

**BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

FRIDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 26, 2021

PRESENT:

Eugenia Larmore, Chair
James Ainsworth, Vice Chair
Dennis George, Member
Barbara “Bobbi” Lazzarone, Member
Daren McDonald, Member

Janis Galassini, County Clerk
Jennifer Gustafson, 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. Chair Larmore called the meeting to order, the Clerk called the roll, and the Board conducted the following business:

21-092E PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no response to the call for public comment.

21-093E SWEARING IN

Janis Galassini, County Clerk, swore in the appraisal staff.

21-094E WITHDRAWN PETITIONS

There were no petitions withdrawn.

**21-095E PARCEL NO. 510-082-54 – RCG-SPARKS LLC –
HEARING NO. 21-0044C**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2021-22 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 121 Los Altos Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner
None.

Assessor
Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor, no one oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 510-082-54 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Lazzarone, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld, and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$29,491,774, resulting in a total taxable value of \$37,646,882 for tax year 2021-22. 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.

21-096E PARCEL NO. 090-040-35 – DP PARTNERS STEAD I LLC – HEARING NO. 21-0039A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2021-22 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 Moya Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor, no one oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 090-040-35 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Lazzarone, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be reduced to \$500, and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$500 for tax year 2021-22. 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.

21-097E **PARCEL NO. 090-040-42 – DP PARTNERS STEAD I LLC –**
HEARING NO. 21-0039B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2021-22 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 Moya Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor, no one oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 090-040-42 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Lazzarone, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be reduced to \$1,911,695, and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,911,695 for tax year 2021-22. 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.

21-098E **ROLL NO. 2265009 – SMITH STORAGE SYSTEMS, LLC –**
HEARING NO. 21-0025P20

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2020-21 taxable valuation on personal property located at 13951 Mt. Bismark Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 29 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 29 pages.

Exhibit II: Letter and supporting documentation, 11 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Russell Smith and Damon Booth were sworn in by County Clerk Jan Galassini.

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

Ms. Galassini stated documents received by the Petitioner, designated as Exhibit A, and documents from the Assessor's Office, labeled Exhibit II, were placed on file. The Board received printed copies of the exhibits.

Mr. Booth mentioned he was not present at the last hearing, but his client was contesting the assessment done by the County Assessor's Office. He said the valuation was based on an aerial photo and the comparison of similar businesses. He disagreed with the businesses used as comparisons, saying they were distinguishable from his client's business. He indicated he and the Smiths attempted to work with the Assessor's Office and tried to get a site inspection done, although there was not enough time to do so before the hearing. He stated his client was more than willing to work with the Assessor's Office. The client did not understand the change in valuation from a notice dated January 11, 2021 for \$8,774.88 and a delinquent notice dated February 8 for \$9,652.37. Mr. Booth reached out to the Assessor's Office to inquire whether this was a penalty increase but received no response. Because they had not received paperwork from the Assessor's Office, his clients requested to self-report this information through the Assessor's portal. He explained the landlord specified in the lease agreement that he would be responsible for reporting personal property. He stated the parcel was leased by two businesses, and the bottom portion and right side of the property were leased by his client.

Mr. Smith indicated that, when he previously appeared, he had agreed to talk to the appraisers to straighten this issue out. After the initial hearing, he was informed that the Appraiser had recently learned of another business on the parcel that was not licensed. Mr. Smith then approached the other company and verified they had a license and paid personal property tax. He felt the Appraiser was not willing to work with him, so he hired an attorney. He opined the Assessor's Office should have provided him with the personal property form for him to complete, and they should have conducted a site visit, but that did not happen. He was told he had to pay the entire amount.

Appraiser Scott stated the intent of the continuance was so the Petitioner could provide her with the information necessary so a site inspection could be performed; if warranted, a stipulation or recommendation could then have been made. Immediately following the February 8 hearing, she noted, appraisers from the Assessor's Office met with the Petitioner and discussed what information was necessary so a change in valuation could be considered. She reviewed the many attempts made to contact Mr. Smith without response until an email was received from Mr. Booth on February 17 advising that he was representing the Smiths and requesting details about previous communications. The Assessor's Office responded to Mr. Booth promptly and provided the hearing evidence packet along with copies of all follow-up emails. She informed Mr. Booth the Assessor's Office had still not received any documentation from the Petitioners. She noted several

more emails were exchanged but no financial information was received until the Assessor's Office received tax returns on the evening of February 23. She added none of the applicable schedules or worksheets were attached and no asset information could be established, leaving them with no basis for a site inspection. With only one day until the hearing, she stated, there was not time to perform a site inspection and generate an asset list. She asked the Board to uphold the estimated valuation of \$685,000 based on the lack of asset information and stated the Petitioners could appeal to State Board of Equalization (SBOE) if they wanted to pursue a possible reduction in valuation.

Member George stated all that was needed was a list of equipment from the Petitioner, but since the information was not provided, the Board was left with little choice.

Mr. Booth said there was an open exchange of communication between his office and the Assessor's Office, though communication with the clients' tax firm was difficult because it was tax season. He asserted his client was willing to provide a list of equipment. He said the next step would be to appeal to the SBOE, although his clients would be open to the idea of providing an equipment list if the Assessor's Office would reopen the portal; a site inspection could then be scheduled.

Mr. Smith opined he had done everything he was supposed to but did not know why he did not receive the paperwork to complete like everyone else did.

Vice Chair Ainsworth inquired about the length of time this business had been in operation. Mr. Smith replied it had operated for two years in that area. The Vice Chair asked whether a personal property list had been submitted the previous year. Mr. Smith said no, and Appraiser Scott agreed. Vice Chair Ainsworth questioned the valuation from the previous year, and Appraiser Scott admitted it was a low estimate due to an error by the Assessor's Office.

Based on the Petitioner's testimony, Member McDonald asked about differences between the Smiths' business and the businesses used by the Assessor's Office. Mr. Smith stated one business was a forklift dealer who had nothing to do with pallet racking or conveyors. He explained everything on the property was conveyors, racking, carts, forklifts, and other warehousing equipment. He indicated he had a resale certificate, and sales tax was reported to the County when something was sold. He claimed he never received paperwork indicating the need to provide an inventory, even though the Assessor's Office told him they had tried to contact him and attempted to send documents. He opined the Assessor's Office was trying to tax him for the property although he did not own it. He explained he was told conflicting information about what was needed to be reported as personal property. He commented he had no confidence in the tax office and thought he was not treated right.

Member McDonald said page 5 of a tax return provided by the Petitioners indicated that Mr. Smith had \$1,700,619 in fixed assets not included as land or identified in any other way. The depreciation schedule was not attached, and he could not see any further information. He asked Mr. Smith if there was a reason he should not rely that

statement of more than a million dollars as the correct valuation. Mr. Smith replied tax specialists did his taxes because they did them better than he could. He asserted he informed the Assessor's Office during the previous hearing that he did not understand how business property was personal property.

Member McDonald asked Mr. Smith to answer his question about why the Assessor's Office should not use the asset information provided on his tax records. Mr. Booth stated he did not have that information in front of him, but he knew Mr. Smith had provided partial tax returns for 2018 and 2019. He indicated the Petitioner had no issues providing the complete returns that would reflect depreciation.

Member McDonald explained the depreciation schedules used by the State and County were different than the one used for income tax purposes. Mr. Booth confirmed he understood that.

Member Lazzarone asked about the delay in progress since the first hearing, wondering why this could not be resolved in nearly three weeks. Appraiser Scott stated staff met with the Petitioner after the hearing on February 8 and discussed the information needed to consider an adjustment, including depreciation schedules and tax returns, so they could determine what was at the property to perform a site inspection. Unfortunately, they were unable to obtain tax records until February 23 and could not perform a site inspection prior to this hearing given those time constraints.

Vice Chair Ainsworth commented the Board only had the information presented to go by and there was not enough there to recommend an adjustment. He thought the best process would be to approve the Appraiser's valuation and have the Petitioner appeal that decision to the SBOE. Member Lazzarone agreed the Assessor's Office did not have the information needed. Member McDonald concurred and said the information provided by the Petitioner showed a higher valuation than the Assessor's Office's values.

Vice Chair Ainsworth asked the Assessor's Office to work with the Petitioner to compile the information needed for the SBOE. Appraiser Scott stated they could and encouraged the Petitioner to file an appeal to the SBOE to retain the opportunity to continue the valuation discussion. She had provided Mr. Booth some additional information they could use to come to a resolution.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Larmore agreed there was a place for discussion. She acknowledged the Assessor's Office value was based on the best belief of comparable businesses. She believed there was the potential for a possible adjustment and encouraged the Petitioners to appeal to the SBOE.

With regard to Roll No. 2265009, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Lazzarone, seconded by Vice Chair Ainsworth, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values for the 2020-21 Unsecured Roll Year be upheld. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his burden to show that the personal property was valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

21-099E PARCEL NO. 044-363-11 – SARRATEA TRUST, FULGENCIO –
HEARING NO. 21-0049

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2021-22 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1555 Eli 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, Fulgencio Sarratea was sworn in by County Clerk Jan Galassini.

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

Mr. Sarratea opined the taxes on his home were too high. He asserted the house had many problems including cracked cement in the back, cracks on the inside walls, and a shifting of the house. Chair Larmore clarified Mr. Sarratea expressed concern about his house, including issues with the foundation and the walls.

Appraiser Cronin introduced the subject comparable sales on page 2 of the hearing evidence packet. Based on information provided on Mr. Sarratea's behalf, the Assessor's Office recommended the record should be corrected to reflect a finished basement area of 380 square feet. This correction would reduce the total taxable value by \$1,935. He reviewed sales included in the hearing evidence packet and stated the sales comparison supported the subject parcel's total taxable value.

Regarding comments on the condition of the home, Appraiser Cronin stated this was the first he had heard of extensive damage to the home. He had recommended adjustments based on information from the Petitioner related to the finished area of the basement. He mentioned the home was built in 1985 and was an older home, but he was unaware of extensive damage to the foundation or other issues. He remarked the photos he

received depicted the house was not in the best condition, although he had not been looking for issues with the foundation or cracks.

Vice Chair Ainsworth inquired whether maintenance was taken into account on a home when it was appraised. Appraiser Cronin noted a depreciation factor of 1.5 percent per year was placed on homes to account for the age of the structures; this equated to a 54 percent depreciation reduction in this case.

Mr. Sarratea expressed concern that his taxes were too high.

Chair Larmore agreed taxes were increasing across the area due to growth. As long as it was increasing equally, there was no cause to apply reductions. Member George indicated everyone was uncomfortable paying more taxes, but the Appraiser showed Mr. Sarratea was paying less in taxes than his neighbors. Appraiser Cronin asserted he did not speak to the tax amounts that were paid or what neighbors were paying, but rather to the value of comparable properties in the area. Chair Larmore said the value was less than that of a newer home based on depreciation.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Larmore suggested the Petitioner work with the Assessor's Office and take an appeal to the State Board of Equalization (SBOE) with additional information about issues with the home. She noted the Assessor's Office recommended a reduction, which would need to be taken into consideration when making a motion. Member McDonald agreed the Petitioner could appeal to the SBOE with an engineering or contractor bid to show the level of damage that existed.

With regard to Parcel No. 044-363-11, 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 Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member George, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$225,863 and the taxable land value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$446,363 for tax year 2021-22. The reduction was based on Assessor's Office recommendation. 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.

21-100E RESIDENTIAL VACANT LAND REAL PROPERTY APPEALS

This item was opened but, due to technical difficulties with the Petitioner, the Board heard the hearings for Minute Item No. 21-101E before completing this item.

The following petitions scheduled on the agenda were requested to be consolidated at the request of Appraiser Pete Kinne:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
156-040-09	ST JAMES'S VILLAGE INC	21-0047A
156-040-14	ST JAMES'S VILLAGE INC	21-0047B
156-040-15	ST JAMES'S VILLAGE INC	21-0047C
156-111-23	ST JAMES'S VILLAGE INC	21-0047D
156-141-04	ST JAMES'S VILLAGE INC	21-0047E

Petitions for Review of Assessed Valuation were received protesting the 2021-22 taxable valuation on land and improvements located in Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Maps and supporting documentation, 6 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 47 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Caryn Tijsseling, via the Zoom app, was sworn in by County Clerk Janis Galassini.

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

Ms. Tijsseling stated the appeal was for five undeveloped vacant parcels for which the assessed value increased by an average of 265 percent over the 2020 assessed values. She disagreed with the comparable properties provided and said they did not accurately reflect or compare to the St. James Village subdivision. She explained St. James Village was a large subdivision in the Galena Forest area which would be parceled into one-acre lots and sold for custom home development. She indicated the comparable parcels were for tract housing and thought Galena Forest was different and unique compared to the Spanish Springs and Verdi areas from which the comparables were taken. Additionally, she believed an incorrect assumption was made related to the state of the infrastructure that existed at the subject parcels. The parcels were currently subject to a tentative map and there were issues with the infrastructure at this time.

Ms. Tijsseling explained the St. James Village area was originally intended to be regulated by Washoe County but was turned over to the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) for water management a few years prior. She said they were working with TMWA and the County to resolve the issue, but it was unclear at the current time. She indicated sewer issues had not been resolved either, but they were working to interconnect to future sewer lines because not all properties could be on septic tanks. She believed the infrastructure for the subject parcels had not been accurately taken into consideration when the Assessor's Office performed the appraisal. Sales in the area had not met people's

expectations and evidence was provided about a lack of interest in the vacant lots due to COVID-19, which continued to affect the custom home market. She asserted they did not know what the final map would look like when infrastructure was in place. She believed a 10 percent increase in assessed value was fair and asked for reconsideration.

Appraiser Kinne explained this hearing was for a large acreage subdivision of land and the Assessor's Office had not received an appeal of this sort for quite some time. He explained some language which could be used during his presentation that the Board might not be familiar with, such as the terms tentative map and per-lot value. He denoted the valuation history of the parcels and said two methods were used when valuing large acreage: price per acre and value of number of allowable sites per zoning or tentative map. He stated an underdevelopment discount had been deducted from the vacant parcels. He indicated the large subject parcel was subdivided into 13 lots and converted back to its original acreage in July 2011; the conversion and discussions with the developer concluded no development would take place in St. James Village and the value was changed to a per-acre value at that time. For the 2021-2022 reappraisal, it was discovered that subject parcels in the adjacent land were listed for \$50 million. Based on the listing of the subject property and the tentative maps in place, he said, it was decided the property would be valued on the number of allowable sites per parcel, applying the St. James Village base lot value of \$170,000 to that number and discounting 80 percent for the development costs that would be incurred by a developer. He said the tentative map with parcel overlay was located on page 23 of the hearing evidence packet. He explained the base lot value of \$170,000 was derived by 12 actual vacant land sales that took place between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020 within the St. James Village community.

Mr. Kinne reviewed the comparable land sales used to support the new total taxable value. He asserted the comparables were all inferior to the subject property. St. James Village was a private gated community located at the foot of the Sierra Nevada Mountains between Reno, Lake Tahoe, and Carson City. The community consisted of 444 home sites with a minimum lot size of one acre and approximately 220 approved home sites yet to be developed. The homes and lots within St. James Village had experienced tremendous growth in sales price and number over the prior 24 months, with the demand for luxury homes at an all-time high in the Reno-Sparks area. He stated the median sales price in St. James Village was \$1.4 million on a one-acre parcel.

Member George asked about the extreme jump in tax and wondered whether it was due to the consolidation of parcels into one parcel. Appraiser Kinne explained the significant increase in value was due to past discussions he had with the developer who stated there would not be development on that land; as such, he valued the property low. When the tentative maps showed up, he had to reassess the property to reflect the actual value.

Member McDonald asked how long ago the consolidation happened. Appraiser Kinne replied it was changed to a price-per-acre valuation in tax year 2011-2012.

Ms. Tijsseling believed the real estate market should have nothing to do with the assessed property value. She noted the property had not been sold and she did not understand the legal basis for the significant increase in valuation. She thought assumptions were made about marketability, infrastructure, and a timeline for development of the subdivision, but these did not warrant an increase of 265 percent; a 10 percent increase was appropriate.

Member McDonald said he understood the primary reason for the change in valuation was a change in use and how the parcels were divided. He wondered whether this was consistent with Ms. Tijsseling's understanding. Ms. Tijsseling said it was consistent with their prior understanding, but she did not believe that would create the change in valuation that occurred. Member McDonald asked whether the parcels had power and water infrastructure. Ms. Tijsseling stated the water situation was currently subject to dispute and they were working with TMWA on a solution, but tying into the treatment plant would result in a significant cost increase and there were concerns about the state of that water. She noted she was unaware of any issues with electricity although it had not been discussed. Member McDonald asked whether the subject lots were presently for sale. Ms. Tijsseling stated they were not available for sale because the infrastructure issues needed to be resolved.

Member George asked whether the Petitioner's recommendation for a 10 percent increase was based on previous experience. Ms. Tijsseling replied that was the number her client felt would be reasonable.

Member George asked Appraiser Kinne whether the increase was based on the concentration of lots or individual lots. Appraiser Kinne replied the change was due to the extremely hot real estate market. He believed the previous year's per-acre value was not reasonable, but he did not increase the value then because of conversations with the developer. He asserted it was unfair to keep the value the same or increase by 10 percent when lots were selling for \$170,000 per acre.

Vice Chair Ainsworth inquired about the 80 percent development decrease. Appraiser Kinne said they applied the typical St. James Village lot value of \$170,000 to the tentative map and then discounted it 80 percent to account for the costs of development including infrastructure. He asserted this was accounted for in the underdevelopment discount.

Chair Larmore asked for clarification that the \$170,000 value came from sales within this development, and the Spanish Springs and Verdi comparable values were intended as support of the valuation. Appraiser Kinne stated the \$170,000 lot value was based on St. James Village, but it was difficult to get comparable land sales because they were not common.

Member Lazzarone wondered whether the specific parcels were not on the market due to the infrastructure issues. Appraiser Kinne said he reviewed the listing and it appeared this was still an actively listed community on multiple listing services.

Chair Larmore thought the change was due to a new understanding of intent to develop the property. Appraiser Kinne confirmed that was the reason. He believed valuing based on the tentative map was fairer and more accurate than applying a lump sum to each acre. He stated they were providing a huge discount of 80 percent for underdevelopment. Chair Larmore mentioned it created a value for the entitlements that came with a tentative map. Appraiser Kinne agreed and said the entitlements attached to these parcels made them worth much more than raw one-acre parcels with no entitlements.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Doug Brown, via the Zoom app, stated he worked with Ms. Tijsseling but he was more involved in the water aspect than she was. He explained St. James Village was originally granted its tentative maps in the 2000s. A water system was approved by Washoe County at that time, which was a tree system that operated off of wells. He mentioned the water service from Washoe County was taken over by TMWA, but St. James Village had not been annexed into TMWA's service area. He indicated they had applied to be annexed into the service area but TMWA would not approve the water system they had; they had to tie into the Whites Creek Water Treatment System for any future final map approvals. He noted the cost to connect to that system would be \$7.5 to \$11.5 million or more, and those costs had not been anticipated. He said they were able to work with TMWA and managed to get five lots into the final map stage; TMWA had signed off on the maps but had not provided service because the lots had not been annexed in. He indicated St. James Village had sold lots that might not have water service. He noted they had applied for approval of seven more lots, but they could not be sold until the water issue was resolved. He agreed the entitlements existed, but they came at a very high cost. He noted the final map needed to be recorded by October or they would lose their tentative map rights. He thought that information was important to the valuation of the property.

Member McDonald said he concurred with the method of valuation but wondered if it was premature to start valuing by site since they were looking at having to make improvements that would exceed the value of the land as assessed. He inquired about events that should trigger the switch from valuation by acre to valuation by site. At the time when the 13 lots were converted back to the original acreage, Appraiser Kinne responded, the per-acre value was the best unit of comparison. The value of the property had stayed stagnant for more than five years. A tentative map or active listing would trigger the switch from per-acre to using the number of sites. He noted the base value of \$170,000 per lot resulted in a value of \$37.4 million, but an underdevelopment discount was applied because of the water situation and other utility issues with the property; at 80 percent, this discount reduced the value by \$29,920,000.

Member McDonald brought up an earlier comment by Mr. Brown about a possibility that St. James Village had sold a parcel without having water entitlements intact. He wondered what discount was applied to that. Ms. Tijsseling stated Mr. Brown had that information. Appraiser Kinne believe the lot Member McDonald referred to was recently sold for \$255,000 and no discount was applied.

Member George summarized the Assessor's Office valuations and wondered exactly what the Petitioner was seeking. Ms. Tijsseling replied they wanted a 10 percent increase over the previous year's value or a reconsideration of the entire valuation.

Chair Larmore was comfortable with the Assessor's Office valuation methodology in using actual St. James Village numbers, supported by data from across the County. The 80 percent adjustment appeared to be valid and it considered infrastructure, time, and impact. She explained the Assessor's Office could reconsider if the final maps did not go through and the tentative maps were forgone on this property. The tentative map signified some plans for development, she opined, and she agreed with the Appraiser's valuation.

With regard to Parcel Nos. 156-040-09, 156-040-14, 156-040-15, 156-111-23, and 156-141-04, which petitions were brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, 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.

21-101E PARCEL NO. 032-062-21 – RHEMA CHRISTIAN CHURCH – HEARING NO. 2632F20

This item took place prior to the discussion of Minute Item No. 21-100E but after that item had been opened.

INCREASE – Consideration of and action to approve or deny Roll Change Request (RCR).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice Chair Ainsworth stated he read all of the information provided by Rhema Christian Church and believed this to be a situation dealing with a landlord, a trust, a barber shop, and a church. He understood the Assessor's Office's stance to be that the church would lose its exemption on the entire building if it leased out property to a for-profit business. He wondered whether a change in law had occurred, saying he was hesitant to vote on a roll change request that was not backed by the law.

Assessment Services Coordinator Lora Zimmer referred to Nevada Revised Statute 361.125 Section 2, saying that, unless otherwise provided in NRS 361.157, any property must be taxed if it was used exclusively or in part for any purpose other than church purposes and a rent or other valuable consideration was received for its use. They had reached out to the property owner and the owner's attorney multiple times asking for the exact square footage that was being leased to a barber shop and a wireless store, but information was not provided. The Assessor's Office recommended exempting one third of the value and taxing the other two thirds for the other two businesses.

Vice Chair Ainsworth interpreted the language to mean that the parcel might not be allowed to be broken out. Ms. Zimmer indicated two businesses used the property for functions other than church purposes; the Assessor's Office recommended to reduce the percent of allowed exemption.

Vice Chair Ainsworth asserted he did not want to set a precedent if it was not supported by law, fearing someone would discover this was done when it should not have been. Ms. Zimmer replied other religious organizations leased out portions of their property and prorated exemptions were applied in those situations.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 032-062-21, RCR No. 2632F20, on motion by Member Lazzarone, seconded by Vice Chair Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the exemption amount for RCR No. 263F20 be approved. With those adjustments, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly, and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**PARCEL NO. 035-093-12 – DE TORRES, LAURA et al –
HEARING NO. 3-1**

INCREASE – Consideration of and action to approve or deny Roll Change Request (RCR).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 035-093-12, RCR No. 3-1, pursuant to NRS 361.769, on motion by Member Lazzarone, seconded by Vice Chair Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to increase the values for Parcel No. 035-093-12 be approved. With those adjustments, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly, and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

21-102E **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Approval of minutes for the County Board of Equalization meeting of January 22, 2021.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member George, seconded by Member Lazzarone, which motion was duly carried, it was ordered that the minutes of January 22, 2021 be approved.

21-103E APPROVAL OF OTHER MINUTES FROM THE 2021 MEETINGS

County Clerk Jan Galassini indicated there was a law in place which required minutes to be approved within 45 days. Since there would not be another meeting before the end of the year, the proposed minutes for any remaining meetings would be emailed to Board Members, and each Member would email their approval to the County Clerk.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Larmore stated the Board would agree as a whole to approve the items as provided.

21-104E BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Larmore thanked the Assessor's Office for providing information and helping the Board understand the issues, saying she appreciated the reduction in cases for the year which showed they were working with the Petitioners. She thanked the Clerk's Office for everything running smoothly, considering that COVID-19 and the Zoom app made the meetings more difficult. She thanked the District Attorney's Office for the legal advice and for keeping the Board out of trouble. She thanked the Board for being a great team and she appreciated the questions they asked.

Member George appreciated the support staff and complimented the Assessor's Office for tolerating the Board's questions. Chair Larmore added her appreciation to staff members who provided technical support, computers, and Zoom.

21-105E PUBLIC COMMENT

Chief Property Appraiser Rigo Lopez expressed appreciation for this being a lighter year for appeals than expected. He thanked County Clerk Jan Galassini and her team for putting everything together. Given the circumstances of COVID-19 and having to work remotely, he said it was amazing how everything got done with the help of Clerk's Office and Assessor's Office staff. He thanked the legal team for keeping them out of trouble. He appreciated the tech staff for everything they did. He said Chair Larmore did a great job, expressing appreciation for how she took control of the meetings and handled the Petitioners. He noted the Board did a great job, made a good team, asked good questions, and tried to understand why decisions were made.

County Clerk Jan Galassini said it was an amazing year and these meetings were her favorite. She thought the Board of Equalization was fun because of the Board Members; their personalities, questions, and knowledge added a dynamic to what the Clerk's Office did. She thanked the Board for their public service. She thanked the District Attorney's Office for keeping everyone focused and out of trouble. She appreciated their legal expertise. She thanked the Assessor's Office and noted they made Clerk's Office staff's jobs easier. She expressed appreciation to tech staff for working out all the details

so things ran smoothly. She thanked her staff for their hard work and said this could not be done without them.

* * * * *

10:53 a.m. There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

EUGENIA LARMORE, Chair
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

JANIS GALASSINI, County Clerk
and Clerk of the Washoe County
Board of Equalization

*Minutes prepared by
Doni Gassaway, Deputy Clerk*