



Officers, 2016-2017

Amy Thomas Laub
Chair
Nationwide Insurance Company

Arthur J. Parham, Jr.
Vice Chair
Entergy Services, Inc.

Robert J. Tuinstra, Jr.
Secretary & Treasurer
E.I. DuPont De Nemours
and Company

Theodore H. Ghiz, Jr.
Past Chair
The Coca-Cola Company

John J. Pydyszewski
Past Chair
Johnson & Johnson

Robert F. Montellione
Past Chair
Prudential Financial

Douglas L. Lindholm
President
Council On State Taxation

Directors

Barbara Barton Weiszhaar
HP Inc.

Deborah R. Bierbaum
AT&T

C. Benjamin Bright
HCA Holdings, Inc.

Paul A. Broman
BP America Inc.

Michael F. Carchia
Capital One Services, LLC

Tony J. Chirico
Medtronic, Inc.

Susan Courson-Smith
Pfizer Inc.

Meredith H. Garwood
Charter Communications

Denise J. Helmken
General Mills

Beth Ann Kendzierski
Apria Healthcare, Inc.

Kurt Lamp
Amazon.Com

Mollie L. Miller
Fresenius Medical Care
North America

Rebecca J. Paulsen
U.S. Bancorp

John H. Paraskevas
Exxon Mobil Corporation

Frances B. Sewell
NextEra Energy, Inc.

Warren D. Townsend
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

Fred Nicely
Senior Tax Counsel
(202) 484-5213
fnicely@cost.org

June 30, 2017

Margie Cusack, Research Manager
International Association of Assessing Officers

Sent Via E-mail: cusack@iaao.org

Re: Comments on Big Box Task Force Exposure Draft

Dear Ms. Cusack:

On behalf of the Council On State Taxation (“COST”), I appreciate the International Association of Assessing Officers (“IAAO”) providing the public with the opportunity to comment on its Big Box Task Force’s Exposure Draft. COST submits comments to address two concerns.¹ First, COST believes a specific position paper on big box retail stores is unwarranted. Secondly, if the paper is ultimately issued, the inequitable bias against the use of some types of comparable sales should be corrected.

About COST

COST is a nonprofit trade association consisting of approximately 600 multistate corporations engaged in interstate and international business. COST’s objective is to preserve and promote equitable and nondiscriminatory state and local taxation of multijurisdictional business entities. COST, in conjunction with the International Property Tax Institute (“IPTI”), has evaluated the states’ and other countries’ property tax administrative practices to promote fair and equitable property taxation.²

Fair and Equitable Property Tax System

The COST Board of Directors has adopted a formal policy statement on Fair and Equitable Property Tax Systems.³ That policy statement position is:

State and local property tax systems must be fairly administered and tax burdens equitably distributed among taxpayers. A property tax system that is inefficient or that disproportionately falls upon business is not equitable and will negatively impact a state’s business tax climate.

¹ COST has not reviewed, and therefore takes no position on, the cases and their summaries in Appendix A.

² COST/IPTI’s “Best and Worst of International Tax Administration” Scorecard is available at: <http://cost.org/WorkArea/DownloadAsset.aspx?id=88125>. A revised Scorecard is slated to be issued late this fall.

³ COST’s Policy Statements are available at: <http://www.cost.org/Page.aspx?id=3140>.

And specifically related to valuation methodology, the policy statement position is:

A statewide valuation methodology that is conducted in accordance with Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) and updated on a regular basis to factor in changes in value, including depreciation and all forms of obsolescence, should be utilized.

COST is very concerned about legislation in several states that has unfairly targeted the use of comparable sales to prohibit appraisers, representing either side, from using normal and accepted appraisal practices to value business properties.

Position Paper Focused on “Big-Box” Retail Stores Unwarranted

The paper indicates its scope is limited to “big-box” retail stores, stores that range from 50,000 square feet to 200,000+ square feet. Confusingly, however, in the same paragraph (lines 14-15) it is noted the paper could be applied to any size retail store and to other property types. Most of the paper presents a fairly generic and benign overview of how business real property should be valued, which negates the need for a paper stating it is addressing “big-box” retail store issues. Further, many states have uniformity clause provisions in their state constitutions that prohibit their legislature or assessors from prescribing one special form of valuation for “big-box” retail stores as compared to other types of business properties. Therefore, COST strongly recommends the IAAO not adopt this paper.

Unfortunately, the paper as drafted is “hiding the ball.” While it is full of references to valuation methods that apply to most business real properties, the real purpose of the paper appears to be to legitimize some government assessors’ efforts to limit a comparable sales analysis for certain types of retail stores (*e.g.*, see lines 743 to 764 addressing deed-restricted properties and vacant properties).

The paper also incorrectly misstates the “highest and best use” is that with the current occupant of the property rather than what a willing buyer would be willing to pay for the property (*e.g.*, see lines 551-560). The assumption that the highest and best use of a property “is likely” the continued use of the property by the current owner improperly disregards obsolescence issues, *e.g.*, what market participants would purchase a property for on the open market.

Troubling Restrictions on Certain Comparable Sales

The paper starts off in its “Summary of Big Box Issues” with a bias against appraisers for retail stores by vastly overstating that they only seek to have big box retail stores “valued as-if-vacant.” This is not a true statement and reflects poor terminology. In most states such properties are valued based on the highest and best legal use of a property using a value-in-exchange methodology, a valuation that does not depend on properties being vacant or occupied. If the IAAO still seeks to have this paper published, the use of “valued as-if-vacant” should be replaced with a “value-in-exchange” terminology.

It is understood that the beneficiaries of the property tax do not want to see their revenue source wither when property valuations in their community have a downturn; however, artificially keeping values higher than market value for certain retail stores is not the appropriate solution. Some of the

valuation decreases, which include “big-box” retail stores, likely stem from the 2008 recession.⁴ Nowhere is this addressed in the paper. Additionally, demand for commercial retail space is in flux, with consumers increasingly making purchases via internet sellers that do not need storefronts or even trends to pursue smaller format store sizes. And, it does not mention recent trends of retail store closures occurring across the country.⁵ None of these issues are adequately addressed in the paper.

Instead, starting at line 743, an overly broad statement is made that deed-restricted comparable sales should not be used in ad valorem valuations. COST suggests that section be significantly rewritten to have the appraiser address the impact a deed-restricted comparable sale may have had on the property's sales price. A deed-restricted property should not automatically equate to a determination that such a sale should always be excluded from a comparable sale analysis. Following USPAP Standards (*e.g.*, Rule 1-5 and 1-6), appraisers representing both the property owner and the government need to have full use of nationally accepted appraisal practices when valuing property to accurately ascertain its market value for property tax purposes.


Beginning on line 754, the same holds true for the vacant property issue addressed in the paper. The paper suggests an appraiser should have no flexibility when reviewing comparable sales to similar properties if one is vacant and the other is occupied. The impact of an extended vacancy, along with other issues impacting a property's sales price, should appropriately be addressed in an appraisal; however, that does not mean appraisers should be inappropriately forced to exclude such properties from their appraisals.

Conclusion

COST recommends the IAAO not adopt this issue paper. If it proceeds, the portions of the paper indicating deed-restricted property and vacant property must be excluded. It should also be revised to allow their use with a caveat that the appraiser explain what, if any, valuation impact those issues have on a property being used as a comparable sale. The impact of a vacancy or a deed restriction on a comparable property are items that appraisers can address in an appraisal; thus, the IAAO should not adopt a paper that unfairly dictates such properties must be excluded from the comparable sales approach.

Please contact me with any questions regarding COST's position in this area.

Sincerely,



Fred Nicely

cc: COST Board of Directors
Douglas L. Lindholm, COST President & Executive Director

⁴ See Lev Borodovsky, “A Turning Point for Commercial Property,” Wall Street Journal, June 26, 2017 p. B10. A graph shows that from 2007 to 2009 there was a 40% drop in commercial real-estate prices.

⁵ Forbes magazine reported that major retailers had already announced the closure of 3,591 stores nationwide in 2017, a trend that unfortunately is likely to continue. See Walter Loeb, “These 21 Retailers Are Closing 3,591 Stores – Who is Next,” Forbes, March 20, 2017.