

**Order of the Grant County**  
**Board of Equalization**

Property Owner: Carole Rigano and Marilyn Dalesky  
Parcel Number(s): 040408001  
Assessment Year: 2015 Petition Number: 2015-147

Having considered the evidence presented by the parties in this appeal, the Board hereby:

sustains       overrules      the determination of the assessor.

**Assessor's True and Fair Value**

<input type="checkbox"/> Land	\$	<u>2,016,005</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements	\$	<u>                    </u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Minerals	\$	<u>                    </u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Personal Property	\$	<u>                    </u>
Total Value	\$	<u>2,016,005</u>

**BOE True and Fair Value Determination**

<input type="checkbox"/> Land	\$	<u>2,016,005</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements	\$	<u>                    </u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Minerals	\$	<u>                    </u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Personal Property	\$	<u>                    </u>
Total Value	\$	<u>2,016,005</u>

This decision is based on our finding from:

Washington State law which directs that the true and fair market value of property shall be based upon sales of the subject property, or sales of comparable properties, made within the past five years, cost, cost less depreciation, reconstruction cost less depreciation, or capitalization of income. "True and fair" value is market value; that is, the price to be paid by a willing buyer to a willing seller.

Washington State law further stipulates that the assessment determined by the County Assessor is presumed to be correct and can only be overcome by presentation of clear, cogent and convincing evidence that the value is incorrect.

The issue before the Board is the January 1, 2015, true and fair market value. A hearing was held on February 12, 2016, before the Board of Equalization. The appellants, were not in attendance but was represented by Kelly Field at the hearing and the Assessor's office was represented by Melissa Hortiz, Chief Appraiser.

The Assessor valued the property at \$2,016,005 for the 2015 assessment year. The owners appealed, asserting a value of \$160,000.

The subject property is a 69.6 acre tract of land within the city limits of Quincy that is zoned residential. 5.6 acres of this land is right-of-way valued at \$1.00 per acre, with the remaining 64 acres valued as development potential. The parcel is currently being used for agricultural purposes but is not in the current use program.

The appellant's submitted news information from April 2006 addressing Microsoft coming to Quincy, a colored map showing the subject and the surrounding area. Mr. Field submitted at the hearing a map from the County Mapsifter program showing the subject property outlined in yellow. Mr. Field stated that the appellants had a offer on the property and were receiving \$1,000 a month to keep it going, the buyers still owed over 2.25 million when he backed out of the offer. At the present time the subject is rented and they receive \$10,500/year and the renter pays the water costs. The new Quincy high school will be built close to the subject if the levy passes this month.

The assessor representative submitted information to the board and the appellant. This information included Quincy zoning map, and 4 development potential land sales. Ms. Hortiz stated that this property has never been in the current use program. The owners have applied for current use, but it won't be applied until 2016 assessment for 2017 tax year. The subject is zoned residential, but is being used for agricultural purposes at this time. Of the four sales, the most emphasis was put on parcel 040411250, sold in August 2012 for \$350,000; \$43,695/acre. The subject property has been valued at \$42,000/acre, but has received a -25% adjustment due to it being larger than the majority of development potential parcels in Quincy.

The Board finds the arguments presented by the appellant are not substantial enough to meet the clear, cogent, and convincing standard of proof necessary to offset the presumption of correctness established under RCW 84.40.0301. The Board finds the Assessor's Response to Real Property Petition dated January 4, 2016, which was mailed to the appellant and submitted as evidence in this hearing adequately reflect the subject's important value-related characteristics. Therefore, the Assessor's value is sustained at \$2,016,005, due to there was no support to lower from the appellants. The appellants have applied and been accepted into the current use program, which will begin for 2016 assessment year for taxes payable in 2017. There was a -25% adjustment made to the subject due to the property being larger than the majority of development potential parcels in Quincy.

Dated this 25<sup>th</sup> day of February, (year) 2016

*Selen Fancher*  
Chairperson's Signature

*Neil Hammond*  
Clerk's Signature

<b>NOTICE</b>
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 <a href="http://bta.state.wa.us/appeal/forms.htm">bta.state.wa.us/appeal/forms.htm</a> 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)