

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

THURSDAY

9:00 A.M.

JANUARY 27, 2011

PRESENT:

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

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

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

SWEARING IN

On behalf of the Assessor's Office, no one was present to be sworn.

WITHDRAWN PETITIONS

There were no petitions withdrawn prior to the hearing.

11-0061E REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES

Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent informed the Board a request had been submitted by Michael Tobias for Hearing No. 11-0144, Assessor's Parcel No. 526-102-07. It was determined to place the hearing on the February 23, 2011 agenda.

11-0062E CONSOLIDATION OF HEARINGS

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

11-0063E PARCEL NO. 077-260-22 – HERMAN LIVING TRUST ET AL
TTEE – HEARING NO. 11-0168

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 550 Mountain Aspen Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 22 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Mr. Herman said an agreement had been reached with the Assessor's Office and with that agreement he had no evidence to present. He thanked Assessor Wilson, Appraiser Warren and Appraiser Johns for their help.

Appraiser Warren read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating the recommendation for reduction was based upon their review of the classification of the building. He said they determined to cost it as a light general commercial utility building, which resulted in a lower improvement value. Chairman Covert clarified the appeal was based on a classification issue. Appraiser Warren stated that was correct.

With regard to Parcel No. 077-260-22, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value remain the same and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$43,414, resulting in a total taxable value of \$76,314 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0064E PARCEL NO. 038-230-16 – DIBITONTO, SAM –
HEARING NO. 11-0129

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 510 Crystal Park Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Buyer closing statement, 1 page.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Correct pages of Hearing Evidence Packet, 2 pages.

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

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

The Assessor's Office submitted Exhibit II, stating there was a correction. Chairman Covert asked if the appellant received a copy of the new evidence and if he was in agreement with the recommendation. Appraiser Clement stated the appellant was not in agreement.

Mr. Dibitonto said he bought the property in October 2010 and paid \$352,000. He referred to page 2 of Exhibit II wherein it stated the bank accepted the first offer after the listing was reduced. He testified to the Board that was not a correct statement. He explained the property went on the market and the bank felt it was worth \$350,000 and he felt it was worth \$350,000. Before he purchased the subject he called his insurance company and they agreed to insure it for \$350,000. He said the Assessor's Office thought the property was worth \$546,000. Chairman Covert inquired if it was a repossession sale. Mr. Dibitonto stated he had no idea, the bank had it for sale and he thought the price was fair. He stated he did not think the circumstances leading up to the sale were germane to the value of the property, because this property had three or four different liens against it. He asserted he had paid taxes since 1940 and he expected to, but he was looking for a fair and equitable value.

Member Krolick asked if Mr. Dibitonto had documentation to show the purchase price. Mr. Dibitonto submitted evidence, which was marked as Petitioner's Exhibit A.

9:10 a.m. The Board took a brief recess to receive copies of the evidence.

9:16 a.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

Appraiser Clement read from page 2 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating Verdi remained a very desirable place to live and homes with river frontage were rare. He explained the subject was a river front parcel with a pond. He said a 10 percent adjustment was given to the land value in acknowledgement of the access issue. The subject had approximately 3,486 square feet of living area and a 1,690 square foot basement. He reviewed the features, comparable sales, and range of values associated with the subject property (page 2, Exhibit II).

Appraiser Clement stated he requested a copy of the appraisal the owner said the value was based on, but did not receive one. He said based upon the information received and the comparable sales, he believed this was not an arms length transaction and did not represent market value. Appraiser Clement stated the Board would be hearing about certain transactions that would not make sense, which he thought depicted the mortgage crisis in the United States. He said he watched a television program and was able to gain a better understanding of why some transactions did not make sense. History showed that people used to deal with a bank directly to purchase a home and the bank would hold the note because they had interest in that property, but that was not the case anymore. He said a lot of mortgages had been sold to the stock market, which he believed added to the mortgage crisis. Appraiser Clement said his job was to provide the best data to the Board so the Board could make the best decision possible. He thought Mr. Dibitonto got a great deal on this property. He explained insurance coverage for \$350,000 did not cover the land, only the improvements.

Appraiser Clement stated in conclusion, if there was an appraisal on the property, he would expect to see the comparable sales he provided. He asserted Improved Sales (IS) #2 and #3 were recent transactions that bracketed the subject nicely in comparison and were not distressed sales. Although IS #1 was a distressed short-sale and located next to the subject, it was extremely comparable and represented the bottom end of the market. He stated his opinion of value, based upon the comparable sales presented, was \$474,000 or \$136 per square foot. He said it was the Assessor's Office recommendation that obsolescence in the amount of \$44,241 be deducted from the improvement value. With that adjustment he believed taxable value did not exceed full market value and the property was equalized with similarly situated properties.

Member Brown inquired exactly what disqualified this property from being an arms length transaction. Appraiser Clement stated an arms length transaction was normally defined as being a transaction between a willing buyer and a willing seller and both knowledgeable in the market. In this instance the bank was a willing seller, but he did not think the original owner of the property was a willing participant.

Mr. Dibitonto stated the purpose of an appraisal was to establish the value, but had nothing to do with other people's bad investments in the stock market. The value of something was intrinsic but it was also based upon the market. He said the house next to the subject sold for more money, but he noted the owner owed the federal government \$200,000, which was part of the purchase price. He concurred the insurance policy was only covering the home (\$238,000) and the value of the land brought it up to \$350,000. He said the property that had to be crossed to get to the subject, was a storage area. He said the intrinsic value of the house was how bad someone wanted it and not how accessible it was. The road going to it was the subject of litigation, because it was so bad no one could drive on it. He believed the subject was only worth \$350,000, not \$450,000.

Member Green inquired if the property next to the subject had the same road for access. Mr. Dibitonto stated that was correct, and part of the problem was there were four people that had to pay for the road. He explained they were going to get

assessed to bring it up to current conditions or maintain it. Member Green stated the property next to the subject that just sold would have a lower value due to the accessibility issue. Mr. Dibitonto said that was correct.

Appraiser Clement clarified the house sold for \$562,000. Chairman Covert stated they had to have a willing buyer to pay that much for the property.

Member Green stated Verdi was a very desirable area and anything on the river would bring a premium. He believed the comparable sales used by the Assessor's Office established the values. He commented that if the Board adjusted this property, property owners in that area would expect the same adjustment next year. He was in favor of upholding the Assessor's Office recommendation.

Member Krolick agreed stating the sale of the property next to the subject, along with the other comparable sales, established a value. He concurred it might not be the most desirable access, but it was gorgeous property.

With regard to Parcel No. 038-230-16, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value remain the same and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$280,500, resulting in a total taxable value of \$474,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0065E PARCEL NO. 522-422-07 – STOWELL, RICHARD K & HANNELORI A – HEARING NO. 11-0098

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2741 Silverton Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 7 pages.

Exhibit B: Photos, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, Lori and Richard Stowell were sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Ms. Stowell stated she was going to compare the subject property to their next door neighbor's home. She said both were built at the same time and by the same contractor. Her home was a tract house consisting of 2,393 square feet and the neighbor's was 2,718 square feet. The neighbor property had three full baths and four bedrooms, while the subject had 2½ bathrooms and three bedrooms. She wondered why the neighbor's property was assessed lower than the subject.

Mr. Stowell said there were some hidden differences between the two properties. He explained he had to get two sump pumps to drain the crawl space. He explained currently there was no standing water, but the soil was still moist and they had potential concerns for fungus. Chairman Covert inquired where the water was coming from. Mr. Stowell stated they hired civil engineers to inspect the problem, and they described it as a water blister from the water table that was coming up under the property. Chairman Covert clarified that it was a natural problem. Mr. Stowell stated that was correct, but it was also commensurate with the watering of the golf course. He said they communicated the problem to the people in charge of the golf course, but did not receive any help from them. He said if anyone were to purchase the subject, the water problem would have to be disclosed, which the previous owners did not do. He testified there were a couple of areas of omissions that were not done on the inspection sheet when they purchased the property.

Mr. Stowell stated the Assessor's Office assessment showed the subject had four bedrooms, which it did not. He said one of the rooms did not have a closet, which he thought qualified it as a den and not a bedroom. He testified the closet that was in that room had been turned into a half-bath.

Chairman Covert stated the petition showed the owner's opinion of value at \$142,000 for the building and \$198,400 for the total. Ms. Stowell stated the neighbor's land value was \$137,595. Chairman Covert clarified the Petition showed the owner's opinion of value to be \$198,400. Ms. Stowell stated that was correct. Chairman Covert stated the Assessor's Office opinion of value was \$202,191.

Member Green asked how they mitigated the water issue. Mr. Stowell explained they had a sump pump placed on both sides of the house and pumped the water into the street. He further stated the golf course would not allow them to put the water on their property. He said they had to get a permit from the City of Sparks to be able to pump the water into the gutter. Member Green inquired if the subject home was on a foundation. Ms. Stowell stated that was correct.

Member Brown inquired if they took any action against the previous owners for failure to disclose. Ms. Stowell stated they tried to but were informed it would cost at least \$50,000 and the chance of winning was about 10 percent. She said they put

in about \$20,000 to have the civil engineer come out and investigate, which included the cost to mitigate the problem.

Chief Deputy Clerk Parent entered into evidence Petitioner's Exhibit B. Member Green asked if any of the other neighbors had the same water problems. Ms. Stowell stated two houses down had problems about five years ago, but no one was currently living there. Mr. Stowell stated there were some other houses next to the lake on the other side of the street that had issues, but he believed those problems were the result of irrigation. He said their problem was proven to be a natural water flow and not a sewer leak. Member Green stated he had personal knowledge of having to have sump pumps under a home.

Appraiser Churchfield stated he prepared the appeal based on the sales comparison approach. He reviewed the features, comparable sales, and range of values associated with the subject property. He said the Assessor's Office would look into the appellant's notice of a difference in the number of bedrooms and bathrooms. Chairman Covert inquired if anyone from the Assessor's Office looked at the house to see about the water issue. Appraiser Churchfield replied this was the first he had heard about the water problem.

Member Woodland asked if the subject was located in a flood zone. Appraiser Churchfield responded he did not know. Ms. Stowell stated they were not in a flood zone and they were not required to have flood insurance.

Ms. Stowell stated she was familiar with the comparable sales on Ten Mile Drive. She said those were custom built homes and they overlooked the golf course. She said she was not familiar with the other comparable sales used and noted they were not located near the subject.

Chairman Covert stated all comparables were identified as a 3.5 quality class and he wondered if there was a difference in the Ten Mile Drive homes from the subject. Appraiser Churchfield supplied that the homes on the left side of Ten Mile Drive had views and the homes on the right did not have views. He said the comparable he chose did not have a view and the comparable sale listed for Toronto Court was only a block away.

Member Green stated he was in support of giving the appellant what they were asking for. He explained they purchased the home for \$315,000, which was before the market went down.

With regard to Parcel No. 522-422-07, pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value remain the same and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$142,000 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$198,400 for tax year

2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0066E PARCEL NO. 009-562-23 – PIZZIA, LORENZO G –
HEARING NO. 11-0152

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 25 Scattergun Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter, 1 page.

Assessor

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

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

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

Mr. Pizzia stated a copy of his addendum (Exhibit A) stated the reason for his appeal. Chairman Covert clarified the appellant's estimate of value was \$290,000. Mr. Pizzia stated he was relying on the comparison between the subject and his neighbor's property. He said his neighbor's property was smaller and the taxable value was much less than his. He was asking for fairness and equality.

Appraiser Johnson read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. He said it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the taxable value based on the comparable sales used showing this property was equalized with similarly situated properties. He noted the property was receiving a size adjustment.

Chairman Covert inquired if the appellant had anything to rebut. Mr. Pizzia stated he would rely upon the fairness of the Board.

Member Green stated the subject was located in a very nice area and the values had come down some. Member Brown stated the subject had gone down very little in value and noted it had been bought in 1998 for \$348,000.

With regard to Parcel No. 009-562-23, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that

the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0067E PARCEL NO. 204-112-11 – HAMMERS, WILLIAM D –
HEARING NO. 11-0120

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5314 Tappan Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Perfected petition and Assessment Cards, 4 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk, submitted Petitioner's Exhibit A to the Board.

Mr. Hammers stated after reviewing the Assessor's Office packet and values, he believed they were in line. He said he was originally concerned with the overall market and that two out of the last three years, his value went up so he filed his appeal to verify with the Board that his assessment was a fair value. He said he really felt he did not have much of a case.

Appraiser Sutherland read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. She noted the three comparable sales used denoted a range of \$95 to \$106 per square foot, with the subject valued at \$82 per square foot. She stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the taxable value, which did not exceed full cash value with similarly situated properties.

Mr. Hammers said he was concerned because sale values were being compared with taxable value. He questioned if there was a homeowner's exemption allowed.

Josh Wilson, Assessor, stated during the 2005 legislative session, AB 49 was passed regarding the property tax cap. He explained that bill limited the annual growth of a tax bill to 3 percent for owner occupied properties. He said the appellant would have seen a large abatement in the beginning, because the tax bill he had been receiving was based on the previous bill and not on the assessment conducted on the property. He explained Nevada did not have a homeowner's exemption. Mr. Hammers inquired if the 3 percent cap was still in force in today's market. Assessor Wilson responded it was, but it was meaningless when property values were going down. It really protected property owners when values went up.

Mr. Hammers wanted to clarify the value was based on comparable sales, not so much on the 3 percent cap. Assessor Wilson stated Nevada's taxable value system was unique and he explained the methodology for assessing property. Mr. Hammers inquired how land was valued. Assessor Wilson responded in tract subdivisions the Assessor's Office used allocation, whereby they would determine land to building ratios, determine the median selling price and then apply 20 percent to the median selling price to come up with the land value. Adjustments would then be applied with regard to the site specifications.

With regard to Parcel No. 204-112-11, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

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

10:24 a.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

11-0068E **PARCEL NO. 234-381-18 – BARBARA J BANK TRUST – HEARING NO. 11-0033**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1273 Firefly Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Dillon, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the value based on comparable sales which demonstrated the subject was equalized with similarly situated properties.

Chairman Covert stated the Petitioner was requesting a total value of \$165,000 and the current value was \$177,254. Appraiser Dillon stated that was correct.

With regard to Parcel No. 234-381-18, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0069E PARCEL NO. 049-030-25 – DOOLEY, JOHN E MD –
HEARING NO. 11-0074

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 17180 Logan Meadow Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 14 pages.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gail Vice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. Appraiser Vice read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the subject's improvement value based on comparable sales ranging from \$206 to \$234 per square foot, which the subject exceeded at \$312 per square foot. She said obsolescence was necessary so that the taxable value did not exceed the fair market and the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 049-030-25, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$1,057,756 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,304,506 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0070E PARCEL NO. 516-491-21 – DELIA, ROBERT J AND ELIZABETH M – HEARING NO. 11-0079

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4930 Painted Stone Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter, 5 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Ms. Parent informed the Board the Petitioner submitted evidence prior to the hearing and it was entered into the record and marked as Petitioner's Exhibit A. Appraiser Warren requested a minute to look at the evidence. He noted the appellant's evidence showed they were in agreement with the recommendation to reduce the value (page 5). He reported after looking at more recent sales, he discovered a reduction was warranted by reducing the improvement value from \$223,690 to \$210,300. This resulted in the application of \$19,390 in obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 516-491-21, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$210,300 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$227,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0071E PARCEL NO. 148-192-02 – FARNSWORTH FAMILY TRUST –
HEARING NO. 11-0088

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 20042 Bordeaux Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Residential Summary Statistics, 1 page.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the total taxable value to \$1,050,000 based on comparable sales.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-192-02, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$870,000 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,050,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0072E PARCEL NO. 076-200-07 – DOOLEY INV LLC –
HEARING NO. 11-0093

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 7280 Ernie Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Photographs, 3 pages

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Kenneth Johns, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the value to \$180,000, based on his opinion the current value would not garner that amount in an open market. He also discovered the subject was entitled to a 25 percent reduction for lack of power. He recommended the land value be reduced by \$11,750, and the improvement value be reduced to \$154,150 by applying obsolescence in the amount of \$15,934, resulting in a new total taxable value of \$180,000.

With regard to Parcel No. 076-200-07, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$25,850 due to a power adjustment and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$154,150 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$180,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0073E PARCEL NO. 526-272-07 – LOVE, WILLIAME & GAY H –
HEARING NO. 11-0100

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 7055 Draco Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

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

Chairman Covert noted the Petitioner had not completed a valid petition. Herb Kaplan, Deputy District Attorney, clarified the Assessor's Office and the Clerk's Office did not receive a perfected petition as requested. Assessor Wilson stated when his office received a letter or other form of communication that someone wished to appeal their property tax, it was logged in and a perfected petition was requested. Deputy District Attorney Kaplan stated it was up to the Board to determine whether the letter contained enough information that would normally be contained on a petition.

Chairman Covert said the date on the original letter showed it was received on January 4th, with the cutoff date to receive a perfected petition by January 15th and it concerned him that the appellant did not return a perfected petition. He stated the Assessor's Office had a recommendation to reduce and directed the hearing to continue.

Member Brown requested clarification with regard to the recommendation. Appraiser Warren went through the recommendation stating the reduction was being based on sales in the neighborhood since July 1, 2010, which suggested a lower value.

With regard to Parcel No. 526-272-07, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$152,100, resulting in a total taxable value of \$200,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0074E PARCEL NO. 023-302-12 – DAVIS, JAMES L –
HEARING NO. 11-0101

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2015 Lakeridge Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Linda Lambert, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating comparable sales indicated a range of value of \$93 to \$157 per square foot, noting the subject fell within that range at \$99 per square foot. It was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current value.

Chairman Covert noted the appellants did not respond to a request for a completed petition and did not submit any evidence on their behalf. Member Brown stated he felt Improved Sale #2 showed a much lower value and Appraiser Lambert testified it was a court ordered sale, but represented the lower end of the range.

With regard to Parcel No. 023-302-12, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0075E PARCEL NO. 003-340-54 – HOYLE, LARRY W & SANDRA I – HEARING NO. 11-0103

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 110 Silverstone Place, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating comparable sales utilized for the subject property indicated a range of value from \$81 to \$109 per square foot, which the subject fell below at \$80 per square foot. He said taxable value did not exceed full

cash value and the property was equalized with similarly situated properties. Chairman Covert stated he agreed with the Petitioner there should be an age adjustment, but it was not part of the Nevada Revised Statutes at this time.

With regard to Parcel No. 003-340-54, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0076E PARCEL NO. 018-161-34 – LAMB, ERIKA C –
HEARING NO. 11-0104

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2693 Markridge Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Declaration of Value and appraisal, 23 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Member Woodland questioned the difference between the owner of record and the Petitioner. Appraiser Johnson noted it was a recent sale on December 23, 2010 and the owner of the subject was Erika Lamb. Herb Kaplan, Deputy District Attorney, stated the Petition had a Declaration of Value attached that listed Erika Lamb as the buyer and he believed the Board could move forward with the hearing.

Appraiser Johnson read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet. He said due to a current appraisal of the subject submitted by the Petitioner, the total taxable value exceeded full cash value and it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to apply \$34,512 in obsolescence to the improvement value and the appellant was in agreement.

Member Green stated at an earlier hearing the Board did not reduce to the purchase price, but were now being asked to do that on this case. He said looking at the comparables sales, a smaller house sold for \$325,000. Improved Sale #3 sold for \$343,000 and he wondered if the appraiser felt the sales were more realistic than the actual purchase price. Appraiser Johnson stated he felt a reduction was warranted based on the appraisal submitted and the sales price. Member Green stated he had a problem with fee appraisals when done in reference to a loan.

Assessor Wilson discussed the difference between the earlier hearing and this case. He also noted the Assessor's Office felt the earlier hearing was not an arms length transaction. He distinguished the difference for this case hinged on the fee appraisal and whether they (Assessor's Office) agreed with it or not. He noted sometimes the Assessor's Office did not agree with the fee appraisal, but did this time. Member Green stated he did not want to over assess any taxpayer. He commented he knew the neighborhood and if the property had a view he felt \$200,000 might not be realistic. He wanted the Board to be consistent in their decisions.

With regard to Parcel No. 018-161-34, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$123,500 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$200,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0077E PARCEL NO. 023-651-01 – TERRENCE G MCGAW &
CATHERINE J GORING FAMILY TRUST –
HEARING NO. 11-0105**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2281 Applewood Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

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

Appraiser Lambert read from Page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating the comparable sales indicated the subject's taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject was equalized with similarly situated properties.

With regard to Parcel No. 023-651-01, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0078E PARCEL NO. 530-663-02 – CARTER LIVING TRUST, JESSE H – HEARING NO. 11-0108

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2287 Soar Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter, 1 page.

Assessor

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

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

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

Appraiser Delgiudice read from Page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating the comparable sales indicated the subject's taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject was equalized with similarly situated properties.

With regard to Parcel No. 530-663-02, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0079E PARCEL NO. 214-062-07 – ALLISON, DAVID C & KIMBERLY L – HEARING NO. 11-0117

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4525 Mountaingate Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal information, 21 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Appraiser Johnson read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the improvement value to \$511,100 in the form of obsolescence and the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 214-062-07, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$511,100 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$635,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0080E PARCEL NO. 009-432-10 – WARNER, WILLIAM D & MICHELLE B – HEARING NO. 11-0125

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 905 Greensburg Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Supporting documentation, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joseph Johnson, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating the comparable sales ranged from \$110 to \$187 per square foot and the subject's taxable value was at \$136; therefore, it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current value.

Chairman Covert inquired about the appellant's evidence and comparable sales. Appraiser Johnson stated he reviewed the sales but did not feel they were comparable.

With regard to Parcel No. 009-432-10, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0081E PARCEL NO. 220-101-08 – JONES, THOMAS W –
HEARING NO. 11-0128

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3501 Cheechako Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

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

read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet page 1 stating it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current value based on the comparable sales utilized.

With regard to Parcel No. 220-101-08, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0082E PARCEL NO. 218-200-09 – STANLEY FAMILY TRUST –
HEARING NO. 11-0131**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3425 Eagle Ridge Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 5 pages.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joseph Johnson, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the improvement value and the appellant was in agreement. He reported during a recent interior inspection it was discovered the quality class should be 5.5 rather than 6.0. He also discovered the second floor above the garage was more in line with a finished loft and there was a minimal view from the subject's living area, which warranted an adjustment of 15 percent rather than 25 percent.

With regard to Parcel No. 218-200-09, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$87,975 due to a view adjustment and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$481,029 due to a recent inspection, resulting in a total taxable value of \$569,004 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that

the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0083E PARCEL NO. 021-140-23 – BULLOCK FAMILY TRUST, GARY & RACHEL – HEARING NO. 11-0135

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5990 Pembroke Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Dillon, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the value based on an interior inspection of the property. It was observed the quality class was more indicative of a 3.0 instead of a 4.0. She said based on their observations there other corrections necessary regarding the type of roof and the type of heating. She said the total taxable value would be recosted at \$242,139 and would not include any obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No.021-140-23, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$173,889 due to a change to the quality class and observations regarding a roofing issue, resulting in a total taxable value of \$242,139 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0084E PARCEL NO. 021-140-26 – BULLOCK FAMILY TRUST, GARY & RACHEL – HEARING NO. 11-0136

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6020 Pembroke Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Dillon, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated after an interior inspection of the property, it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to change the quality class from a 4.0 to a 3.0 and add a fireplace that was not on the record.

With regard to Parcel No. 021-140-26, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$171,290, to correct the quality class from 4.0 to 3.0, resulting in a total taxable value of \$233,040 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0085E PARCEL NO. 045-690-22 – MORRISON, MICHAEL W & LAURA J
– HEARING NO. 11-0137

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4755 Townsite Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 37 pages.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the improvement value based on obsolescence and the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 045-690-22, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$524,500 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$700,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0086E PARCEL NO. 520-243-03 – PROMMEL, ROBERT –
HEARING NO. 11-0142

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5992 Cielo Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gary Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating the comparable sales were pretty close to the market value of the subject property and he did not feel a reduction was appropriate. He said it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current value.

Chairman Covert stated the Petitioner quoted a foreclosure sale as proof of value and indicated there were three or more properties within the neighborhood that were about to go to foreclosure. He wondered if this neighborhood was under any different financial stress than what was happening in other neighborhoods. Appraiser Warren stated Wingfield Springs was a neighborhood that saw a substantial amount of new construction and a lot of people purchased those homes and were now seeing more foreclosures.

With regard to Parcel No. 520-243-03, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0087E PARCEL NO. 520-243-10 – PROMMEL, ROBERT –
HEARING NO. 11-0143

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6030 Cielo Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Appraiser Warren, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating comparable sales showed the subject did not exceed full cash value. Chairman Covert stated the appellant provided the same evidence as the previous hearing. Appraiser Warren stated the evidence provided a sale but did not provide a street address so he could not verify it. He said it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current value.

With regard to Parcel No. 520-243-10, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0088E PARCEL NO. 038-695-09 – WILKERSON FAMILY TRUST –
HEARING NO. 11-0147

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 460 Riverdale Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal reports and comparables, 25 pages

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Corinne Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated the Assessor's Office was recommending the application of \$107,698 in obsolescence to the improvement value based on the fee appraisal. She noted the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 038-695-09, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$540,750 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$650,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0089E PARCEL NO. 224-091-12 – MACLEOD, LINDA –
HEARING NO. 11-0155

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2689 Spearpoint Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable Sales and Assessment Notice, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Linda Lambert, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She read from page 1 of the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet stating it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the improvement value due to obsolescence and the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 224-091-12, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$343,110 due to obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$436,020 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0090E PARCEL NO. 232-533-01 – KORN, WILLIAM G JR & ELIZE L – HEARING NO. 11-0156

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2440 Mountain Spirit Trail, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal reports, 47 pages.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Dillon, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the value by \$532,305 (obsolescence), based on the submitted fee appraisal and the appellant was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 232-533-01, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced, due to obsolescence, in the amount of \$532,305, resulting in a total taxable value of \$660,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11:33 a.m. The Board took a brief recess.

11:40 a.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

11-0091E PARCEL NO. 148-381-01 – BARBER FAMILY TRUST – HEARING NO. 11-0073

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 6605 De Chardin Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated the Assessor's Office was basing their recommendation for reduction on the sale of the property. The owner admitted they got a good deal at \$111,000 and thought \$120,000 was a fair value.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-381-01, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$120,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$120,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0092E **PARCEL NO. 148-343-15 – BALFREY REV LIVING TRUST – HEARING NO. 11-0092R10**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010-11 taxable valuation on land located at 5945 Gauguin, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Tax bills for previous years, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated the Assessor's Office was recommending a reduction based on the sales price.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-343-15, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$85,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$85,000 for tax year 2010-11. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0093E **PARCEL NO. 504-460-02 – NEVADA SALTWATER LLC – HEARING NO. 11-0121**

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

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Declaration of Value, 5 pages.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to reduce the land value and the appellant was in agreement. She said the reduction was based on the sale which took place on December 29, 2010.

With regard to Parcel No. 504-460-02, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$200,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$200,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0094E PARCEL NO. 232-270-04 – O`DONNELL FAMILY TRUST –
HEARING NO. 11-0150

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2120 Candle Rock Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Virginia Dillon, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated it was the Assessor's Office recommendation to uphold the current value. Chairman Covert noted the appellant listed multiple listings on the petition. Appraiser Dillon stated she reviewed all of the listings and some were the land sales utilized by the Assessor's Office. After review, she still concluded that the subject's taxable value did not exceed full cash value.

With regard to Parcel No. 232-270-04, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the

Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0095E ROLL CHANGE REQUESTS – SARGENT, JIMMY R II –
PARCEL NO. 527-112-18, ROLL CHANGE REQUEST NOS:
942F08, 942F09, and 942F10,**

Gary Warren explained the subject property had been assessed since 2008; however, a value had not been placed on the home. An increase to the assessment value was being requested and according to the Nevada Revised Statutes, a hearing needed to be scheduled and notification to the owners was required. In answer to Chairman Covert’s question, Appraiser Warren clarified the request for the increase in assessment was for the past three years on the same house.

Following discussion, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, Chairman Covert ordered that, pursuant to NRS 361.345(2), the County Clerk issue notices of tax roll increases to affected property owners and set February 25, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. as the date and time for the Board to act on Roll Change Requests Nos. 942F08, 942F09, and 942F10, increasing taxable values as delivered to the Clerk.

11-0096E BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board member comments.

11-0097E PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one present for public comment.

* * * * * * * * *

11:50 a.m. There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, the meeting was adjourned.

JAMES COVERT, Chairperson
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

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

*Minutes prepared by
Jaime Deller, Deputy Clerk*