BOARD OF ASSESSMENT APPEALS, STATE OF COLORADO

1313 Sherman Street, Room 315 Denver, Colorado 80203

Petitioner:

TARANGO, INC.,

v.

Respondent:

MOFFAT COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION.

ORDER ON STIPULATION

Docket Number: 52654

THE PARTIES TO THIS ACTION entered into a Stipulation, which has been approved by the Board of Assessment Appeals. A copy of the Stipulation is attached and incorporated as a part of this decision.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS:

1. Subject property is described as follows:

County Schedule No.: P001685

Category: Valuation Property Type: Commercial Personal

- 2. Petitioner is protesting the 2009 actual value of the subject property.
- 3. The parties agreed that the 2009 actual value of the subject property should be reduced to:

Total Value:

\$394,445

(Reference Attached Stipulation)

4. The Board concurs with the Stipulation.

ORDER:

Respondent is ordered to reduce the 2009 actual value of the subject property, as set forth above.

The Moffat County Assessor is directed to change his/her records accordingly.

DATED AND MAILED this 21st day of October 2010.

BOARD OF ASSESSMENT APPEALS

Karen & Hert

Karen E. Har

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of the decision of the Board of Assessment Appeals.

Cara McKeller

Sura a. Baumbach

Debra A. Baumbach



BOARD OF ASSESSMENT APPEALS BD OF ASSESSMENT APPEALS STATE OF COLORADO

2010 OCT 20 Pil 3: 52

Docket Number: 52654 Single County Schedule Number: P001685
STIPULATION (As to Tax Year 2009 Actual Value)
Tarango
Petitioner,
vs.
Moffat COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION,
Respondent.
Petitioner(s) and Respondent hereby enter into this Stipulation regarding the tax year 2009 valuation of the subject property, and jointly move the Board of Assessment Appeals to enter its order based on this stipulation. Petitioner(s) and Respondent agree and stipulate as follows: 1. The property subject to this stipulation is described as: Industrial Personal Property
2. The subject property is classified as Indus Personal Protect (what type of property).
The County Assessor originally assigned the following actual value to the subject property for tax year:
Land \$.00 Personal Parkerty \$ 316,645.00 Total -\$ 316,645.00
4. After a timely appeal to the Board of Equalization, the Board of Equalization valued the subject property as follows:
Land \$.00 1 true NAL Frorerty \$ 444,445.00 Total \$ 444.445.00

After further review and negotiating Equalization agree to the following tax year property:	on. Petitioner(s) and County Board of 2009 actual value for the subject
Land 5	.00
PERSONAL PROPERTY S	394,445.00
S Total \$	394.445 .00
6. The valuation, as established above year 2009	ove, shall be binding only with respect to tax
7. Brief narrative as to why the redu Please see attached page for ex	
•	white the same of
Appeals on November 1, 2010 (date) hearing has not yet been scheduled before DATED this 20 day of the degree of t	the Board of Assessment Appeals.
Petitioner(s) or Agent or Attorney Shayne M. Madsen	County Attorney for Respondent, Board of Equalization
Jackson Kelly PLLC	·
Address: Attorneys for Petitione	er Address:
-1099 18th Street, Ste. 2150	
	221 West Victory Way Ste 120
Denver, CO 80202	
	221 West Victory Way Ste 120 Craig, CO 81625
	221 West Victory Way Ste 120 Craig, CO 81625
Telephone: 303-390-0012	221 West Victory Way Ste 120
	221 West Victory Way Ste 120 Craig, CO 81625 Telephone: 9/U-824-913/ Summer Bunks
	221 West Victory Way Ste 120 Craig, CO 81625
	Telephone: 9/0-824-913/ County Assessor Address:
	Telephone: 9/U-824-913/ County Assessor Address: 221 West Victory Way Ste 240
	221 West Victory Way Ste 120 Craig, CO 81625 Telephone: 9/0-824-913/ County Assessor Address:
	Telephone: 9/U-824-913/ County Assessor Address: 221 West Victory Way Ste 240

7. Brief narrative as to why the reduction was made:

The parties recognize that passage of H.B. 08-1414 in June of 2008 has had serious negative impact to the value of the property in question, but also recognize and agree that the cost to Petitioner of obtaining additional appraisals, preparation of expert financial reports, etc. and the concomitant requirement for additional review and response by Respondent and its professional staff to conclusively determine the extent of this impact is not warranted under the circumstances. The parties agree that the economic obsolescence resulting from the H.B. 08-1414 statutory and regulatory restrictions warrants a reduction in the value of the property for the year in question. In recognition of this fact both parties have agreed to this stipulation as set forth above.