Order of the KITTITAS County

Board of Equalization

Property Owner: _	Cindy McMeans	S				
Parcel Number(s):	785034					
Assessment Year:	2015		Petition Number:	BE-150056		
Having considered ⊠ sustains			ties in this appeal, th	e Board h	nereby:	
Assessor's True ar		BOE True and Fair Value Determination				
∠ Land	\$	189,000	Land		\$	
	s \$	82,030	☐ Improvement	ents	\$	
Minerals	\$		☐ Minerals		\$	
Personal Prop	perty \$		Personal P		\$	
Total Value	\$	271,030	Total Valu	e	\$	

This decision is based on our finding that:

The issue before the Board is the assessed value of land/improvements.

A hearing was held on March 28, 2016. Those present: Chairman Ann Shaw, Jennifer Hoyt, Reta Hutchinson, Clerk Debbie Myers, Appraiser perescin, Appellant Cindy McMeans, and Observer Lisa Lawrence.

Appellant Cindy McMeans discussed the red zone for water and how it affected her property. She listed recent sales near her parcels and said some of the comparables listed from the county have electricity and some other differences which she believed made them not comparable. She said none of the comparables were from before the red zone was created, and now they can't build in the red zone. Ms. McMeans provided maps with her property shown in relation to the canal and Clockum road.

Appraiser Mark Peterson said the appraisal date of the property is 1-1-15 and they have to use sales before 1-1-15 for comparables. He said exhibit one shows the comparables the Assessor's office used. He also said most of the Appellant's property is above the canal but not considered remote, and discussed the land models used to value the property. Mr. Peterson referred to the maps provided with comparable sales which were above the canal and said some were valued as dry parcels; there was some road frontage with a value of \$10,000 for the first acre, then it decreases from there. He also discussed range models and how sthey differ and that they are adjusted for topography in some situations.

Appellant McMeans asked about the valuations, since she can't sell one acre, she would have to sell 20 acres at a time. Appraiser Peterson agreed, but said that is how their computer models work in valuing the property. He said a residential acre has more value because it is a building site. Road access was also discussed.

Pursuant to RCW 84.40.0301, the value placed on the property by the Assessor is presumed to be correct, and can only be overcome by clear cogent and convincing evidence. This means the appellant is required to provide enough information to convince this Board that it is highly probable the assessed value is incorrect.

The Board of Equalization has determined that there is not a valid reason for adjusting the assessed value of this parcel. The Board has reviewed the comparables provided by the Assessor and determined that the assessed value is well supported. There are improvements on this parcel including a well and septic. The Board of Equalization voted 3-0 to sustain the Assessor's determination.

Dated this _	31	_ day of	March	, (year)			
Chairperson's S	11/	shaw	<u></u>	Clerk's Sig	Deblie	myers	_

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, 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 may use the Washington Relay Service by calling 711. For tax assistance, call (360) 534-1400.

Distribution: • Assessor • Petitioner • BOE File

REV 64 0058e (4/30/13)