## Order of the Thurston County Board of Equalization

Property Owner: <u>EE</u>	DMUND RAUSER			
Parcel Number(s):	12933241100	······································		
Assessment Year: 2	016	Petition Number: <u>16-017</u>	5	
Having considered the	e evidence presented by the partic	es in this appeal, the Board	hereby:	
$\Box$ sustains $\triangleright$	overrules the determination	on of the assessor.		
Assessor's True and	Fair Value	<b>BOE True and Fair Val</b>	ue Determination	n
$\boxtimes$ Land	\$ 106,200	$\boxtimes$ Land	\$ 104,150	
Improvements	\$ <u>0</u>	Improvements	\$ 0	
Minerals	\$	Minerals	\$	
Personal Proper	ty \$	Personal Property	\$	
TOTAL:	\$ 106,200	TOTAL:	\$ 104,150	
Assessor's Current U	Jse Value Determination	<b>BOE Current Use Value</b>	e Determination	
🔀 Land	\$ 260	$\boxtimes$ Land	\$ 260	
Improvements	\$_0	Improvements	\$ <u>0</u>	
Minerals	\$	Minerals	\$	
Personal Proper	ty \$	Personal Property	\$	
TOTAL:	\$ 260	TOTAL:	\$ 260	kter

<u>This decision is based on our finding that</u>: The Board supports the Assessor's recommended reduction in the market value and sustains the Assessor's current use value based on the testimony and evidence presented. The Board relies, in a measure, on its previous reviews of the subject property.

The subject property is enrolled in the current use timber program, along with a portion of two contiguous lots. Therefore, this decision includes a determination of both the market value and the current use value.

The Assessor recommended a reduction in the market value from \$106,200 to \$104,150. The standard of review is reduced from clear, cogent, and convincing evidence to the preponderance of the evidence due to the Assessor's recommended reduction.

The Petitioner testified that there is no well or septic on the subject parcel. The Petitioner provided bids totaling \$26,513.74 to install a well and a septic system. The Petitioner noted that this did not include the cost for building a road or bringing power to the property. The Petitioner provided the sales of two improved parcels in support of his requested value. The Board does not find the Petitioner's argument to use the extracted land values from these improved property sales to value the subject property to be persuasive.

The Assessor provided a market-adjusted cost approach, a neighborhood sales listing, and a "generic multiple regression model" in support of the recommended value. The Assessor's neighborhood sales listing includes Parcel Number 1293422500, a vacant 1 acre parcel that sold for \$70,000 on May 17, 2013, and Parcel Number 12933422100, a vacant 3 acre parcel that sold for \$171,500 on October 29, 2012. The Board finds that these sales support the Assessor's recommended reduction in the market value for the subject property. Because the generic multiple regression model contained inputs that seemed at odds with the Cost Valuation Report, the Board does not rely on the generic multiple regression model.

Thurston County Board of Equalization Petition Number 16-0175 Edmund Rauser Page Two of Two

The Board concludes that the Petitioner did not provide a preponderance of the evidence to warrant a further reduction in the market valuation, or clear, cogent, and convincing evidence sufficient to reduce the current use value of the subject property.

Dated this 2017 23rd day of January Robert B. Shirley, Chairman Clerk of the Board

**NOTICE** This order can be appealed to the State Board of Tax Appeals by filing a notice of appeal with them at PO Box 40915, Olympia, WA 98504-0915 or at their website at bta.state.wa.us/appeal/forms.htm within thirty days of the date of mailing of this order. The Notice of Appeal form is available from either your county assessor or the State Board.

To ask about the availability of this publication in an alternate format for the visually impaired, please call 1-800-647-7706. Teletype (TTY) users use the Washington Relay Service by calling 711. For tax assistance, call (360) 534-1400.

Distribution: • Assessor • Petitioner • BOE File

REV 64 0058 (6/9/14)

SHIPPED JAN 2 7 2017

## Order of the Thurston County Board of Equalization

Property Owner:	EDMUND	RAUSER				
Parcel Number(s):	129332	41200 📧				
Assessment Year:	2016		Petition Number: <u>16-017</u>	6		
Having considered t	he eviden	ce presented by the	parties in this appeal, the Board	here	eby:	
sustains	🛛 overn	ules the determ	nination of the assessor.			
Assessor's True an	d Fair Va	alue	<b>BOE True and Fair Va</b>	lue I	Determination	
🔀 Land	\$	105,450	$\boxtimes$ Land	\$	103,750	
Improvements	s \$_	0	Improvements	\$	0	
Minerals	\$		Minerals	\$		
Personal Prop	erty \$_		Personal Property	\$		
TOTAL:	\$	105,450	TOTAL:	\$	103,750	
Assessor's Current Use Value Determination			<b>BOE Current Use Valu</b>	<b>BOE Current Use Value Determination</b>		
🔀 Land	\$	85,980	Land	\$	52,005	
🛛 Improvements	\$	0	Improvements	\$	0	
Minerals	\$_		Minerals	\$		
Personal Prope	erty \$_		Personal Property	\$		
TOTAL:	\$	85,980	TOTAL:	\$	52,005	

<u>This decision is based on our finding that</u>: The Board supports the Assessor's recommended reduction in the market value and sustains the Assessor's current use value based on the testimony and evidence presented. The Board relies, in a measure, on its previous reviews of the subject property.

One acre subject property is enrolled in the current use timber program, along with two contiguous lots. One acre of the subject property is not enrolled in the current use timber program. Therefore, this decision includes a determination of both the market value and the current use value.

The Assessor recommended a reduction in the market value from \$105,450 to \$103,750. The standard of review is reduced from clear, cogent, and convincing evidence to the preponderance of the evidence due to the Assessor's recommended reduction.

The Petitioner submitted a copy of the Board of Tax Appeals' Decision in Docket No. 81253 for the 2010 assessment year, in which the BTA found that "the Assessor's methodology for valuing the unenrolled parcel is flawed." The BTA noted that the subject property cannot be divided under current zoning regulations. The BTA found that the fair market value of the 1 acre not enrolled in the current use timber program was \$76,475, one-half of the total fair market value for the 2 acre parcel. The Board of Equalization finds this Decision of the Board of Tax Appeals to be persuasive authority. The Board of Equalization divides the total current use value of \$52,005 for the 2016 assessment year as follows: 1 acre enrolled in the current use timber program: \$130, and 1 acre not enrolled in the current use timber program: \$51,875.

The Petitioner testified that there is no well or septic on the subject parcel. The Petitioner provided bids totaling \$26,513.74 to install a well and a septie system. The Petitioner noted that this did not include the cost for building a road or bringing power to the property.

Thurston County Board of Equalization Petition Number 16-0176 Edmund Rauser Page Two of Two

The Petitioner provided the sales of two improved parcels in support of his requested value. The Board does not find the Petitioner's argument to use the extracted land values from these improved property sales to value the subject property to be persuasive.

The Assessor provided a market-adjusted cost approach, a neighborhood sales listing, and a "generic multiple regression model" in support of the recommended value. The Assessor's neighborhood sales listing includes Parcel Number 1293422500, a vacant 1 acre parcel that sold for \$70,000 on May 17, 2013, and Parcel Number 12933422100, a vacant 3 acre parcel that sold for \$171,500 on October 29, 2012. The Board finds that these sales support the Assessor's recommended reduction in the market value for the subject property. Because the generic multiple regression model contained inputs that seemed at odds with the Cost Valuation Report, the Board does not rely on the generic multiple regression model.

The Board concludes that the Petitioner did not provide a preponderance of the evidence to warrant a further reduction in the market valuation. The Board concludes that the Petitioner provided clear, cogent, and convincing evidence to overcome the Assessor's presumption of correctness and to warrant a reduction in the current use value of the subject property.

Dated this 23rd \_day of 2017 January Robert B. Shirley, Chairman The Board

NOTICE

This order can be appealed to the State Board of Tax Appeals by filing a notice of appeal with them at PO Box 40915, Olympia, WA 98504-0915 or at their website at bta.state.wa.us/appeal/forms.htm within thirty days of the date of mailing of this order. The Notice of Appeal form is available from either your county assessor or the State Board.

To ask about the availability of this publication in an alternate format for the visually impaired, please call 1-800-647-7706. Teletype (TTY) users use the Washington Relay Service by calling 711. For tax assistance, call (360) 534-1400.

Distribution: • Assessor • Petitioner • BOE File

REV 64 0058 (6/9/14)

SHIPPED JAN 2 7 2017

Corrected order SHIPPED FEB 1 5 2017

## Order of the Thurston County Board of Equalization

Property Owner:	EDMUND I	RAUSER			
Parcel Number(s):	1293324	1300 (8)			
Assessment Year:	2016		Petition Number: 16-017	7	
Having considered	the evidenc	e presented by the pa	rties in this appeal, the Board	here	eby:
sustains 🗌	🛛 overrul	les the determina	ation of the assessor.		
Assessor's True and Fair Value BOE True and Fair Value Determination				Determination	
🔀 Land	\$ 1	105,450	🔀 Land	\$	103,750
🛛 Improvement	s \$_0	)	Improvements	\$	0
Minerals	\$		Minerals	\$	
Personal Prop	erty \$		Personal Property	\$	
TOTAL:	\$ 1	05,450	TOTAL:	\$	103,750
Assessor's Current Use Value Determination BOE Current Use Value Determination					
🔀 Land	\$ 2	260	$\boxtimes$ Land	\$	260
🛛 Improvement	s \$_0	)	Improvements	\$	0
Minerals	\$		Minerals	\$	
Personal Prop	erty \$		Personal Property	\$	<b>-</b>
TOTAL:	\$ <u>2</u>	.60	TOTAL:	\$	260

<u>This decision is based on our finding that</u>: The Board supports the Assessor's recommended reduction in the market value and sustains the Assessor's current use value based on the testimony and evidence presented. The Board relies, in a measure, on its previous reviews of the subject property.

The subject property is enrolled in the correction of two contiguous lots. Therefore, this decision includes a determination of both the market value and the current use value.

The Assessor recommended a reduction in the market value from \$105,450 to \$103,750. The standard of review is reduced from clear, cogent, and convincing evidence to the preponderance of the evidence due to the Assessor's recommended reduction.

The Petitioner testified that there is no well or septic on the subject parcel. The Petitioner provided bids totaling \$26,513.74 to install a well and a septic system. The Petitioner noted that this did not include the cost for building a road or bringing power to the property. The Petitioner provided the sales of two improved parcels in support of his requested value. The Board does not find the Petitioner's argument to use the extracted land values from these improved property sales to value the subject property to be persuasive.

The Assessor provided a market-adjusted cost approach, a neighborhood sales listing, and a "generic multiple regression model" in support of the recommended value. The Assessor's neighborhood sales listing includes Parcel Number 1293422500, a vacant 1 acre parcel that sold for \$70,000 on May 17, 2013, and Parcel Number 12933422100, a vacant 3 acre parcel that sold for \$171,500 on October 29, 2012. The Board finds that these sales support the Assessor's recommended reduction in the market value for the subject property. Because the generic multiple regression model contained inputs that seemed at odds with the Cost Valuation Report, the Board does not rely on the generic multiple regression model.

Thurston County Board of Equalization Petition Number 16-0177 Edmund Rauser Page Two of Two

The Board concludes that the Petitioner did not provide a preponderance of the evidence to warrant a further reduction in the market valuation, or clear, cogent, and convincing evidence sufficient to reduce the current use value of the subject property.

( ]	ert B. Shirley, Chairman January , 2017 Ruth J. Elder, Clerk of the Board
	NOTICE
	This order can be appealed to the State Board of Tax Appeals by filing a notice of appeal with them at PO Box 40915, Olympia, WA 98504-0915 or at their website at bta.state.wa.us/appeal/forms.htm within thirty days of the date of mailing of this order. The Notice of Appeal form is available from either your county assessor or the State Board.
7706.	c about the availability of this publication in an alternate format for the visually impaired, please call 1-800-647- Teletype (TTY) users use the Washington Relay Service by calling 711. For tax assistance, call (360) 534-1400. Distribution: • Assessor • Petitioner • BOE File
REVO	4 0058 (6/9/14)
	SHIPPED JAN 27 2017 Re

Corrected Order SHIPPED FEB 1 5 2017 (PE)