Minutes
Board of Assessor's Meeting
April 8, 2010

Members Present: Eugene Reed and John McSorley.
Member Absent (Excused): Jason Neuman
Others: Lionel MacEachern from NHDRA, Mark Nieder from Commerford, Nieder, Perkins, LLC and Heidi Seaverns.

10:00 AM Chairman McSorley called the meeting to order and turned the meeting over to Lionel MacEachern. Mr. MacEachern thanked the Board members for the opportunity to meet with them. He explained that the first part of the meeting would be a pre-valuation meeting and he would be reviewing the update contact with the Board & Mr. Nieder. Mr. MacEachern noted that since the due date for the update was October 1, 2010, the Town would need to file an MS-1 extension. Ms. Seaverns stated the Town would be filing an extension as soon as it was available. Mr. MacEachern asked if the list of personnel assigned to the job had been finalized (Section 2.3.3 of Contract). Mr. Nieder stated the list had not been finalized. He went on to say that he and Ms. Gilpatrick would be working on the job as well as 1 or 2 other supervisors. Mr. MacEachern asked if an email request was sufficient to request preliminary values from CNP (Section 2.5.2 of Contract). Mr. Nieder stated that an email request was sufficient. Mr. MacEachern reminded Mr. Nieder that monthly progress reports should be provided to both the Town and DRA (Section 2.6.1.2 of Contract). Mr. MacEachern asked if Mr. Nieder would be using Marshall & Swift to determine unit costs (Sections 3.1.1 & 3.1.2 of Contract). He also asked if CNP would be sending letters to local builders to help to determine unit costs. Mr. Nieder stated he would be using Marshall & Swift and letters sent to builders usually don't get a very good response. Next item to be discussed was the Manual (Section 2.3.3 of Contract). Mr. MacEachern stated that the contract should reference the most recent USPAP standard, not 2005 (Section 3.2.1 of Contract). He also stated that it was a requirement that DRA receive a copy of the Manual. Mr. MacEachern asked who would be performing the sales analysis . Mr. Nieder stated he and another supervisor would be validating sales & performing the analysis. He also indicated that he would most likely be changing the way vacant land value was calculated in the system. Informal hearings, which will be held in September, were briefly discussed (Section 3.5 of Contract). Mr. MacEachern asked who would be setting utility values (Section 7 of Contract). Mr. Nieder indicated he would probably start from scratch for the utilities. He suggested that the Board send a letter, which he will provide, asking for an inventory of property owned by the utility in Nottingham. There was a brief discussion about the BTLA appeal by NHEC. Mr. MacEachern asked if the performance bond was been in place(Section 9.1 of Contract). . Ms. Seaverns stated that the execution of the contract had just been completed and she was under the assumption that the bond process has been started. Mr. MacEachern asked if Mr. Nieder had any idea when preliminary values would be ready. Mr. Nieder answered that at this time he did not know when they would be ready. He went on to explain that as the project progresses; he would have an idea of when the preliminary values will be ready. Mr. MacEachern asked if Mr. Nieder typically used sales questionnaires. Mr. Nieder said he does not use them usually; they would come from the Town. Mr. Reed asked what time period would be used for the sales analysis. It was stated that sales from April 1, 2008 through now would be used. Mr. MacEachern concluded this portion of the meeting by stating that DRA would keep involved in this process and provide additional oversight to the project for the Town. Both the Board members and Mr. MacEachern thanked Mr. Nieder for his time. Mr. Nieder then left the meeting.

Mr. MacEachern began the assessment review portion of the meeting by handing out Assessment Review 2010 Information Packets to the Board members and Ms. Seaverns (available in Town Office for review). This packet contains general procedures for Pre-Assessment review meetings, a chart that shows the guidelines for assessment review, Assessing Standards Board (ASB) Assessment review guidelines glossary, State laws pertaining to assessments & assessment review, Current Use Board (CUB) rules on assessment of open space land, and BTLA decisions that pertain to current use (Marlow) and policy not to assess certain taxable property (Stoddard). Mr. MacEachern stated he would need a set of tax maps. Ms. Seaverns stated that would not be a problem. Mr. MacEachern referred to the Assessment Review Guidelines Chart. He stated sections A (Level & Uniformity of Assessments) & E (Proportionality) have to do with the 2010 Equalized Ratio Study so these sections would not be completed until January through March of 2011. Section B (Assessing Practices) has to do with the availability of records to the public, the property record cards reflecting correct value, program in place to update property record cards as changes are made (building permits, etc.), review of Current use properties to insure all documentation is in place that is required by law and that properties are reviewed at least once every 5 years (85% accuracy for random selection) and that appraisal contracts are submitted to DRA with a personnel list. Section C (Exemptions & Credits) states that all exemptions and credits are reviewed once every 5 years to ensure taxpayer still qualifies, and that forms are on file for any religious, charitable or educational exemptions. The random sample for credits & exemptions must have a 95% accuracy rate. Section D (Data Accuracy) deals with the property record cards. Again, a random sample will be chosen and that sample must have an 80% rate of cards free from material errors. A material error is considered 7 ½ % inaccuracies in the improvements or a total of 5% for land and improvements. These percentages are of value. The cards are also verified as to the accuracy of the data elements (measurements of the buildings, etc.). If there are any cards with more than 5 discrepancies, the card is referred to the ASB. In all cases of discrepancies, the contactor is given an opportunity to respond to DRA before action is taken. Section F (USPAP Compliant Manual) requires that DRA review the current Manual against the USPAP DRA compliant checklist. Ms. Seaverns asked if Mr. MacEachern knew when he would be in to review the items discussed prior. Mr. MacEachern thought review would take place in the August 2010/September 2010 timeframe. Mr. Reed asked about how the confidence level is measured (under Section E). Chair McSorley explained that it is a statistical calculation but the simple way to explain it is that with a small amount of sales, the confidence level is wider than with a large amount of sales. Mr. MacEachern thanked the Board for their time. The members thanked Mr. MacEachern for his time and information.

Having no further business,
11:10 AM **Motion** McSorley, second Reed to adjourn.
Vote: 2-0 in favor.

Respectfully Submitted,

Heidi Seaverns

Approved as written
6/1/2010