Bill as Introduced

SB 54-FN-LOCAL – AS INTRODUCED

2003 SESSION

03-0473
10/09

SENATE BILL ***54-FN-LOCAL***

AN ACT relative to the implementation of town or city property revaluations.

SPONSORS: Sen. Boyce, Dist 4

COMMITTEE: Public Affairs

ANALYSIS

This bill provides that reappraisals of property by a town or city shall not be implemented within 6 months of the date of final tax bills.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

SB 54-FN-LOCAL – AS INTRODUCED

03-0473
10/09

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Three

AN ACT relative to the implementation of town or city property revaluations.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 New Section; Property Reassessments; Date of Implementation. Amend RSA 75 by inserting after section 8-a the following new section:

75:8-b Implementation of Assessments. A reappraisal of real estate in a city or town for the assessment of property taxes shall not be implemented in a tax year if the reappraisal and reassessment was not completed and certified under RSA 21-J:11-a at least 180 days before the date of the final tax bill as defined in RSA 76:1-a, I.

2 Board of Tax and Land Appeals; Effect of Reassessment. Amend RSA 71-B:19 to read as follows:

71-B:19 Effect. Any such assessment or reassessment if satisfactory to the board shall when completed be returned to the clerk of the city or town, and shall be treated as an original assessment and the selectmen or assessors shall assess the taxes on the property accordingly. If it is advisable or necessary for the commissioner of revenue administration to make such assessment or reassessment it shall when completed be returned to the clerk of such city or town and, ***provided the reassessment complies with RSA 75:8-b,*** shall be treated as an original assessment and the selectmen or assessors shall assess the taxes on the property accordingly. The tax collector shall have the same power to enforce payment of the tax, interest and penalties as though such assessment or reassessment were imposed on April 1. The lien provided in RSA 80:19 shall take effect on that portion of the property supplementally assessed for a period of 18 months following the actual time of the supplemental assessment.

3 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

LBAO
03-0473
1/17/03

SB 54-FN-LOCAL - FISCAL NOTE

AN ACT relative to the implementation of town or city property revaluations.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The Department of Revenue Administration, New Hampshire Municipal Association, and Board of Tax & Land Appeals state this bill will increase state, county, and local expenditures by an indeterminable amount in FY 2004 and each year thereafter. There will be no fiscal impact on state, county, and local revenue.

METHODOLOGY:

The Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) states this bill would impact municipalities' contracts for reappraisals. Currently, contracts for reappraisals typically run up to 30 to 60 days before final tax billings, and moving their time frames up four to five months will most likely increase their costs. In addition, this bill would increase local costs for updating values for certification if implementation of a completed reappraisal was delayed a year.

The New Hampshire Municipal Association states final tax bills are usually sent out in November, and new property values would need to be certified the preceding May, which would not be possible under DRA's certification process. As a result, the use of the new certified values would be delayed until the following year, making them a year out of date. There may be a cost to municipalities from the inability to use the most current values, particularly if the "old" values are no longer accurate and are challenged by taxpayers using evidence of more current but uncertified values. It is not clear how property revaluations occurring in non-certification years (outside of DRA's four-year certification cycle), as well as partial revaluations are to be treated. While the value of property, as it existed on April 1st is the standard, it is generally not possible to have those values finalized six months before the final bill. It is likely that a six month completion and certification requirement would increase costs in that municipalities would have to have additional staff to re-value their properties in a shorter time frame.

The Board of Tax & Land Appeals (BTLA) states because the proposed bill would require DRA certification of the new values before tax bills are sent out, implementation of new values as a result of an reappraisal could not occur until May or June after the effective year of the

reappraisal. Such a delay would require municipalities to review the market and update the re-appraised values for implementation in the subsequent year, thus incurring additional costs on the part of municipalities and some counties (RSA 81 requires county commissioners to assess unincorporated towns and unorganized places). Additional state expenditures would likely occur due to longer and delayed oversight by the Board on RSA 71-B:16 ordered reassessments, and by DRA on their monitoring and re-certification responsibilities. Assuming the reappraisals will correspond with DRA's RSA 21-J:11-b certification schedule, the following number of parcels will be re-appraised each year, and subject to update the following year:

Years	Municipal Parcels	County Parcels
2003-2004	157,757	0
2004-2005	152,539	0
2005-2006	182,921	1,700
2006-2007	151,908	0

Subsequent year value updates using existing physical data is estimated at $10 per parcel. There will also be additional oversight costs for BTLA, as well as monitoring and certification costs for DRA that are indeterminable at this time. Fiscal year value updates are estimated as follows:

Fiscal Year	Municipal Costs	County Costs
2004	$1,577,570	$ 0
2005	$1,525,390	$ 0
2006	$1,829,210	$17,000
2007	$1,519,080	$ 0

Amendments

Sen. Green, Dist. 6
March 13, 2003
2003-0706s
10/04

Amendment to SB 54-FN-LOCAL

Amend the title of the bill by replacing it with the following:

AN ACT relative to the local inventory of property values for assessment of property taxes.

Amend the bill by replacing all after the enacting clause with the following:

1 Department of Revenue Administration; Equalization Procedure. Amend the introductory paragraph of RSA 21-J:9-a to read as follows:

The following procedures shall apply in determining the equalization of property within the cities, towns, and unincorporated places as required by RSA 21-J:3, XIII, ***but shall not affect a municipality's requirements for inventory of property and assessment of taxes as of April 1***:

2 Inventory of Property; September 1 Deadline; Penalty Added. Amend RSA 21-J:34 to read as follows:

I. A report filed by the governing body of each city, town, unincorporated town, and unorganized place, shall certify the number of residents and total valuation of each class of property included in the inventory of residents and ratable estates. This report shall be filed by September 1 of each year[~~, unless this filing date is extended by the commissioner for just cause~~]. ***Municipalities which fail to timely file the report required by this paragraph due to willful neglect or intentional disregard of laws or rules and not reasonable cause shall pay a penalty to the state in the amount of $100 for each day that the report is not timely filed. Within 30 days after the imposition of the penalty by the commissioner, officials of the city, town, or unincorporated place upon which the penalty was imposed may appeal by written application to the board of tax and land appeals or the superior court in the county in which the city, town, or unincorporated place is located. The board of tax and land appeals or the superior court, as the case may be, shall determine de novo the correctness of the commissioner's actions.***

3 Property Taxation; Annual List. Amend RSA 74:1 to read as follows:

74:1 Annual List. The selectmen of each town shall annually, in April, make a list of all the polls ***and the total assessed property value,*** and ***shall*** take an inventory of all the estate liable to be taxed in such town on the first day of that month.

4 Revised Inventory; Date Clarified. Amend RSA 75:8, I to read as follows:

I. Annually ***by the first day of the local property tax year***, and in accordance with state assessing standards, the assessors and selectmen shall adjust assessments to reflect changes so that all assessments are reasonably proportional within that municipality. All adjusted assessments ***as of the first day of the local property tax year*** shall be included in the inventory of that municipality and shall be sworn to in accordance with RSA 75:7.

5 Property Tax Inventory List. Amend RSA 76:10 to read as follows:

76:10 Selectmen's Lists and Warrant. A list of all property taxes by them assessed ***as of April 1, or as otherwise permitted by statute,*** shall be made by the selectmen under their hands, with a warrant under their hands and seal. The list shall be directed to the collector of such town, requiring [~~him~~] ***the collector*** to collect the same, and to pay to the town treasurer such sums and at such times as may be therein prescribed. The selectmen shall assess such taxes to the owner as of April 1, or to the current owner, if known. The selectmen of a town or the board of assessors of a city may round off to the nearest dollar the total tax due on each parcel appearing on the list.

6 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

2003-0706s

AMENDED ANALYSIS

This bill requires local tax officials to assess and collect property taxes on property valued as of April 1, unless otherwise permitted.

Public Affairs
March 19, 2003
2003-0863s
10/01

Amendment to SB 54-FN-LOCAL

Amend the title of the bill by replacing it with the following:

AN ACT relative to the local inventory of property values for assessment of property taxes.

Amend the bill by replacing all after the enacting clause with the following:

1 Department of Revenue Administration; Equalization Procedure. Amend the introductory paragraph of RSA 21-J:9-a to read as follows:

The following procedures shall apply in determining the equalization of property within the cities, towns, and unincorporated places as required by RSA 21-J:3, XIII, ***but shall not affect a municipality's requirements for inventory of property and assessment of taxes as of April 1***:

2 Inventory of Property; September 1 Deadline; Penalty Added. Amend RSA 21-J:34 to read as follows:

I. A report filed by the governing body of each city, town, unincorporated town, and unorganized place, shall certify the number of residents and total valuation of each class of property included in the inventory of residents and ratable estates. This report shall be filed by September 1 of each year[~~, unless this filing date is extended by the commissioner for just cause~~]. ***Municipalities which fail to timely file the report required by this paragraph due to willful neglect or intentional disregard of laws or rules and not reasonable cause shall pay a penalty to the state in the amount of $100 for each day that the report is not timely filed. Within 30 days after the imposition of the penalty by the commissioner, officials of the city, town, or unincorporated place upon which the penalty was imposed may appeal by written application to the board of tax and land appeals or the superior court in the county in which the city, town, or unincorporated place is located. The board of tax and land appeals or the superior court, as the case may be, shall determine de novo the correctness of the commissioner's actions.***

3 Property Taxation; Annual List. Amend RSA 74:1 to read as follows:

74:1 Annual List. The selectmen of each town shall annually, in April, make a list of all the polls ***and the total assessed property value,*** and ***shall*** take an inventory of all the estate liable to be taxed in such town on the first day of that month.

4 Revised Inventory; Date Clarified. Amend RSA 75:8, I to read as follows:

I. Annually ***by the first day of the local property tax year***, and in accordance with state assessing standards, the assessors and selectmen shall adjust assessments to reflect changes so that all assessments are reasonably proportional within that municipality. All adjusted assessments ***as of the first day of the local property tax year*** shall be included in the inventory of that municipality and shall be sworn to in accordance with RSA 75:7.

5 Property Tax Inventory List. Amend RSA 76:10 to read as follows:

76:10 Selectmen's Lists and Warrant. A list of all property taxes by them assessed ***as of April 1, or as otherwise permitted by statute,*** shall be made by the selectmen under their hands, with a warrant under their hands and seal. The list shall be directed to the collector of such town, requiring [~~him~~] ***the collector*** to collect the same, and to pay to the town treasurer such sums and at such times as may be therein prescribed. The selectmen shall assess such taxes to the owner as of April 1, or to the current owner, if known. The selectmen of a town or the board of assessors of a city may round off to the nearest dollar the total tax due on each parcel appearing on the list.

6 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

2003-0863s

AMENDED ANALYSIS

This bill requires local tax officials to assess and collect property taxes on property valued as of April 1, unless otherwise permitted.

Committee Minutes

Master

Date: February 10. 2003

Time: 9:32 a.m.
Room: 105-A, Senate House

The Senate Committee on Public Affairs held a hearing on the following:

SB 54 relative to the implementation of town or city property revaluations.

Members of Committee present: Senator Roberge
Senator Larsen
Senator Barnes
Senator Green
Senator Morse

The Chair, Senator Sheila Roberge, opened the hearing.

Senator Robert K. Boyce, D. 4: I am Senator Boyce, Dist. 4, and I am the prime sponsor of this bill, and thank you madam chair and members of the committee. This is actually a fairly simple and straightforward bill and it was at the request of a constituent. It simply says that if there is a re-appraisal the taxes based on that reappraisal will not be changed because of that re-appraisal until six months after the date of the appraisal. This is to give people, particularly people, who run businesses and base their costs projections for the future year on what they are going to pay taxes in that future year. In this particular case, my constituent has a campground, sort of setup, that in the fall of each year he sets the rates that he will be charging for the next summer. If in December, he gets a new tax bill based on a reassessment in the town, which he did this year, that tells him that the taxes are going up by a significant amount, which they did this year. His rates for next summer may not really reflect his actual cost for doing business, so this is simply to allow for a time period between when the notice that your taxes are being changed and when they change, it just allows for time period to have that happen, and that being said, I'll take any questions.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Senator Barnes.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: We __(inaudible-noisy)___ on this piece of legislature, Senator Boyce, every time I hear simple, I get nervous.

Senator Robert K. Boyce, D. 4: I try to keep them simple. This is only one page.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: I would like to go to page three.

Senator Robert K. Boyce, D. 4: That's the fiscal note.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: A million and a half-dollars in municipal costs?

Senator Robert K. Boyce, D. 4: I have no idea, how they come up with that unless they, I guess they figure that's it's going to somehow mean that half a year of loss, they won't be able to collect the higher taxes for half a year, I suppose that is what they are looking at.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: I know you were a good conservative in your career in the legislature, and I was wondering...

Senator Robert K. Boyce, D. 4: Well, I actually don't understand exactly that would be a cost to the municipality anyway, because when a municipality determines their budget, and then looks at the tax payers, they apply the budget need across the tax base to get the tax rate for all the tax payers. If that base, is based on an assessment that's today, and they have the need, they get that much money. If the assessment goes up, and they apply it today, they apply it on that, and they get the same amount of money. The taxpayers may see a one and a half million-dollar change, some of them less some of them more, because of this. What this does is that it simply says they can't apply a new reassessment. If they do a whole town wide reassessment, it increases the value of the town by half a billion dollars. Well that half a billion-dollar increase simply will mean that the tax rate won't go down for everybody that first year, it will be six months later that it will go

down. I don't see how there would be any actual costs. I haven't read through their method of figuring out how they did this. Their estimating thing would have to spend dollars to reassess these makes no sense. This doesn't say you have to do any new assessments, this just says if there is a reassessment that they have to wait six months before those rates would change.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Senator Barnes.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: Thank you madam chair. Senator Boyce, do you think you could do some investigation and see how much it's going to cost me as a taxpayer to this tax?

Senator Robert K. Boyce, D. 4: Well, if your town had an reassessment and your property went up by ten percent, property value went up by ten percent, and everybody else in your town also saw a ten percent increase in their property it wouldn't make any difference in your taxes.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: With this piece of legislation.

Senator Robert K. Boyce, D. 4: Right. Now what's happening in some of the towns, particularly those that have waterfront? The towns are saying okay, everybody is buying up the waterfront, so the price of water front property is rising faster than the rest of the town. So they do, I'm not sure what they call it, but it's a partial reassessment. They say, okay, we are just going to look at the waterfront this year and they all went up by forty-five percent. In some cases they went up fifty percent in the actual value of the property so they did a spot reassessment of what's on the lake. They didn't do the whole town. So even though properties up on the hill may have gone up forty percent, they increased the properties on the lake by fifty percents. By applying that immediately, what that does it raises the taxes for the people on lake, and reduces the taxes for people off of the lake, but it doesn't give them any notice. If it was delayed by six months the people in the town would still be paying the slightly higher taxes for another six months, what they are paying today, they wouldn't see the decrease for six months, but the people who are paying more would not have to pay the increase for six months, they would get some advance notice that they will have to find the money.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Further questions for Senator Barnes.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: I hate to be thick Senator, but I still don't understand municipal costs, municipal costs means that the taxpayer I am paying for it, and I would like to know what that...

Senator Robert K. Boyce, D. 4: I would like to find that out, too...

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: Would you do the courtesy and the committee to get us the explanation of that before I vote on this.

Senator Robert K. Boyce, D. 4: I would be happy too.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: If it's going to cost the taxpayers in my town dollars, I want to look at it real closely, I'm kind of conservative when it comes to this kind of this thing.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Any further questions. Thank you.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: Thank you.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Paul Franklin.

Paul Frankin, Chairman of the Board of Tax & Land Appeals:

Morning, madam chairman, members of the committee, my name is Paul Franklin, I am the Chairman of the Board of Tax & Land Appeals. I think I am the fellow that did that fiscal note, so I guess I'll try to answer Senator Barnes question and Senator Boyce's question.

I believe also, the fiscal note was also reviewed by the Department of Revenue Administration. I think from a technical standpoint, our view of the bill and the DRA's, in view of the bill are very similar, if not identical. I can't speak for them, they aren't here, but I sense it is by reading their

explanation. I think the problem is not the problem, the logistical issue that all assessments are taken as of April 1, each year. That is the target date by statute, and so to give you an example, I think where the problem arises, I'll give you in real time. If a town contracts or does a reassessment on their own, they have to do it as of April 1, of the year. Let's choose April 1, 2002, as the target year. Most towns are in the process of having contracts, or private firms and what those firms do is, they review sales that have occurred usually within one to two year period prior to the April 1, date. They are also looking at sales that occurred just after that April 1 date, as they are finalizing the values. So quite often they don't deliver to the town the new assessed values until the summer of 2002, in the example I am giving you. If the implementation of those values had to wait until the Department of Revenue Administration had certified those new values, 180 days after that, that certification, the DRA can correct me if I'm wrong, but my understanding that certification would not occur until May or June of 2003. So the first time they could implement those values that were done for 2002, would be for the tax bills that go out in 2003. The values would be a year old at that time. Perhaps in a stagnant market that would not be not much of an issue, I think you are all aware that hasn't occurred for awhile and it certainly isn't occurring now. The fiscal note was based on the premise that if you did a reassessment or reappraisal for 2002, and you could not be implemented until 2003, because those values were a year old you would have to look at the market anew to update them to meet DRA certification requirements, which my understanding is still be thrashed out through the Assessing Standards Board, and/or DRA Rules. So the fiscal note is based on a calculation of what that update would cost. I estimated $10.00 a parcel. I think that is a conservative estimate. I other words they would still be able to use all the physical listing, all the measurements, etc., they just have to check the market anew and modify the assessments of the market, either they have gone up or gone down. The calculations were based on the number of parcels that might be up for reappraisal each year, and that was tied to DRA Certifications schedule that is being implemented in first year 2003, and those are rough estimates and the number of parcels are being up for certification and thus in theory up for appraisal in that certification year.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Senator Barnes.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: Thank you. You heard Senator Boyce talk about his constituent, is that a common problem out there?

Mr. Franklin: What he brought up is an issue, yes, that is an issue, and I think it is a very legitimate concern.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: How do we address it?

Mr. Franklin: It's a difficult one to address, and I think most towns that I see going through revals tend to try to do a very good job and apprising their taxpayers as to what the impact will be on their tax bill. Towns have a very hard time projecting that, because what is happening is that properties as a whole in town maybe going out at 8, 10, 12 percent a year, but as Senator Boyce referenced, there are areas in town where it's going up at a much faster rate, and areas in town where it is going up at a lesser rate. So towns try to project as to what the average rate of increase in assessment is which is going to be offset by the tax rate going down, but it's those who go up faster than the average who get hit harder and those that go up slower than the average who benefit. That is very hard to project.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Senator Barnes.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: Thank you. I see you signed up as against this piece of legislation; can you suggest something to Senator Boyce and this committee how we can help those people in situations like this one? It sounds like a real problem, having been a businessman in the past, I can understand that you can't do business and charge too little money because in the next year you won't be in business. The cost of doing business is going up, but like this gentlemen Senator Boyce is talking about ___inaudible)____, how can we do something to prevent that from happening. I heard you say it's in the towns hands.

Mr. Franklin: I think that....

The cost of doing business is going up, but like this gentlemen Senator Boyce is talking about ___inaudible)____, how can we do something to prevent that from happening. I heard you say it's in the towns hands.

Mr. Franklin: I think that....

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: I think it's unfair for that to happen to people. I'm sure there is more than just Senator Boyce's constituent out there.

Mr. Franklin: I don't have any magic wand and I think this has been going one for decades, if not centuries when towns do revals, this occurs. I think that towns generally, the ones I see do a good job in trying to project so that be it a private owner who's on a fixed income, that has to try to project how much their taxes are going to go up, people with escrow money or business owners there is always some uncertainty that year of the reval. I could think about it Senator Barnes, but quite honestly, as you know I have been kicking around the tax arena for twenty-five years and I'm not sure I could come up with a magic answer to that other than good public relations, trying to explain the process so that an informed person can make a reasonable estimate as to what their tax impact will be.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Further questions.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: One final question. Have you talked to Senator Boyce's constituent?

Mr. Frankin: I have not.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: Senator Boyce can you get your constituent to talk with this gentlemen?

Senator Robert K. Boyce, D. 4: He wanted to be here today, but he was cardiac testing or something this morning, and he couldn't reschedule that so he did want to...

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: My suggestion is that maybe you could get them together with Paul and see where this conversation goes.

Mr. Franklin: If I could Senator Barnes, I think as you are also aware that there is always the Appeal process, the Abatement Appeal Process which lags six months to a year behind when the tax liability comes out, so there is that if a person is disportionately assessed he should try to get some relief.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Senator Barnes.

Senator John S. Barnes, Jr., D. 17: I understand, but sometimes when you have conversations with somebody it makes things a little bit better then wait six months or a year for getting a new process. I'm a kind of guy that likes to see the constituents taken care of as quickly as possible. Sometimes when I talk to a person like you, and you have been very helpful in the past, meeting with the constituents and they have always, at least understood the situation better after having met.

Mr. Franklin: I'll be happy to do whatever is appropriate. Thank you.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Senator Larsen.

Senator Sylvia B. Larsen, D. 15: Isn't there some issue with a community being aware that property values have changed and then permitting that tax in equity or that tax disparity between evaluation and taxation to continue for six months and don't you in effect transfer, even though you are aware evaluations have changed, you ask the rest of the community to carry the impact of the tax change, say a lake front owners price increases, the evaluation increases, asking the whole town to carry that over, as a kind of a community benefit, to just help him out, isn't there some tax in equity that would occur even though you have had a reval, that you would say, well the whole community will spread this out; even though I understand the problem dramatically shifting property taxes in a year increases, there is some question in my mind in terms of knowing there's inequity and then saying, well, we're going to ignore it for another six months.

Mr. Franklin: Yes, any time that there a show need for a reappraisal and municipality because of disparity between types of properties and neighborhoods and that is delayed that disparity will continue and sometimes be even increased, I think you are entirely right. Thank you.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Bob Boley:

Bob Boley, Director of Committee Services for the Department of Revenue Administration:

Thank you, madam chairman, and members of the committee.
My name is Bob Boley, I am Director of Committee Services for the Department of Revenue Administration and there is not too much I would like to add to what Mr. Franklin has already addressed. He has highlighted the issues that we have with this bill and it would be difficult to implement on a timely basis because of the equal first lien date that is required to be placed on properties. I think the other point that I would like to make, he mentioned that delaying the implementation of the reassessment reevaluation would require that the towns spend additional moneys perhaps $10.00 or more per parcel to update the next year to bring it up to the level that is called for in the Statutes and by the Constitution, in addition though this would be new work that would put perhaps a burden on the appraisal companies that they would not be able to handle that additional work. We have just a limited number of appraisal companies here in New Hampshire, they are all very busy working with towns as they go through reevaluations and prepare for certification and to create a situation where they would be required to come back a second year in a row to do an update would be not only an added expense but possibly something that they physically would not be able to handle. I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Anybody else here who would like to speak? Here and now we will close the hearing on Senate Bill 54. Thank you for coming.

Hearing on Senate Bill 54, closed at 9:48 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Livia Acdan

Livia Acdan
Senate Public Affairs Secretary

Speakers

SENATE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Date: 02/05/03 Time: 9:30 a.m. Public Hearing on 105-A **Bill #54-FN**

Relative to the implementation of town or city property reevaluations.

Please check box(es) that apply.

SPEAKING	FAVOR	OPPOSED	NAME (Please print)	REPRESENTING
✓ ☒	☒ ✓	☐	Sen Lou Boyce	Sponsor
✓ ☒	☐	☒	Paul Franklin	Bd of Tax & Land Appeals
✓ ☐	☐	☒	Bob Bolan	DRA
☐	☐	☒	Judy Silva	NHMA
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		

Committee Report

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SENATE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Date: March 19, 2003

THE COMMITTEE ON Public Affairs

to which was referred Senate Bill 54-FN-L

AN ACT relative to the implementation of town or city property revaluations.

VOTE: 5-0

2003-0863s

Having considered the same, report the same with the following amendment and recommend that the bill: **AS AMENDED OUGHT TO PASS.**

Senator Richard Green
For the Committee

SB54 Docket

Next|Prev|Results List|Main|Bill Status

Bill Title: (New Title) relative to the local inventory of property values for assessment of property taxes.

Date	Body	Description
1/9/2003	S	Introduced and Ref. to Public Affairs; SJ 2, Pg.26
1/24/2003	S	Hearing; February 5, 2003, Room 105-A, SH, 9:30 a.m.; SC6
3/21/2003	S	Committee Report; Ought to Pass with Amendment{0863},(New Title), [03/27/03]; SC15, Pg.12-13
3/27/2003	S	Committee Amendment{0863},(New Title), AA, VV; SJ 10, Pg.188-189
3/27/2003	S	Oght to Pass with Amendment{0863},(New Title), MA, VV; Refer to Finance [Rule 26]; SJ 10, Pg.189
4/4/2003	S	Committee Report; Ought to Pass with Amendment{1099}, [04/10/03]; SC17, Pg.8
4/10/2003	S	Committee Amendment{1099}, AA, VV; SJ 12, Pg.278
4/10/2003	S	Ought to Pass with Amendment{1099}, MA, VV; OT3rdg; SJ 12, Pg.278
4/10/2003	S	Passed by 3rd Reading Resolution; SJ 12, Pg.310
4/10/2003	H	Introduced and ref to Mun & Cnty Govt; HJ 34, p1144
4/16/2003	H	Hearing Apr 23 1:30 RM301,LOB
5/21/2003	H	Maj Report OTP/AM for May 29 (Vote 11-0;CC)
5/21/2003	H	Prop Comm Am{1750}(New Title); HC 43, p1377-1379
5/29/2003	H	Removed from Consent Cal, req Rep Almy; HJ 45, p1448
5/29/2003	H	Comm Am, AA VV; Passed with Am VV; HJ 45, p1474-1476 + 1477
6/5/2003	S	Sen. Roberge Non Concur Requests Commitee of Conference, MA, VV
6/5/2003	S	President Appoints; Senators Boyce, Green, Below
6/5/2003	H	House Acceded to req for Conf Comm, Rep Patten MA VV; HJ 47, p1515
6/5/2003	H	(Spkr appts Reps: Patten, Stohl, Twombly & Theberge)
6/9/2003	S	Committee of Conference Meeting; June 10, Room 105-A, SH, 3:30 p.m.
6/19/2003	H	Conf Comm Report (House Am + New Am{2068}) Filed;

Next|Prev|Results List|Main|Bill Status

Docket Abbreviations