

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

TUESDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 01, 2011

PRESENT:

James Covert, Chairperson
John Krolick, Vice Chairperson
Benjamin Green, Member
Linda Woodland, Member
James Brown, Member

Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk
Herb Kaplan, Deputy District Attorney

The Board of Equalization convened at 9:00 a.m. in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Chairman Covert called the meeting to order, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

SWEARING IN

No one was sworn in on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

11-0171E WITHDRAWN PETITIONS

The following petitions scheduled on today's agenda had been withdrawn by the Petitioners prior to the hearing:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
236-061-09	SHIPMAN, MARILYN F	11-0362
018-102-15	TOT TRUST	11-0586

11-0172E REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk, informed the Board that a request for continuance had been received from David Landes, Assessor's Parcel No. 506-030-03, Hearing No. 11-0364 and from Sierra Nevada Holding Company, Assessor's Parcel No. 508-094-12, Hearing No. 11-0407. The Board determined to hear the two hearings on February 24, 2011.

CONSOLIDATION OF HEARINGS

The Board consolidated items as necessary when they each came up on the agenda.

11-0173E PARCEL NO. 026-021-53 – MUMM, CHRISTOPHER ERIC TRUSTEE – HEARING NO. 11-0287

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3815 Moorpark Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 16 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Christopher E. Mumm was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. Chairman Covert noted the Assessor's Parcel Number listed on the agenda was incorrect and the correct number should be 026-021-53.

Appraiser Spoor informed the Board the Assessor's Office was recommending a reduction to the assessed value and she believed the appellant was in agreement.

Mr. Mumm confirmed he was in agreement and acknowledged that property values in Sun Valley had gone down especially when they were surrounded by mobile homes.

Appraiser Spoor stated the recommendation was to reduce the improvement value to \$88,404, based on a total obsolescence amount of \$58,940, resulting in a total taxable value of \$115,404.

With regard to Parcel No. 026-021-53, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$88,404 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$115,404 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0174E PARCEL NO. 018-271-09 – ADKINS FAMILY TRUST, S. RAY & JUNE – HEARING NO. 11-0564

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3316 Susileen Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Copy of Petition with photos and attachments, 14 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 11 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, June Adkins was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joseph Johnson, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Ms. Adkins stated she reviewed the properties located immediately around her home and found her value was much higher. She testified that a house for sale close to the subject was listed at \$149,900, which was less than the taxable value for her property. She noted that home was larger than hers. She presented pictures of other houses for sale and evidence regarding valuation regarding properties located around the subject.

Appraiser Johnson described the improved sales and land sales as shown on page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. He noted Improved Sale #1 was the most comparable to the subject. Based on the comparable sales, he believed the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

Chairman Covert inquired of Appraiser Johnson if he reviewed the evidence presented by the Petitioner. Appraiser Johnson stated there was not much information within the evidence and he would have to review the Assessor's records to more effectively evaluate the other properties.

Member Green stated the hand written letter within the Petitioner's evidence dated August 14, 2009 had disturbing information regarding withdrawal of the protest and reference to the tax bill being lowered. He believed there was miscommunication between the appellant and the Appraiser and thought it should be clarified. Appraiser Johnson stated he had no such conversation with the appellant. Ms.

Adkins stated it was Stacy Ettinger, Appraiser, who came to her property a couple of years ago.

Appraiser Johnson stated the property at 3308 Susileen Drive was built in 1963 and the subject was built in 1972. He said the listing was being depreciated at 1.5 percent, which was the difference between the two properties with regard to valuation. He noted the property at 3314 Susileen Drive was built in 1964 and was also receiving depreciation.

Chairman Covert inquired if Ms. Adkins understood how depreciation worked with regard to valuation. Ms. Adkins said she did not realize nine years made that much difference.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board. Member Green noted the subject's value had gone down since 2008, (2008-\$260,000, 2009-\$212,000, 2010-\$205,000 and 2011-\$188,000). He believed the continued reduction reflected the market. Member Krolick stated the 3 percent cap may also be affecting the valuation.

With regard to Parcel No. 018-271-09, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0175E PARCEL NO. 214-061-17 – SMYTH, EDWARD L TTE –
HEARING NO. 11-0296

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4440 Mountaingate Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 10 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Edward Smyth was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joseph Johnson, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Mr. Smyth commented that when he looked to refinance his home and/or put it up for sale, his realtor and financial representative informed him that values had dropped greatly. He testified he believed that when the home immediately next to the subject sold less than one year ago, it contributed to the drop in values. He reported a discrepancy with regard to the correct square footage of the subject stating it was 5,290 square feet and the Assessor's Office had it at 6,200 square feet.

Mr. Smyth stated the property that sold had a four-car garage, a pool and was on a full acre of land. The subject was on a half-acre and had a three-car garage. He said based upon some limited discussion with the financial institution and the realtor he felt the value of the subject should be \$800,000, as opposed to the \$897,000 being currently assessed. Chairman Covert inquired if that was the value the appellant was requesting the Board to consider. Mr. Smyth said that was correct.

Appraiser Johnson went over the comparable sales listed on page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. Member Green inquired about the difference between a quality class of 6.5 and 6.0 with regard to valuation. Appraiser Johnson remarked it was minimal and would depend on interior finishes, floor coverings, cabinets and fixtures. He said there would only be about a \$20,000 to \$30,000 difference between the two quality class specifications.

Mr. Smyth said the prior owners of the property next door put in the pool approximately three years ago, a circular driveway and other improvements, spending about \$70,000 to \$80,000. He said most of the homes in his immediate area were on half-acre lots. Mr. Smyth said the property was purchased for \$2 million approximately six months after he bought the subject property and then it was sold for \$1 million last year, which was nearly a 50 percent reduction in value. He said he paid \$1.35 million for the subject.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board. Member Green stated Improved Sale #1 (IS) occurred early in 2010. The difference in quality class of 6.5 for IS #1 and 6.0 for the subject only represented about a \$20,000 difference, according to the Assessor's Office. There was also a discrepancy between the garage sizes, but he did not think those differences amounted to \$90,000. He felt a value of \$875,000 was more appropriate considering the comparable sale being discussed was for almost \$100,000 more than the subject was assessed.

Member Krolick inquired if Member Green was proposing to make an adjustment to the land value. Member Green responded not to the land, but toward the improvement value in the form of obsolescence. Member Krolick said the subject's land value was \$123,900 and the property next door was valued at \$130,095, and almost twice the acreage. He stated he would be more inclined to make an adjustment to the land

rather than to the improvements. Member Green stated larger acreage was not always an advantage when located in a gated community.

9:35 a.m. The Board took a brief recess due to technical problems with the recording equipment. (Due to technical difficulties with the recording equipment, the motion below was not recorded.)

With regard to Parcel No. 214-061-17, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion carried on a 3-2 vote, with Chairman Covert and Member Green voting "no", it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

9:40 a.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

11-0176E **PARCEL NO. 232-072-04 – SASS, CHARLES O & KAREN – HEARING NO. 11-0360**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 7882 Morgan Pointe Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Assessment notice and comparative market analysis report, 3 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 8 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Charles Sass was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Dillon, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Mr. Sass stated his home's value, for reasons unknown, had fallen precipitously for the last six months; however, his assessed value had gone up. He testified the owner of 7886 Morgan Pointe Circle had listed it for \$249,000, but it was taken off the market after a year. Another home in the neighborhood, exactly the same size as the subject, was now listed at \$219,000 and had been on the market for \$249,000.

He stated the owners walked away from a home on the corner of Morgan Pointe Circle and Sommerset Parkway and were trying to rent it.

Appraiser Dillon read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet noting improved sales used in determining the taxable value. She said based on the improved sales used, taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the property was equalized with similarly situated properties. She noted it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current value.

Chairman Covert inquired if the appellant purchased the property on May 19, 2010. Appraiser Dillon noted that was correct.

Mr. Sass stated he did not have a good comparable sale to use as evidence. He thought he proved values were not increasing in his neighborhood, they were actually decreasing. He said if 7800 Morgan Pointe sold, he would have good evidence that the subject was way overvalued.

With regard to Parcel No. 232-072-04, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0177E PARCEL NO. 038-710-04 – SIMONS TRUST, WILLIAM J – HEARING NO. 11-0510

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 40 Waterbuck Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Property Assessment Data, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Topography map, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Comparable sale, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Comparable sale, 1 page.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 8 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, William Simons was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Steven Clement, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Mr. Simons said he had a number of issues concerning the valuation. He presented evidence to the Board, which was marked as Petitioner's Exhibits B, C and D. He stated the first thing he wanted to point out about the property was the extensive slopes. There was a steep (downward) slope off the road with no level drive. There was also a very steep (downward) slope in the corner, by the road. He showed a deeded drainage way, for the subdivision, that went under the road and noted a drainage easement along the side of the property. Chairman Covert inquired if it was an open drain and Mr. Simons responded it was. Mr. Simons said there was a tremendous amount of land lost to slope, although there was a small level strip along the side of the subject that was fairly level and buildable. The whole lower section was separated by a steep slope and was not useable (downward slope). He said the property consisted of 100,000 square feet, but half of it was not buildable on the upper slope and half of the lower section, which left approximately 15,000 to 20,000 square feet of buildable land. He noted the house to the west was built right on the edge of the slope. Mr. Simons stated there was no view of the river, no view to the left or the right, only forward toward the mountains from the subject. He showed the Board where the floodplain was located on the map and also reported that could not be built upon.

Mr. Simons reviewed a home that sold last month at 38 Waterbuck Way for \$645,000, with the Assessor valuing the land at \$103,000. He said the property had more square footage, had a better building pad, had easier access, and did not have the river adjoining. He noted it was almost impossible to get down to the river from the subject because of the slopes and the distance. He reported another home for sale listed at \$599,000, which had been listed for over a year. He discussed another home for sale with tremendous river views, superior quality, the land was level and it was valued less. Mr. Simons stated he had just come home from deployment when he and his family decided to purchase the subject, and knew he paid too much for it. He was going to put a house on the property, but couldn't afford to.

Appraiser Clement referred to page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. He said the most recent sales indicated a range from \$235,000 to \$300,000; therefore, taxable value did not exceed full cash value and it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current value. Appraiser Clement stated 38 Waterbuck Way was not river front property so it had a considerably less base lot value, as did all the non-river lots in that neighborhood. The other property Mr. Simons mentioned was a bank-owned parcel that was older and not comparable. He commented there was an innate amount of flood zone topography that went with being a river front lot in Verdi, which was all considered in the base lot values.

Chairman Covert inquired if the subject's size and shape was much different than the others. Appraiser Clement stated it was comparable to the other lots in the gated community. Chairman Covert stated it seemed the subject had some other impediments the other properties did not have. Appraiser Clement stated the other

properties had building pads, had been graded and homes had been built on them. Chairman Covert stated he was referring to the drainage easement. Appraiser Clement responded there was no adjustment for the drainage easement. He said he did not believe that was a detriment to the subject property.

Member Green wondered if the subdivision plan showed specific building sites. Mr. Simons said there were no specific indications of where to build, but there were specifications of where they could not build. Appraiser Clement stated the subject was larger than the adjoining parcels.

Mr. Simons stated the home that was sold last month was 3,761 square feet and the other that had been on the market for about the same price was almost 1,000 square feet larger, a little older and was a beautiful home.

Chairman Covert inquired if there were any improvements to the subject property. Appraiser Clement responded it was a vacant lot, with a common area and a gate, which meant the improvements were allocated.

Chairman Covert brought discussion back to the Board. Member Green stated he felt the value should be upheld. He believed there were some problems with the property, but the adjoining properties were able to grade and build.

With regard to Parcel No. 038-710-04, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0178E PARCEL NO. 212-112-03 – CHALK BLUFF LLC –
HEARING NO. 11-0514

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located on Robb Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel summary report, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Miscellaneous documents regarding access problems, 13 pages.

Exhibit C: Flyer for truck stop and web pages, 3 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 12 pages.

William Simons was present on behalf of the Petitioner, and previously sworn.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Steven Clement, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Mr. Simons said the subject had been graded, but approximately 25 percent of property was sloped. He reported the subject was zoned Large Lot Residential 1 (LLR1). The City of Reno tried to re-zone the subject in 2009, but it was defeated because of massive protests by surrounding residents who wanted the zoning to be commercial. It was determined to leave the zone classification as LLR1 and he felt the valuation of the subject should reflect the zoning (LLR1). He commented there was no legal access to the subject and all other comparables had legal access. He produced title reports as evidence there was no legal access (Exhibit B). He said the subject was valued at the same price as the property to the south, which had legal access and similar slope conditions as the subject. He wondered how a property with no legal access could be valued the same as property with legal access. He explained legal access could be purchased, but they would have to go through the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and meet all of their specifications. He said the only access to the subject would be from the freeway and they would have to meet freeway access standards. NDOT requires that any facilities (on/off ramps) would also have to be improved if development occurred in that area. He said when the Interstate was installed there was an on-ramp that went from the south to the eastbound lanes, which was deleted before it went out to bid. He asserted development to the subject would necessitate that on-ramp. He believed the on-ramp would take away property from the subject, it would not be condemnation, it would be a loss. Mr. Simons stated if they were able to purchase access from NDOT they would still have to meet all their standards and make improvements to the interchange, which would reduce the property. He agreed that once legal access was obtained, the value should be the same as other properties with legal access.

Mr. Simons explained the subject property was purchased by his family quite awhile ago and he felt the property would be good at some time, but not now and he was asking for some consideration.

Chairman Covert inquired if the property sloped up or down from the freeway. Mr. Simons stated it sloped down from the interchange, but up from the freeway. He said there was a tremendous amount of slope to the eastside (70 to 80 percent drop) from the top all the way down and there was a drainage pipe at the bottom. He felt that prevented the northeast corner from being built upon because they could not legally build over a drainage pipe. The pipe would have to be relocated and he did not know the cost of that. Chairman Covert reported his community asked NDOT to put an

on/off ramp from the access road to the new freeway and the cost was quoted at \$1 million. Mr. Simons stated when the freeway went through before he owned the property the property owner was compensated for access.

Member Woodland inquired if the subject property was the land where the truck stop was going to be. Mr. Simons presented documentation regarding a flyer about the Robb Drive Truck Stop, which was not the subject (Exhibit C). He explained residents were against the truck stop because of the potential for large amounts of traffic. Chairman Covert inquired what the residents wanted to use the land for. Mr. Simons replied they wanted a baseball park.

Appraiser Clement read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating the comparable sales used demonstrated a range of \$3.55 to \$13.54 per square foot, and therefore taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the property was equalized with similarly situated properties. He said he could not find proof that the property had no legal access and it was Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current value.

Appraiser Clement explained that most of the fill brought in to the subject was from the re-track (railroad) project. He believed the property was engineered, filled and ready to be built on. In response to Chairman Covert, Mr. Simons stated they did not pay or receive anything for the fill. Appraiser Clement stated the subject had a pretty good envelope to build on. Chairman Covert inquired if it was level and flat, and Appraiser Clement responded the top part could be built on. He said there was dirt being brought across the subject and dumped on to the adjoining parcel and he did not know how that could happen if the subject did not have legal access.

Appraiser Clement stated the subject could be built on at some point in time, it was a supreme location and there would be costs incurred through NDOT, but he thought that was reflected in the 56 cents a square foot for the value.

Appraiser Clement next reviewed the zoning issues brought up by the appellant stating the parcels to the west were rezoned several months ago to commercial. He agreed they did defeat the truck stop (industrial zoning), because according to the Master Plan the I-80 Corridor would be developed for commercial properties.

Member Green asked where access would come from if they did not get access off I-80. Appraiser Clement stated it would have to come off the interchange, because it would be difficult for NDOT to put in another interchange just past the Robb Drive interchange. The subject would have to gain access from the on/off ramp of Robb Drive.

Mr. Simons stated he produced evidence from First American Title that showed no access and NDOT's report showing they sold access to the other property. He said the property had approximately 10 to 15 acres that were flat, but that was all. He said he would like to see the Master Plan from the City of Reno that showed anything else

zoned LLR1, because if there was, he believed the residents would be up-in-arms. He said they tried to change the Master Plan and it was shot down, so it was still at LLR1. He said if all the hurdles could be overcome, the subject could be developed and the taxes should be adjusted at that time. He noted there was no income from the property. He stated NDOT could grant themselves access to dump material on the adjoining property. He reported the material going across the subject to the neighbor's property was grindings from roadway construction.

Appraiser Clement stated the parcel to the south was twice the size of the subject and he did not believe they were comparable. He indicated the property was filled and graded and ready to go.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board. Member Woodland inquired what the appellant was asking the Board to do. Mr. Simons responded to change the land value to \$150,000, based on the property to the south being assessed exactly the same as the subject, but they had legal access. Chairman Covert stated the access situation did concern him. Chairman Covert said he believed the barricade at the Robb Drive interchange prevented travelers from going the wrong way, but could be developed. He said dealing with the State was going to be costly and felt there was an impediment attached to that. Member Krolick stated he did not think it was an impediment based on the value of the other properties, and the cost of \$1 million to have access to the kind of income this property could generate, he thought was insignificant. Member Green thought the Board could find some relief for the Petitioner, even though it was hard to make comparisons with the other properties sold, including the listing at 0 Robb Drive (212-112-02), which reflected the market at \$21 million (\$10 square foot).

Member Woodland moved to reduce the land value to \$300,000 due to lack of access. Member Green seconded the motion. Member Green stated by reducing the land value due to lack of access would allow the Assessor's Office the ability to place the appropriate value when access was obtained. Chairman Covert stated he felt the reduction was too much and he did not support it. He thought a reduction to \$400,000 was more appropriate. On a call for the vote, the motion failed 2-3, with Members Brown and Krolick and Chairman Covert voting no.

Chairman Covert called for another motion.

With regard to Parcel No. 212-112-03, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion carried on a vote of 3-2 with Members Green and Krolick voting no, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$400,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$400,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

10:34 a.m. The Board took a brief recess.

10:44 a.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

11-0179E **PARCEL NO. 020-122-27 – SARKAR, ENAM & MAHBUBA – HEARING NO. 11-0167**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 250 Gallaway Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 3 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joseph Johnson, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Johnson read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet, highlighting that the subject's taxable value of \$74 per square foot fell well below the low end of the comparable sales. He noted all sales were inferior in living area, age, and bathrooms. He said based upon the comparable sales used, taxable value did not exceed full cash value and it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current taxable value.

Chairman Covert inquired if Appraiser Johnson reviewed the Petitioner's evidence. Appraiser Johnson replied he did, but felt the comparables were inferior in size, bedrooms and bathrooms and were bank-owned.

With regard to Parcel No. 020-122-27, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0180E PARCEL NO. 208-373-02 – PUCCINELLI FAMILY TRUST –
HEARING NO. 11-0177

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2850 Avenida De Landa, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Area listings of current sales, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Letter and supporting documentation, 2 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 10 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Sutherland, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Sutherland read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. She noted the price per square foot of the sales used ranged from \$108 to \$115 per square foot, which was more than the subject's value at \$92 per square foot and therefore did not exceed full cash value. It was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current taxable value.

Chairman Covert confirmed the subject was purchased in July, 2010. Appraiser Sutherland stated that was correct. Chairman Covert felt the purchase price was a good indication of the value.

With regard to Parcel No. 208-373-02, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0181E PARCEL NO. 007-104-06 – HINMAN, WAYNE E TRUSTEE –
HEARING NO. 11-0225

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 217 Imperial Blvd., Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 10 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Michael Bozman, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Bozman read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. He said based upon the comparable sales used, the taxable value for the subject did not exceed full cash value and it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current taxable value. He noted the Petitioner was requesting the value to be \$95,000, which was more than what was currently being assessed.

Member Green noted the Petitioner checked the box on the Petition regarding denial of an exemption. Theresa Wilkins, Chief Deputy Assessor, stated she did not believe there was an exemption and that the appellant checked the wrong box. She informed the Board she would check with the Petitioner to determine if he was eligible for an exemption.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-104-06, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0182E PARCEL NO. 078-221-13 – CAMPBELL, RODNEY M. -
HEARING NO. 11-0348

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 320 Appaloosa Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Notice, 2 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 15 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Chris Sarman, Appraiser I, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Sarman stated the Assessor's Office was recommending a \$10,000 reduction to the land value. Chairman Covert inquired if the appellant was in agreement with the recommendation. Appraiser Sarman stated he had not spoken to the appellant. He reported it was the Assessor's Office intention to reduce the land value in this entire neighborhood at a later hearing. He said as an improved property, the overall taxable did not exceed full cash value; however, after looking at some of the newer land sales that had occurred since July 2010, he believed the recommendation to reduce was supported. Chairman Covert said the Petition reflected a suggested land value of \$20,000. Appraiser Sarman stated the recommendation was to reduce the value from \$45,000 to \$35,000.

Member Woodland inquired if this was an equalization issue. Appraiser Sarman stated not at this time, the recommendation was based on recent land sales.

With regard to Parcel No. 078-221-13, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$35,000 based on recent land sales, and the taxable improvement value be upheld (\$131,558), resulting in a total taxable value of \$166,558 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0183E PARCEL NO. 148-062-16 – BOYER, GREGORY E –
HEARING NO. 11-0353

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5760 Florimont Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 8 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Kinne stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the improvement value in the form of obsolescence and the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-062-16, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced by an additional \$95,485 in obsolescence, resulting in a new improvement value of \$675,000 and a total taxable value of \$815,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0184E PARCEL NO. 556-362-04 – DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST
CO. – HEARING NO. 11-0372

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 17905 Spring Canyon Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Inspection report and comparable property information, 7 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Sutherland, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Sutherland read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. She said the three comparable sales used indicated a range of \$78 to \$96 per square foot, which supported the value of the subject. She stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current taxable value as it did not exceed full cash value.

Chairman Covert said the Petitioner provided evidence showing four sales and three listings and inquired if the Assessor's Office looked at them. Appraiser Sutherland responded she did and noted one listing he showed selling for \$199,000 actually sold for \$129,000. She said she did not see any evidence that supported a reduction to the taxable value.

With regard to Parcel No. 556-362-04, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0185E PARCEL NO. 003-750-12 – ASKIN, CHRISTOPHER P & ANN B – HEARING NO. 11-0388

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4635 Kathleen Denise Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable Sales information, 4 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 7 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Kinne stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the improvement value to \$73,500 for a total taxable value of \$98,900. Chairman Covert inquired if the appellant was in agreement and Appraiser Kinne responded the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 003-750-12, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$73,500 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$98,900 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0186E PARCEL NO. 148-343-06 – KATZOFF, STUART M –
HEARING NO. 11-0404

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5920 Cartier Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 5 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Chairman Covert noted the Petitioner stated an appraisal would be forthcoming and he wondered if an appraisal had been received. Appraiser Kinne reported an appraisal had not been received. Appraiser Kinne read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet and noted that based on the comparable sales used, the subject's taxable value did not exceed full cash value. He said it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current taxable value.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-343-06, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0187E PARCEL NO. 232-322-04 – ROLAND, JASON L & TIFFANY L – HEARING NO. 11-0410

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1765 Dakota Ridge Trail, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 5 pages.

Exhibit II: Corrected first page of the Hearing Evidence Packet, 1 page.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Dillon, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Dillon noted the reason for the corrected first page reflected a typographical error with regard to the taxable value for the improvements. She said it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the improvements to \$440,000, based on obsolescence, for a total taxable value of \$495,000 and the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 232-322-04, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to

\$440,000 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$495,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0188E PARCEL NO. 014-160-01 – RASMUSSEN, ERIC C –
HEARING NO. 11-0515

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1080 Mount Rose Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal report, 4 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Linda Lambert, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Lambert informed the Board the Petitioner provided a recent appraisal from a local appraiser that established the market value of the subject at \$800,000. She stated, based on the appraisal and comparables sales, it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the improvement value to \$665,000, due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$800,000 and the appellant was in agreement. Chairman Covert inquired if it was a fee appraisal and Appraiser Lambert responded that was correct.

With regard to Parcel No. 014-160-01, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$665,000 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$800,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0189E PARCEL NO. 019-172-14 – SANDHU, KULDIP S & SURJIT K –
HEARING NO. 11-0516

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1100 Skyline Blvd., Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 9 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Linda Lambert, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Lambert stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce and the appellant was in agreement. She read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet noting the comparable sales used indicated a range of \$169 to \$175 per square foot. The subject's value was currently assessed at \$200 per square foot. Based upon the sales used, it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to apply \$114,370 of obsolescence to the improvement value, resulting in a total taxable value of \$170 per square foot (\$654,160).

With regard to Parcel No. 019-172-14, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$541,915 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$654,160 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0190E PARCEL NO. 039-625-11 – KALINSKE, DONNA –
HEARING NO. 11-0524

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5898 Walnut Creek Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 1 page.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 10 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Sutherland, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Sutherland read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet noting the comparable sales used reflected a range of \$101 to \$129 per square foot. The subject property was valued at \$94 per square foot; therefore, it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current taxable value.

Chairman Covert said the Petitioner's evidence of comparable sales were at a higher price than those used by the Assessor's Office. Member Green remarked the Petitioner was attempting to sell the house for \$160,000.

With regard to Parcel No. 039-625-11, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0191E PARCEL NO. 023-460-18 – GREATHOUSE, KAREN S – HEARING NO. 11-0527

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4220 Swanson Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 12 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Linda Lambert, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Lambert noted an error contained on the first page of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet (HEP). She said it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the value, not reduce as indicated on page 1 of the HEP. She noted the time adjusted sales indicated a range of \$141 to \$234 per square foot, which was above the subject's value of \$105 per square foot. She said that based upon the comparable sales used, the taxable value did not exceed full cash value with similarly situated properties.

Member Green stated the subject was purchased in 2006 for \$1.25 million and the comparables used by the Assessor's Office were between \$500,000 to \$900,000. He noted the subject was considerably lower and wondered how the value reached that level. Appraiser Lambert reported the subject had a considerable depreciation adjustment because it was built in 1948.

With regard to Parcel No. 023-460-18, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0192E PARCEL NO. 212-076-37 – RISLEY, STEPHANIE E –
HEARING NO. 11-0530

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6850 Sharlands Ave., Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 9 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 8 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Sutherland, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Sutherland stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the improvement value, based on obsolescence, and the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 212-076-37, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$51,700 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$68,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0193E PARCEL NO. 218-143-08 – POGGIONE, LEO –
HEARING NO. 11-0542

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4479 Troon Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal report, 22 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 8 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joseph Johnson, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Johnson stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the improvement value by applying \$177,738 in the form of obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$595,000. He noted the reduction was based on a current sale as well as an appraisal provided by the Petitioner and the Petitioner was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 218-143-08, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member

Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$491,410 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$595,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11:25 a.m. The Board took a brief recess.

11:30 a.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

11-0194E PARCEL NO. 5101084 – BIGBY, GREG AND DIANE – HEARING NO. 11-0294PP

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010-11 taxable valuation on land and personal property located in Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Supporting documentation, 4 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Personal property record, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mark Stafford, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Stafford stated this was for an aircraft account located at the Stead Airport, which had been assessed since 2007. He said an aircraft declaration was mailed to the property owner in August, which was returned indicating no changes to the property. A bill was sent in October 2010 and after receiving the bill the property owner contacted the Assessor's Office stating the aircraft had been sold to her father-in-law in January 2010. He noted page 3 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet showed the aircraft registration to Ace Bigby, who resided in Oregon.

Appraiser Stafford stated before he prepared for the hearing Mrs. Bigby called him and he asked her to produce a bill of sale, but she did not have one. He inquired as to where the airplane was located and Mrs. Bigby supplied the aircraft was in Oregon. He asked why the aircraft declaration was returned indicating no changes and she said she did not remember returning the declaration. He then suggested she should attend the hearing today and make her representations to this Board. Mrs. Bigby said she would attend the hearing, however she was not present.

Appraiser Stafford informed the Board that the Federal Aviation Association (FAA) clearly stated it was transferred to an out-of-state owner in January 2010. On the other hand, he had a returned declaration stating there was no change in August, but it apparently transferred to a family member. That was why he asked Mrs. Bigby to attend to explain the circumstances to the Board.

Chairman Covert inquired if anyone had been to the Stead Airport to see if the airplane was there. Appraiser Stafford reported there were multiple hangers at the airport, which he would not have access to and that he did not see it outside.

Chairman Covert stated he did not feel it was an arms length transaction since there was no bill of sale. He said without proper documentation, he felt the Board could not change the valuation.

With regard to Roll No. 5101084, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values for the 2010-11 Unsecured Roll Year be upheld. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the personal property was valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

11-0195E PARCEL NO. 020-122-26 – SARKAR, ENAM & MAHBUBA – HEARING NO. 11-0166

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 230 Gallaway Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 3 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joseph Johnson, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Johnson stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to apply an additional \$80,258 in obsolescence to the improvement value and the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 020-122-26, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$155,744, resulting in a total taxable value of \$190,994 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0196E PARCEL NO. 008-012-16 – DP REAL ESTATE INVESTMENTS
LLC – HEARING NO. 11-0525**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 695 Denslowe Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 6 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Michael Bozman, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Bozman read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. He asserted the subject sold on November 18, 2010 for \$59,900 which indicated the value should be lowered by applying obsolescence.

Chairman Covert asked if the appellant was in agreement with the recommendation. Appraiser Bozman stated he did not know but noted the appellant was requesting a value less than the recommended reduction.

With regard to Parcel No. 008-012-16, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to

\$31,100 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$59,900 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0197E PARCEL NO. 200-010-03 – MAE ANNE LLC –
HEARING NO. 11-0140**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at Mae Anne Ave., Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter, 3 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Sutherland, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Sutherland read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. She said it was recommended that the development cost adjustment be increased from 30 percent to 45 percent resulting in a land value of \$192,164. She noted the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 200-010-03, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$192,164 by increasing the development cost adjustment from 30 percent to 45 percent, resulting in a total taxable value of \$192,164 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0198E PARCEL NO. 502-250-09 – CHOCOLATE GROUP LLC –
HEARING NO. 11-0187**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at West Gepford Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal report, 93 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Spoor stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the land value based on the appraisal submitted by the appellant, and the comparable sales used. She said the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 502-250-09, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$200,000 due to a recent appraisal, resulting in a total taxable value of \$200,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0199E PARCEL NO. 051-400-23 – EDNEY FAMILY LIVING TRUST – HEARING NO. 11-0255

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at West Hidden Valley Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 11 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Steven Clement, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Clement informed the Board the Assessor's Office was recommending a reduction of 50 percent to the land value due to no access to water, which would result in a new taxable value of \$48,700.

With regard to Parcel No. 051-400-23, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$48,700 due to water access issues, resulting in a total taxable value of \$48,700 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0200E PARCEL NO. 218-250-01 – MADDOX, CHARLES B –
HEARING NO. 11-0531

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at South McCarran Blvd., Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Supporting documentation, 32 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joseph Johnson, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Johnson stated the Assessor's Office recommended a reduction to reduce the land value to \$220,000 based on an appraisal submitted by Petitioner, and the Petitioner was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 218-250-01, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$220,000 due to a recent land appraisal, resulting in a total taxable value of \$220,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found

that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0201E PARCEL NO. 220-080-14 – MADDOX, CHARLES B –
HEARING NO. 11-0533

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at Caughlin Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Supporting documentation, 59 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joseph Johnson, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Appraiser Johnson stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the land value based on the appraisal submitted. Chairman Covert inquired what the improvements to the property consisted of. Appraiser Johnson stated the improvements were the common area and were allocated.

With regard to Parcel No. 220-080-14, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$368,388 due to a recent appraisal, and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$378,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board Member comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

* * * * *

11:52 a.m. There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, the meeting was adjourned.

JAMES COVERT, Chairperson
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

AMY HARVEY, County Clerk
and Clerk of the Washoe County
Board of Equalization

*Minutes prepared by
Jaime Deller, Deputy Clerk*