

DRAFT

Memorandum

To Mayor Michael A. Nutter
Council President Anna C. Verna
Members of City Council
From BRT Governance Working Group
Date September 11, 2009
Re **BRT Governance Options**

Background

On May 6, 2009, Mayor Nutter and Council President Verna issued the following joint statement regarding the Board of Revision of Taxes (BRT) in response to a series of news articles appearing in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*.

“Like many Philadelphians we are very concerned about recent revelations regarding the BRT. We have known for some time that there needed to be significant change at this organization.

The issues that have been raised in recent news accounts represent a culture that is unacceptable in city government. There must – and will be – massive change. Not only do Philadelphians deserve a tax assessment that is fair and accurate, they have to have faith in those trusted to oversee the tax assessment system.

Understanding this, the Nutter Administration and City Council will work together to reform, restructure or dissolve the BRT as quickly as possible.”

In June 2009, two working groups, both comprised of staff members from City Council and the Nutter Administration, began meeting to develop options for the Mayor and City Council’s review. These options are intended to address long standing concerns regarding the BRT’s governance and property assessment procedures. The working groups were asked to report back to the Mayor and City Council in September 2009, to coincide with the resumption of the City Council legislative session. This memo details the options drafted by the BRT Governance Working Group. The BRT Governance Working Group has also developed a supplemental memo on the options specific to implementing the Actual Value Initiative (AVI). The other working group, the BRT Data Working Group, will provide options regarding property assessment procedures in a separate memorandum.

Board of Revision of Taxes

The Board of Revision of Taxes (BRT) is the City agency responsible for determining the value of real property as the basis for real estate taxes levied by the City of Philadelphia and the School District of Philadelphia. The BRT is a seven-member panel appointed by the Judges of the First Judicial District of Pennsylvania. The BRT also hears all appeals of property valuations filed by City property owners. As currently constructed, the BRT exists outside the direct authority of the Mayor and City Council.

Charge for the BRT Governance Working Group

The BRT Governance Working Group was charged with providing options for decision-makers on potential courses of action related to the governance of the BRT. The options included attempt to address some of the following core challenges with the BRT:

- Inconsistent assessment practices - The number of assessments that the BRT completes each year varies widely. Over the last six years, the BRT has done about 720,000 assessments that resulted in either market value increases or market value decreases. Over 600,000 of those assessments were completed in just two years – FY04 and FY08. By doing most of its assessments only sporadically, the BRT ensures that most property owners will go years without seeing any change in assessments, but then might see very large changes in a single year.
- System-wide inequities - The BRT has said that homes with lower values tend to have assessments that are closer to their actual values than do properties with higher values. As a result, taxpayers who own lower valued houses tend to pay more taxes in relation to the value of their home than do taxpayers who own higher valued properties.
- Inconsistent treatment of individuals – The *Philadelphia Inquirer* series uncovered evidence suggesting that individuals are treated inconsistently and may benefit from special relationships with staff members and/or Board members.
- Potential conflict in co-locating the assessment and appeal functions – There is at least the appearance of a conflict in having the same agency assess values and then hear the appeals of those assessments.
- Confusing and unpredictable property tax system – The formula currently used to compute an individual’s property tax bill is complicated and taxpayers are often confused why the value of their property bears no direct relationship to its assessed value.
- Bifurcated Staffing Structure – Currently, over 70 BRT staff members are employed by the School District of Philadelphia (SDP). These employees are not covered by the City’s civil service rules.
- Damaged public perception of BRT - Appropriately, there has been a public outcry in response to the issues raised in the news about the mismanagement of the BRT.

In order to help the Mayor and City Council address the very real issues raised concerning the BRT, the Governance Working Group has developed a number of options related to the BRT’s governance structure. These options include the following:

<p><i>Option A</i></p>	<p>Maintain the current system without any governance changes, but implement necessary reforms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BRT would continue with the Actual Value Initiative (AVI). <i>See recommendations of BRT Data Working Group</i> • When AVI is ready to be implemented, Council would be required to adjust the millage rate. State legislation might be needed to adjust the rate of the School District real estate tax. Council should also consider enacting legislation to lessen the impact of AVI on individual taxpayers. <i>See Appendix A: Transition to Actual Value – Property Tax Relief Measures</i> • Implement Staffing Reforms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Retrain or remove staff members who do not have the appropriate skill levels for their jobs ○ Update job requirements for assessors ○ Improve training of assessors ○ Consider moving BRT employees off the School District payroll
------------------------	--

<p><i>Option B</i></p>	<p>Keep the BRT as the assessing and appeals agency, but change how BRT board members are appointed to enhance accountability; implement necessary reforms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enact an ordinance providing for City appointment of BRT board members, rather than appointment by Board of Judges (this requires approval by voters). Alternatives include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appointment by Mayor ○ Appointment by Mayor with Council confirmation ○ Appointment of some members by Mayor and other members by Council ○ Appointment from nominations made by nominating Panel • Establish training/education/experience requirements for board members. • Implement needed reforms, as detailed in Option A.
<p><i>Option C</i></p>	<p>Separate the assessment and appeals functions by keeping the BRT as the assessing agency (and perhaps by changing how BRT board members are appointed), and creating a new agency to handle appeals; implement necessary reforms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enact an ordinance to reassign appeals function to a new agency (this requires approval by the voters) <i>See attached chart below for detailed options as to how new appeals agency could be constituted. The ordinance would provide the BRT the ability to continue to do assessments, and could also provide for changes to appointment of BRT board members, as set forth in Option B.</i> • Implement needed reforms, as detailed in Option A.
<p><i>Option D</i></p>	<p>Abolish the BRT. Separate the assessment and appeals functions by creating a new agency to handle appeals, and by assigning the assessment function either to a newly created agency or to an existing City agency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enact an ordinance abolishing the BRT and assigning its powers and duties to other agencies (this requires approval by the voters). Alternatives include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Creating a new agency to handle assessments and a new agency to handle appeals. ○ Assigning the assessment function to an existing City agency (such as Finance), and creating a new agency to handle appeals. <i>Details of these alternatives are set forth in the attached chart below</i> • Implement needed reforms, as detailed in Option A.

Issues and Options Details

The BRT Governance Working Group has compiled the attached “issues and options” chart to provide analysis of the pros and cons of the various options before the Mayor and City Council.

ISSUE: SHOULD THE CITY REFORM THE BOARD OF REVISION OF TAXES OR REPLACE IT?

Question	Pros	Cons
<p>What are the pros and cons of reforming the existing Board of Revision of Taxes (BRT)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of existing structure eliminates need for wholesale redesign of system. • Change in assessment process could be implemented more quickly without need for transition to new entity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor public perception of existing BRT requires restoration of public confidence in assessments and appeals. • Problems with existing system are considered too great to overcome through small changes. Instead, existing problems require structural overhaul. • Maintaining current system wastes opportunity for fundamental change, increased efficiency, modernization of assessments and more improved assessments/appeals.
<p>What are the pros and cons of abolishing the BRT?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abolition will result in increased public confidence in property assessments/appeals. • City seizes opportunity for fundamental change, increased efficiency, modernization of assessments and improved assessments/appeals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abolition and restructuring requires creation of a new system. • May lengthen time required to reform the assessment process.

ISSUE: SHOULD THE CITY RETAIN BRT STAFF MEMBERS ON THE SCHOOL DISTRICT'S PAYROLL? [NOTE: This question applies to all employees on the School District's payroll, whether they currently perform assessment- or appeals-related functions at the BRT.]

Options	Pros	Cons
<p>Retain BRT staff on School District payroll, which would allow current School District employees to continue their political activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School District receives 60% of property tax revenue and should make a financial contribution to the entity performing the assessment/appeals function. [NOTE: The School District could fund these positions through a contract with the City even if the employees weren't on the District's payroll.] • Avoids difficult personnel issues re whether these employees can "test into" the Civil Service. • No cost to the City. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public perception re patronage employees. • School District has not budgeted for most of these positions past September 2009. • Blurs line of accountability and inhibits administrative efficiencies
<p>Remove BRT staff from School District payroll, which would prevent current School District employees from continuing their political activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses public perception that these employees are patronage hires who do not add value. • Consistency and fairness: other employees at the BRT are already part of the civil service system and the same should apply to these employees. • School District has not budgeted for most of these positions past September 2009. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel issues related to this transition, including whether these employees can "test into" the Civil Service, whether they currently participate in the School District's pension plan and how to manage continuity therewith, etc. • Open question re how many employees are necessary to support the assessments unit. • Fiscal impact of shifting compensation for people performing this work function onto the City's budget. [NOTE: If the School District funds these positions through a contract, the fiscal impact could be eliminated.]

ISSUE: SHOULD THE CITY SEPARATE THE ASSESSMENT AND APPEALS PROCESSES?

Question	Pros	Cons
What are the pros and cons of separating the assessment and appeals processes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensures independence and integrity of two functions, which offers greater credibility and public confidence.• Eliminates potential conflict in having the same agency assess values and hear the appeals of those assessments.• In line with practices in all major cities and their respective counties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Departs from current practice and may involve an adjustment period in which to iron out problems with new system.

ISSUE: IF THE CITY SEPARATES THE ASSESSMENT AND APPEALS PROCESSES, WHERE SHOULD THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS BE HOUSED?

Options	Pros	Cons
With the BRT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of existing structure eliminates need for wholesale redesign of system. • Change in assessment process could be implemented more quickly without need for transition to new entity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public perception that the current assessment system is broken. • Problems with existing system are considered too great to overcome through small changes. Instead, existing problems require structural overhaul. • Maintaining current system may make it more difficult to increase operational efficiency and modernize assessment process.
In a new Assessment Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Board ensures independence from the administration, which offers greater credibility and public confidence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of establishing a new board. • Current system uses BRT, which is a separate agency, and the BRT model has proven problematic. • More difficult for City government to improve internal operations and cross-departmental information sharing.
In an existing City department or agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower overhead cost than establishing new assessment agency. • Institutional knowledge of senior city employees with respect to City issues available in-house to assessment unit. • Increased City oversight of assessments. • Current system uses BRT, which is a separate agency, and the BRT model has proven problematic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public may prefer greater separation between Administration and assessment agency. [NOTE: This concern can be addressed by including a provision that the Chief Assessor can be fired for cause only.]

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easier for City government to improve internal operations and cross-departmental information sharing. • Ensures that the City has the responsibility and authority for accurate assessments. 	
<p>In the Finance Department</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance Department is currently charged with the overarching responsibility for financial functions, making Finance logical choice for a department in which to house real estate assessments. • Finance Department already has responsibility for a number of tax-related functions including the tax review board and revenue collections. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived conflict in vesting entity charged with assessing properties in same department whose mission includes collecting revenues for the City and budgeting for future expenditures. [NOTE: This is currently characteristic of the Revenue Department, which is charged with collecting tax revenue and assessing business values. This concern can be addressed by highlighting City Council's role in setting the millage rate and by including a provision that the Chief Assessor can be fired for cause only.]

ISSUE: IF THE CITY SEPARATES THE ASSESSMENT AND APPEALS PROCESSES, SHOULD IT CREATE A NEW, INDEPENDENT APPEALS BOARD?

Question	Pros	Cons
What are the pros and cons of creating a new, independent appeals board?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If the City decides to house assessments with the BRT or in an existing City agency or department, a separate appeals board will:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Ensure independence from the agency/department in which assessments are performed and, by extension, provide more meaningful due process protections to the taxpayer;○ Improve public confidence in the appeals function; and○ Potentially lower the overhead cost of maintaining a full-time staff in-house to handle appeals by establishing an appeals board that meets only when necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If the City decides to house assessments in an existing City agency or department, a separate appeals board may reduce administrative efficiency.

ISSUE: IF THE CITY CREATES A NEW, INDEPENDENT APPEALS BOARD, THE FOLLOWING “GOVERNANCE” QUESTIONS MUST BE CONSIDERED.

Question	Options	Pros	Cons
How many members?	7 or 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odd number of board members would prevent tie votes. • Similar in size to current BRT (7 members), which was able to handle significant appeals volume in 2002-03. • Consistent with appeals entity size in key peer cities (New York, Boston, Seattle). • If board of 9, could hear appeals in panels of 3 and, to ensure uniformity, provide standards for decision-making and/or provide en banc appeal to the full board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be overwhelmed by workload, especially if appeals volume increases dramatically – for instance, upon the implementation of the Actual Value Initiative. [NOTE: This issue could be alleviated, in part, through the use of hearing examiners, especially since this appeal volume may or may not occur, and most likely would be of a temporary nature.] • Concern re consistency in outcomes if cases heard by panels. [NOTE: This issue possibly could be resolved by requiring that each panel’s members have similar qualifications.] • Smaller board may not be viewed as sufficiently representative by the public.
	15-30+ (odd number)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odd number of board members would prevent tie votes. • If appeals volume is significantly increased, having a larger board would help make the workload manageable. • Opportunity for more stakeholder involvement/more diverse board composition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty of attracting sufficient number of qualified/eligible applicants to fill a board of this size. • If appeals volume is not significantly increased in the long-run, then left with a large board • Concern re consistency in outcome if cases heard by panels. • Cost.

Question	Options	Pros	Cons
How long should terms be?			
	3-5 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-year term strikes a balance between enabling board members to serve long enough to become expert in the appeals board work but not so long that the time commitment is prohibitive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-year term may be too short to surmount learning curve. • 5-year term may be too long for board members in the private sector, depending upon time commitment board service entails.
Question	Options	Pros	Cons
Should terms be fixed and staggered?			
	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures some continuity in board composition – and preservation of institutional knowledge – when new board members seated. • Predictability of term length may help attract board members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointing authority/authorities would not have the opportunity to appoint the majority of board members during its/their own term (which was considered a sufficient problem with the Board of Education to justify a Charter amendment), lessening its/their accountability.
	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointing authority/authorities would have the opportunity to appoint the majority of board members during its/their own term (which was considered a sufficient improvement to the Board of Education to justify a Charter amendment). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about continuity in board composition – and preservation of institutional knowledge – when new board members seated. • Lack of predictability of term length may make it harder to attract board members.

Question	Options	Pros	Cons
Should terms be coterminous with appointing authority/ Authorities?			
	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointing authority/authorities would have opportunity to reconstitute board upon election. • Direct line of accountability to appointing authority/authorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability of appointing authorities to name all members may make it appear that the board is not independent. • Concern re continuity in board operations and preservation of institutional knowledge if entire board turned over at once.
	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would help reinforce public perception of board’s independence and impartiality. • Promotes continuity in board operations and preservation of institutional knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointing authority/authorities would not have the opportunity to appoint the majority of board members during its/their own term. • Concern re renegade board.
Question	Options	Pros	Cons
Should they have term limits?			
	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodic turnover helps bring new perspectives to board. • Reinforces public perception of new board as independent, professional, consistent with good government principles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require competent, dedicated board members to step down even if willing/able to continue serving.
	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables competent, committed board members to continue their service as long as they are willing and able 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public perception of board members as part of entrenched elite/lifers. • Board might not benefit

		to do so.	from new perspectives if little/no turnover in board composition.
Question	Options	Pros	Cons
Do members continue to serve until a successor is appointed and qualified?			
	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures continuity in board operations. • Standard practice for existing board and commissions. 	
	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures continuity in board operations. • Standard practice for existing board and commissions.
Question	Options	Pros	Cons
Do they serve at the pleasure of their appointing authority; or removal for cause?			
	Serve at pleasure of appointing authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountability to appointing authority. • If new appointing authority came to power, it would have opportunity to appoint board members without having to wait for terms to expire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public perception of politicized process. • Might deter potential board members from applying/expressing interest in position.
	Removal only for cause	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board appears more independent of politics. • Might help attract professional board members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointing authority might have basis for removal that does not meet “for cause” standard.

Question	Options	Pros	Cons
Should there be prescribed qualifications for board members?			
	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with professional standards promulgated by the International Association of Assessing Organizations (IAAO). • Creates public perception of appeals board as comprised of qualified professionals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits pool of potential appointees. • Depending on how narrowly the qualifications are defined, they may inadvertently exclude a potentially qualified applicant.
	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affords appointing entity with more discretion in selecting board members. • Potentially creates a more diverse board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May weaken public confidence in and ability of the appeals board. • Not consistent with practices promulgated by the IAAO.
Question	Options	Pros	Cons
If there are prescribed qualifications, what are they?			
	<p>Board to include: (1) experienced, PA-certified real estate appraisers; (2) licensed attorneys with expertise in commercial or residential property valuation</p> <p>[Bill Nos. 090384 and 090385 include language</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with International Association of Assessing Organizations (IAAO) standard, which lists “property owners, real estate appraisers, real estate brokers, mortgage loan officers, public accountants, lawyers, and other knowledgeable persons” as appropriate appeals board members. • Creates public perception of appeals board as comprised of qualified professionals. • Benefits of diversity of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits pool of potential appointees. • Depending on how narrowly the qualifications are defined, they may inadvertently exclude a potentially qualified applicant.

	regarding prescribed qualifications for board members.]	<p>experience/expertise within board composition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholder groups represented on board. 	
	A homeowner and/or commercial property owner representative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits of diversity of experience/expertise within board composition. • Key stakeholder groups represented on board. • Expands the pool of potential appointees. • Consistent with International Association of Assessing Organizations (IAAO) standard for inclusion of property owner as appropriate appeals board member. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public may not perceive individuals as qualified professionals.
	Other qualifications (for instance, including all professions listed in IAAO standard)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadens the pool of potential nominees. • Potentially creates a more diverse board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits pool of potential appointees. • Depending on how narrowly the qualifications are defined, they may inadvertently exclude a potentially qualified applicant.
Question	Options	Pros	Cons
Should board members be required to live or work in the City?			
	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the nature of the appeals board's work, board members should have a vested interest in the City. • Personal knowledge of Philadelphia gained by living or working in the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits the pool of potential board members.

		<p>City may be an asset in hearing appeals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative publicity surrounding the BRT increases the importance of having board members the citizenry thinks represents its interests and residents/property owners. 	
	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current Charter requirement (i.e., residency in the City or one of the surrounding counties) should apply to the appeals board, as it does for other boards and commissions. Appointing authority will likely make appointments in a fashion that resolves any concerns about sufficient nexus to Philadelphia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Philadelphians may object to having their property tax appeals heard by board members who neither live nor work in the City. Board members without a direct connection to the City may be at an informational disadvantage when hearing appeals.
Question	Options	Pros	Cons
Who is the appointing authority?			
	Mayor appoints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having a single decision-maker streamlines appointment process. Clear line of accountability running straight to the Mayor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislative body not involved in appointment process, so no opportunity for public hearings on appointees. Potential for public perception that board comprised of “insiders.”
	Mayor appoints with Council confirmation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive and legislative branch both involved in appointment process. Public hearing process will enable examination of appointees’ credentials and help increase public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential board members may be deterred by public hearing process. Potential for public perception that board comprised of “insiders.”

		<p>confidence in new appeals board.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment process would take longer.
	<p>Appointment of some members by Mayor and other members by Council</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive and legislative branches would have shared responsibility for appointing board members. • Public hearing process will enable examination of appointees' credentials and help increase public confidence in new appeals board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential board members may be deterred by public hearing process. • Potential for public perception that board comprised of "insiders." • Appointment process would take longer. • May create schism among board members who are appointed by different authorities • Blurs line of accountability
	<p>Nominating panel</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already in place for some Administration positions (e.g., Finance Director). • Helps spread out the workload attendant to managing an application process that may involve dozens or hundreds of applicants. • If initial list provided by nominating panel is not sufficient, panel can be asked to provide additional lists (as per current practice). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment process would take longer.
	<p>Selection by Board of Judges (current practice)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process already in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public perception that current system is broken. • Fact that Board of Judges votes are confidential may feed into public perception that the board is comprised of "insiders." • Mayor and legislative body

			not involved in appointment process.
Question	Options	Pros	Cons
How is the chair designated?			
	By appointing authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear line of accountability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of dysfunction if board members do not support the chair selected by appointing authority.
	By vote of board members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair will have the support of a majority of board members. • Consistent with practice employed by other city boards and commissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Influence of appointing authority may be more limited.
Question	Options	Pros	Cons
Are board members compensated and, if so, by salary or per meeting?	[NOTE: With respect to compensation amount, the legislation could authorize Council “from time to time to otherwise provide” so as to permit future adjustments without the need for additional Charter changes.]		
	Non-compensated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasizes public service nature of the position. • Savings to City budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to significant workload of serving on appeals board, working professionals might not be willing to serve without some compensation for their time. • Inconsistent with practice in peer cities/other jurisdictions surveyed.
	Compensated – annual salary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budgeting predictability. • Reflects current practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not tied to work performed. • Risk that City will “overpay” if appeals caseload is less than was expected when setting the salary amount. • If caseload far exceeds prediction, compensation

			cap may be so low vis a vis time commitment that board members may resign/potential board members may refuse appointment.
	Compensated per meeting, with annual cap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensation tied directly to work performed. • Consistent with model currently used for Zoning Board of Adjustment and Tax Review Board. • Rebutts public perception that BRT board members are overpaid. • Easy to administer. • Budgeting predictability (so long as compensation capped at set amount). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May create a perverse incentive to reduce the length of meetings by rushing cases through. • If caseload far exceeds prediction, compensation cap may be so low vis a vis time commitment that board members may resign/potential board members may refuse appointment.
Question	Options	Pros	Cons
Does Appeals Board have an executive director? If so, chosen how? Any qualifications?			
	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clear leadership and administrative capacity at the appeals board. • Could insure continuity when board members turnover. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unnecessary bureaucracy. • Increased cost.
	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff members can provide support to the board with respect to scheduling, hearing prep, and other administrative matters, as occurs with similar entities like the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA). • Budget savings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [NOTE: Pursuant to best practices in assessing, there should be a high-level executive in charge of the assessing function (i.e., a “Chief Assessment Officer”), as distinguished from the appeals function.]

DRAFT

Appendices

Appendix A: Transition to Actual Value – Property Tax Relief Measures

Appendix B: Comparative Analysis of Assessment and Appeals Structure and Function in
Other Cities