Monmouth County 2015 Annual Reassessment & the Impact on Property Taxes



The County of Monmouth is committed to providing clear and complete information about the property reassessment process and its tax implications. This document provides clarification about the current process and answers to the most frequently asked questions.

Keeping residents informed of the property assessment methods and procedures will result in better understanding and greater confidence in the system. The goal is to establish a property assessment function focused on uniformity and accuracy. When the assessments are set to the same standard of value (market value), the property tax burden is distributed fairly and equitably in accordance with the Constitution of the State of New Jersey.

TOP TEN FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

1. WHY DID SOME RESIDENTS' PROPERTY TAXES INCREASE?

Answer: The recent increase in some property tax bills may be the result of an increased property assessment.

Each Monmouth County municipality, in accordance with New Jersey Public Law 2013 CH.15, the Real Property Assessment Demonstration Program, is in the process of transitioning to a new property tax model where annual reassessments will appraise all real property within the taxing district according to its full and fair value. The purpose of a reassessment is to fairly distribute the tax burden among all property owners within the township. The validity of the market value estimate depends on the collection of accurate data; this reassessment program is supported by an annual interior/exterior inspections cycle. These inspections will be spread-out over the next five years to ensure that all property record cards are accurate and up to date. All residents will receive advance notification by mail, two weeks prior to the inspection. Residents are asked to cooperate with the inspection process and are advised that the field inspectors who conduct the inspections do not determine the final assessment.

Please keep in mind that property taxes cannot be contested, as they are a result of the budget process. The assessed value can be appealed yearly, between November 15 (pre-tax year) and January 15. For information on the appeal process, please see question #7.

The Property Tax Procedure

- 1. Value is determined as of October 1 of the pre-tax year for all real property within the County. The preliminary tax list is certified to the Monmouth County Board of Taxation on November 1, 2015.
- 2. Each municipal governing body along with the county governing bodies and the local school board prepare their respective budgets and hold public hearings. Anticipated revenue from various sources is subtracted from the budget and the amount remaining to be raised by a levy on real and personal property is reported to the Monmouth County Board of Taxation (County Tax Board).
- 3. The County Tax Board apportions the amount to be raised by property taxes to support the county government among the taxing districts in the county, then adds to the respective county portion the amount needed from property taxes to finance the municipal government and the school district, and divides the total levy by the assessed value of all taxable property to establish the local general tax rate.
- 4. The general tax rates are reported to the municipality which collects the property tax for the county, the school district, and itself.
- 5. Special taxing districts (i.e. fire, garbage) report the amount needed to the assessor, who calculates the tax rate for this purpose by dividing the amount to be raised by the total value of taxable property in the special district. This rate is added to the regular general tax rate for the municipality to determine the taxes on properties located within the special districts.
- 6. The appropriate tax rate is multiplied by the assessment on each property to determine the taxes due for the current year.

1

Prepared by the Monmouth County

2. WHY DID MY NEIGHBOR'S PROPERTY CHANGE AT A DIFFERENT PERCENTAGE RATE?

Answer: Each property within the County is unique and appreciates/depreciates at different rates. Depending on the precision of the assessed value prior to the reassessment, the overall value change can vary from neighbor to neighbor taking into consideration: location, interior/exterior condition & finish, overall building quality, square footage, style, age, lot size, etc.

Generally, taxpayers of the most severely under-assessed properties before a revaluation will pay a greater share of the tax burden after a revaluation. This means that their property taxes will increase even if operating costs remain the same. Likewise, taxpayers of the overvalued properties will pay a smaller share of the tax burden after the revaluation. This means their property taxes will decrease if the total amount to be raised from taxes remains the same. In reality, municipal, county and school budget costs generally increase each year. The rise can be attributed to inflation, the general cost-increase of goods and services, and other economic factors.

3. HOW DID MY ASSESSED VALUE CHANGE SO MUCH FROM ONE YEAR TO THE NEXT?

Answer: Depending on the accuracy of your assessment prior to the reassessment, the transition from a "fractional assessment system" to a 100% market value system is most likely responsible for the change. Below is an example of the former "Fractional Assessment System."

<u>Example</u>

Common Level: 94.75% (2014 Ratio of Market Value to Assessed Value) Assessed Value (shown on postcard): \$400,000.00 Implied Market Value: \$422,162 (400,000/.9475)

In 2015, for all towns that have transitioned away from "fractional assessments," the Ratio of Assessed Value to Market Value is 100%.

New Jersey taxpayers have been lead to believe that their assessments do not change from year to year. While it is true that absent revaluation, reassessment, compliance, judgment, or physical change the assessment shown on the Ch. 75 Notification of Assessment Postcard is the same from one year to the next, in truth, the taxpayer's "implied market value" changes annually. Taxpayers throughout the state are often unaware of the relationship between the assessed value, the ratio and the implied market value and the critical role this relationship has on their individual tax bill.

As an example, a taxpayer who has an assessment of \$200,000 does not contest the assessment because his next door neighbor who has the same house just sold for \$300,000. After comparing his current assessment to his neighbor's recent sale price the taxpayer thinks that he is under-assessed. What the taxpayer doesn't understand is that the town's current ratio is 50% therefore; the implied market value of the property is actually \$400,000.

If assessment inequities exist, it may be necessary for the assessor to review the assessments and make adjustments as needed to maintain equity. When performing annual assessments based on fair market value, for example, assessments cannot merely be carried over from year to year without regard to market influences. Property values are continually changing, and the values do not change at the same rate for all properties. Without changes in the assessments, inequities will soon develop.

4. SHOULD I EXPECT A LARGE CHANGE IN MY ASSESSMENT ANNUALLY?

Answer: Not likely. Your municipality's town-wide transition from a "fractional assessment system" (where the assessment represents a fraction of the current value) to 100% of market value will only take place once. Moving forward, the expectation is that the changes in your assessment will be marginal as market values change. True market value is fairly constant; a multiple year study is used to gauge market conditions to secure against general temporary inflation or deflation.

Board of Taxation - August 2015

2

Once a municipality has transitioned to market value, each year the Assessor, by law, must review each property and revise the assessment, both up and down, in accordance with market value evidence, so that the assessment is set equal to the current market value. While the taxpayer will experience the initial shift from a "fractional assessment" to 100% of market value in a similar way that they experienced the implementation of a revaluation, moving forward all future annual changes are expected to be small. Annual assessment changes are expected to be in accordance with observed market value data. The municipal assessor under the Real Property Assessment Demonstration program must review and revise the assessment on an annual basis to maintain a 100% market value to assessment ratio.

5. HOW ARE PROPERTY VALUES ESTABLISHED?

Answer: Standardized mass appraisal methods and techniques are used to systematically appraise groups of properties. This includes the analysis of recent sales and statistical studies.

To avoid discriminatory treatment, reassessments should cover the entire municipality in scope. A good reassessment program includes:

- Analysis of all recent real property sales, including a comparison of sales prices with assessed values of sold properties; identification of real property value trends
- A parcel by parcel review of all real property values
- Review, revision and mapping of all unit land values
- Entry of data into Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal System (CAMA)
- Gathering and utilization of pertinent income data; development and application of local cost conversion factors to improvements with adjustments to individual Property Record Cards
- Review and adjustment of depreciation and obsolescence factors with changes to individual property records
- Reconciliation and revised true value for each property
- Placing revised taxable values on the tax list for the year in which the reassessment becomes effective

Properties must be stratified, or broken down, into somewhat homogenous groups. Similar property groups will tend to appreciate or depreciate at roughly the same rate. It is not sufficient for the assessor to merely stratify properties and sales according to their statutory classification and develop one trending factor for the entire class of property. Properties, even properties within the same assessment classification, may vary considerably in quality, style, age, location and amenities, and cannot be expected to change in value at the same rate.

6. WHY DID THE ALLOCATION OF MY LAND AND IMPROVEMENT VALUE CHANGE?

Answer: The allocation of land to building is an administrative process and may not accurately reflect the market value of the individual parts. As such, the subject's total value can be appealed and dictates the taxes for the year.

Predominantly, residential real estate is bought and sold as a whole and valued as such. Depending on the method of valuation, the allocation between land and improvements may be subjective; such allocation shall not be presumptive of a correct apportionment of true value. Within the Allocation Method, the value of the entire property is estimated by the Income or Comparison Approaches; the value of the structure on the land is found by the Replacement Cost Approach and is deducted from the total value. The remaining amount is assumed to be the land value. Other methods like the Replacement Cost Approach uses current building costs and standards of material and design to estimate the cost of creating a building having the same utility as that of the subject property. An allowance then is made for depreciation. A value for the land is determined separately and added to the value developed for the building. In this approach, the value allocation of land and improvement may accurately reflect the market value of each part separately. Nevertheless, the total assessment should be the single driving force in reviewing the assessment for accuracy.

3

7. WHAT IF I DISAGREE WITH MY NEW ASSESSMENT?

Answer: First, contact your municipal Assessor's Office to review your property record card for errors. If the record card is accurate and you disagree with the total assessment, you may file an appeal with the Monmouth County Tax Board. The time to appeal an assessment for 2015 was between November 15, 2014 and January 15, 2015. For properties with an assessed value over \$1,000,000 the deadline to appeal to the Tax Court of New Jersey was either April 1, 2015 or May 1, 2015 depending on your municipality. For more information on how to appeal your 2016 assessment, please visit the Monmouth County Board of Taxation Online Appeal System at <u>secure.njappealonline.com</u> and click on the "<u>Appeal Guide</u>." The County's Online Appeal Filing System will open on or about November 15, 2015 for the filing of 2016 assessment appeals.

8. WHY ARE THE 1st AND 2ND QUARTER TAX PAYMENTS DIFFERENT FROM THE 3RDAND 4TH? Answer: The first and second quarter payments are estimated based on the 2014 tax rate and assessment.

Your tax bill is arrived at by multiplying the total assessment by the overall tax rate (general rate + special district rates). The general tax rate is decided by dividing the amount to be raised by taxation or the "levy" by the total value of all property within the municipality. The total levy is the amount the county, local school, regional school, and the municipality needs to provide services. Once the general rate is realized (typically between May and June), the property's total assessment is used to calculate the "total amount owed for the current year". To calculated the amount to be paid in the 3^{rd} and 4^{th} quarter bills the 1^s and 2^{rd} quarter payments (which were estimated payments calculated from the property's prior tax payment) are subtracted from the total amount owed for the year current year and the remainder is split equally between the 3^{rd} and 4^{th} quarter payment.

9. WHAT HAPPENS IF I DO NOT PAY MY TAX BILL?

Answer: There is normally a 10 day grace period after which interest is applied, calculated at 8% on the first \$1,500 past due and 18% for any amount over \$1,500 (per NJSA 54:4-67). Properties with delinquent municipal charges (taxes, sewer and interest) totaling \$10,000.00 or more at calendar year end are subject to an additional 6% year end penalty. Please contact your municipal Tax Collector for more information concerning tax payments.

10. I THOUGHT THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY HAD A 2% CAP ON PROPERTY TAXES – WHY DID MY TAX BILL GO UP OVER 2%?

Answer: The 2% "cap" law puts a restriction on how much a local budget may increase. This law does not directly limit the increases/decrease of property taxes.

In preparation of an annual budget, no local unit, including municipalities, counties, fire districts, and existing solid waste collection districts with a tax rate of more than \$.10 (ten cents) may increase the tax levy above 2% of the previous year's with the following exceptions:

- 1. Capital expenditure increases
- 2. Debt service increases
- 3. Emergencies weather and "declared" emergencies
- 4. Pensions and health benefits

Regulations for these caps are administered by the Department of Community Affairs, Division of Local Government Services, Local Finance Board. Any questions about budget caps or tax levy caps should be directed to that agency.

Please contact your municipal Assessor's Office or the Monmouth County Board of Taxation if you need further clarification on the above information or assistance on any property tax matter.

PROPERTY TAX RELIEF PROGRAMS

There are a number of municipal and state programs:

- Annual Property Tax Deduction for Senior Citizens, Disabled Persons: Annual deduction of up to \$250 from property taxes for homeowners age 65 or older or disabled who meet certain income (not exceeding \$10,000) and residency requirements.
- Annual Deduction for Veterans: Annual deduction of up to \$250 from taxes due on the real or personal property of qualified war veterans and their unmarried surviving spouses.
- Property Tax Exemption for Disabled Veterans: Full exemption from property taxes on a principal residence for certain totally and permanently disabled war veterans and their unmarried surviving spouses. Unmarried surviving spouses of servicepersons who died on wartime active duty may also qualify.
- Property Tax Reimbursement (Senior Freeze) You may be eligible for a reimbursement of the difference between the amount of property taxes you paid for the base year (the year you first became eligible) and the amount paid for the year for which you are applying for a reimbursement if you met all the following requirements for the base year and for each succeeding year, up to and including the year for which you are claiming the reimbursement.

MONMOUTH COUNTY ADP 5-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION OVERVIEW

| | "Annual Reassessments supported by 20% annual internal inspections" | | | | |
|--------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Year 1 | 2014 | The 1st year of ADP implementation is, by design, an introduction into the authority to review and revise each parcel with a mandatory adjustment, up and down, to the Director's Ratio. This gentle transition of authorities and calendar was tempered for both the taxpayers and the assessment community and retains the Assessor's protection of the Chapter 123 corridor of value. Changing to the Director's ratio in the initial year invoked a small reaction to the assessment change. Consequent to the minor assessment adjustments in year-1 was a minor reallocation of the local tax levy. The 1st year was underscored by the new appeal calendar which was managed by the County's Online Appeal System. | | | |
| Year 2 | 2015 | Year-2 should be viewed as the year of transition. With each parcel being revised from the Director's Ratio to 100% of market value, this year intentionally produced assessment changes that were often significant (similar to a traditional revaluation). More importantly, the "3rd Q billing" reflected a significant redistribution of the tax levy within the town. | | | |
| Year 3 | 2016 | Moving forward, with annual adjustments from 100% MV to 100% MV for every parcel, on average all future year's assessment changes should be increasingly more stable and driven by a 3-year weighted average of the observable change in the neighborhood-level market. Three years shall be used in appreciating markets to ensure that the Assessor is not "chasing the highest dollar". In depreciating markets a higher weight will be given | | | |
| Year 4 | to the more recent (presumably lower sales) to help prevent significant over-assessment. A v conservative multiplier will be used for all areas that do not have ample sales activity. This areas that do not have ample sales activity. | | | | |
| Year 5 | 2018 | in data. From this point forward the entire assessment function should be focused on annually delivering an assessment list that is increasingly more in line with current market values. The singular goal is to deliver accurate individual assessments. If each assessment is defensibly set equal to current market value than all of the significant systemic costs previously associated with the appeal process can be saved by the taxpayer. | | | |

Transitioning all 53 municipalities from "fractional assessments" to "Annual Reassessments supported by 20% annual internal inspections"

5

Monmouth County Assessment Demonstration Program

Year 1 - 2014 Implementation Schedule

2014 Assessments revised to market value by Assessor NONE

| NON | E | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------------------|
| | 20 | 014 Assessments revised | by Assess | sor to current ratio |
| 1 | | 4th year QRA | 28 | 3 MANALAPAN |
| 2 | ALLENHURST | 3rd year QRA | 29 |) MANASQUAN |
| 3 | ALLENTOWN | 4th year QRA | 30 |) MARLBORO |
| 5 | ATLANTIC HIGHLANDS | S 1st year QRA | 31 | MATAWAN |
| 6 | AVON BY THE SEA | 4th year QRA | 32 | 2 MIDDLETOWN |
| 7 | BELMAR | 1st year QRA | 33 | 3 MILLSTONE |
| 8 | BRADLEY BEACH | 3rd year QRA | 34 | MONMOUTH BEAC |
| 9 | | 3rd year QRA | 35 | |
| 10 | COLTS NECK | 4th year QRA | 36 | 8 NEPTUNE CITY |
| 11 | DEAL | 4th year QRA | 37 | 7 OCEAN TWP |
| 12 | EATONTOWN | 2nd year QRA | 38 | 3 OCEANPORT |
| 13 | ENGLISHTOWN | 4th year QRA | 39 | RED BANK |
| 15 | FARMINGDALE | 3rd year QRA | 40 |) ROOSEVELT |
| 16 | FREEHOLD BORO | 1st year QRA | 42 | 2 SEA BRIGHT |
| 17 | FREEHOLD TWP | 4th year QRA | 43 | 3 SEA GIRT |
| 18 | HAZLET | 4th year QRA | 44 | SHREWSBURY BO 1 |
| 19 | HIGHLANDS | 4th year QRA | 45 | 5 SHREWSBURY TW |
| 20 | HOLMDEL | 4th year QRA | 46 | S LAKE COMO |
| 21 | | 4th year QRA | 47 | 7 SPRING LAKE |
| 22 | | 4th year QRA | 48 | |
| 23 | KEANSBURG | 1st year QRA | 49 |) TINTON FALLS |
| 24 | KEYPORT | 3rd year QRA | 50 | |
| 25 | LITTLE SILVER | 4th year QRA | 51 | UPPER FREEHOLD |
| 26 | LOCH ARBOUR | 4th year QRA | 52 | |
| 27 | LONG BRANCH | 2nd year QRA | 53 | 3 WEST LONG BRAN |
| | 2015 Assessments revise | ed to market value by | 7 | |
| | traditional rev | valuation | | |
| 4 | ASBURY PARK | 2014 Revaluation |] | |
| 14 | FAIR HAVEN | 2014 Revaluation |] | |
| 41 | RUMSON | 2014 Revaluation | | |
| | | | | |

| 28 | r to current ratio MANALAPAN | 4th year QRA |
|----|---------------------------------|--------------|
| 29 | MANASQUAN | 2nd year QRA |
| 30 | MARLBORO | 4th year QRA |
| 31 | MATAWAN | 4th year QRA |
| 32 | MIDDLETOWN | 4th year QRA |
| 33 | MILLSTONE | 4th year QRA |
| 34 | MONMOUTH BEACH | 3rd year QRA |
| 35 | NEPTUNE TWP | 3rd year QRA |
| 36 | NEPTUNE CITY | 3rd year QRA |
| 37 | OCEAN TWP | 2nd year QRA |
| 38 | OCEANPORT | 1st year QRA |
| 39 | RED BANK | 2nd year QRA |
| 40 | ROOSEVELT | 4th year QRA |
| 42 | SEA BRIGHT | 2nd year QRA |
| 43 | SEA GIRT | 3rd year QRA |
| 44 | SHREWSBURY BORO | 4th year QRA |
| 45 | SHREWSBURY TWP | 4th year QRA |
| 46 | LAKE COMO | 2nd year QRA |
| 47 | SPRING LAKE | 1st year QRA |
| 48 | SPRING LAKE HGTS | 4th year QRA |
| 49 | TINTON FALLS | 4th year QRA |
| 50 | UNION BEACH | 3rd year QRA |
| 51 | UPPER FREEHOLD | 3rd year QRA |
| 52 | WALL TWP | 2nd year QRA |
| 53 | WEST LONG BRANCH | 4th year QRA |

| Year 2 - 2015 Implementation Schedule |
|---------------------------------------|
|---------------------------------------|

6

| | | 2015 Assessments revised to |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | ABERDEEN | |
| 3 | ALLENTOWN | |
| 4 | ASBURY PARK | |
| 6 | AVON BY THE SEA | |
| 10 | COLTS NECK | |
| 11 | DEAL | |
| 13 | ENGLISHTOWN | |
| 14 | FAIR HAVEN | |
| 17 | FREEHOLD TWP | |
| 18 | HAZLET | |
| 19 | HIGHLANDS | |
| 20 | HOLMDEL | |
| 21 | HOWELL | |
| 22 | INTERLAKEN | |

| 2015 Assessments revised to current ratio - revaluation pending for future years. | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------|--|
| 5 | ATLANTIC HIGHLANDS | 2017 Revaluation | |
| 7 | BELMAR | 2017 Revaluation | |
| 12 | EATONTOWN | 2016 Revaluation | |

| o ma | market value by Assessor | | | | |
|------|--------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| | 25 | LITTLE SILVER | | | |
| | 26 | LOCH ARBOUR | | | |
| | 28 | MANALAPAN | | | |
| | 30 | MARLBORO | | | |
| | 31 | MATAWAN | | | |
| | 32 | MIDDLETOWN | | | |
| | 33 | MILLSTONE | | | |
| | 40 | ROOSEVELT | | | |
| | 41 | RUMSON | | | |
| | 44 | SHREWSBURY BORO | | | |
| | 45 | SHREWSBURY TWP | | | |
| | 48 | SPRING LAKE HGTS | | | |
| | 49 | TINTON FALLS | | | |
| | 53 | WEST LONG BRANCH | | | |

| 2015 Assessments revised to market value by traditional revaluation | | | |
|---|---------------|------------------|--|
| 2 | ALLENHURST | 2015 Revaluation | |
| 8 | BRADLEY BEACH | 2015 Revaluation | |
| 9 | BRIELLE | 2015 Revaluation | |

Prepared by the Monmouth County

2015 Annual Reassessment & the Impact on Property Taxes

| 16 | FREEHOLD BORO | 2016 Revaluation |
|----|---------------|------------------|
| 23 | KEANSBURG | 2017 Revaluation |
| 27 | LONG BRANCH | 2016 Revaluation |
| 29 | MANASQUAN | 2017 Revaluation |
| 37 | OCEAN TWP | 2016 Revaluation |
| 38 | OCEANPORT | 2017 Revaluation |
| 39 | RED BANK | 2016 Revaluation |
| 42 | SEA BRIGHT | 2016 Revaluation |
| 46 | LAKE COMO | 2016 Revaluation |
| 47 | SPRING LAKE | 2017 Revaluation |
| 52 | WALL TWP | 2016 Revaluation |
| | | |

| | 1 | 1 2 |
|----|----------------|------------------|
| 15 | FARMINGDALE | 2015 Revaluation |
| 24 | KEYPORT | 2015 Revaluation |
| 34 | MONMOUTH BEACH | 2015 Revaluation |
| 35 | NEPTUNE TWP | 2015 Revaluation |
| 36 | NEPTUNE CITY | 2015 Revaluation |
| 43 | SEA GIRT | 2015 Revaluation |
| 50 | UNION BEACH | 2015 Revaluation |
| 51 | UPPER FREEHOLD | 2015 Revaluation |
| | | |

| | | Year 3 - 2016 Imple | ementa |
|----|----------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| | | 2016 Assessments revised | to marke |
| 1 | ABERDEEN | 2nd year QRA | |
| 2 | ALLENHURST | 1st year QRA | |
| 3 | ALLENTOWN | 2nd year QRA | |
| 4 | ASBURY PARK | 2nd year QRA | |
| 6 | AVON BY THE SEA | 2nd year QRA | |
| 8 | BRADLEY BEACH | 1st year QRA | |
| 9 | BRIELLE | 1st year QRA | |
| 10 | | 2nd year QRA | |
| 11 | DEAL | 2nd year QRA | |
| 13 | ENGLISHTOWN | 2nd year QRA | |
| 14 | FAIR HAVEN | 2nd year QRA | |
| 15 | FARMINGDALE | 1st year QRA | |
| 17 | FREEHOLD TWP | 2nd year QRA | |
| 18 | HAZLET | 2nd year QRA | |
| 19 | HIGHLANDS | 2nd year QRA | |
| 20 | HOLMDEL | 2nd year QRA | |
| 21 | HOWELL | 2nd year QRA | |
| 22 | INTERLAKEN | 2nd year QRA | |
| 24 | KEYPORT | 1st year QRA | |
| 25 | LITTLE SILVER | 2nd year QRA | |
| 2 | 016 Assessments revi | ised to market value by | 1 |
| | traditional | revaluation | |
| 12 | EATONTOWN | 2016 Revaluation | |
| 27 | LONG BRANCH | 2016 Revaluation | |
| 29 | MANASQUAN | 2016 Revaluation | |
| 37 | OCEAN TWP | 2016 Revaluation | |
| | RED BANK | 2016 Revaluation | |
| 42 | SEA BRIGHT | 2016 Revaluation | . |

2016 Revaluation

2016 Revaluation

46 LAKE COMO

52 WALL TWP

| entation Schedule | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| narket va | arket value by Assessor | | | | |
| 26 | LOCH ARBOUR | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 28 | MANALAPAN | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 30 | MARLBORO | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 31 | MATAWAN | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 32 | MIDDLETOWN | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 33 | MILLSTONE | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 34 | MONMOUTH BEACH | 1st year QRA | | | |
| 35 | NEPTUNE TWP | 1st year QRA | | | |
| 36 | NEPTUNE CITY | 1st year QRA | | | |
| 40 | ROOSEVELT | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 41 | RUMSON | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 43 | SEA GIRT | 1st year QRA | | | |
| 44 | SHREWSBURY BORO | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 45 | SHREWSBURY TWP | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 48 | SPRING LAKE HGTS | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 49 | TINTON FALLS | 2nd year QRA | | | |
| 50 | UNION BEACH | 1st year QRA | | | |
| 51 | UPPER FREEHOLD | 1st year QRA | | | |
| 53 | WEST LONG BRANCH | 2nd year QRA | | | |

| 20 | 16 Assessments revised to revaluation pending for f | |
|----|--|------------------|
| 5 | ATLANTIC HIGHLANDS | 2017 Revaluation |
| 7 | BELMAR | 2017 Revaluation |
| 16 | FREEHOLD BORO | 2017 Revaluation |
| 23 | KEANSBURG | 2017 Revaluation |
| 38 | OCEANPORT | 2017 Revaluation |
| 47 | SPRING LAKE | 2017 Revaluation |
| | | |

| | Year 4 - 2017 Implementation Schedule 2017 Assessments revised to market value by Assessor | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------|--|----|----------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | ABERDEEN | 3rd year QRA | | 29 | MANASQUAN | 1st year QRA |
| 2 | ALLENHURST | 2nd year QRA | | 30 | MARLBORO | 3rd year QRA |
| 3 | ALLENTOWN | 3rd year QRA | | 31 | MATAWAN | 3rd year QRA |
| 4 | ASBURY PARK | 3rd year QRA | | 32 | MIDDLETOWN | 3rd year QRA |
| 6 | AVON BY THE SEA | 3rd year QRA | | 33 | MILLSTONE | 3rd year QRA |
| 8 | BRADLEY BEACH | 2nd year QRA | | 34 | MONMOUTH BEACH | 2nd year QRA |
| 9 | BRIELLE | 2nd year QRA | | 35 | NEPTUNE TWP | 2nd year QRA |
| 10 | COLTS NECK | 3rd year QRA | | 36 | NEPTUNE CITY | 2nd year QRA |
| 11 | DEAL | 3rd year QRA | | 37 | OCEAN TWP | 1st year QRA |
| 12 | EATONTOWN | 1st year QRA | | 39 | RED BANK | 1st year QRA |
| 13 | ENGLISHTOWN | 3rd year QRA | | 40 | ROOSEVELT | 3rd year QRA |
| 14 | FAIR HAVEN | 3rd year QRA | | 41 | RUMSON | 3rd year QRA |

7

2015 Annual Reassessment & the Impact on Property Taxes

| 15 | FARMINGDALE | 2nd year QRA | | |
|---|---------------|--------------|--|--|
| 17 | FREEHOLD TWP | 3rd year QRA | | |
| 18 | HAZLET | 3rd year QRA | | |
| 19 | HIGHLANDS | 3rd year QRA | | |
| 20 | HOLMDEL | 3rd year QRA | | |
| 21 | HOWELL | 3rd year QRA | | |
| 22 | INTERLAKEN | 3rd year QRA | | |
| 24 | KEYPORT | 2nd year QRA | | |
| 25 | LITTLE SILVER | 3rd year QRA | | |
| 26 | LOCH ARBOUR | 3rd year QRA | | |
| 27 | LONG BRANCH | 1st year QRA | | |
| 28 | MANALAPAN | 3rd year QRA | | |
| 2017 Assessments revised to market value by | | | | |

| 2017 Assessments revised to market value by traditional revaluation | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------|--|
| 5 | ATLANTIC HIGHLANDS | 2017 Revaluation | |
| 7 | BELMAR | 2017 Revaluation | |
| 16 | FREEHOLD BORO | 2017 Revaluation | |
| 23 | KEANSBURG | 2017 Revaluation | |
| 38 | OCEANPORT | 2017 Revaluation | |
| 47 | SPRING LAKE | 2017 Revaluation | |

| | | - | |
|---|----|------------------|--------------|
| | 42 | SEA BRIGHT | 1st year QRA |
| | 43 | SEA GIRT | 2nd year QRA |
| | 44 | SHREWSBURY BORO | 3rd year QRA |
| | 45 | SHREWSBURY TWP | 3rd year QRA |
| ſ | 46 | LAKE COMO | 1st year QRA |
| ſ | 48 | SPRING LAKE HGTS | 3rd year QRA |
| ſ | 49 | TINTON FALLS | 3rd year QRA |
| ſ | 50 | UNION BEACH | 2nd year QRA |
| ſ | 51 | UPPER FREEHOLD | 2nd year QRA |
| ſ | 52 | WALL TWP | 1st year QRA |
| ſ | 53 | WEST LONG BRANCH | 3rd year QRA |
| | | | |

2017 Assessments revised to current ratio revaluation pending for future years.

None

| Year 5 - 2018 Implementation Schedule | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|-----|--------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | 201 | 8 Assessments revis | sed | to mar | ket value by Assessor | |
| 1 | ABERDEEN | 4th year QRA | | 28 | MANALAPAN | 4th year QRA |
| 2 | ALLENHURST | 3rd year QRA | 1 1 | 29 | MANASQUAN | 2nd year QRA |
| 3 | ALLENTOWN | 4th year QRA | | 30 | MARLBORO | 4th year QRA |
| 4 | ASBURY PARK | 4th year QRA | | 31 | MATAWAN | 4th year QRA |
| 5 | ATLANTIC HIGHLANDS | 1st year QRA | | 32 | MIDDLETOWN | 4th year QRA |
| 6 | AVON BY THE SEA | 4th year QRA | | 33 | MILLSTONE | 4th year QRA |
| 7 | BELMAR | 1st year QRA | | 34 | MONMOUTH BEACH | 3rd year QRA |
| 8 | BRADLEY BEACH | 3rd year QRA | | 35 | NEPTUNE TWP | 3rd year QRA |
| 9 | BRIELLE | 3rd year QRA | | 36 | NEPTUNE CITY | 3rd year QRA |
| 10 | COLTS NECK | 4th year QRA | | 37 | OCEAN TWP | 2nd year QRA |
| 11 | DEAL | 4th year QRA | | 38 | OCEANPORT | 1st year QRA |
| 12 | EATONTOWN | 2nd year QRA | | 39 | RED BANK | 2nd year QRA |
| 13 | ENGLISHTOWN | 4th year QRA | | 40 | ROOSEVELT | 4th year QRA |
| 14 | FAIR HAVEN | 4th year QRA | | 41 | RUMSON | 4th year QRA |
| 15 | FARMINGDALE | 3rd year QRA | | 42 | SEA BRIGHT | 2nd year QRA |
| 16 | FREEHOLD BORO | 1st year QRA | | 43 | SEA GIRT | 3rd year QRA |
| 17 | FREEHOLD TWP | 4th year QRA | | 44 | SHREWSBURY BORO | 4th year QRA |
| 18 | HAZLET | 4th year QRA | | 45 | SHREWSBURY TWP | 4th year QRA |
| 19 | HIGHLANDS | 4th year QRA | | 46 | LAKE COMO | 2nd year QRA |
| 20 | HOLMDEL | 4th year QRA | | 47 | SPRING LAKE | 1st year QRA |
| 21 | HOWELL | 4th year QRA | | 48 | SPRING LAKE HGTS | 4th year QRA |
| 22 | INTERLAKEN | 4th year QRA | | 49 | TINTON FALLS | 4th year QRA |
| 23 | KEANSBURG | 1st year QRA | | 50 | UNION BEACH | 3rd year QRA |
| 24 | KEYPORT | 3rd year QRA | | 51 | UPPER FREEHOLD | 3rd year QRA |
| 25 | LITTLE SILVER | 4th year QRA | | 52 | WALL TWP | 2nd year QRA |
| 26 | LOCH ARBOUR | 4th year QRA | | 53 | WEST LONG BRANCH | 4th year QRA |
| 27 | LONG BRANCH | 2nd year QRA | l | | | |
| 2018 Assessments revised to market value by traditional revaluation2018 Assessments revised to current ratio - revaluation pending for future years. | | | | | | |
| None None | | | | | | |

Monmouth County Board of Taxation

Telephone: 732-431-7404

James Stuart, CTA, President • Thomas J. Byrne, Vice President Kathleen Cody Bjelka, Commissioner • Clifford Moore, Commissioner • Wayne C. Pomanowski, Commissioner Matthew S. Clark, CTA, Tax Administrator · Veronica Schenk, CTA, Asst. Tax Administrator

8

Prepared by the Monmouth County