

**BOARD OF EQUALIZATION  
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

FRIDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 13, 2026

PRESENT:

**Daren McDonald, Chair**  
**Eugenia Bonnenfant, Vice Chair**  
**Erin Albright, Member**  
**Robert Lissner, Member**  
**Corinthia Yancey, Alternate Member**

**Janis Galassini, County Clerk**  
**Cobi Burnett, Deputy District Attorney**

ABSENT:

**Savita Shukla, Member**

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 McDonald called the meeting to order, the Clerk called the roll, and the Board conducted the following business:

**26-015E      PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**26-016E      SWEARING IN**

County Clerk Jan Galassini swore in the appraisal staff.

**26-017E      WITHDRAWN PETITIONS**

The following petitions scheduled on the agenda were withdrawn by the Petitioners prior to the hearing:

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>	<b>Hearing No.</b>
020-201-65	MOANA AHA CENTER LLC	26-0004E25

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, seconded by Member Albright, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the hearing be withdrawn.

**26-018E      CONTINUANCES**

The following petitions scheduled on the agenda were granted continuances to February 25, 2026:

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>	<b>Hearing No.</b>
126-522-03	JOHN & GAIL L. KROLICK	26-0052
126-580-25	JOHN & GAIL L. KROLICK	26-0053
082-492-02	JOY & JOE PANICARO	26-0006

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, seconded by Member Albright, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the hearing be continued to February 25, 2026.

**26-019E      PARCEL NO. 025-330-03 – ROXANNE DECARLO – HEARING NO. 26-0001E25A**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2025-26 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 7400 S Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Letter, Notice of Taxes, Consolidated Financial Statements, and Supplementary Information, 79 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Exemption Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office (AO).

Member Bonnenfant asked Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Cobi Burnett for clarification regarding the motion language for the stipulations. DDA Burnett noted that if the stipulation motion language in the motion binder was related to the specific stipulation heard, that should be the motion used. He noted the motion could also be tailored by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, although he preferred that a motion in the binder be used. She asked if Agenda Items 8 and 9 would be number 15 in the motion binder. DDA Burnett said he believed that was correct.

With regard to Parcel No. 025-330-03 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, seconded

by Member Lissner, 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 upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$0 for tax year 2025-26. 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.

**26-020E      PARCEL NO. 025-330-16 – ROXANNE DECARLO – HEARING**  
**NO. 26-0001E25B**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2025-26 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 S Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:**      Letter and supporting documentation, 79 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:**      Exemption Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office (AO).

Member Bonnenfant asked Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Cobi Burnett for clarification regarding the motion language for the stipulations. DDA Burnett noted that if the stipulation motion language in the motion binder was related to the specific stipulation heard, that should be the motion used. He noted the motion could also be tailored by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, although he preferred that a motion in the binder be used. She asked if Agenda Items 8 and 9 would be number 15 in the motion binder. DDA Burnett said he believed that was correct.

With regard to Parcel No. 025-330-16 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, seconded by Member Lissner, 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 upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$0 for tax year 2025-26. 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.

**26-021E**      **PARCEL NO. 042-470-06 – NELLO GONFIANTINI III TRUST – HEARING NO. 26-0015**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 Ridgeview Drive, 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.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office (AO).

Member Bonnenfant asked Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Cobi Burnett for clarification regarding the motion language for the stipulations. DDA Burnett noted that if the stipulation motion language in the motion binder was related to the specific stipulation heard, that should be the motion used. He noted the motion could also be tailored by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, although he preferred that a motion in the binder be used. She asked if Agenda Items 8 and 9 would be number 15 in the motion binder. DDA Burnett said he believed that was correct.

With regard to Parcel No. 042-470-06 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, seconded by Member Lissner, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be reduced to \$220,400, and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$261,232 for tax year 2026-27. 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.

**26-022E**      **PARCEL NO. 122-126-19 – JOHN R ADAMS – HEARING NO. 26-0016**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 560 Ponderosa Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:**      Letter, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Email and Assessment Notice, 4 pages.  
Exhibit C: Letters, Petition, and Assessment Notices, 13 pages.

Assessor

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

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

County Clerk Jan Galassini distributed documents, Petitioner's Exhibit C, to the Board from the Petitioner. She reminded the Board that the Assessor's Office (AO) and the Petitioner would each receive 20 minutes to present their testimony, with 10 minutes for the Petitioner's rebuttal.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Kelson Powell, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He referred to page 1 of the HEP and reported that the property was a 1,680 square foot (sq ft) single-family residence located at 560 Ponderosa Avenue on the west slope of Incline Village and said that the map of the property was located on page 6 of the HEP. He asked whether the Board had any questions about the property's location. The Board had no questions. Chair McDonald requested that Mr. Powell continue his testimony.

Mr. Powell indicated that page 2 of the HEP included four Improved Sales (ISs) that he said were comparable to the subject property. He pointed out a typographical error in the *recommendations* section that listed *IS 11*, but should read *IS 1*. He reported that all comparable sales provided by the AO were within a four-mile radius of the subject property. He said that IS 3 was the best comparable sale supporting the value of the Petitioner's property because it was similar in land quality and building size. He explained that IS 3 sold on January 18, 2024, for \$1,320,000, or \$743 per sq ft. He noted that the ISs ranged from \$743 to \$1,105 per sq ft.

Mr. Powell explained that four comparable Land Sales (LSs) were located on page 2 of the HEP. He said that vacant LSs were limited in Incline Village, and the listed LSs were chosen for their proximity and size similarity to the subject parcel. He reported that LS 4 was the best comparable because it was located in an adjacent neighborhood to the subject but was smaller and required additional coverage to build. He said that after adjustments, all LSs listed on page 2 of the HEP supported the land value of the subject property.

Mr. Powell reported that he empathized with Mr. Adams' situation, and relayed that to his knowledge, there were no local senior property tax (p-tax) relief programs. He recalled that he had made several attempts to contact Mr. Adams without success and had left a voicemail on January 21, 2026, to arrange an interior inspection. He said that he also emailed and sent a letter via the United States Postal Service (USPS) to Mr. Adams regarding the comparable sales information. He indicated that he visited the subject parcel on January 27, 2026, but could see no issues with the property from the

street. He said that a reduction in the property value was made at the State Board of Equalization (SBOE) in 2012, lowering the land value from \$280,000 to \$266,000. He noted that a 5 percent downward adjustment was applied to the parcel for a steep driveway and was still being applied as an access adjustment.

Mr. Powell stated that each year during reappraisal, a traffic study was performed to better understand which properties were affected and by how much. He pointed out that the subject parcel had not been identified as an affected property that required a downward traffic adjustment, but would be reviewed again in the fall. He mentioned that any neighborhood detriments that affected Mr. Adams' property would also affect the comparable sales used in the analysis. He believed that additional obsolescence for the property was not appropriate and concluded by stating that the sales comparison approach value ranged from \$743 to \$1,105 per sq ft, which he said supported the current taxable value of \$449 per sq ft. He asserted that the current taxable value did not exceed full cash value and requested that the total taxable value of \$753,498 be upheld.

Chair McDonald noted that Mr. Adams mentioned in Petitioner's Exhibit A, that he began construction on the property in the 1970s and finished in the early 1990s. He pointed out that the appraisal record indicated the year built was 1986 and asked how much depreciation had been applied to the structure, as he believed the property should be close to being capped in depreciation. Mr. Powell reported that the property should be depreciated at 60 percent since it was 40 years old. He said there was a 1.5 percent depreciation rate per year, with a maximum of 75 percent.

Chair McDonald asked when the recent traffic study occurred. He speculated that the AO did not perform a street-by-street study every year. Mr. Powell indicated that the traffic study was performed annually. He explained that a paired sales analysis was performed, comparing high-traffic parcels with low-traffic comparable parcels to determine whether there was a significant difference in sales price. He reported that the most recent traffic study of the subject parcel was conducted in the fall of 2025.

Ms. Galassini noted that the Petitioner's Exhibit distributed to the Board would be placed on the record as Petitioner's Exhibit C.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 122-126-19, 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 Bonnenfant, seconded by Member Yancey, 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.

**26-023E      PARCEL NO. 131-080-24 – BRUCE A MCNULTY – HEARING NO. 26-0069**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 501 Country Club Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:**      Letter, 3 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:**      Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet (HEP) including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 18 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

County Clerk Jan Galassini distributed documents, Petitioner's Exhibit A, to the Board from the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Adam Smith, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He referred to page 1 of the HEP and said that the subject parcel was a single-family residence located at 501 Country Club Drive on a 0.52-acre lot on the corner of Country Club Drive and Fairway Boulevard. He asked the Board if there were any questions about the property's location. The Board had no questions. Chair McDonald requested that Mr. Smith continue his testimony.

Mr. Smith reported that the subject parcel had a weighted average year (WAY) of 1986. He said that the property was built in 1978 and was 3,798 square feet (sq ft), including a 208 sq ft finished basement. He noted that the subject was a five-quality class, or *very good*, and located in the Championship Influence neighborhood. He said that the parcels in that neighborhood were characterized by their proximity to the Championship Golf Course without having significant frontage sq ft. He explained that the subject had a downward adjustment of 20 percent due to its location on a high-traffic corner, as well as an \$11,000 lump-sum adjustment prescribed by the 2018/2019 Board for its location.

Mr. Smith referred to page 2 of the HEP and noted that the Improved Sales (IS) Chart listed three comparables, selected for their similarity to the subject parcel. He said that IS 1 was located across the street from the parcel on the corner of Country Club Drive and First Green Drive. He explained that IS 1 was inferior to the subject parcel in the living area and quality but superior in lot size. He indicated that IS 2 was located approximately 800 feet (ft) southwest of Fairway Boulevard and was inferior in living area, with a similar lot size and quality. He mentioned that IS 3 was the most recent sale, located

northwest of the subject on 14th Green Drive, and was similar in living area. He said the ISs' price per sq ft ranged from \$849 to \$921, which he stated was above the subject's \$243 per sq ft.

Mr. Smith explained that there were no vacant Land Sales (LSs) in Champion Influence. He said that, due to the limited LSs in Incline Village, it was necessary to expand his search to similar neighborhoods in the area. He noted that LS 1 was located at 836 Carano Court, southwest of the subject parcel. He noted that LS 1 was similar in size to the subject parcel, with its most recent LS being on February 25, 2025, at \$850,000 with coverage. He said that LS 2 was located at 968 Tyner Way in Upper Tyner and had an inferior lot size, with insufficient coverage for building when it was previously sold. He reported that the coverage sold was pending because the driveway needed to be removed for further construction to proceed. He said that LS 3 was located at 697 Tumbleweed Circle, west of Tyner Way and north of Valley Drive. He mentioned that LS 3 had partial coverage at the time of the sale and required the purchase of additional coverage to build. He pointed out that the LSs ranged from \$535,000 to \$850,000 and, after adjustments, the subject parcel's total taxable land value did not exceed full cash value.

Mr. Smith noted that the applicant referred to 999 Fairview Boulevard. He explained that 999 Fairview Boulevard did not have direct golf-course frontage and had heavily filtered views of the golf course. He said that a photo of 999 Fairview Boulevard was located on page 18 of the HEP. He explained that there was a 20 percent downward adjustment for traffic and having a corner lot. He said there was no market evidence to warrant an increase. He recalled that, per the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) statistics, the annual average daily traffic (AADT) peaked in 2017 at 3,300 cars per day, and decreased in 2024 to 2,150 cars per day. He said that flood adjustments were applied based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps, but asserted that the subject parcel did not lie within a flood zone. He mentioned that, of the 66 privately owned parcels in Championship Influence, 501 Country Club Drive had the 6th-largest lot size and the lowest taxable land value. He said that the ISs and LSs indicated that the total taxable value did not exceed the full cash value and recommended that the Board uphold the total taxable value.

Chair McDonald asked if the Board was able to read through the Petitioner's Exhibit. Ms. Galassini indicated that the distributed document would be placed on the record as Petitioner's Exhibit A.

Chair McDonald recalled that when the Petitioner appealed in the past, the 20 percent downward adjustment for traffic was among the highest granted. Mr. Smith confirmed that the adjustment was one of the highest due to the traffic along Country Club Drive as well as the parcel being located on a corner lot.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Member Albright read the motion for overvaluation, Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 361.355. Vice Chair Bonnenfant stated that the motion should be for inequity, NRS 361.356.

With regard to Parcel No. 131-080-24, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Albright, seconded by Member Lissner, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner has failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

**26-024E      PARCEL NO. 077-250-01 – JOHN R ADAMS – HEARING NO. 26-0007**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 Mid Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Letter, Assessment Notice, Email with photos, 6 pages.

**Exhibit B:** Letter and petition, 13 pages.

**Assessor**

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

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

County Clerk Jan Galassini distributed documents to the Board from the Petitioner, Petitioner's Exhibit B.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jeff Cronin, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted that the subject parcel was an approximately 330-acre home site zoned general rural agricultural (GRA) located on 0 Mid Road in Palomino Valley. He explained that a map of the location could be found on page 6 of the HEP and asked whether the Board had any questions regarding the subject property's location. The Board had no questions. Chair McDonald requested that Mr. Cronin continue his testimony.

Mr. Cronin reported that the subject property was located just off the maintained portion of Mid Road and Wilcox Ranch Road in Palomino Valley. He said the parcel was about a 20-minute drive from Pyramid Highway and that, once at the entrance of the parcel, an approximately three-quarters of a mile road led to a rough-graded one acre

pad site. He noted that the area's topography was mountainous and that, while he had visited the parcel, he did not have access to the pad site. He said that photos on pages 7 through 10 of the HEP illustrated the subject property, the pad site, and the road. He reiterated that the subject property was zoned GRA, allowing one home site per 40 acres or larger. He pointed out that development appeared feasible and that there was power nearby at the surrounding home sites along Wilcox Ranch Road.

Mr. Cronin recalled that the subject parcel was listed in March 2023 for \$675,000 but was removed after about seven months. He said that the subject's 2026/2027 taxable value was \$102,000. Member Lissner asked if the parcel could be subdivided. Mr. Cronin reported that the parcel could be subdivided into 40-acre properties, creating eight separate parcels.

Chair McDonald asked if there were utilities on the property. Mr. Cronin said there were no utilities. Chair McDonald queried if the parcel was undeveloped, aside from an access road and a gate. Mr. Cronin confirmed that the parcel was undeveloped other than an access road and gate. He referred to page 6 of the HEP and noted that the green area on the map indicated developed parcels. He speculated that there would be a high likelihood of utilities on-site for those developments; however, he was unsure whether some were operating on solar power. Chair McDonald asked whether the Petitioner had begun any application processes or filed any indications of development. Mr. Cronin reported that there were no permits listed for the property.

Chair McDonald asked about dumping hazards. Mr. Cronin said that the Petitioner expressed concerns regarding a Waste Management (WM) neighborhood pickup stop located on the northwest corner of Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 077-410-31. He referred to page 10 of the HEP and pointed out the line of trash receptacles. He reported that a WM representative stated that neighborhood collection stops were not uncommon in rural areas, particularly where roads were unmaintained. He explained that residents beyond the unmaintained portion of Wilcox Ranch Road moved their trash cans for WM pickup. He said that the Petitioner believed that the collection stop diminished the market value; however, no evidence was provided to support the claim.

Mr. Cronin relayed that there was no paired sales data or measurable evidence to support an adjustment for external obsolescence. He said that there were Land Sales (LS) listed on page 2 of the HEP and pointed out that LS 1 recently sold for \$200,000, which supported the subject's taxable value of \$102,000. Chair McDonald asked Mr. Cronin to detail the LSs for the Board. Mr. Cronin explained that the most recent sales were LS 1 through LS 3, which he said supported a market value range of \$107,000 to \$200,000 per home site. He reported that the photo on page 11 of the HEP contained a parcel image of LS 1, which he said was about a half mile west of the subject parcel and had similar zoning, access, and development potential. He recalled that LS 1 had a more level topography than the subject parcel and was smaller, yet sold for \$200,000 in March of 2025. He referred to the map on page 6 of the HEP and said that LS 3 was about four miles and a roughly 25-minute drive from the subject parcel. He explained that it took him 45 minutes to reach LS 3 from Pyramid Highway; however, it had similar zoning and

access to the pad site as the subject parcel. He mentioned that LS 3 was smaller than the subject parcel but farther away, and that it sold for \$107,000 in June of 2025. He said that LS 4 was an older comparable LS at 321 acres, a mile west of the subject parcel, and had similar zoning and access. He said that LS 4 had challenging topography, and while the sale was dated, he thought that it provided the best overall indication of value due to its similarities in size and characteristics. He reported that LS 4 sold for \$353,000 in 2021 and would probably sell for much more in the current market. He said that the most recent LS supports a range of \$107,000 to \$200,000 per home site, with the most comparable stated sale supporting the value at \$353,000. He requested that the Board uphold the taxable value for the subject property.

Member Albright asked if the Petitioners would have to go through an application process to subdivide the parcel. Mr. Cronin indicated that he assumed there was a process; however, he was not familiar with the subdivision application process.

Chair McDonald noted that the Board was not usually provided with dated LSs and that the AO normally confined itself to LSs issued within the last few years. Mr. Cronin confirmed that the AO typically provided recent LSs. He explained that he wanted to support the subject parcel's value with three very recent sales; however, he believed the Board could better understand the subject parcel's value when presented with a much larger parcel near the property. He reported that LS 4 was not used to value the property that year but said that he felt it demonstrated the potential of the subject property. Chair McDonald asked if LS 1 through LS 3 were similar in terms of position and development. Mr. Cronin confirmed that LS 1 through LS 3 had road access and a gate, but that little else had been done on the properties.

Ms. Galassini indicated that the distributed document would be placed on the record and labeled as Petitioner's Exhibit B.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 077-250-01, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.355, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Lissner, seconded by Member Bonnenfant, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's appraisal of the subject property be upheld. The Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are overvalued or excessive by reason of undervaluation for taxation purposes of the property of any other person, firm, company, association or corporation within any county of the State or by reason of any such property not being so assessed.

**26-025E**      **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** Approval of minutes for the County Board of Equalization meeting of March 28, 2025.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Bonnenfant, seconded by Member Albright, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the minutes for the April 5, 2024, meeting be approved.

**25-026E      BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Chair McDonald thanked the Board for their work and for attending the meeting. He indicated that he looked forward to the next meetings and welcomed Members to ask questions.

**25-027E      PUBLIC COMMENT**

Bruce McNulty indicated he was tardy but believed the Board's decision would not have affected his taxes, since there was a 3 percent cap on tax increases. Chair McDonald requested that County Clerk Jan Galassini increase Mr. McNulty's public comment time by five minutes. Mr. McNulty read from his document, previously placed on file with the Clerk as Petitioner's Exhibit B, regarding the history of his property, the Assessor's Office's (AOs) tax and land valuations and processes, and the favoring of long-term ownership under Assembly Bill (AB) 489. He asserted that he expected a fair hearing for what he believed was a strong argument that supported the physical favors that affected land valuations for tax purposes. He suggested that no matter the outcome, the Board work with the AO to effect a more enlightened approach to valuations, represented as a tax basis for the County. He recalled being a homeowner for over 30 years and his understanding of the dynamics of the Incline Village and Crystal Bay area. He believed that the method would benefit from a better-organized approach, given the limited staff, rather than continue pretending they were listening to his protests. He explained that the AO's values did not reflect the higher levels that would have resulted in his tax bill. He said that the upcoming tax period did not reflect the unique characteristics of his position, which he speculated the AO's Hearing Evidence Packet (HEP) noted. He felt that the properties the AO utilized did not compare to his property for various reasons, including traffic, square footage, and proximity to the golf course. He said it was remarkable that the appraisers were overwhelmed by the task of justifying a tax increase. He indicated that the Board's decision did not affect the dollar amount the County received from him as a homeowner under AB 489, and that the increases he received from supplemental costs added more to the tax base than he paid. He said there was a dichotomy in how land values were approached in Incline Village and opined that it was cumbersome for the AO and homeowners to understand how appraisers arrived at land values. He stated that his property had flood risk, increased traffic, no attributes such as golf-course access or frontage, and no view of mountains or the lake, and wondered why his property was being compared to those that had those attributes. He apologized to the Board for his tardiness to the meeting.

Chair McDonald informed Mr. McNulty that the Board voted to uphold the AO's opinion of the land; however, Mr. McNulty had the right to appeal to the State Board of Equalization (SBOE) by March 10, 2026. He noted that Mr. McNulty raised an

important issue and suggested that he appeal to the State Board. He said sometimes things needed to run through the process before they were addressed.

\* \* \* \* \*

**9:54 a.m.** There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, with no objection the meeting was adjourned.

---

**DAREN MCDONALD**, Chair  
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

---

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

*Minutes prepared by  
Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk*