

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

MONDAY

9:00 A.M.

JANUARY 31, 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 9:03 a.m. in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Chairperson Covert called the meeting to order, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

11-0131E SWEARING IN

Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent swore in Craig Anacker of the Assessor's staff who would be presenting testimony for the 2011 Board of Equalization hearings.

11-0132E WITHDRAWALS

The following petition scheduled on today's agenda had been withdrawn by the Petitioner prior to the hearing:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
162-053-12	PARISE FAMILY TRUST	11-0357

11-0133E REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

The following petitions were continued to February 25, 2011:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
050-364-04	HICKS, RONALD MICHAEL & BETTY J	11-0288
122-181-59	SCARPA, STEVEN J	11-0349

11-0134E CONSOLIDATION OF HEARINGS

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

11-0135E PARCEL NO. 071-120-01 – UNITED STATES GYPSUM CO –
HEARING NO. 11-0224

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 215 2nd Street (Highway 447), Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 3 pages.

Exhibit B: Appeal of Assessed Value documentation, 76 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Department of Taxation Hearing Evidence Packet, 49 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Christopher Zamora and Andrew Davis were sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Department of Taxation, Janet Kelley was sworn. She oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said the property was comprised of a manufacturing plant, residential, and recreational facilities.

Mr. Zamora stated page 1 of Exhibit B provided the details about the property and U.S. Gypsum's response to the current market conditions. He said the company did not know when or if the Empire plant would reopen, but the earliest that could occur would be 2016. He discussed the impact of the plant closing on the employees.

Mr. Zamora noted page 4 of Exhibit B identified the plant as being very old. He stated there were concerns that the assessment methodology relied on a single approach to value, which did not reflect all forms of obsolescence. He said two other approaches were used to come up with what was believed to be a more reasonable estimate of the value for the plant, which Mr. Davis would address.

Mr. Davis stated the manufacturing facility was currently valued using the cost approach. He said page II of the Executive Summary in Exhibit B showed the manufacturing facility using a discounted cash flow analysis and an impairment analysis. He stated the impairment analysis looked at other manufacturing facilities in the U.S. Gypsum holdings that were impaired. He said the Empire plant was the oldest and highest cost facility and would probably be one of last plants to be brought back online when construction recovered because of its cost structure. He stated the two analyses generated a range of values between \$8.9 and \$14 million, which when reconciled indicated an \$11,585,050 value.

Mr. Davis said page 10 in Exhibit B provided the details of the impairment analysis. He stated the impairment percentage was the amount of write down for the various facilities, which was 40.5 percent on average. He said for Washoe County, applying 40.5 percent, or \$9.2 million in economic obsolescence, would arrive at an adjusted improvement value of \$13,532,784. Adding the land value and deducting the exemptions would arrive at a total taxable value of \$14,117,834. He said the discounted cash flow analysis on page 11 indicated an \$8.9 million value. He stated page 12 was the discounted cash flow analysis provided prior to the announcement of the plant's idling, which projected a low utilization and which was where the \$9.5 million figure used came from. He noted the shaded area indicated the historical numbers. He said page 13 showed the information after the announcement and after consulting with the State. He stated it indicated the plant would be idle from 2011-2015 and would be expected to be brought back online in 2016. Chairperson Covert asked if it was anticipated the plant would be modernized. Mr. Davis said he understood there would not be any modernization of the plant. He stated the numbers reflected there would be no major capital expenditures to retool the plant. Chairperson Covert said there would be some substantial startup costs with the plant being idle for so long. Mr. Davis replied that was absolutely correct.

Member Green asked if having to replace the defective Chinese drywall installed across the country was having any impact on production facilities. Mr. Davis replied it would. Member Green felt many builders would be hesitant to buy from overseas in the future due to the cost of replacement. Mr. Davis stated that could be true.

Ms. Kelley stated the appellant's packet was provided this morning and it was more comprehensive than what she had been provided earlier. She noted information was shared that she had been told was confidential and not to be disclosed. She said the assessment was done prior to knowing the plant was going to be idled, but being idled was not the same as being disposed of. She indicated she did not see in their discounted cash flow the residual value of the property as it existed today. She said it was true it was a very old plant and many of the buildings were already depreciated down to their lowest possible value, which was also true for the equipment when looking at the replacement costs. She advised she had a problem with an incomplete discounted cash flow, and there was also difficulty in separating the data for Washoe and Pershing Counties. She stated even though she was provided with some information after the idling of the plant, she did not feel confident enough in numbers provided by the Petitioner to change her evaluation. She asked the Board to stick with the statutory replacement costs new method.

Chairperson Covert asked if the plant would wind down or would it suddenly be shut down. Ms. Kelley replied production had been reduced over the years. Chairperson Covert said he was referring to this tax year. Ms. Kelley replied it came to a sudden stop, but the plant had been in production for the majority of this reporting year, the houses were occupied, and the recreational facilities were in use.

Member Woodland noted the housing would be available for the workers until June 30, 2011 and how did that factor in. Ms. Kelley stated the workers could stay in the housing rent free while searching for other employment or until the corporation

could possibly make a different decision. She noted the corporate 10K indicated these severe downturns usually turned around in two to three years and would then normally be followed by an upsurge because there would be pent up demand for the product. She felt the restart year was also in question.

Chairperson Covert noted his experience of 30 years in heavy manufacturing indicated if a plant was shut down that long, especially one this old, the plant would not start up again due to the cost factors involved in the restart. Ms. Kelley indicated that was entirely possible.

Member Brown asked for a simple explanation of statutory replacement costs. Ms. Kelley said the taxpayer declared the acquisition cost of the personal property and the construction costs for all improvements, which were then factored each year for inflation and depreciation. She noted all improvements were depreciated at 1.5 percent per year for 50 years and the personal property was depreciated for up to 20 years depending on what the item was.

In rebuttal, Mr. Zamora said all of the information contained in Exhibit B had previously been given to the County, but not in a single document. He felt no one had a problem with the methodology used if the facility was a going concern and would continue to operate but, when doing replacement costs new less depreciation (RCNLD), the “D” stood for depreciation for all forms of obsolescence. He advised the RCNLD model could not have anticipated the downturn in the economy, and was attempting to value the plant on a going forward basis. He stated the State sent some information to the appellant that included a clause, which indicated a taxpayer who believed there was additional obsolescence that needed to be recognized, had the right to bring that information forward.

Mr. Davis clarified all of the information in the packet they just provided was a compilation of information already given to the State. He said for example on page 10 the State had asked for and was provided the impairment information regarding the other facilities. He discussed the other information in the packet that had already been provided to the State.

Member Green asked if the plant was restarted in 2016, how long would the raw materials last and did they have anything to do with the plant shutting down. Mr. Davis stated the plant shutting down was more about its primary operation of manufacturing wallboard. He said because of transportation costs, the plant needed to be situated at the mouth of the mine to get the raw materials. He stated there might be some holdover residual value for the minerals, but it would be cost prohibitive to transport the minerals to another facility.

Chairperson Covert asked what Mr. Davis was asking the Board to do. Mr. Davis replied the appellant was asking for a value of \$11,585,050 in Washoe County. Chairperson Covert asked which page Ms. Kelley’s evaluation was on. Ms. Kelley replied it was in the State’s Exhibit I, Exhibit 3, Mining Property and Ad Valorem

Appraisal Transmittal. Chairperson Covert noted the taxable value was \$22,605,823. Ms Kelley said she was suggesting the value be upheld. She noted the value being requested by the appellant was higher than what was originally requested in their Petition.

Member Green noted the plant was closing today, so it operated for half of the fiscal year. Mr. Davis replied that was correct. Chairperson Covert assumed it would be winding down during that period. Member Green imagined that would be true. He said he tended to agree with the Petitioner that \$22 million was too much at this point in time. He stated equipment sitting idle would start to deteriorate and the property would be a prime site for vandals with the property sitting out in the desert. He stated he did not know if \$11 million was the right number, but he felt \$22 million under the circumstances was not a good number.

Member Krolick said he agreed with Member Green. He asked what value the town had going forward beyond the mentioned salvage value. He stated when a plant like this was closed down, talent would be lost. Member Green agreed and reiterated he believed \$22 million was not the right number.

Chairperson Covert asked how this would have been handled if the plant was shut down last year. Ms. Kelley replied the value going forward would have been looked at and it would have been substantially reduced. She said the State was allowed to put on specific weights or to reduce in a specific fashion. She advised zero would be allowed in additional depreciation for the first year of closure and would go to 50 percent within five years.

Member Krolick asked if the improvements were fully depreciated. Ms. Kelley replied most of the buildings were. Member Woodland said this was a unique situation with the whole town closing.

Chairperson Covert said his position was since the plant operated through the tax year the Board was dealing with, he was willing to go down to \$15 million due to obsolescence. He felt next year would be different because it would recognize, based on his personal experience, the plant would never start up again because it would be too costly to do so.

Member Woodland asked what NRS this fell under. Herb Kaplan, Deputy District Attorney, replied 361.357. He believed the appeal was on the 2011-12 tax year, which meant the statements made regarding the plant operating part of the tax year were not quite correct.

With regard to Parcel No. 071-120-01, 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 remain the same and the taxable improvement value be reduced by obsolescence to \$15,000,000 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.

11-0136E PARCEL NO. 152-462-05 – EMERY, GORDON P & EVELYNE –
HEARING NO. 11-0236

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5575 Flowering Sage Trail, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Market dynamics, 2 pages.

Exhibit B: Statement of Gordon P Emery, 11 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, Gordon Emery was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Mr. Emery reviewed the subject's values from 2009/10 through 2011/12. He said he was questioning the increase in the subject's taxable improvement value over the previous year, because the housing market had fallen dramatically over the last three to four years. He noted Josh Wilson, Assessor, indicated the County's property values declined an average of 8.2 percent for the next fiscal year as shown in the KOLOTV.com page in Exhibit B. Mr. Emery said Arrowcreek was one of the areas hardest hit, and he assumed the taxable improvement value would decline in a similar manner. He stated there had been no improvements to his property during the last year, so the taxable improvement value had been improperly appraised.

Mr. Emery stated his income from Social Security and his military pension did not cover the mortgage payments, so his wife worked to help meet their monthly obligations. He said they did not meet the income to debt-ratio required to refinance their house. He stated their home and an income property were for sale at 50 percent of what they were listed for in 2006. He noted they had an adjustable rate mortgage (ARM) due in December, which they would be unable to meet without selling one of the houses. He said he put a figure of \$569,996 for the subject's improvement value on his petition, but he would like to amend that figure to \$557,246 to reflect the Assessor's 8.2 percent decrease. He stated that amount was still far short of the decrease in the value of Arrowcreek properties.

Mr. Emery noted he had trouble accessing the Assessor's data online when attempting to do research. He discussed the recent and prior sales of Arrowcreek properties included in Exhibit B, and noted every property sold had its sales price go down from its previous sales price. He said the Market Dynamics page obtained from his realtor indicated sales prices were down 5 percent, which he felt was understated. Chairperson Covert asked if the information encompassed Arrowcreek or the County. Mr. Emery replied it was specific to Arrowcreek. He stated a post on the Internet by Ron Bell noted custom homes in Arrowcreek were down close to 70 percent and a *Reno Gazette-Journal* article showed the devaluation of Arrowcreek was at 65.6 percent. He thought his request to drop the value of the subject 8 percent was nominal, and the evidence was clear that the property had been appraised incorrectly.

Member Green said the \$165,000 2010 land value dropped to \$55,000, while the improvement value went up \$8,000. He noted the total taxable value was \$662,022, which was almost \$100,000 less than last year and was more than an 8 percent reduction. Mr. Emery understood that, but he was addressing the taxable improvements on the house and not the property. He asked why the house was assessed higher than in previous years.

Member Brown asked what the subject property was listed at. Mr. Emery replied it was listed at \$840,000.

Appraiser Regan discussed the improved sales on page 1 of Exhibit I, which bracketed the subject's quality class, the year built, and supported the subject's taxable value. She noted Arrowcreek was recognized as a distressed market, especially for custom homes. She indicated last year the subject's land was dropped 66 percent, the overall taxable value was down 13 percent, and the improvements had almost \$208,000 in applied obsolescence. She advised obsolescence had to be applied to all of the high value custom homes in Arrowcreek. She stated this home's quality class put it into the high value range and, for several years, items had fallen off the costing table for high value custom homes, which was what happened with this home. She said every year the improvements were recosted and then they were analyzed for the necessity of applying obsolescence. She said given the variables, every custom home was unique, so there would not be one flat number reflected in the overall reduction. She stated overall the value was down, the market was being addressed, and the Assessor's value was not exceeding market. She noted the appellant would see a decrease in his taxes from last year, because the overall taxable value was down.

Josh Wilson, Assessor, explained the 8.2 percent reduction represented a mathematical computation of roughly \$2.8 billion being removed from the roll divided by the total taxable value of the property in the County last year, which did not mean every property went down 8.2 percent.

In rebuttal, Mr. Emery stated the reduction was still 8.2 percent regardless of how it was determined. He said he just learned the homes on Flowering Sage Drive had a reduction, and he was not sure why his home was different.

Member Green stated he supported upholding the Assessor value, which was down more than 8 percent from last year. He said the overall assessment reflected the market, and the house was listed for more than the Assessor's value. Member Brown stated he concurred. Member Woodland said the value was already reduced \$97,000.

With regard to Parcel No. 152-462-05, 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.

11-0137E PARCEL NO. 538-065-01 – SEWELL, CAROL J. –
HEARING NO. 11-0371

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 11985 Canyon Dawn Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Supporting documentation, 3 pages.

Exhibit B: MLS information for 12060 Anthem Drive, 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, Carol Sewell was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Ms. Sewell stated she was appealing the value of the improvements, because the subject's improvement value was higher than the improvement values for properties that were exactly the same and had comparable uses. She said she drove around and looked at all of the streets south of Landmark, trying to find the homes exactly like the subject with a detached garage. She stated she found 10 homes in the area built between 2003/2005, some of which also had recreational-vehicle garages. She advised she added up the total improvement values and divided it by 10 for an average of

\$280,806. She said her home was valued at \$301,000, which placed her home among the top values. She stated the highest value among the 11 homes was \$304,676 and the lowest was \$251,964, which was a difference of \$52,000 or 21 percent.

Chairperson Covert asked what the YIMP column in Exhibit A signified. Ms. Sewell stated it was taken from the Assessor's information and had to do with yard improvements. She believed the higher number meant there were more yard improvements. She thanked Appraiser Stafford for her time and for being very helpful.

Ms. Sewell stated the house in Attachment 2 in Exhibit A had an average total value of \$308,968, while her home's value was \$301,000 and was 800 square feet smaller. She said there was quite a bit of variability between the homes that were equivalent to her home and also among the larger homes, which she could not figure out. She stated the average improvement value of the identical homes was 7 percent lower and the larger homes were 2.6 percent more than her home. She felt the disparity might be because the Assessor's Office had not gotten around to looking at everybody's house this year, even though they looked at the land.

Ms. Sewell said Appraiser Stafford indicated the comparable sales justified the value of her home. She discussed the upgrades the owner put into the house and the \$100,000 in upgrades in the backyard for the property shown in Exhibit B, which sold for \$400,000. She stated if the sales price of \$93.07 per square foot was applied to her property, it would make the total value \$324,648. She said she was asking the improvements be reduced to \$278,682, which would make it comparable to 11900 Canyon Dawn Drive.

Appraiser Stafford discussed the comparables on page 1 in Exhibit I. She noted the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's value. She explained the appellant's comparable sale occurred on January 26, 2011, which was after the cutoff date the Assessor's Office could use. She said the differences in the property values for Ms. Sewell's comparables were due to depreciation and different additives. She noted the larger homes had four different floor plans, and the largest had additional obsolescence applied due to its taxable value exceeding market value.

Chairperson Covert asked if the Assessor's Office had looked at all of the appellant's comparable properties. Appraiser Stafford stated they had been looked at, but there was no way of knowing if any additional yard improvements had been made unless building permits were taken out.

Member Krolick said LS-2 seemed to be identical except for a small detached garage and some additional depreciation. He noted there was a difference between the subject and what that property sold for. Member Green stated the square footage of the garages was different. Member Krolick said the two parcels had a difference in land size, but the subject had a uniquely shaped lot where its utility did not add value. Chairperson Covert asked if there was an adjustment for the shape of the property. Appraiser Stafford replied there was not.

In rebuttal, Ms. Sewell stated the Assessor's comparable table was unreadable. She noted she did not use any properties north of Landmark, which IS-1 was. She stated the builder of IS-1 kept the price up while it sat on the market for two years to try and prop up the value of the existing homes, but he offered a lot of stuff for free. She felt that value was inappropriate because the purchaser immediately lost a lot of money. She noted her neighbor's property had been vacant for two years, was the same model as the one that just sold, and was listed for \$450,000. She stated the realtor indicated there had been a lot of interest, but the offers coming in were at \$250,000. She explained her model of home was on the market for \$365,000 after a price drop from \$399,900 and after being on the market for 209 days. She said the more homes she looked at, the more upset she became with her increase in property value. She believed what she was asking for was exceedingly reasonable.

Member Green said LS-3 and LS-4 backed up to Pyramid Highway, which was a handicap during a sale. Ms. Sewell said there appeared to be just two property values for properties backing up to the Pyramid Highway, which had a slightly lower land value.

Chairperson Covert said the appellant was asking for a \$22,598 reduction in the improvement value. Member Krolick felt that was indicative of where the market was in that area. He said it was a beautiful development with large parcels and for once a developer got it right, but it was a commute to Reno.

Member Green asked if horses were allowed. Ms. Sewell replied they were not. Member Green felt that meant the extra square footage was not an advantage. He stated the Assessor's Office's comparables were excellent, even though he had problems with LS-3 and LS-4 butting up to the Pyramid Highway. He said the comparables were from early in the year and the market continued to go down since then. He advised he favored going with the appellant's request. Member Woodland felt the appellant's request might be too low.

With regard to Parcel No. 538-065-01, pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Chairperson Covert, 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 by \$22,598 to \$278,682, resulting in a total taxable value of \$360,282 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.

10:32 a.m. The Board recessed.

10:40 a.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

11-0138E PARCEL NO. 050-303-12 – WOODARD, DWAYNE & LYNLEE –
HEARING NO. 11-0252

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3625 Poco Lena Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter, 2 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, Dwayne and Lynlee Woodard were sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Mr. Woodard stated none of the Assessor's comparables were in the subject's subdivision and they were all smaller lots. He noted for the past three years there had been no conventional sales in the area, but a recent short sale and a recent foreclosure sale which were not on the Assessor's list. He stated homes that used to be listed in the \$800,000 to \$1 million range were now in the \$500,000 - \$600,000 range and were still not selling. He reviewed the recent sales in Exhibit A. He said he was requesting the total taxable value be reduced to \$299,835. He noted the property was approximately \$290,000 underwater, and they did not have any horses even though it was zoned for them.

Appraiser Stockton confirmed there were no comparables in the subject's neighborhood. He said the only sale in the last couple of years was the sale on Douglas Drive, which was significantly larger and was a short sale. He discussed the improved sales on page 1 of Exhibit I, which he believed were more comparable to the subject. He said the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's value.

Member Woodland noted the improvement value was already reduced by \$54,418. Appraiser Stockton replied that was correct. He noted the land value was reduced quite a bit the previous year, but this year it was left the same. He said 15 percent in obsolescence was applied to the improvement values in this neighborhood based on some of the listings.

In rebuttal, Mr. Woodard said the Assessor's Office disallowed the most recent sale on January 11, 2011. He noted his home was 44 percent smaller than the home on 153 Peppy San Court. He said he would be happy to sell the property at the assessed value of \$384,225, but he could not get the price to that when doing the math. Chairperson Covert explained the Board could consider sales up to January 1st of this year, and any sales after that date would be considered for next year's appeals.

Ms. Woodard advised her neighborhood was unique and the comparisons used outside of the neighborhood were not real comparisons. She said whether or not the sales were short sales, they were the comparables used by the bank when they tried to refinance the property. She noted the bank indicated the lack of comparable sales was causing trouble with refinancing. She said it was apparent to her that what was being valued in the area was unimproved land, because people bought in the neighborhood with a specific individual lifestyle in mind. She said they were underwater on their mortgage, and her position with the State was just eliminated. She stated they were trying not to hurt their neighbors by walking away from the property, and they were asking that be taken into account when the Board made its decision.

Chairperson Covert agreed the lack of comparable sales made it difficult for the Assessor's Office as well. Member Woodland believed the Assessor had done a good job on this one. Member Green stated he favored upholding the Assessor's value.

Ms. Woodard said properties with uninterrupted views of the lake were going for an extra \$200,000, and she would like that to be considered.

Member Krolick said LS-2 was basically the reverse of the subject property and it was hard for him to consider going any lower.

With regard to Parcel No. 050-303-12, 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 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.

11-0139E PARCEL NO. 152-220-01 – CANE, NANCY –
HEARING NO. 11-0232

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3420 Nambe Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner
Exhibit A: Comparables, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Comparables, 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, Nancy Cane was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Ms. Cane explained Exhibit B summarized the assessed value of the subject and several of its neighbors. She said the subject's assessed value was for 2011 and the others were for 2010. She noted her assessed value was still higher in 2011 than what the neighbors were in 2010.

Ms. Cane stated there needed to be a correction to the number of fireplaces from three to two, and the inserts cost \$2,000 each instead of the \$11,000 value assessed. She said the Assessor's Office also had the elevator's cost listed as \$43,000, but they only paid \$22,000 for it. She noted her home was a two-story home, and all but one of the homes listed were considered two-story homes because they had finished daylight basements.

Appraiser Regan reviewed the comparables sales on page 1 of Exhibit I, which supported the taxable value of the subject. She said the subject could not be compared to the other homes on the street because Nevada did not use a market-based system and because custom homes varied widely. She explained Nevada's costing system used *Marshall and Swift*, which required basements be broken out, even if the improvement quality was the same as the rest of the home. She stated because of the way they were broken out, the costing varied from home to home. Chairperson Covert asked about the difference between having a daylight basement versus having an additional story. Appraiser Regan explained a home with a daylight basement appeared to be a one-story home from the street, and the market identified daylight basements differently.

Chairperson Covert noted the land for the improved sales was considerably bigger than the subject. Appraiser Regan said the building sites were looked at and none of those building sites would be divided, but they might be down sloping and not really usable.

Appraiser Regan felt the appellant had looked at homes on her street that she was familiar with but had different taxable values than the subject. She said the differences in the taxable values for the homes in Exhibit B were because of their having different quality classes, differing amounts of depreciation due to being built in different years, and differing amenities. She said within the *Marshall and Swift* costing system, those differences created huge variations. She stated the analysis done by the Assessor's

Office costed the improvements using *Marshall and Swift* and then by analyzing the total taxable value.

She said *Marshall and Swift* costed residential elevators by using two different elevators, which was determined by the elevator's size and weight. She said if the elevator was up to four feet by four feet or the weight was more than 700 pounds, it would mean it would fall under the higher cost. She stated the weight limit was 950 pounds according to the appellant, which placed it in the higher cost for elevators. She advised the quality of the fireplaces was tied in to the quality class of the home, but the number of fireplaces could be corrected as a factual error.

In rebuttal, Ms. Cane reiterated the fireplaces cost \$2,000. She said she still did not understand why they were being assessed at \$11,536, nor did she understand the assessment for the elevator because it would cost \$22,000 to replace it. She stated she also did not agree with the Assessor's Office regarding her comparables. She knew what the quality of the homes was because she had been in them, and they were all beautiful inside. She still believed her assessed value for 2011 was too high when compared with her neighbors. Chairperson Covert stated he understood the land value was not the issue. Ms. Cane confirmed the issue was only on the improvement value.

Member Woodland asked if the fireplaces could be adjusted now. Chairperson Covert stated the Assessor's Office usually wanted to conduct an inspection. Appraiser Regan said she would be comfortable with an adjustment being made for the fireplace based on not seeing a chimney for a third fireplace in the photo of the subject. Member Krolick asked how the cost was determined for the fireplaces. Appraiser Regan said it was costed as part of the finish work of the house. She explained it was not just the cost of the item, but the cost also to get it installed. She said *Marshall and Swift* took a comprehensive look at the engineering and such needed to put an item in place, which was why it was tied into the home. Chairperson Covert asked if an inspection was conducted on the elevator. Appraiser Regan said the information was taken off the plans, an inspection was done, and the appellant was contacted regarding the load limit.

Ms. Cane advised the elevator was part of foundation and framing, which was then surrounded by a concrete wall on two sides. She stated the elevator was three feet by four feet, so the surrounding wall was four feet by five feet. She said the elevator had a very basic finish, which she should not be penalized for. She stated if it was part of the framing of the home at \$170 per square foot, it was not fair it was separated out. She reiterated the elevator was surrounded on two sides by a concrete wall. Chairperson Covert stated that was not part of the normal construction of the house.

Member Green asked what was in the small basement. Ms. Cane replied it was unfinished and housed the heater, the soft water filter, and the water heaters.

Member Green said the Board had to look at the value of the property and if the subject property was overpriced for the neighborhood and if the comparables were

relevant. He believed the question would be if the house would sell for less money if it had two fireplaces instead of three.

Ms. Cane asked why the Assessor's Office had different values on the fireplaces. Appraiser Regan explained *Marshall and Swift* looked at whether the structure for the fireplace went up two floors even if the fireplace was located on the first floor. She noted the single-story fireplace would be removed.

With regard to Parcel No. 152-220-01, 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 Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12 while correcting the factual error for the listing of a third fireplace. 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 for the current assessment year.

11-0140E PARCEL NO. 152-451-07 – ENNEKING LIVING TRUST –
HEARING NO. 11-0355

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5855 Flowering Sage Trail, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Assessed value comparison, 3 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, Jerry and Roxy Enneking were sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Mr. Enneking said he compared his property to seven others in their immediate area and their property was the only one with an increase in the building value. He stated he did not have an issue with the land value. He said after discussing the increase with the Assessor Office, he understood it was based on the quality of the home; so his appeal was prepared based on how the subject compared to other improvement values. He reviewed page 1 of Exhibit A and noted the properties with the higher "R" value had a greater reduction than those on the lower end of the "R" value. He said the information on page 2 compared the dollars per square foot and the percent of

obsolescence. He stated based on the statutory authority checked on the petition, he selected Parcel No. 152-452-05 with a 2011 per square foot value of \$125.21 and applied it to his property, which resulted in an improvement value of \$808,982. He noted that property and the subject had similar lots and views. He said the other home was larger than the subject, but had a quality value of only five points higher. He felt it was a fair comparison even though it was a larger home.

Appraiser Regan reviewed the improved sales on page 1 of Exhibit I. She said they were all slightly inferior in quality class to the subject, but they were recent sales. She stated the subject property was subject to the high value costing issues encountered this year. She said everything was recosted using the proper costing table, the depreciation was reapplied, and the analysis was redone. She explained there was a quality class cutoff for sales in the Arrowcreek area at 8.5 for the 30 percent obsolescence she applied. She said because of the sales she had at a 9 quality class, more obsolescence was applied to keep the properties under market. She advised that was why the exact same percentage was not seen. She said even though it seemed a blanket reduction could be applied, that could not be done due to the recosting. She explained the higher quality classes were hit harder by the market.

In rebuttal, Mr. Enneking stated the cutoff from an 8.5 to a 9 quality class did not seem to justify the 5 percent difference in the reduction, especially when they were comparable homes. Chairperson Covert asked if the appellant understood the reasoning for the evaluation techniques was due to an error that occurred in the previous two years. He said that error unfortunately meant this year the comparisons were not comparing apples-to-apples. Mr. Enneking said he understood, but he was not informed of it until today. He stated Exhibit A covered a three year period, and he did not see an error. Chairperson Covert said the quality class was missing from the exhibit, which would make the comparison more valid.

Chairperson Covert believed the appellant's request for a 12.8 percent reduction would be excessive.

With regard to Parcel No. 152-451-07, 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.

11-0141E PARCEL NO. 050-303-15 – CLARK, MICHAEL –
HEARING NO. 11-0213

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3775 Poco Lena Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter, 2 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, Michael Clark was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Mr. Clark complemented Appraiser Stockton for being very helpful and courteous. He said as a real estate and mortgage broker, he was familiar with the concepts involved in the appraisal process. He stated six new homes had been on the market for over three years in his neighborhood, which indicated there was no market in the area. He said that made it difficult for the Assessor's Office as well as the homeowners. He advised part of the problem was the banks were having issues with the lack of comparables. He stated in his area the only recent sales were a foreclosure and a short sale, which had to be considered because they were now comparables. He stated many people had their nest eggs tied up in properties that they could not sell, refinance, or afford to stay in. He said he was seeing prices fall back to those of 10 years ago. He believed the Board could help people stay in their houses by reducing their values.

Mr. Clark discussed his comparable sales in Exhibit A. He stated the Assessor's Office used a comparable in the Callahan Ranch neighborhood. He said a lender would never use that as a comparable because it was too far away from his neighborhood in the flats of Washoe Valley. He stated the land sales used were for properties next to Washoe Lake State Park, which initially sold at a premium, but held their value a bit more than his property did. He advised his property was in the middle of the subdivision, with no view, and no access to the park. Based on his information, he felt his home should have a \$465,440 improvement value and his lot should be valued at \$70,000, for a total taxable value of \$576,280.

Appraiser Stockton noted the subject had many horse amenities, such as a stable and fencing, which added considerable value from a costing standpoint. He advised improved sales were difficult to find, especially sales that had horse amenities. He reviewed the comparables sales on page 1 of Exhibit I. He said the appellant's sale at 153 Peppy San Court occurred on January 11, 2011, which would be one of the sales looked at next year because it occurred after this year's cutoff date of January 1st. He noted the recommendation to increase obsolescence was based on analyzing the comparable sales.

Appraiser Stockton said the area was flat and the land sales had the same limited view of the lake, even the parcels backing up to the State Park. He said LS-4 was slightly elevated and had a filtered view of the lake through some power lines. He noted it was a bank-owned property, and the bank just started lowering the price every two to three weeks until it sold at \$70,000. He advised it was relisted at \$199,000. He felt there was support for a land value in the range of \$140,000 to \$200,000.

Member Green said it was tough to find comparable sales, but the west side of Highway 395 was a totally different area than the Callahan Ranch area. He stated he could not relate to them as comparable sales. Appraiser Stockton agreed the west side was generally recognized as being superior in the marketplace, and that was part of the reason for the recommendation to lower the taxable value.

In rebuttal, Mr. Clark said Appraiser Stockton valued the land and improvements at approximately \$168 per square foot, even though he showed there was a recent comparable sale at \$115 per square foot and another at \$137 per square foot. He indicated he would be happy to take the average of the two numbers. He said the land sale he addressed was on an upslope and clearly had a much nicer view than his property.

Member Woodland said the January 11th land sale could not be considered until next year. Mr. Clark said it would be used by everyone else. Member Woodland explained the cutoff for this year's comparable sales was January 1st for everyone.

Member Green asked if IS-3 had stables or outbuildings. Appraiser Stockton replied it did not. Member Green asked about fencing. Mr. Clark said his fencing consisted of railroad ties and metal horse panels, which was not elaborate even though it kept the horses in.

Chairperson Covert said the distressed sales were setting the market value. Member Green stated all sales needed to be looked at regardless of what type of sale it was, including the sale of the lot by the bank for \$70,000.

Chairperson Covert suggested accepting the Assessor's recommendation on the improvements, and reducing the land value to \$100,000. Member Krolick said he could not support adjusting the land based on the other sales. He believed the \$70,000 sale was way off base with true market conditions. Chairperson Covert said that was why he did not suggest reducing the land to \$70,000 because it did not truly represent the market, but it tainted the \$140,000 value.

With regard to Parcel No. 050-303-15, 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 with Member Krolick voting "no," it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$100,000 and the taxable improvement value be reduced by \$116,121 in obsolescence to \$541,899, resulting in a total taxable value of \$641,899 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.

11-0142E PARCEL NO. 055-200-71 – FLYING ME RANCH LLC –
HEARING NO. 11-0266

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6755 Franktown Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Multi-use parcels, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Comparable land sales and photos, 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, Norm Azevedo and La Vonne Johnson were sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Mr. Azevedo said he bought the 598 acre operating cattle ranch in 2008, and built the house on the subject parcel exactly where the original house was located before it burned down. He stated the Assessor's Office placed too high a value on the building site. He stated for agricultural properties like the subject, the Assessor would pull a portion of the agricultural land out of agricultural use for the residential unit, would determine the value of the dirt associated with the home, and would value it consistently with the mandates of Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 361.227.

Mr. Azevedo reviewed the land values of the neighboring ranches on Franktown Road as shown in Exhibit A, which included the home site and the value determined by the Nevada Tax Commission for the agricultural land. He noted the Assessor used one acre for the comparables' residential units, while they pulled out 1.5 acres for the subject. He said the subject's home site was equal to or smaller than the other older ranches. He stated Appraiser Johns attributed the difference in value to the location, size, topography, and tree adjustments; but the subject's size, topography, and trees were comparable to each of the comparable sales. He stated the subject's 598 acres had over 300 acres with topography in excess of 30 percent, 185 acres with topography of less than 30 percent, and the entire property was used as a ranch.

Ms. Johnson stated she did the appraisal as if it was a 1.5 acre home site. She agreed there had not been that many sales, but the sales that occurred were shown in the sales chart. She stated the most similar comparables were LS-5 and LL-1, but LL-1 had been listed for over four years. She said there were no 1.5 acre parcels in the subject neighborhood because they were all larger parcels. She stated the price per acre was roughly \$40,000 to \$50,000, which meant the subject's value should be \$90,000 for the 1.5 acre home site.

Mr. Azevedo stated the ranch was in poor condition when he bought it, and he paid \$2,000 an acre for the subject. He commented on the 115 acre San Antonio Ranch that recently sold for \$15,000 an acre, which were the meadows directly in front of his house.

Chairperson Covert asked if the appellant's house was on the subject property. Mr. Azevedo said it was. Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, explained the residence had not been picked up for the tax roll yet, which would be done during the reopen period. He said it was currently valued as not having a house on the property.

Appraiser Johns said the appellant purchased two parcels of land in April 2009 for an adjusted sales price of \$985,000, with some water rights and some minor improvements. He reviewed the comments on pages 1 and 2 of Exhibit I. He said the appellant's contention was the site value was too high, but the Assessor's Office had to look at the entire value of the parcel. He noted the 206 acres were being valued at less than \$145,000, out of which \$4,000 was the agricultural portion and approximately \$141,000 was the site value.

Appraiser Johns stated he met with Mr. Azevedo regarding his concerns regarding a possible equalization issue. He said all of the parcels in Exhibit A had the same site value except for number 5. He stated he would look at the parcel next year and believed it would be equalized with the rest of the parcels.

Appraiser Johns said when a property was taken out of agricultural use, the typical method of determining the value of the site was to visit the property. He stated the appraiser who worked the parcels in the past put adjustments on nearly all of them. He said he did not see the need to make any adjustments on the subject parcel. He discussed the locations of the appellant's comparable land sales in Exhibit B. He advised only LS-3, which was also one of the Assessor's comparables, was comparable with the subject.

Member Krolick asked about the reasoning behind 1.5 acres versus one acre home sites. Appraiser Johns explained the house occupied roughly one acre and a large metal building occupied the half acre. He noted Mr. Azevedo agreed at the time that 1.5 acres was a reasonable estimation for the home site. Member Krolick said it was more of an access situation than taking it away from agricultural. Appraiser Johns replied it played a very minor role, but he had to consider all factors when determining a site value. He noted a neighbor had two acres for its site value. Member Krolick said Mr. Azevedo's

testimony was a typical ranch property had one acre for its home site. Appraiser Johns believed there were some in the Palomino Valley with 20 to 30 acre home sites.

Member Green asked about the base-lot value. Appraiser Johns replied it was \$140,700 for a non-agricultural lot in the Franktown area. Appraiser Lopez clarified residential parcels on Franktown Road had a much higher base-lot value.

Josh Wilson, Assessor, said he was concerned regarding the treatment of the agricultural site adjustments that were seemingly made on the properties Mr. Azevedo brought forward, but not necessarily on Mr. Azevedo's property. He stated in the event any of those adjustments might be applicable to Mr. Azevedo's home site, he wanted the values applied consistently for equalization purposes. He said Appraiser John's testimony that another appraiser put adjustments on other parcels, while he did not feel adjustments were appropriate for this parcel, concerned him a little.

Mr. Azevedo asked which parcel had a two-acre home site. Appraiser Johns said there were several in the vicinity. Mr. Azevedo stated he built his home where he did because the meadow was not buildable due to the springs in it. He believed the previous owner of the subject had a one acre home site, which was the norm. He said to follow up on Appraiser John's comments, the topography of the home site was no different from the other ranches, and they all had tree issues. He stated his ranch burned in the early 1980's, and he was in the process of reseeding the portions of the property that did not get reseeded properly when it was done initially. He said it would be fair if he was treated consistently.

Ms. Johnson stated the golf course sale was different from the subject, even though it was similar in size. She said the golf course offered a good view of the mountains, which the subject's home site did not. She felt it was important to look at the sales and listings in the subject's neighborhood. She said someone would buy 40 acres at \$200,000 before buying 1.5 acres at \$140,000. She stated the Franktown Court listing had been on the market for over four years, which was also important when valuing the home site.

Member Green asked what value the appellant wanted. Mr. Azevedo replied he was requesting the \$90,000 value calculated by his appraiser, but he would be willing to be treated consistently with his neighbors and would accept \$117,000 for the home site's land value and the agricultural value for the rest of property.

Member Green stated he had a hard time comparing sales on the east and west sides of the highway. He noted the Assessor's and the appellant's values were \$27,000 apart.

Mr. Wilson clarified the site assessment would be reduced to \$117,000, but the agricultural acres would remain unchanged. Mr. Azevedo agreed.

Member Woodland made a motion with regard to Parcel No. 055-200-71, pursuant to NRS 361.357, to reduce the site-lot value to \$117,000 keeping the improvements at \$14,928 and leaving the agricultural land value the same, resulting in a total taxable value of \$131,928. 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. Member Brown seconded the motion. The motion carried with Member Green voting "no."

12:45 p.m. Member Brown left the meeting.

Ron Sauer, Chief Appraiser, asked for clarification on the numbers in the motion because he had different numbers. Ms. Parent requested the amount be corrected so the Decision Notice would be correct. Herb Kaplan, Deputy District Attorney, requested the motion be amended to recognize the agricultural land.

Chairperson Covert reopened the hearing.

With regard to Parcel No. 055-200-71, 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 with Member Green voting "no" and Member Brown absent, it was ordered that the site lot value be reduced to \$117,000 with the agricultural land remaining at \$4,017, for a total land value of \$121,017, and the taxable improvement value be upheld at \$14,928, resulting in a total taxable value of \$135,945 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.

11-0143E PARCEL NO. 042-313-26 – STRANGMAN, JOHN F –
HEARING NO. 11-0305

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2532 Starr Meadows Loop, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Supporting documentation, 58 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, John Strangman was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

12:49 p.m. Member Brown returned to the meeting.

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

Mr. Strangman felt he was not being treated fairly, and he wanted to be treated the same as his neighbors in the tract development. He said his land value should be the same as his next door neighbor (\$56,800) at 2520 Starr Meadows Loop. He stated the structure value should be \$123,852, which was the same as others in the neighborhood as shown on page 50 of Exhibit A. He noted there was an error in the subject's record because it indicated there was a patio roof, which did not exist. He did not supply comparable sales because he felt the values the Assessor's Office used for other homes in his neighborhood were sufficient to support his position. He said the process of sampling by sales was a skewed process, because the desired properties sold and the undesirable properties did not. He stated that was demonstrated by a home west of his that was a distressed sale and by a foreclosed property to his east that had not sold. He said the neighborhood properties were all built at the same time and most were built by the same developer. He stated the house next door had the same view as his, but was not assessed the 75 percent view premium he was assessed.

12:55 p.m. Member Woodland left the meeting.

Appraiser Regan reviewed the comparable sales on page 1 of Exhibit I. She addressed the appellant's concerns by stating, the subject had always been valued based on 5,314 square feet.

12:59 p.m. Member Woodland returned to the meeting.

Appraiser Regan stated the porch roof was in error, which was brought to her attention last year. She said it was removed from the roll back three years, but the correction had no affect on his actual taxes because of the tax cap abatement. She explained how porch roofs were handled using *Marshall and Swift*. She believed the record was correct, but the Assessor's Office would look into it further if that was what the appellant wanted.

Appraiser Regan said the appellant was being assessed for a view and his neighbor was not. She said the neighborhoods were physically walked during the 2008 reappraisal, and she made a judgment call that the neighbor did not have a view. She said not being able to make the view analysis any longer from a backyard required making a judgment call. She stated the appellant's MLS indicated the neighbor's property did have a view, and she made a mistake in not applying a view premium.

Chairperson Covert asked what a 75 percent view premium meant. Appraiser Regan stated the view was of the city and the golf course. She said the appellant's view was average and view premiums could go up to 140 percent. She said every year when they tried to validate what was done regarding the view premiums, the

sales showed tremendous view premiums in excess of 200 percent. She noted the limited amount of data available was why she stayed with the historical adjustments rather than bringing them up to what the market was reflecting. She said the recommendation was to uphold the value, and she acknowledged she would equalize parcels next year based on the MLS.

In rebuttal, Mr. Strangman stated he could not see the golf course from his property because of its orientation, but could see the developed Ballardini Ranch and over to Peavine. He said he could only see downtown from the bedroom or the very westerly side of a window, and his property was only one story. He stated the view from the neighboring property was wonderful.

Chairperson Covert suggested reducing the view premium to 50 percent.

With regard to Parcel No. 042-313-26, 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 with Member Woodland abstaining, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$85,200 and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$203,714 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.

1:12 p.m. The Board recessed.

1:45 p.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

11-0144E **PARCEL NO. 049-871-09 – HILLYARD DANE C –**
HEARING NO. 11-0345

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 14960 N. Timberline Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Market value analysis, 32 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Mr. Hillyard said he was a local real estate broker, and he built his house in 2006. He stated he compared six properties within a mile of his house that sold between January 2010 and August 2010 in his analysis. He reviewed the 15174 Timberline Drive sale shown in Exhibit A, which was the most comparable property to the subject. He said only one of his six comparables was used by the Assessor, while the other comparables they used were located miles away from the subject. He stated he did not use them because they were irrelevant and were not reflective of the subject's style of house. He reviewed IS-1, which was his comparable sale number 3. He said its quality and cost of construction substantially exceeded that of the subject.

Mr. Hillyard felt the quality of the home was an issue because it had a modern look to it. He reviewed the subject's description as shown in Exhibit A. He said he pointed out to the Assessor's Office that stained concrete was an economical product, even though it looked expensive. He understood his house was rated superior to all of the comparables, even though its cost was substantially less. He stated his opinion of value would be \$735,000, which he increased \$15,000 to a total taxable value of \$750,000 due to his finishes being superior to many of the comparables.

Mr. Hillyard said he understood the process of valuing property as he did it daily in his job, and last year he did in excess of 100 bank/broker opinion's of value.

Chairperson Covert asked if the appellant was aware of the Assessor's recommendation. Mr. Hillyard replied he was.

Appraiser Anacker said one of the appellant's comparable sales was overbuilt for the area. He stated the others had a lower quality class and had less square footage, which was why the Assessor's Office used the other two comparables on page 1 of Exhibit I. He reviewed the Assessor's comparables and the recommendation. Chairperson Covert asked if a gated community was considered to be a plus or a minus. Appraiser Anacker believed it would be a minus because of the homeowner's association fees, which a lot of people would not want to pay.

In rebuttal, Mr. Hillyard disagreed the homeowner's association was a disadvantage when selling a property, because they kept people from having such things as chickens and tractors in their yards as happened in his neighborhood. He said he did about the national forest and the trails went right up to the house. He also disagreed with the Assessor's quality assessment of his number one comparable. He felt the Assessor's numbers came from when the house was originally completed, but a substantial portion of the house had been redone since then. He believed the valuations were in error because his house was rated higher than a house that cost \$1 million more to build.

Chairperson Covert said if the neighbor took out a building permit, the Assessor's Office would have picked that up. Mr. Hillyard said no additional square

footage was added. Chairperson Covert believed a remodel required a building permit. Appraiser Anacker said it would be hoped they would pull a building permit. Mr. Hillyard stated the house had been sold, so he did not know if they did. He said the property had a full guest house with a kitchen. He believed it was a timing issue, and the Assessor might not be aware of what had been done to the property.

Member Brown asked if the appellant was disputing the land value. Mr. Hillyard replied there was a sale on Legend Trails for \$87,500, so it was not really an issue because the values were within \$10,000 to \$20,000 of each other. Appraiser Anacker said the Legend Trail sale involved an owner who sold it back to himself, and the previous group of owners transferred the title back to him. He said he did not consider it an arms-length transaction. Mr. Hillyard said his issue was the value of the house and what were the actual comparables.

Member Green asked if the square footage included the cabana. Appraiser Anacker confirmed it did.

Member Woodland asked what the outbuilding was shown on page 4 of Exhibit I. Appraiser Anacker replied it was a detached garage. Mr. Hillyard explained it contained a workshop.

With regard to Parcel No. 049-871-09, 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 Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced by obsolescence to \$940,100, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,058,850 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.

11-0145E PARCEL NO. 077-370-09 – IDEKER FAMILY TRUST –
HEARING NO. 11-0185

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5990 Grass Valley Road, 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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated there was a recommendation shown on page 2 of Exhibit I, but he did not know if the appellant was in agreement with it.

With regard to Parcel No. 077-370-09, 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 upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced by obsolescence to \$366,700, resulting in a total taxable value of \$409,000 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.

11-0146E PARCEL NO. 046-170-09 – LEE FAMILY TRUST, R MICHAEL – HEARING NO. 11-0195

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 7440 Granite Ridge 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, 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, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. Appraiser Regan said there was a recommendation shown on page 2 of Exhibit I with which the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 046-170-09, 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 Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced by obsolescence to \$1,503,996, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,703,496 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.

11-0147E PARCEL NO. 017-371-03 – RAMSDELL, RYAN & JENNY –
HEARING NO. 11-0206

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 19755 Paddlewheel Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Supporting documentation, 12 pages.

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, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said the appellant was in agreement with the recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I, which was based on an appraisal submitted by the appellant.

With regard to Parcel No. 017-371-03, 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 by \$36,153 in obsolescence to \$210,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$330,000 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.

11-0148E PARCEL NO. 077-300-25 – RANGLES, HEATHER –
HEARING NO. 11-0231

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5000 Twin Springs Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Assessor's Quick Info Pages, 6 pages.

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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the appellant referenced IS-1, which was one of the Assessor's comparables in Exhibit I. He stated the second sale of a manufactured home converted to real property had quite a disparity in the price for similar manufactured homes. He stated the 4 quality class for the subject, IS-1, and IS-2 were not the same in *Marshall and Swift* as for conventional stick-built houses. He noted IS-3 was a conventional stick-built house, which was included because of the lack of more manufactured home sales in the area. He believed IS-1 was a very low indication of value. He said based on the comparables, the recommendation was to uphold.

Member Brown commented on the subject's sale price of \$398,000. Appraiser Warren said it was a nice setup as shown on page 3 of Exhibit A, and it was not a typical manufactured house.

With regard to Parcel No. 077-300-25, pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 land and improvements were valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

2:24 p.m. The Board recessed.

2:25 p.m. The Board reconvened with Member Green absent.

11-0149E **PARCEL NO. 036-495-01 – CONTRERAS, JAVIER – HEARING NO. 11-0251**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1274 Express Street, 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, 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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the recommendation was to uphold. Chairperson Covert noted the appellant was asking for the Assessor's total taxable value of \$117,742. Appraiser Warren said that was correct.

With regard to Parcel No. 036-495-01, 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 with Member Green absent, 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.

2:29 p.m. Member Green returned.

11-0150E PARCEL NO. 152-771-02 – CHOWDHURY, FAZLEY E ET AL – HEARING NO. 11-0268

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5580 Rue St. Tropez, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 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, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She discussed the recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I, and noted the appellant was in agreement with it.

With regard to Parcel No. 152-771-02, 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 by obsolescence to \$397,020, resulting in a total taxable value of \$505,020 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.

11-0151E PARCEL NO. 016-730-47 – BENNA FAMILY TRUST, STEPHEN C & KAREN L – HEARING NO. 11-0334

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 13330 Rancho Verde 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, 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, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated the gravel pit limited the appeal of the property. She discussed the recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I. She noted the appellant was in agreement with the recommendation.

With regard to Parcel No. 016-730-47, 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 \$193,052 in obsolescence to \$579,158, resulting in a total taxable value of \$679,158 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.

11-0152E **PARCEL NO. 035-602-15 – BARONE, DEBRA E –**
HEARING NO. 11-0338

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 989 Calle Myriam 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, 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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He discussed the recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I. He felt the appellant was appealing because the improvement value went up from last year, which was due to the change in the amount of obsolescence applied. He explained the allocation process used in the neighborhood involved taking the improved sales and determining a median sales price. He said this year 20 percent of that value was used to represent the land value. He stated if the properties required adjustments so the sales prices did not exceed taxable value, an adjustment for obsolescence would be made. He noted the obsolescence in this neighborhood was \$10,000, which was down from last year.

With regard to Parcel No. 035-602-15, 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.

11-0153E **PARCEL NO. 043-062-01 – MURPHY FAMILY TRUST –**
HEARING NO. 11-0343

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

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Residential appraisal report, 13 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, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said the appraisal submitted by the appellant was reviewed and the Assessor's Office was in agreement with it. She reviewed the recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I, and noted the appellant was in agreement with the recommendation.

With regard to Parcel No. 043-062-01, 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 upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced by \$132,767 in obsolescence to \$440,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$790,000 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.

11-0154E PARCEL NO. 043-311-35 – BURKITT FAMILY TRUST – HEARING NO. 11-0344

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 412 Sierra Leaf Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Supporting document, 1 page.

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, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She noted the

property was deed restricted to a 55-plus community. She stated the three comparable sales all exceeded the taxable value of the subject parcel and the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's value.

Chairperson Covert asked what conclusion was arrived at after the review of the Petitioner's evidence. Appraiser Regan replied it appeared four of the properties were outside of the subject property's neighborhood.

With regard to Parcel No. 043-311-35, 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.

11-0155E PARCEL NO. 077-300-19 – GUNTER, DAVID L & LYNN M –
HEARING NO. 11-0346

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3475 Right Hand Canyon Road, 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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He discussed the comparable sales and the recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I.

Chairperson Covert asked if the Parcel No. described on the petition as a comparable was researched. Appraiser Warren replied the subject parcel's quality class was half a point higher than the referenced comparable, it had an unfinished basement, and it was built in 2005. He said the neighbor's property had a large detached garage and was built in 1991. He stated there was also quite a difference in the depreciation between the two properties.

With regard to Parcel No. 077-300-19, 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.

11-0156E PARCEL NO. 076-470-13 – YEAGER, CHARLES E –
HEARING NO. 11-0347

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 200 Chieftan 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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the appellant's comparable on the petition was the Assessor's IS-1 (Exhibit I), and the sales price was a low indication of sales in Palomino Valley. He noted IS-2 sold for significantly more, and the Assessor's position was the subject's taxable value at \$73 per square foot was supported by the comparables on page 1 of Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 076-470-13, 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 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.

11-0157E PARCEL NO. 142-241-36 – DICKERSON, KAREN R –
HEARING NO. 11-0352

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 14000 Raider Run Road, 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, 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, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said when she spoke to the appellant she said the recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I sounded reasonable, but there was nothing confirming her agreement in writing.

With regard to Parcel No. 142-241-36, 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 by \$137,617 in obsolescence to \$305,330, resulting in a total taxable value of \$386,080 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.

11-0158E PARCEL NO. 152-301-03 – HINMAN, WAYNE E ET AL TTE – HEARING NO. 11-0354

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3327 Forest View 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, 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, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She discussed the comparable sales and advised the recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I was to uphold.

Chairperson Covert indicated the appellant requested a total taxable value of \$250,000, but did not provided any information regarding that value.

With regard to Parcel No. 152-301-03, 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 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.

11-0159E PARCEL NO. 222-060-50 – FARAHI, BEHROUZ B –
HEARING NO. 11-0359

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 485 Anitra 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, no one was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She noted the appellant was in agreement with the recommendation on page 2 of Exhibit I, which was based on the appellant's appraisal.

With regard to Parcel No. 222-060-50, 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 \$2,101,269 in obsolescence to \$2,600,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$3,100,000 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.

11-0160E PARCEL NO. 516-361-11 – WILLIAM D. BROCKETT –
HEARING NO. 11-0366

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5444 Junction Peak 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, 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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He indicated the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's values based on the comparable sales.

Chairperson Covert noted the appellant did not supply any information supporting his requested property value as shown on the petition. Appraiser Warren stated he was not aware of there being any other information.

With regard to Parcel No. 516-361-11, 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.

11-0161E PARCEL NO. 518-481-03 – NGUYEN , MY-LINH –
HEARING NO. 11-0367

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5470 Vista Terrace Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Memo and supporting documentation, 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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated there was a recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I to apply obsolescence to the improvements based on the recent sale of the subject property. He noted the appellant was in agreement with the recommendation.

With regard to Parcel No. 518-481-03, 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 Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced by obsolescence to \$205,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$265,000 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.

11-0162E PARCEL NO. 526-231-01 – COOKE, JARED A & LORIL –
HEARING NO. 11-0368

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 7075 Jermann Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Assessment Notice and Property Assessment data on properties in Foothills at Wingfield Village Subdivision, 10 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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated the recommendation was to apply \$60,000 in total obsolescence to the

improvements as shown on page 1 of Exhibit I. He did not know if the appellant was in agreement with the recommendation.

With regard to Parcel No. 526-231-01, 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 upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced by \$60,000 in obsolescence to \$126,471, resulting in a total taxable value of \$164,571 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.

11-0163E PARCEL NO. 514-110-02 – LEYVA, CHRISTOPHER J. –
HEARING NO. 11-0370

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1442 Fraun 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, 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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated there was a recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I to reduce the subject to the sales price, and the appellant was in agreement with the recommendation.

With regard to Parcel No. 514-110-02, 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 Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced by \$170,471 in obsolescence to \$471,410, resulting in a total taxable value of \$525,000 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.

11-0164E PARCEL NO. 534-232-02 – DEES, DON J –
HEARING NO. 11-0408

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 105 Bridle Path Terrace, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable listings and sales, 17 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, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said the information on page 5 corrected the factual errors regarding the size of the swimming pool and the amount of fencing. He advised the recommendation on page 1 of Exhibit I showed the recommended additional obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 534-232-02, 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 Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable improvement value be reduced by \$28,984 due to the correction of a factual error for tax year 2011-12. AND 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 \$6,375 in obsolescence to \$228,400, resulting in a total taxable value of \$294,000 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.

11-0165E PARCEL NO. 017-360-21 – REPTILE RIDGE PROPERTIES INC –
HEARING NO. 11-0390

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 Neilson Road, 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, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He discussed the comparable sales and listings on page 1 of Exhibit I and advised the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's values.

Chairperson Covert stated there was no evidence of what the appellant wanted.

With regard to Parcel No. 017-360-21, 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.

11-0166E PARCEL NO. 017-360-22 – REPTILE RIDGE PROPERTIES – HEARING NO. 11-0391

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 305 Neilson Road, 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, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He discussed the comparable sales and listings on page 1 of Exhibit I and advised the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's values.

Chairperson Covert stated there was no evidence of what the appellant wanted, nor did he provide an opinion of the subject's estimated value.

With regard to Parcel No. 017-360-22, 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.

11-0167E PARCEL NO. 017-360-24 – REPTILE RIDGE PROPERTIES INC – HEARING NO. 11-0392

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 315 Neilson Road, 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, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He discussed the comparable sales and listings on page 1 of Exhibit I and advised the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's values.

Chairperson Covert stated the appellant did not provide any assessment of what the estimated value was of the property.

With regard to Parcel No. 017-360-24, 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.

11-0168E PARCEL NO. 017-360-25 – REPTILE RIDGE PROPERTIES INC – HEARING NO. 11-0393

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 Neilson Road, 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, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He discussed the comparable sales and listings on page 1 of Exhibit I and advised the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's values.

Chairperson Covert stated the appellant did not provide any estimation of the value of the property.

With regard to Parcel No. 017-360-25, 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.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board Member comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no public comments.

* * * * *

3:16 p.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
Jan Frazzetta, Deputy Clerk*