
Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by dailyherald - 2007/08/29 20:30

I agree with Tracy Olsen, Nebo School District business manager, that the district did not receive a tax windfall. But it's obvious that many residential property owners have been assessed much more in taxes this year.

Read more...

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by earljr - 2007/08/30 15:01

The county assessment algorithm is really a crapshoot. I spent a few minutes looking up properties in north Utah County. I had no trouble finding many that were assessed at about half their actual value. A couple properties actually had sold on the MLS a couple years ago (before the big jump in prices) for well over \$100k more than the current assessment. At the same time, mine is assessed at probably a little more than it is worth. If we are going to tax based on property value, then we should value everything far more accurately. At least we should get the easy values right.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by Russ - 2007/08/31 17:28

earljr wrote:

The county assessment algorithm is really a crapshoot. I spent a few minutes looking up properties in north Utah County. I had no trouble finding many that were assessed at about half their actual value. A couple properties actually had sold on the MLS a couple years ago (before the big jump in prices) for well over \$100k more than the current assessment. At the same time, mine is assessed at probably a little more than it is worth. If we are going to tax based on property value, then we should value everything far more accurately. At least we should get the easy values right.

The letter writer, and you, are on the right track. The taxable value should be the last price the property sold for. Then, we wouldn't need some knuckleheaded department assessing property differently for different places, or for some "special" people.

Establish the taxable value this way would establish a constant evaluation, and then we could set the mill levy to what is needed to meet the budget requirement. But then, everyone would know and understand exactly what is going on...much to honest for our system, apparently.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/08/31 23:43

Russ wrote:

earljr wrote:

The county assessment algorithm is really a crapshoot. I spent a few minutes looking up properties in north Utah County. I had no trouble finding many that were assessed at about half their actual value. A couple properties actually had sold on the MLS a couple years ago (before the big jump in prices) for well over \$100k more than the current assessment. At the same time, mine is assessed at probably a little more than it is worth. If we are going to tax based on property value, then we should value everything far more accurately. At least we should get the easy values right.

The letter writer, and you, are on the right track. The taxable value should be the last price the property sold for. Then,

we wouldn't need some knuckleheaded department assessing property differently for different places, or for some "special" people.

Establish the taxable value this way would establish a constant evaluation, and then we could set the mill levy to what is needed to meet the budget requirement. But then, everyone would know and understand exactly what is going on...much to honest for our system, apparently.

This all sounds well and good until you look at what it actually accomplishes. Let's start with a (somewhat) real-world example. I bought my house 7 years ago for \$168000. I have a neighbor down the street who bought his a few years earlier for about \$125000. I have a couple of neighbors across the street who bought earlier this year for around \$350000. Why should my neighbor down the street pay less than any of the rest of us and why should I pay less than my neighbors across the street for homes that are all currently valued in the \$325000 to \$350000 range?

We have a problem with disparity in valuations, but that doesn't mean we should get rid of property taxes based on current valuation. What we need are assessors who are willing to put in the work to find the anomalies on both ends of the valuation spectrum and fix them.

Property owners whose valuations are too high already have a grievance process. I would encourage everyone who thinks their property is valued too high to appeal. The real problem is all the properties that continue to be undervalued for tax purposes. I don't know of anyone who is going to go to the assessor and say, "Hey, I don't think I'm paying enough." With today's technology it should not be too difficult for assessors to root out properties with unusually low valuations and perform live reassessments.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by Russ - 2007/09/01 10:41

dadofone wrote:

Russ wrote:

earljr wrote:

The county assessment algorithm is really a crapshoot. I spent a few minutes looking up properties in north Utah County. I had no trouble finding many that were assessed at about half their actual value. A couple properties actually had sold on the MLS a couple years ago (before the big jump in prices) for well over \$100k more than the current assessment. At the same time, mine is assessed at probably a little more than it is worth. If we are going to tax based on property value, then we should value everything far more accurately. At least we should get the easy values right.

The letter writer, and you, are on the right track. The taxable value should be the last price the property sold for. Then, we wouldn't need some knuckleheaded department assessing property differently for different places, or for some "special" people.

Establish the taxable value this way would establish a constant evaluation, and then we could set the mill levy to what is needed to meet the budget requirement. But then, everyone would know and understand exactly what is going on...much to honest for our system, apparently.

This all sounds well and good until you look at what it actually accomplishes. Let's start with a (somewhat) real-world example. I bought my house 7 years ago for \$168000. I have a neighbor down the street who bought his a few years earlier for about \$125000. I have a couple of neighbors across the street who bought earlier this year for around \$350000. Why should my neighbor down the street pay less than any of the rest of us and why should I pay less than my neighbors across the street for homes that are all currently valued in the \$325000 to \$350000 range?

We have a problem with disparity in valuations, but that doesn't mean we should get rid of property taxes based on current valuation. What we need are assessors who are willing to put in the work to find the anomalies on both ends of the valuation spectrum and fix them.

Property owners whose valuations are too high already have a grievance process. I would encourage everyone who thinks their property is valued too high to appeal. The real problem is all the properties that continue to be undervalued for tax purposes. I don't know of anyone who is going to go to the assessor and say, "Hey, I don't think I'm paying

enough." With today's technology it should not be too difficult for assessors to root out properties with unusually low valuations and perform live reassessments.

I disagree. "Current evaluation" is at best, a speculative number. You can ONLY sell your property for that value IF you can find someone to purchase it at that price. Since you have not, then you are just guessing that you could. Do so, and then, under the plan I suggest, that would then become the new taxable value. Right now, I have a home whose taxable value is about \$30,000 MORE than I can possibly get out of it. I am perfectly willing to sell it to the auditor who set that value - but I am betting that they won't buy it either. Not at that price! Why not be honest?

One of the things that we do is drive people out of their homes by assessing them at a higher price, and ultimately tax them out of their homes if they cannot afford the taxes on the perceived value. Another is that we allow confusion enter into the picture. Instead of the taxing entity getting a vote on a higher mill levy, they can just raise the taxable value of the property in the district. How is that fair? One requires a vote, and the other is no under the table, it is practically unbelievable.

You are bothered by the idea that the neighbor might be paying less in taxes than you. Well, nobody said life was fair. I submit that when buying/selling, that you should consider the future. If you did, then what you suggest would not be a problem. Are you saying that the price that property can actually be sold for is not a legitimate price to tax it on?

I once bought a car for \$300. My son and I pushed it home, and I fixed it. When I went to get it licensed, they wanted taxes on \$3600. I took the risk of being able to fix the car, and very well could have wound up junking it, losing my \$300. I provided a bill of sale, clearly stating the purchase price. NOBODY would have paid \$3600 for the car which would not run. Do you really believe that I should have been taxed for that perceived value? Really? By the way, the market value of the car was about \$2500 in good, running condition.

Why should we pay based on some speculative perceived value. Why not be honest - and fire 99% of the auditors out there? We don't need them...we DO HAVE a real value...the one the property actually sold for.

How do you propose to solve the problem of those retired whom are now on a fixed income, and can no longer afford to let someone else continually reset their taxes, eventually pushing them out onto the street?

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/01 13:49

Russ wrote:

dadofone wrote:

Russ wrote:

earljr wrote:

The county assessment algorithm is really a crapshoot. I spent a few minutes looking up properties in north Utah County. I had no trouble finding many that were assessed at about half their actual value. A couple properties actually had sold on the MLS a couple years ago (before the big jump in prices) for well over \$100k more than the current assessment. At the same time, mine is assessed at probably a little more than it is worth. If we are going to tax based on property value, then we should value everything far more accurately. At least we should get the easy values right.

The letter writer, and you, are on the right track. The taxable value should be the last price the property sold for. Then, we wouldn't need some knuckleheaded department assessing property differently for different places, or for some "special" people.

Establish the taxable value this way would establish a constant evaluation, and then we could set the mill levy to what is needed to meet the budget requirement. But then, everyone would know and understand exactly what is going on...much to honest for our system, apparently.

This all sounds well and good until you look at what it actually accomplishes. Let's start with a (somewhat) real-world example. I bought my house 7 years ago for \$168000. I have a neighbor down the street who bought his a few years earlier for about \$125000. I have a couple of neighbors across the street who bought earlier this year for around

\$350000. Why should my neighbor down the street pay less than any of the rest of us and why should I pay less than my neighbors across the street for homes that are all currently valued in the \$325000 to \$350000 range?

We have a problem with disparity in valuations, but that doesn't mean we should get rid of property taxes based on current valuation. What we need are assessors who are willing to put in the work to find the anomalies on both ends of the valuation spectrum and fix them.

Property owners whose valuations are too high already have a grievance process. I would encourage everyone who thinks their property is valued too high to appeal. The real problem is all the properties that continue to be undervalued for tax purposes. I don't know of anyone who is going to go to the assessor and say, "Hey, I don't think I'm paying enough." With today's technology it should not be too difficult for assessors to root out properties with unusually low valuations and perform live reassessments.

I disagree. "Current evaluation" is at best, a speculative number.

And? It's still a lot closer to reality than what you paid for your house 5, 10, 20 or even 30 years ago.

You can ONLY sell your property for that value IF you can find someone to purchase it at that price. Since you have not, then you are just guessing that you could.

So the entire real estate appraisal business is all based on a bunch of guesses? Is that what you're trying to say?

I think you're smarter than that Russ and I think you're just making stuff up to justify a position that would benefit you personally. Well, tax policies should not be set in order to benefit individuals. Tax policies should be set to benefit society as a whole. If there are individual circumstances that warrant reconsideration, there are already ways to do so (see my comments earlier regarding appealing valuations.)

Do so, and then, under the plan I suggest, that would then become the new taxable value. Right now, I have a home whose taxable value is about \$30,000 MORE than I can possibly get out of it. I am perfectly willing to sell it to the auditor who set that value - but I am betting that they won't buy it either. Not at that price! Why not be honest?

Didn't I already say that you could appeal your valuation? If you honestly believe your house is over-valued, then do the work and prove it. Why not be honest and just say that you favor a policy that benefits you personally while screwing your neighbors who've bought their houses more recently?

One of the things that we do is drive people out of their homes by assessing them at a higher price, and ultimately tax them out of their homes if they cannot afford the taxes on the perceived value.

Tax relief is available for situations such as you describe. You could argue that the relief should be more widely available and I would probably agree. But I really doubt there are too many situations where people actually have to give up their homes because of increasing property taxes. This is just a scare tactic used to further nutty tax reform proposals.

Another is that we allow confusion enter into the picture. Instead of the taxing entity getting a vote on a higher mill levy, they can just raise the taxable value of the property in the district. How is that fair? One requires a vote, and the other is no under the table, it is practically unbelievable.

Yeah, you've posted this garbage before and I think it was James T. who thoroughly rebutted you and explained how things really work. It just goes to prove that you either don't know what you're talking about (and don't care to know) or that you are dishonestly posting incorrect information to further your agenda. If you really cared about affecting tax policy you'd at least stop posting disinformation. Here's how things really work:

By law, the mill levy is adjusted every year so that each taxing entity receives the same amount of money as the year before. If property values go up, the mill levy automatically goes down in proportion. If your property value increases or decreases at the same rate as the average property within a tax district then your property tax will stay the same.

The only way your property taxes go up, outside of an actual tax increase or additional levy, is if your property increases in value relative to the average property within the tax district. If taxing entities want to increase the amount of money they collect (i.e. increase taxes) then they must hold truth in taxation hearings open to the public. If there's enough of a public outcry it is possible to reverse the increase. For some reason, elected officials are somewhat loathe to vote for tax increases when their constituents are yelling and screaming bloody murder.

You are bothered by the idea that the neighbor might be paying less in taxes than you. Well, nobody said life was fair.

Yes, I am bothered by that idea. Tax policy should be fair. I never said life should be. ::)

I submit that when buying/selling, that you should consider the future. If you did, then what you suggest would not be a problem.

I submit that you are selfish and don't mind if your neighbors get screwed as long as you don't.

Are you saying that the price that property can actually be sold for is not a legitimate price to tax it on?

I think you already know that's not what I'm saying. Never did I come close to saying such a thing. What I am saying is that if you don't believe your property is valued properly that you already have the ability to appeal. Is that not enough for you?

I once bought a car for \$300. My son and I pushed it home, and I fixed it. When I went to get it licensed, they wanted taxes on \$3600. I took the risk of being able to fix the car, and very well could have wound up junking it, losing my \$300. I provided a bill of sale, clearly stating the purchase price. NOBODY would have paid \$3600 for the car which would not run. Do you really believe that I should have been taxed for that perceived value? Really? By the way, the market value of the car was about \$2500 in good, running condition.

Well, seeing as how we no longer tax passenger vehicles based on value this isn't really a valid comparison. Regardless, if I remember correctly, when we did tax vehicles based on value, there was an appeal process available for situations just as you describe. Did you avail yourself of this process? If not, that's your fault, not the State's.

Why should we pay based on some speculative perceived value. Why not be honest - and fire 99% of the auditors out there? We don't need them...we DO HAVE a real value...the one the property actually sold for.

Because the real value is what the property is actually worth. If your house is only worth to you what you paid for it twenty years ago, then I'd be happy to take it off your hands. I might even give you a ten percent premium.

How do you propose to solve the problem of those retired whom are now on a fixed income, and can no longer afford to let someone else continually reset their taxes, eventually pushing them out onto the street?

As I said before, tax abatement and/or deferral is already available.

<http://propertytax.utah.gov/standards/standard03.pdf>

If there's one thing we agree on it's that people should not be taxed out of their homes. Apparently, the State agrees. If you really do know people who are in danger of losing their homes, please share this information with them. I'm sure they'd appreciate it.

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/01 14:23

I was right. It was James T. who tried to straighten you out on this subject a few weeks ago.

James T. wrote:

Russ wrote:

You are not hearing what I am saying.

(Assessed taxable value) X (Mill levy) = (Money raised)

A Mill levy is often voted on, discussed, public meetings are held, etc., etc.

In order to raise more, then, it becomes necessary to raise the assessed taxable value of the district, county, whatever. This is NOT voted upon, it is in the hands of the assessor, who sends out a notice AND may very well dance to the pressures from the government entity that is spending the money.

The taxing entity doesn't care what either the mill levy or the assessed values are, because their only variable is total revenue raised. The mill levy becomes whatever it needs to become to give them the revenue they want. The following is from the state's website on property taxes and truth in taxation:

<http://propertytax.utah.gov/about/truth.html>

The "Truth in Taxation" law imposed specific public notice and public hearing requirements that are triggered when a taxing entity proposes to increase its property tax revenues (not rates) above those collected in the previous year (tax revenues generated by "new growth" in an entity's tax base are exempt from the disclosure requirements). The public hearings are required to allow elected officials to explain the reasons for the proposed increase and allow citizens to comment on any proposed increase.

Utah's "Truth in Taxation" laws are revenue-driven, not rate-driven. That means the requirement to hold a "Truth in Taxation" hearing is based upon the collections of a taxing entity, not the rate charged. Utah law requires "Truth in Taxation" hearings to be held when a taxing entity elects to collect more revenue than was collected the previous year, although the entities are permitted to keep revenues generated by "new growth" -- such as value added to the tax rolls from a new subdivision or a new business.

Because "Truth in Taxation" is revenue-based, a hearing may still be required if an entity's tax rate remains unchanged or even declines. For example, if property values increase 10 percent as the result of reappraisal, but a taxing entity does not lower its rate proportionately, it must advertise and hold a "Truth in Taxation" hearing. The hearing is required because the increase in value is not considered new growth.

I don't know what else to say...

For anyone reading this thread, please realize that Russ really has no idea what he's talking about or he is being deliberately misleading. I would urge caution when listening to what he has to say, especially regarding property taxes.

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by Russ - 2007/09/01 16:30

Are you willing to buy a piece of property based on the taxable value? I think not. BECAUSE you know that it is not worth that value.

How do you plan on doing your retirement planning, not having any idea what will happen in the next few years that might affect your taxable value? Or is it that you plan on doing as you have suggested, i.e. getting "relief" and letting the rest of us pay the taxes, while you get off without doing the same?

Yes, I have posted on this issue before. BECAUSE it is a better way. Or are you one of the auditors that would be out of a job if we chose to go that way?

I am really glad that you are so willing to discuss the merits of the issue!

Sheesh....

Does everyone that disagrees with you, or comes up with a different angle than you and actually believe would be more fair automatically get the treatment you are dishing out? I suspect so.

Tell you what, are you willing to make up the difference between the taxable value and the actual selling price on the next few purchases on real estate that happen in the county? Shouldn't be a problem for you, should it, seeing as you seem to believe that it is a realistic value.

Tell you what. I will knock \$10,000 OFF the taxable price of my property if you will buy it for the taxable value, less the \$10,000 of course. How can you lose on a deal like that? We BOTH will be tickled! How about that? You should be able to turn it around and make an easy profit on it! What a deal for you!

You won't of course, BECAUSE you know darn well that the taxable value, as manipulated by the politicians, IS NOT the real value of the property and in fact, may have no relation what so ever to the true value of the property. We don't need some guessing game for the value of property.

Yes, there are appeal processes in place. Yes there are abatements in place AND how are they fair? Why have them at all?

My question is why should all that be necessary? I KNOW for a fact what I paid. On the other hand, I HAVE NO IDEA

what the next appraised value is going to be. Nor do you. Putting up with some guessing game in regard to the value of the property is just plain foolishness.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/01 22:06

Russ wrote:

Are you willing to buy a piece of property based on the taxable value? I think not. BECAUSE you know that it is not worth that value.

Come on Russ. Stop with the red herrings and non sequiturs. Of course I'd be willing to buy a piece of property based on the taxable value . . . if I thought the taxable value was less than the current market value. I guarantee you there are probably just as many properties out there valued below their current market value as there are those that are valued too high.

How do you plan on doing your retirement planning, not having any idea what will happen in the next few years that might affect your taxable value? Or is it that you plan on doing as you have suggested, i.e. getting "relief" and letting the rest of us pay the taxes, while you get off without doing the same?

Another non sequitur. If your entire retirement plan can be thrown out of wack by even a 100% increase in property taxes over what they are today then you need to get a new plan(ner).

Tax relief is available as a safety net for those whose retirements don't go as planned. Nothing is guaranteed Russ. We need to have a plan in place so that people aren't forced out of their homes. I thought you cared about that. But apparently, you'd rather just use it as an issue when it serves your agenda. In reality, you'd have people suffer before allowing them to pay less than you, however, if you pay less than everyone else, that's okay.

Yes, I have posted on this issue before. BECAUSE it is a better way. Or are you one of the auditors that would be out of a job if we chose to go that way?

It is not a better way because it is not equitable. Nice try attacking me though . . . maybe you should try defending your logic since it is so obviously failing.

I am really glad that you are so willing to discuss the merits of the issue!

Sheesh....

Excuse me? I am discussing it. You have not refuted one point I have made. Am I wrong about how property taxes are currently calculated? Am I wrong that you already have a grievance process if you think your valuation is too high? Am I wrong in saying that it is not fair to tax one person a lot less than another on two houses that for all intents and purposes are worth the same amount? Am I wrong in inferring that you are selfish and only want a plan that suits you better?

Please Russ, stop with non sequiturs and personal attacks and tell me where I've been wrong in this thread.

Does everyone that disagrees with you, or comes up with a different angle than you and actually believe would be more fair automatically get the treatment you are dishing out? I suspect so.

If they clearly have no idea what they are talking about and won't listen to people when they tell them, then yes, they do. James T. tried to tell you how far off base you were about this topic, but you didn't listen and are still spewing the same misguided information. One might even say that since you have been informed before that you are now blatantly lying.

Tell you what, are you willing to make up the difference between the taxable value and the actual selling price on the next few purchases on real estate that happen in the county? Shouldn't be a problem for you, should it, seeing as you seem to believe that it is a realistic value.

That doesn't even make sense Russ. As I said before, there are plenty of properties selling for much more than the current taxable value. I guess you'd be willing to take the difference back on those, eh Russ?

Tell you what. I will knock \$10,000 OFF the taxable price of my property if you will buy it for the taxable value, less the \$10,000 of course. How can you lose on a deal like that? We BOTH will be tickled! How about that? You should be able

to turn it around and make an easy profit on it! What a deal for you!

Russ, you're not listening. You have a way to appeal the valuation on your house. Stop being an idiot and appeal the f***ing valuation!

You won't of course, BECAUSE you know darn well that the taxable value, as manipulated by the politicians, IS NOT the real value of the property and in fact, may have no relation what so ever to the true value of the property. We don't need some guessing game for the value of property.

Russ, you're clearly not thinking straight. Are mistakes made? Of course they are. That's why we have a grievance process.

Yes, there are appeal processes in place. Yes there are abatements in place AND how are they fair? Why have them at all?

Because that is what is fair and just. Personally, I like living in a society that tries to do what is best for everyone, not just selfish individuals such as yourself.

My question is why should all that be necessary? I KNOW for a fact what I paid. On the other hand, I HAVE NO IDEA what the next appraised value is going to be. Nor do you. Putting up with some guessing game in regard to the value of the property is just plain foolishness.

You just don't get it, do you? Appraising property is not a guessing game. We hire professional people who have a variety of methods to hopefully come up with an accurate valuation.

And no, I am not in the appraisal business, I'm not an assessor or an "auditor" and I don't work for the county. I'm just a regular guy who's trying to figure out how another apparently regular guy could have so little clue about property taxes yet continues to think he's so g*d da*ned smart.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/01 22:30

Russ wrote:

Does everyone that disagrees with you, or comes up with a different angle than you and actually believe would be more fair automatically get the treatment you are dishing out? I suspect so.

I'm sorry if you feel like I'm attacking you Russ. But property taxes are a hot button issue these days and people need to realize that your understanding of property tax assessments is incorrect and any opinion and analysis based upon that faulty information is just not credible.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by WatchDog - 2007/09/01 22:59

Come on, you two. What difference does the process make? As long as it is equal across the board in the way property is evaluated for taxes and everyone gets the same treatment, then in the long run it won't matter. It will all come out in the end as being fair.

Russ seems to have one favorable point. We could save a fair bundle by eliminating a bunch of auditors. That makes some sense to me. I am all for less government costs.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/01 23:08

WatchDog wrote:

Come on, you two. What difference does the process make? As long as it is equal across the board in the way property is evaluated for taxes and everyone gets the same treatment, then in the long run it won't matter. It will all come out in the end as being fair.

Russ seems to have one favorable point. We could save a fair bundle by eliminating a bunch of auditors. That makes some sense to me. I am all for less government costs.

Russ' "favorable point" is based on valuing property only when it is sold. Do you think that is being "equal across the board in the way property is evaluated for taxes?" I certainly don't.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by WatchDog - 2007/09/02 00:18

dadofone wrote:

WatchDog wrote:

Come on, you two. What difference does the process make? As long as it is equal across the board in the way property is evaluated for taxes and everyone gets the same treatment, then in the long run it won't matter. It will all come out in the end as being fair.

Russ seems to have one favorable point. We could save a fair bundle by eliminating a bunch of auditors. That makes some sense to me. I am all for less government costs.

Russ' "favorable point" is based on valuing property only when it is sold. Do you think that is being "equal across the board in the way property is evaluated for taxes?" I certainly don't.

What I think is that you don't hear what he is attempting to say. Nor did you hear my comment that, as long as everyone gets the same treatment, it would all come out the same in the end. Nor do you choose to address what I feel is a good point that he makes. Why pay a bunch of auditors and perhaps allow unfairness to come into play because of what might be their potential bias?

Seems that it may be you with the listening problem.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/02 09:05

WatchDog wrote:

dadofone wrote:

WatchDog wrote:

Come on, you two. What difference does the process make? As long as it is equal across the board in the way property is evaluated for taxes and everyone gets the same treatment, then in the long run it won't matter. It will all come out in the end as being fair.

Russ seems to have one favorable point. We could save a fair bundle by eliminating a bunch of auditors. That makes some sense to me. I am all for less government costs.

Russ' "favorable point" is based on valuing property only when it is sold. Do you think that is being "equal across the board in the way property is evaluated for taxes?" I certainly don't.

What I think is that you don't hear what he is attempting to say. Nor did you hear my comment that, as long as everyone gets the same treatment, it would all come out the same in the end. Nor do you choose to address what I feel is a good point that he makes. Why pay a bunch of auditors and perhaps allow unfairness to come into play because of what might be their potential bias?

Seems that it may be you with the listening problem.

Hmmm . . . that's funny. Now I don't think you've read my responses. I did hear what he is trying to say and in my first response I told him why I thought it would be a good bad idea. Rather than responding to my rebuttal, he then decided to start using non sequiturs and ad hominem.

Now, I did respond to your point that you felt he had a good point by saying his point was based on a faulty premise. Is that not a valid response?

As for you, you've now chosen to introduce new information into your response which I had no opportunity to respond to before. You ask "Why pay a bunch of auditors and perhaps allow unfairness to come into play because of what might be their potential bias?"

Okay, first of all, we need to clear up that I don't really think Russ meant "auditors" but rather "assessors". The assessors may have a bias but that's why we have auditors as well. The auditors should be looking out for bias and making sure it doesn't enter the equation.

Now, you (and Russ) might say, "Well that's great, now I've got two jobs I'm paying for just to get a fair market value on property. Why not just get rid of them both and value property based on the last selling price?"

Well, I've already told you why I don't think that is fair or equitable and neither of you have chosen to respond to that point.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/02 09:14

WatchDog wrote:

Nor did you hear my comment that, as long as everyone gets the same treatment, it would all come out the same in the end.

I didn't hear that? Are you kidding? I directly addressed that comment of yours when I responded that I don't think it is being "equal across the board" to value property based on its last selling price?

Hmmmm, you seem to have failed to answer whether you agree or not.

Listen, Russ made a valid point at first. I even told him it was "all well and good". But then I told him why I didn't think it was fair. His response was more or less "Life's not fair buddy" (duh!) and a bunch of non sequiturs and personal attacks. I didn't say life was, or even should be, fair. But do you (or Russ) think tax policy should be fair? I do and I told you why I don't think Russ' policy would be fair.

Neither of you have chosen to respond telling me why it would be a fair, equitable tax policy to value property based on its last selling price.

I'm waiting . . .

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/02 18:36

Keep on smiting me if it makes you feel better; I don't mind. :) But your words have so far been lacking . . .

Any rebuttal to anything that I've said? Any defense for your information that has been found to be incorrect? Would you like to point out where I've misled anyone in this thread?

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/02 18:45

Hmmm . . . that's funny. I mention smiting and all of a sudden I get two more, almost simultaneously. Could it be that "Russ" and "WatchDog" are the same person? I don't know but it's quite curious. Russ' last activity on the site is Today at 06:40:10 PM and WatchDog's is Today at 06:40:53 PM.

Very interesting . . .

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by KitKat - 2007/09/02 18:49

dadofone wrote:

Hmmm . . . that's funny. I mention smiting and all of a sudden I get two more, almost simultaneously. Could it be that "Russ" and "WatchDog" are the same person? I don't know but it's quite curious. Russ' last activity on the site is Today at 06:40:10 PM and WatchDog's is Today at 06:40:53 PM.

Very interesting . . .

I just gave you an applaud to offset at least one of those smites. I guess smites are the only way some people feel they can get back at you.

For what it's worth, I have been reading your comments on taxation. Good posts!

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/02 19:37

KitKat wrote:

dadofone wrote:

Hmmm . . . that's funny. I mention smiting and all of a sudden I get two more, almost simultaneously. Could it be that "Russ" and "WatchDog" are the same person? I don't know but it's quite curious. Russ' last activity on the site is Today at 06:40:10 PM and WatchDog's is Today at 06:40:53 PM.

Very interesting . . .

I just gave you an applaud to offset at least one of those smites. I guess smites are the only way some people feel they can get back at you.

For what it's worth, I have been reading your comments on taxation. Good posts!

That's sweet of you KitKat. But like I said, I don't care too much about the smites. I just wish they'd engage my arguments with their words. So far, I've gotten nothing but irrelevant arguments and personal attacks.

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by !!1 - 2007/09/02 20:20

dadofone wrote:

KitKat wrote:

dadofone wrote:

Hmmmm . . . that's funny. I mention smiting and all of a sudden I get two more, almost simultaneously. Could it be that "Russ" and "WatchDog" are the same person? I don't know but it's quite curious. Russ' last activity on the site is Today at 06:40:10 PM and WatchDog's is Today at 06:40:53 PM.

Very interesting . . .

I just gave you an applaud to offset at least one of those smites. I guess smites are the only way some people feel they can get back at you.

For what it's worth, I have been reading your comments on taxation. Good posts!

That's sweet of you KitKat. But like I said, I don't care too much about the smites. I just wish they'd engage my arguments with their words. So far, I've gotten nothing but irrelevant arguments and personal attacks.

Dad,

I presume that you actually believe that you don't engage in personal attacks. Got news for ya. You are wrong, at least on that score. I am just as sure as you are that WD knows the difference between an auditor and an assessor. I guess that was not a personal attack though, right? And that crack about the entire real estate appraisal business? Where did that come from? Not a personal attack? Give us a break, will ya? Hint: Honesty is the best policy, BS won't cut it.

They have a right to express their opinion, just as you have. I must wonder just what axe you have to grind in this discussion. There must be one somewhere for you to so adamately protect your "personal opinion". By the way, I beleive that California does just about what Russ suggested. It seems to work for them.

FWIW, I don't care how taxes are figured, as long as it is done fairly. You might try and understand that others have a right to their opinion, even if they disagee with you, God forbid.

Also, I don't care about smites either, so smite away if that turns your crank. One other thing, I won't be getting into some lengthy discussion with you, so save your typing finger.

=====

Re: Taxation problem lies in property valuations

Posted by SLCdon - 2007/09/02 20:43

!!1 wrote:

dadofone wrote:

KitKat wrote:

dadofone wrote:

Hmmmm . . . that's funny.? I mention smiting and all of a sudden I get two more, almost simultaneously.? Could it be that "Russ" and "WatchDog" are the same person?? I don't know but it's quite curious.? Russ' last activity on the site is Today at 06:40:10 PM and WatchDog's is Today at 06:40:53 PM.

Very interesting . . .

I just gave you an applaud to offset at least one of those smites.? I guess smites are the only way some people feel they

can get back at you.?

For what it's worth, I have been reading your comments on taxation.? Good posts!

That's sweet of you KitKat.? But like I said, I don't care too much about the smites.? I just wish they'd engage my arguments with their words.? So far, I've gotten nothing but irrelevant arguments and personal attacks.

Dad,

I presume that you actually believe that you don't engage in personal attacks. Got news for ya. You are wrong, at least on that score.

It's a pure joy to have you around. Another reincarnation of Russ, eh?

I didn't say I didn't engage in personal attacks. But I said nothing until I was attacked first. Am I not to defend myself?

I am just as sure as you are that WD knows the difference between an auditor and an assessor.

It was Russ that made that mistake. I let it go until WD repeated it. Hmmmm . . . another curiosity.

I guess that was not a personal attack though, right? And that crack about the entire real estate appraisal business? Where did that come from? Not a personal attack? Give us a break, will ya?

The crack about the real estate appraisal business? I didn't make a crack. I defended the appraisal business. Russ is the one that thinks they're all just "guessing".

Hint: Honesty is the best policy, BS won't cut it.

That's why I'm calling Russ on his BS, duh. He spreads dishonest information about how property taxes are determined and uses that faulty information to push an agenda. Are you going to let that BS stand?

They have a right to express their opinion, just as you have.

Did I ever say they didn't? I love this argument from fools. All I need to say is you are welcome to your own opinions but not your own facts. Russ is spreading incorrect information. What happens when I try to post a rebuttal correcting him? I get attacked and deluged with non sequiturs. NICE!

I must wonder just what axe you have to grind in this discussion. There must be one somewhere for you to so adamantly protect your "personal opinion".

The only axe I have to grind is the one that furthers the truth.

By the way, I beleive that California does just about what Russ suggested. It seems to work for them.

I tried to have a discussion about why I don't think it's fair to value property in this way but no one seems to want to talk about that point.

FWIW, I don't care how taxes are figured, as long as it is done fairly.

Excellent! Do you think it's fair to value property based on its last selling price? If so, please refer back to my original real-world example and tell me why that would be fair and/or equitable.

You might try and understand that others have a right to their opinion, even if they disagee with you, God forbid.

Already answered.

Also, I don't care about smites either, so smite away if that turns your crank. One other thing, I won't be getting into some lengthy discussion with you, so save your typing finger.

Nice of you to drop by . . . chicken. ;)

=====