustments, I cannot detect such a trend.	Mr. Geiger looked at sale prices rather than ratios to review for a trend. The dataset includes a variety of types and locational influences which is appropriate for analyzing the overall commercial assessments. It is not conducive for how Mr. Geiger was trying to detect a trend.
Finally, I want to stress that I have strong reservations about the representativeness of the sample (again, cited below) that was used to underpin the analysis and reach the conclusion that the assessments should be raised. See more about this in the section on	We used the data that was available to us. As part of the analysis we looked at locational, property characteristic, and property type subgroups and we saw that the ratios in each subgroup tended to be undervalued to similar degree.

Geiger Letter	Assessor Response
While I was at sea this summer bringing up a boat from Tacoma, I was asked for help interpreting the last two pages of assessor's report that does not seem to have a title, date published, and author, although the words "AV 2021 Summary Report- CBJ Commercial Property Valuations" appear at the top of the first page. My ability to comment was somewhat limited by the fact I was at sea, but my first response was that I had no idea what these various statistics mean, as, again, there were no written methods, there was inadequate labeling of the statistics and graphics, and some of the statistics were referred to by confusing acronyms that were not defined. The person who asked my advice then provided me a video of Board of Equalization training in hopes that this would allow me to understand the methods. I was able to watch that video when we were in port and had internet access. Unfortunately, that video also did not provide a clear and detailed explanation of the methods.	The report was the first produced by this office in many years. It was a summary report written with the intention to help the taxpayer understand the process, not how to assess property using mass appraisal. We intend on refining and simplifying the language and explanations in the future.
Without some explanation of the statistical methods, without some clear description of what the statistics are and what they mean, without an explanation of what the graphics and tables mean, the new assessments are essentially just random numbers to a taxpayer trying to make sense of why the taxes went up. Without some ability to follow the logic and understand the process, a taxpayer cannot tell the difference between an assessment increase due to a fair and equitable process versus an increase due to vindictiveness, personal animus, or just whimsy.	The report was the first produced by this office in many years. It was a summary report written with the intention to help the taxpayer understand the process, not how to assess property using mass appraisal. We intend on refining and simplifying the language and explanations in the future. No assessments are done out of vindictiveness, personal animus, or whimsy. Tax payers should feel free to discuss their assessment with the assessor to gain understanding

Geiger Letter	Assessor Response
When I returned to Juneau, I contacted Michael Dahle's office several times to try to better understand the reasoning behind the new assessments. On some occasions, but not all occasions, I noted the date and time of the communication. On August 17, I left a voicemail describing what I wanted to discuss with Mr. Dahle. At 4:00 pm on that same day I called again and this time I spoke to a person who said she would have Michael Dahle call me. On August 18, at 2:18 pm I called again and spoke to someone named Jillian Olson. I explained what that I would like to go over the methods and she said that she would have Mr. Dahle give me a call. At 2:46 pm that same day I received an e-mail from Ms. Olson. In it she noted that I had not filed an appeal, and she stated that Mr. Dahle was too busy to talk to me. However, late in the day, on August 20th, I believe it was, Mr. Dahle did call me. I pointed out that I was driving, and that I was about to go into a meeting, and I asked if we could speak on the phone the following Monday. He said that he would give me a call on that day. When I did not hear from him on that Monday, I called near the end of the day. I could not reach him, and I left another message. I never detected any further attempt by Mr. Dahle to contact me.	We were and continue to be very busy trying to resolve appeals. While attempts were made to communicate with Mr. Geiger, responding to appellants and resolving appeals has been our main goal and top priority.
You supplied me with a spreadsheet titled "sept 30 sale list.xlsx." This appears to be the exact information I also have on a paper page with the words "A Y2021 Analysis Sales List" in the upper left-hand corner. I note this page has the notation "A Y2021 - Com Sales List20210928a. MktData: 9/29/2021 @ 12:59 PM, Page1" at the bottom of the page. If we were to accept for the moment that this sample is a representative of all commercial properties in Juneau, which I believe is a questionable assumption-but one that does appear to be a necessary for the assessor's analysis-then an annual trend in sales prices should be obvious in this sample of 53 sales, as it contains sales from 2016 through the end of 2020. I note that the median sale price in 2016 was \$786 thousand, in 2017 it was \$346 thousand, in 2018 it was \$418 thousand, in 2019 it was \$402 thousand, and in 2020 it was \$654 thousand. For there to be an upward trend in sale prices, the annual median sale price should tend to move upward year after year-maybe not every year, but at least in most years.	Mr. Geiger looked at sale prices rather than ratios to review for a trend. The dataset includes a variety of types and locational influences which is appropriate for analyzing the overall commercial assessments. It is not conducive for how Mr. Geiger was trying to detect a trend.

Geiger Letter	Assessor Response
Note that there are four occurrences in which we can see a year-to-year change in this record. From 2016 to 2017 the median decreased (substantially), from 2017 to 2018 it increased slightly, from 2018 to 2019 the median again decreased (slightly), and then from 2019 to 2020 it again increased. During this period the medians twice decreased and twice increased: this is not indicative of an upward trend. Also, note that at the end of the series the median value was lower than at the median value at the beginning of the series. Again, this supports the notion there was no upward trend.	Mr. Geiger looked at sale prices rather than ratios to review for a trend. The dataset includes a variety of types and locational influences which is appropriate for analyzing the overall commercial assessments. It is not conducive for how Mr. Geiger was trying to detect a trend.
Let's try looking at all of the sales in a series. If we plot all of the sales one after another in time order we find that there are two outliers that dominate the graph (a \$4 million sale in 2017 and a \$20 million sale in 2020).	By IAAO standards these sales are not identified as outliers. They were the highest sale prices in the list but that does not make them outliers.
So conventional methods for estimating trend are unsuitable because these methods will be very influenced by outliers. However, if there is a trend in the whole sales series, then we would expect the number of times a sale price is followed by a sale of larger size to occur more often than what you would get by chance. In other words, if we think having a sale followed by a sale of larger size as like getting a "heads" when we flip a coin, and a "tails" otherwise, then we can use probability to test whether we have more sales followed by higher priced sales than we would expect to see by chance in 53-1 flips of a coin. It turns out there 24 occurrences of a sale is followed by a sale of larger size-very, very close to half of the time. If we were to formalize this into a statistical test we would say that there is no statistically detectable trend (at the conventional significance level of 0.05) using this method.	Mr. Geiger looked at sale prices rather than ratios to review for a trend. The dataset includes a variety of types and locational influences which is appropriate for analyzing the overall commercial assessments. It is not conducive for how Mr. Geiger was trying to detect a trend.
Let's look at this another way. If we divide the series into two groups, with the first 26 sales in the first half, the last 26 in the second half, with the 27th sale deleted so that we have the same number sales in both the early and late groups. It turns out the median price is just about the same in both groups. Indeed, the median price is slightly higher in the earlier group, but not by very much. If anything, this analysis provides very weak support for the idea prices went down. Again, I just don't see support for the idea there was an upward--or really any--trend in prices.	Mr. Geiger looked at sale prices rather than ratios to review for a trend. The dataset includes a variety of types and locational influences which is appropriate for analyzing the overall commercial assessments. It is not conducive for how Mr. Geiger was trying to detect a trend.

Geiger Letter	Assessor Response
I assume that the assessor's office has information that I don't have access to, and maybe some of that information contains evidence of a trend. However, they have not yet presented any evidence that supports the hypothesis that there was an upward trend in sale prices that I have seen in the Board of Equalization hearings.	Mr. Geiger looked at sale prices rather than ratios to review for a trend. The dataset includes a variety of types and locational influences which is appropriate for analyzing the overall commercial assessments. It is not conducive for how Mr. Geiger was trying to detect a trend.
Or if the assessor's office has presented this evidence, it was not presented clearly and it was not well explained. Indeed, this has been a huge problem with trying to understand the whole analysis. Again, almost no explanations have been written down. Statistics have not been clearly labeled and explained, and figures and tables have no accompanying captions and explanations.	The report was the first produced by this office in many years. It was a summary report written with the intention to help the taxpayer understand the process, not how to assess property using mass appraisal. We intend on refining and simplifying the language and explanations in the future.
If the assessor's office does have other evidence that sales prices trended upwards, then this might be highly noteworthy, and certainly relevant to the question of whether this sample of 53 sales is representative of the larger population of commercial properties. I note that this assumption that sale prices have been trending upwards is central to the logic of how the assessments were adjusted upward in 2021 and it is certainly central to the whole idea that there needed to be an adjustment at all.	When looked at as ratios a trend is detected. We used the data that was available to us. As part of the analysis we looked at locational, property characteristic, and property type subgroups and we saw that the ratios in each subgroup tended to be undervalued to similar degree.
The idea you can just take a small sample and use that to represent some kind of larger population is based on the idea that the sample is <i>representative</i> of the population, in some sense. The field of scientific sampling has been developing for over 100 years, and we rely on these methods for many useful things in our lives. Your doctor does not have to drain all the blood out of your body to know your blood cholesterol level. Small blood samples have been repeatedly tested and shown by evidence to be adequate for the purpose by professional associations of clinical pathologists. Sampling for quality control in manufacturing process saves enormous amounts of money and ensures the safety of drugs, foods, air transportation, and on and on.	When looked at as ratios a trend is detected. The sample size and the steps in the analysis were typical of what assessor offices in small jurisdictions deal with every year. It is part of our considerations in the analysis process.

Geiger Letter	Assessor Response
However, it should be obvious that not just any sample will capture the essential characteristics of the entire population under study. A sample of 100 people at a single political party's convention would not be suitable to make an accurate prediction about the outcome of an election with candidates from more than one party. A sample of 50 people at a sexually transmitted disease clinic would not be a good sample to use to estimate the incidence of syphilis in some larger population of people in a city. There is a well-developed theory about how to sample. Central to this theory is the idea of a <i>random sample</i>. With random sampling, the sample size controls what is called the <i>precision-which</i> is a mathematical description of how well, in some sense, the sample matches the population. I want to emphasize that here <i>random sample</i> is a term of art, and it does not mean what it means in common, colloquial speech. A <i>random sample</i>, in the scientific sense, is a sample that can be shown mathematically to be representative of the population for many purposes if the sample size is large enough.	When looked at as ratios a trend is detected. The sample size and the steps in the analysis were typical of what assessor offices in small jurisdictions deal with every year. It is part of our considerations in the analysis process.
If you will let me get a little technical, to produce a random sample of size n, the first requirement is that someone be able to carefully define what the population is and what it is not, so that someone else could know for sure if a sampling unit is either in or is outside the population. For example, if we are sampling land use with a satellite image, the population might be a set of one-kilometers square rectangles with some vegetation on them in Wisconsin. Then, for example, we will know that a specific farm in Minnesota or parts of Lake Mendota are not in the population. The next step is to uniquely label each of the N things in that make up the population. Then someone, at least in principle, will need to take those labels to produce a list of every possible combination of n labels taken out of the population of N labels. So, this list of combinations-that is, list of possible samples-would be very long. Finally, the last step would be to choose one of those combinations of n labels by a process that is really random, in the mathematical sense of the word. Often something other than a random sample is simply assumed to be a random sample. Sometimes this is appropriate and other times not.	In the context of the mass appraisal process, this example is not relevant and not applicable to the mass appraisal of real estate.

Geiger Letter	Assessor Response
From some of the things Mr. Dahle has said in testimony I infer that he is treating the sample of 53 sales as both a representative sample, and more restrictively as a random sample from some kind of hypothetical population that has yet to be described, at least to me.	The population is all commercial properties in Juneau. The sample is not random. It is composed of commercial property sales. It is the best representation available.
Obviously, a sample might not be representative of a larger population if too few sampling units from the population were included in the sample. If you take a coin that comes up "heads" with the same frequency as "tails," and you flip it 4 times, you don't necessarily get half heads and half tails. In fact, with just four tosses most of the time you won't get half heads and half tails.	See below.
However, if you flip it 40,000 times you will get almost exactly half of the coin tosses to come up "heads." I think there are very good reasons to suspect that this of sample 53 commercial properties is far too small for the intended purpose. I also suspect that it is highly non-representative of all commercial properties because the sales look like they might be clustered in locations where property sold for one reason or another.	We used the data that was available to us. As part of the analysis we looked at locational, property characteristic, and property type subgroups and we saw that the ratios in each subgroup tended to be undervalued to similar degree. The sales data is the best representation available.
I heard Mr. Dahle tell the Board of Equalization that what he calls the C.O.V., or what is usually called the coefficient of variation, is a measure of the "confidence" in the analysis. That is true for a random sample, but that would certainly not be true if one was using a highly non-representative sample from a population. Again, a somewhat related problem is that I have never heard the assessor's office exactly define the population they are sampling. So, it is impossible to know if a sample is representative of the population if one cannot understand what is in the population and what is not.	The population is commercial properties. The sample is representative.
Though I am not an expert in real estate, even I understand that commercial properties on Thane Road have different forces shaping their value those in the tourist-affected downtown, the downtown business area, the hospital-Twin Lakes area, the Costco-Lemon Creek area, and so on. This adds to my suspicion that a small sample of 53 sales cannot really be even marginally representative of all commercial properties in Juneau. I have not done it, but you might want to carefully look for spatial clustering in the sample of 53 sales. Such clustering would be strong evidence that the sample is not representative.	Differences, such as location, were considered in the underlying model. Values were trended based on the sales ratio study. As part of the analysis we looked at locational, property characteristic, and property type subgroups and we saw that the ratios in each subgroup tended to be undervalued to similar degree.

Geiger Letter	Assessor Response
After I heard Mr. Dahle's training session for the Board of Equalization, I inferred from what I thought I heard him say, that he-perhaps well-meaningly-deleted observations that he thought were not representative of some hypothetical population that he was thinking of. I attempted to contact Mr. Dahle last summer to clear this up, as I mentioned elsewhere, above. I have now heard Mr. Dahle testify that he did not do that. If observations were what is colloquially called "cherry picked" to support this analysis, this would certainly disqualify this analysis from being anything that could be considered a valid statistical analysis. Now that I have heard Mr. Dahle testify that he did not do this, I am somewhat comforted. However, as a matter of due diligence you might want to try and calculate some of the ratios of the 74 sales that were not included in the analysis to ensure that these don't disproportionately have high ratios of assessed value to adjusted sales values.	The validation of sales was conducted within assessment standards. The reasons that some of the sales from this list were excluded from the ratio study are outlined in the packet in Addendum B. The answer to the due diligence question is also previously outlined in Addendum B. At no time were sales excluded from the study because of their ratio.
To be clear, the idea of choosing data points to delete based on professional judgement, or personal opinion, or to get a more favorable result-which leads to invalid inference-is completely different from deleting points because of a procedure or policy established well ahead of time to ensure outliers don't have undue influence on the analysis. I infer from what Mr. Dahle has said that the assessor's office does have some kind of procedures and set of rules for classifying data points as outliers-and want to be clear that I am definitely not trying to criticize that practice.	In the ratio study we identify outliers utilizing IAAO guidelines on standard and extreme outliers. In this application, professional judgement is, the best way to describe a necessary part of the sales validation process. The reasons that some of the sales from this list were excluded are outlined in the packet in Addendum B. In the main dataset there were no sales that qualified as outliers.
I have worked professionally in scientific sampling, statistics, and biostatistics since 1980, when I was hired as a mathematical statistician by the United States Government. In 1982 I moved to Juneau to work as a biometrician (the word the State of Alaska uses for someone with expertise in statistics and biomathematics) with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and in the 1990s I served as Chief Biometrician for the Division of Commercial Fisheries. From 2007 until 2020 I operated biostatistical consulting firm in Juneau. I have a master's degree in statistics from Oregon State University and PhD from the College of Fisheries and Oceans at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. I have published papers on scientific sampling and statistics in the peer-reviewed scientific literature, and I have served two terms as president of the Alaska chapter of the American Statistical Association. My C.V. is available on request.	We acknowledge that Mr. Geiger may be an expert in his field. However, his expertise does not relate to mass appraisal or the assessment process.

Geiger Letter	Assessor Response
As I said, I have no opinion as to whether commercial property assessed values should go up or go down, and I have no stake in the outcome of the appeals. However, I am interested this process just as an example of a very public and important use of statistical methods in my community. I certainly have tried to appreciate the enormity of the charge that the assessor's office has been given, and I certainly have tried to appreciate that in order to be effective in their very necessary and important work they will definitely make some people very unhappy.	
Further, I appreciate that it is completely impossible for the assessor's office to perfectly develop assessments in such a way that there can be no room for any criticism. But with all that said, I am struck by the lack of strong evidence that there has been an upward trend in commercial property sales values-the idea that in central to the logic that the assessments needed to be raised.	We have met with Mr. Geiger and remain open to discussing this with any taxpayer to explain their valuation.