

**BOARD OF EQUALIZATION  
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

THURSDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 9, 2017

PRESENT:

**Philip Horan, Chairman**  
**James Ainsworth, Vice Chairman**  
**James Brown, Member**  
**Eugenia Larmore, Member**  
**Barbara “Bobbi” Lazzarone, Member**  
  
**Nancy Parent, County Clerk**  
**Michael Large, Deputy District Attorney**

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

**17-049E      PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**17-050E      WITHDRAWN PETITIONS**

The following petitions scheduled on today's agenda had been withdrawn by the Petitioners prior to the hearing:

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>	<b>Hearing No.</b>
050-303-20	COOK, CHUCK W & AUDRA M	17-0071

**17-051E      CONTINUANCES**

On motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Larmore, which motion duly carried, it was ordered the following hearing be continued to February 23, 2017:

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>	<b>Hearing No.</b>
018-351-06	OUELLETTE 2008 TRUST, LOREN & GAYLA	17-0061

**CONSOLIDATION OF HEARINGS**

There were no consolidations.

**17-052E**      **PARCEL NO. 023-430-21 – HUDSON FAMILY TRUST –**  
**HEARING NO. 17-0038**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2017-18 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4927 Lakeridge Ter W, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, no one oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

With regard to Parcel No. 023-430-21 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Larmore, which motion duly carried, it was order that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be reduced to 57,330, and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$317,147, resulting in a total taxable value of \$374,477 for tax year 2017-18. 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.

**17-053E**      **PARCEL NO. 041-062-68 – ROSS, TROY W & DIANA L –**  
**HEARING NO. 17-0052**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2017-18 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4180 Plateau Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, no one oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

With regard to Parcel No. 041-062-68 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Larmore, seconded by Member Lazzarone, which motion duly carried, it was order that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$879,166, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,079,166 for tax year 2017-18. 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.

**17-054E      PARCEL NO. 041-062-68 – ROSS, TROY W & DIANA L –**  
**HEARING NO. 17-0052R16**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2016-17 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4180 Plateau Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, no one oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

With regard to Parcel No. 041-062-68 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Larmore, seconded by Member Lazzarone, which motion duly carried, it was order that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$889,668, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,064,668 for tax year 2016-17. 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.

**17-055E      PARCEL NO. 038-341-22 – ELLIOTT, EUGENE V –**  
**HEARING NO. 17-0026**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2017-18 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 10 Zane Grey Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Letter, photos and supporting documentation, 15 pages.

**Exhibit B:** Letter and 3 photographs, 4 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, Eugene Elliott was sworn in by County Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Mr. Elliott introduced himself and stated his parcel consisted of two acres with a 1,858 square foot house and a barn on it. He stated the photos in the exhibits he provided showed some of the water damage his property sustained. He described some of the issues with the standing water, which included mud surrounding his utility trailer in the backyard and the fact that he had classic cars in his barn which he could not remove. He stated he and his neighbor, Tom Bradley, should not have to spend a lot of money to repair a problem that was not of their making and would reoccur. He asserted he had to stay at home to apply stop-gap measures to make sure the problem did not get worse by sandbagging and digging. He noted his leach field was located next to the barn driveway and the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) website indicated a flooding situation could completely plug a leach field. Homes in his neighborhood did not have the ability to hook up to a sewer system. He also expressed concern about his well and said the mud from a leach field could wash directly toward his well. He worried horse manure could wash into his yard from his neighbor's property and if the sanitary shield on his well failed, it would be a disaster. He mentioned according to the EPA's website, well water should not be consumed in these situations until the well was tested, which would mean another expense. In the meantime he had to drink bottled water. Mr. Elliott reviewed each of the photos in his evidence packet which depicted damage to his property due to excess water. He explained part of the problem was one of his neighbors dug a foundation for the storing of a recreational vehicle (RV) on their property. In the process had put excess dirt over the fence onto the subject property, which turned into mud. He claimed the drain at the bottom of Nightowl Drive had been partially covered with asphalt and the drainage problem did not exist until some of his neighbors added

new buildings to their properties. He thought the drainage problem was the fault of the Washoe County Building Department. He said he talked with Kimble Corbridge from the Community Services Department and was told since he lived downhill from other houses, he should expect property damage.

Mr. Elliott stated he was unsure how else to proceed other than to follow Appraiser Holwill's advice and ask for a reduction in his assessment. This was not something he really wanted to do as it would lower the value of his house. He stated he was concerned about his foundation and crawl space. He noted the leach field from one of his neighbors on Nightowl Drive had been approved by the County, but it was situated so that water from that property ran right towards his well. He thought the primary problem was the Building Department did not inspect the properties; instead they assumed that everyone had done their jobs correctly, which was not always the case. He stated he did not have anything against his neighbors, but felt it was the County's responsibility to tell them what they needed to do and to follow up with them. He also complained about his neighbor's outside light and said it shined right into his house.

Chairman Horan asked if Mr. Elliott's request was for a 20 percent adjustment to his assessed value and Mr. Elliott replied in the affirmative.

Appraiser Holwill explained the appeal was not based on whether the subject property's taxable value exceeded its full cash value, but rather on the drainage and flooding issues which affected the property. He read from page 2 of Exhibit I and reviewed the features, comparable sales, and range of values associated with the subject property. He concluded the subject's taxable value did not exceed full cash value; however, after the recent heavy rainfall it was brought to the Assessor's attention the subject parcel suffered from drainage issues. The recommendation was for a 10 percent reduction to the land value. He explained the recommendation was consistent with what the Assessor's Office had done previously in similar situations. He noted the petitioner had contacted the County's Building Department, as did the Assessor's Office, and the response was that the issue was a civil matter.

Chairman Horan asked Appraiser Holwill to elaborate on what he meant by "similar situations". Appraiser Holwill explained he was referring to drainage issues which resulted in the reduced utility of the land or had become a detriment to the land.

Member Ainsworth stated he did not understand what the comparables had to do with the issue. Appraiser Holwill said the comparables were included only to support that the current taxable value was below the full cash value of the subject.

Member Brown asked how much responsibility fell to the owner versus the County regarding drainage issues. Appraiser Holwill responded he did not know. He discussed the matter with the Building Department and was told the Petitioner should file a civil action against the neighboring property owners. Member Brown asked if the Petitioner did not favor the Assessor's recommendation for a 10 percent reduction. Appraiser Holwill confirmed that was accurate.

Member Lazzarone asked if a 10 percent was a standard reduction amount. Appraiser Holwill replied it was what the Assessor's Office had done in similar situations. Member Lazzarone did not think it seemed like very much considering the damage to the property. She remarked the damage seemed to be beyond the Petitioner's control and Appraiser Holwill agreed.

Chairman Horan asked Michael Large, Legal Counsel, if a reduction in this case would be due to obsolescence. Mr. Large responded the petition was brought pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute 361.357 and the Board could make a valuation determination that the property was less valuable due to permanent damage caused by flooding. It would not necessarily be an adjustment made due to obsolescence; it would be a valuation adjustment. Chairman Horan asked if Mr. Large considered this to be a civil matter. Mr. Large stated in regards to providing legal advice to the land owner and what his potential courses of action might be, it was outside the purview of the Board of Equalization and he did not feel comfortable giving that advice. Chairman Horan stated he asked the question because he thought it was important to look at the ability of the Board to make a decision and to put on the record that the Board would not provide legal advice to the Petitioner.

Mr. Elliott stated the comparison properties submitted by the Assessor's office were not in same situation as his and they did not seem to have drainage problems. Chairman Horan responded his point was valid; however, the Board would not be looking at the comparisons because that was not the issue being addressed.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Member Ainsworth thought the Board should offer a reduction. It seemed to him the Petitioner had a civil case against his uphill neighbor, but noted it was up to him.

Member Lazzarone recounted she had been in a similar situation when her neighbor's water damage affected her property. She thought it definitely reduced the value of the subject land and she would support a reduction to the valuation.

Member Larmore noted the Petitioner requested a 20 percent reduction for both his land and improvements. She said she agreed with the Assessor's Office that there was not necessarily an impact to the improvements and she would agree with a reduction on the land only. Member Brown concurred.

Chairman Horan asked what sort of reduction Member Larmore would suggest and she replied she was comfortable with a 20 percent reduction to the land only. Member Lazzarone asked Member Larmore why she did not feel the improvements were affected by the water issues. Member Larmore replied improvements included anything that was manmade and added to a property. She was not sure the building was damaged, although she agreed the land was damaged. Member Lazzarone remarked she thought the land damage affected the use of the improvements. Member Ainsworth thought the

improvements were affected because the Petitioner did not have access to his garage and Member Lazzarone concurred.

Chairman Horan opined any adjustment should be temporary with the idea that the valuation of the subject would be considered on an continuing basis. He did not think the Board should take a position as to how the issues might be resolved, but he believed the improvements were impacted by the situation and he stated his support of a motion to grant the Petitioner's request for a 20 percent reduction.

Member Ainsworth asked if the suggestion was to reduce the valuation on the land and improvements, or simply on the land. Member Lazzarone responded she would make a motion to reduce both the land and improvements by 20 percent.

Member Larmore stated based on the conversation and the impacted use of the improvements, she would agree with the motion.

Chairman Horan asked the Assessor's Office for the calculated amounts based on a 20 percent reduction. Cori Burke, Chief Deputy Assessor, replied with a 20 percent reduction the land value would be \$62,330 and the improvement value would be \$102,705. Chairman Horan verified with the Assessor's Office the total taxable value would be \$163,035.

Member Lazzarone moved to reduce the taxable land value to \$62,330 and to reduce the taxable improvement value to \$102,705, resulting in a total taxable value of \$165,035 for tax year 2017-18 based on a 20 percent reduction. Member Ainsworth seconded the motion.

Chairman Horan commented this reduction would be considered temporary and the issue would continue to be revisited. He encouraged the Petitioner to take whatever steps he deemed necessary to correct the situation.

Nancy Parent, County Clerk, asked if the motion should mention the reduction was being made pursuant to a specific reason.

Chairman Horan responded comments made by Legal Counsel indicated the valuation was lower than what the Assessor claimed it was. Mr. Large stated it had been implied but it was not specifically stated in the motion. Member Lazzarone proceeded to amend her motion.

With regard to Parcel No. 038-341-22, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Lazzarone, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$62,330 and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$102,705, resulting in a total taxable value of \$165,035 for tax year 2017-18. The reduction was based on issues related to drainage problems on the property. 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.

**17-0056E      PARCEL NO. 038-341-24 – BRADLEY FAMILY TRUST,  
THOMAS R – HEARING NO. 17-0027**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2017-18 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 15 Zane Grey Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Letter, map and photos, 20 pages.

Exhibit B: Video recordings of the subject property on two DVDs.

Exhibit C: Letter and maps, 17 pages.

**Assessor**

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

Nancy Parent, County Clerk, informed the Board about some additional evidence which was submitted by the Petitioner including two videos, a letter and some maps.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Thomas Bradley was sworn in by County Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Al Holwill, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted this was a neighboring property to the previous hearing.

Thomas Bradley asked the Assessor's Office to play the videos showing water damage to his property. One of the videos was displayed to the Board.

Chairman Horan stated it was evident the Petitioner had a lot of water running through his property. Mr. Bradley said he prepared a second video and Chairman Horan replied the Board had seen enough to understand the issue.

Mr. Bradley discussed photographs he had submitted, which depicted the topography of his and his neighbor's, Eugene Elliott's, yards as well as the water and drainage issues on both properties. Specific issues described included a blocked drain, a neighboring horse pasture with no vegetation to block water, a six foot high berm in a neighbor's yard that blocked drainage, the backfilling of a neighboring property without any accommodations for drainage, the sloping yards that directed water into his yard, a home with new gutters that directed water to his property, a four foot deep puddle of



water under there area where he parked, and a four inch drain pipe in the back of a barn. He said he had no problems during the floods of 1997.

Mr. Bradley spoke of actions he had taken two and a half years prior when he contacted the Building Department. He said a gentleman named Harold Stone looked at the property, but said there was nothing the County could do. He argued the County approved all of the building that had taken place above his property, but neglected to plan for drainage issues. He said he had shown Mr. Stone some photographs from 2014 which showed what the drainage looked like at that time.

Mr. Bradley said the plot plan which he obtained from the Building Department, showed the residential additions in his neighborhood and it illustrated what people were supposed to do to get their projects approved. They were supposed to show the drainage plan in relation to existing houses. He indicated his uphill neighbor's recreational vehicle (RV) garage had just been approved the previous July and the plans did not show any arrangements for dealing with drainage. He noted homeowners were supposed to make sure there was drainage to an existing drain or to easements. The Building Department had told him he might have to file a civil suit against the uphill neighbor, but he felt it was the County's fault for approving the permits. He asserted there should also have been a grading permit for his neighbor's new barn.

Chairman Horan said the Board would not address the permit issues; he thought the video and the photographs sufficiently demonstrated the impact to the property.

Mr. Bradley stated the video shown was recorded on January 8th and there had been six more instances of water issues since then. He asserted he would be required to disclose the drainage issues if he chose to sell his property which meant the value of his house was less.

Chairman Horan stated clearly there was a disclosure issue and noted the Petitioner had come forward to request a reduction in the valuation of his property.

Mr. Bradley claimed flood insurance would be about \$400 per year and the cost to repair the damages would likely be more than \$5,000. He said he was retired and on a fixed income and he should not have to pay for the repairs. He had tried to take care of the problem by bringing the issue to the County and nothing was done about it. He felt he should not have to pay any property taxes because the damage to his property was the County's fault due to the approval of the construction on the property above his.

Chairman Horan stated he was not discounting the problem; however, it was not the purview of this Board to address. The Board could only decide on valuation and the case had been made related to that issue. Whether or not the County was at fault for not doing their jobs was not something the Board could judge.

Mr. Bradley responded he brought up the issue because Appraiser Holwill had also approached the Building Department. He said Appraiser Holwill was also dissatisfied with the suggestion to file a civil suit.

Appraiser Holwill noted this appeal was a neighbor to the previous hearing and the issues were very much the same. He asked the Board if they wanted him to review the Assessor's exhibit.

Chairman Horan did not think the comparable sales were applicable in this case. He concurred this petition was very similar to the previous appeal.

Member Ainsworth asked if Mr. Bradley talked to his neighbors about knocking the berm down. Mr. Bradley said he talked to them in October and his neighbor indicated he considered the installation of a French drain, but that did not happen. He commended Appraiser Holwill who responded quickly and had been very helpful.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chairman Horan stated he had heard some interesting comments from a County engineer about flood zones and storm water and how they were treated differently. He remarked this request was similar to the previous hearing and the Petitioner was requesting a 20 percent reduction in both the land and improvement values.

Member Ainsworth thought the Board set a precedent with the last decision they made; however, in this case he did not think the Petitioner had lost access to any buildings like the previous hearing.

Member Horan stated he would support a motion to support the Petitioner's request and Member Lazzarone concurred. Member Horan asked the Assessor's Office to calculate the numbers for a 20 percent reduction on both the land and improvements.

Cori Burke, Chief Deputy Assessor, responded a 20 percent reduction would amount to a land value of \$48,780 and an improvement value of \$97,470 for a total taxable value of \$146,250.

With regard to Parcel No. 038-341-24, which petition was brought 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 Lazzarone, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$48,780 and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$97,470, resulting in a total taxable value of \$146,250 for tax year 2017-18. The reduction was based on issues related to drainage problems on the property. 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.

**17-057E**      **PARCEL NO. 050-303-08 – MULLIN FAMILY TRUST –  
HEARING NO. 17-0058**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2017-18 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4515 Douglas Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Tax bill and assessment notice, 3 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 13 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was sworn in by County 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. She stated the Assessor's Office was prepared to stand on the written record and the recommendation that the Assessor's value be upheld.

Member Lazzarone noted Part F of the petition was not completed by the Appellant, therefore she did not know what kind of appeal it was.

Michael Large, Legal Counsel, stated he could not presume to speak for the Petitioner, but noted the claim was that a bridge should be removed from the Appellant's assessment. Chairman Horan concluded the Board would need to make a determination as to whether the bridge should be removed from the Assessment or not.

Member Ainsworth wondered why the Claimant thought the bridge should not be included. Appraiser Stafford said she explained the reason the bridge was included to the Appellant and he understood.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Member Horan did not think there was any reason to remove the bridge from the valuation and Member Lazzarone agreed.

With regard to Parcel No. 050-303-08, which petition was brought 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 Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and 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 in the current assessment year.

**17-058E      PARCEL NO. 076-590-01 – MICHAEL IZADY INC RETIREMENT PLAN – HEARING NO. 17-0010**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2016-17 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2500 Piute Creek 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 County Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Michael Bozman, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated the Assessor's Office was prepared to stand on their written record.

Chairman Horan stated based on the fact the Petitioner did not submit any evidence to support the request, he would entertain a motion.

With regard to Parcel No. 076-590-01, which petition was brought 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 Lazzarone, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and 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 in the current assessment year.

**17-059E      PARCEL NO. 041-230-14 – SHAKSTAR LLC – HEARING NO. 17-0020**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2017-18 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Upper Ranch Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 8 pages.

**Assessor**

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

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

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

Appraiser Clement stated he was testifying on behalf of Appraiser Ginny Sutherland. He said this case was a bit complicated, but he would address the Appellant's questions as best he could while offering an opinion as to the value of the property.

Appraiser Clement stated the subject property was in a planned unit development (PUD) zone called The Pines, which was situated above the Caughlin Ranch area. He said the access to the parcel was via a dirt road which was less than a mile from a paved road in the Caughlin Ranch neighborhood. He pointed out three of the land comparables in Exhibit I were accessed by the dirt road and downward adjustments had been applied for those properties due to the lack of utilities, power and access. He read from page 2 of Exhibit I and reviewed the features, comparable sales and range of values associated with the subject property.

Appraiser Clement offered some background information regarding the subject property. He displayed a map which was part of Exhibit I and noted the parcels were all part of the PUD for The Pines which had a tentative map for development. The subject parcel was tentatively planned for nine home sites. He explained two of the property owners had a disagreement with the other 14 property owners regarding the realignment of the access for the development of the PUD. The case went to District Court where it was affirmed the Petitioner had agreed to realign access for the development of the parcels; however, the case went further to the Supreme Court where the decision was overturned. Therefore the realignment of the access was not required.

Appraiser Clement stated to determine the market value of the property the Assessor's Office verified it had legal access which would allow it to be developed to the potential allowed for in the PUD that was approved by the City of Reno. The parcels in the area were all appraised at the same time and all had the same value. He stated when reviewing the subject parcel they looked at what the highest and best use was and what the least common denominator was given the detriments to the parcel. That was why the Assessor's Office looked at some general rural (GR) zoned parcels in its review. He said those parcels did not seem to be very representative of the subject; however, they

corresponded to the lowest denominator of the highest and best use. The GR parcels represented the worst case scenario in the Assessor's analysis.

Appraiser Clement noted the Appellant mentioned there was a threatened plant species, the Weber Ivesia plant, in the area. Although the threatened plant did not prevent development on a privately owned parcel, there were some development requirements they would have to comply with such as washing off all the machinery for noxious weeds and putting up fencing so seeds did not blow around the property. All of this was taken into consideration when the property was valued in 2014. He explained before the Supreme Court case, the parcel was valued at \$190,000; however, a stipulation was provided to the taxpayers in the PUD to lower their values to around \$40,000. That value had been maintained since 2014. He stated when the reappraisal was done this year the value was increased. In his opinion, the property had legal access, it was buildable and the market value in 2014 was not the same as it was in the improving residential market of 2017. He noted Appraiser Sutherland spoke with the Appellant and she believed the taxpayer appealed out of frustration with the situation rather than due to the valuation.

Chairman Horan asked if the valuation of the property was similar to the value of all the other properties surrounding it and Appraiser Clement replied yes. He said the properties were initially valued at \$11,000 per acre and then were given a 90 percent downward adjustment. Chairman Horan clarified the value was consistent with all the other properties in the area and Appraiser Clement responded in the affirmative.

Member Brown asked if the property had access to water. Appraiser Clement said he did not read all of the PUD documents; however, he was pretty sure they would have to bring in the infrastructure such as curbs, gutters, sewer lines and pump stations. He was fairly certain they would also have to extend water lines to the area. Member Brown commented that would be expensive.

Member Lazzarone asked if there were any current plans to develop the area. Appraiser Clement stated the PUD, The Pines, still existed and the tentative map was approved in 2007. He commented one could look up The Pines on the City of Reno's website and see where the parcels and roads would go. He did not want to speculate about why the property owners did not want to realign the roads, but from reading the court cases he deduced the realignment would have benefited all the property owners. He felt there would be more and more pressure to develop the area as the real estate market continued to pick up. For an example, Appraiser Clement mentioned an appeal case the Board of Equalization heard around 2010 or 2011. The appeal was in regards to some land in Verdi which the Appellant claimed was nearly worthless because of the cost of development. The Assessor's Office valued the property at approximately \$1 million and the Appellant had purchased it for \$1.1 million. He noted since then, the property had resold for \$11 million. He remarked the point was that it was a completely different market than it was during the recession. He believed there would eventually be pressure to develop The Pines.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chairman Horan stated he would support upholding the Assessor's valuation given that values were consistent throughout the area.

Member Lazzarone said it seemed the Assessor tried to be more than fair by comparing the property to those that were more rural.

With regard to Parcel No. 041-230-14, which petition was brought 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 Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and 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 in the current assessment year.

**17-060E      ROLL CHANGE REQUEST – REAL PROPERTY**

**DECREASE** – Consideration of and action to approve or deny on RCR number 1641N17.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Roll Change Request, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Appraiser Stafford explained the Marshall and Swift cost manual considered the last level of a parking garage to be the roof. That meant a 15-level parking garage would be entered into the system as 14 having stories because the 15th story would be the roof. He stated Hobie's, Inc. had added a roof to their two-story parking garage. The roof was non-load bearing and it did not allow for the parking of vehicles; however, the cost service Marshall and Swift had considered it load-bearing. The roll change request was put forth in consideration of the fact there was a non-load bearing roof structure on the subject parking garage. He informed the Board the recommended change had been sent to the property owner and was met with appreciation.

Chairman Horan stated the explanation was very informative. He said moving forward it would be a good idea to include some of that information with the request for the adjustment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Lazzarone, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered to approve the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to decrease the value for RCR No. 1641N17, Parcel No. 085-090-60 as set forth on the Roll Change Request for 5195 Sun Valley Boulevard. With this adjustment it was found that the subject land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
085-090-60	HOBES INC	1641N17

**17-061E      ROLL CHANGE REQUEST – RCR NO. 1 - PERSONAL PROPERTY**

**DECREASES** – Consideration of and action to approve or deny RCR No. 1-1 through 1-27.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:**      Cover letter and Roll Change Request, 7 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mark Stafford, Appraiser, stated he was joined in his presentation by Delene Pestoni, Principal Account Clerk. He noted the cover letter to the roll change request explained there were various reasons why the Assessor's Office was requesting these adjustments. The value adjustments concerned the 2016-17 tax year on the unsecured tax roll.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Lazzarone, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered to approve the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to decrease the values for RCR No. 1-1, Roll No. 3112060 through RCR No. 1-27, Roll No. 2180950 as set forth on the spreadsheet attached to the Roll Change Request. With those adjustments, it was found that the subject personal property is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
3112060	MIRRIAM AUSTIN	1-1
3218698	ALEXANDER J & ANNAMARIE NEVAREZ	1-2
2128374	CHRIST GOSPEL CHURCH OF RENO NV	1-3



2001292	GEMFIELD RESOURCES LTD	1-4
2119985	CANOE HILL DESIGN AND EMBROIDERY	1-5
2162050	WORLD HEALTH CARE MANAGEMENT	1-6
2127308	NRC ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	1-7
5601177	STEPHEN MARCO	1-8
2625074	CUSTOM PAINTING AND DECORATING	1-9
2104665	GREAT BASIN WELDING SERVICES	1-10
2243017	SHEPLERS 27	1-11
2541074	GREAT BASIN MACHINE INC	1-12
2211992	LA CARRETA TAQUERIA Y PUPUSERIA	1-13
2229742	TOOL SOURCE WAREHOUSE INC	1-14
5101218	SCRAF INC	1-15
5601141	AIRCRAFT PARTNER HOLDINGS INC TRUSTEE	1-16
5601144	AIRCRAFT PARTNER HOLDINGS INC TRUSTEE	1-17
5601150	AIRCRAFT PARTNER HOLDINGS INC TRUSTEE	1-18
5601153	AIRCRAFT PARTNER HOLDINGS INC TRUSTEE	1-19
5601169	AIRCRAFT PARTNER HOLDINGS INC TRUSTEE	1-20
5601171	AIRCRAFT PARTNER HOLDINGS INC TRUSTEE	1-21
5601183	AIRCRAFT PARTNER HOLDINGS INC TRUSTEE	1-22
5601223	AIRCRAFT PARTNER HOLDINGS INC TRUSTEE	1-23
5601238	AIRCRAFT PARTNER HOLDINGS INC TRUSTEE	1-24
5601030	33 RANCH LLC	1-25
2207465	B & A CORE METALS	1-26
2180950	JANIE JANDREAU	1-27

**17-062E      BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

There were no Board member comments.

**17-063E      PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

\*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*

**10:36 a.m.** There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

---

**PHILIP HORAN**, Chairman  
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

---

**NANCY PARENT**, County Clerk  
and Clerk of the Washoe County  
Board of Equalization

*Minutes prepared by  
Catherine Smith, Deputy Clerk*