

**BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

WEDNESDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 12, 2014

PRESENT:

James Covert, Chairman
John Krolick, Vice Chairman
James Brown, Member
Philip Horan, Member
Gary Kizziah, Member

Jaime Deller, Deputy Clerk
Leslie Admirand, 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:

14-120E PUBLIC COMMENT

Agenda Subject: “Comment heard under this item will be limited to three (3) minutes per person and may pertain to matters on and off the Board agenda. Comments are to be made to the Board as a whole.”

There was no response to the call for public comment.

14-121E WITHDRAWN PETITIONS

The following petition scheduled on today's agenda had been withdrawn by the Petitioner prior to the hearing:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
160-794-01	NEVADA STATE BANK	14-0121

14-122E CONTINUANCES

There were no requests for continuances.

PETITIONS NOT TIMELY FILED

**14-123E PARCEL NO. 042-100-02 – EILENFELDT, SHERYL A –
HEARING NO. 14-0338NA**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2745 W Lake Ridge Shores, Washoe County, Nevada.

On motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Kizziah, which motion duly carried, it was ordered to reject the appeal based on the petition not being timely filed and the County Board of Equalization's lack of jurisdiction.

**14-124E PARCEL NO. 013-021-33 – VOLTL, MARIA –
HEARING NO. 14-0062**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 810 Ryland Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Assessor's Quick Information, 2 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, Maria Voltl was sworn in by Deputy Clerk Jaime Delleria.

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

Chairman Covert inquired on the Petitioner's value for the property.

Ms. Voltl indicated that the building value should be half of what was assessed. She said the building located in front of her property was 1,200 square feet and assessed for approximately \$10,000. Her property was 609 square feet, but was assessed for \$20,000. She explained that the parking lot was unpaved and located behind the front building and felt it was overtaxed. Ms. Voltl noted that another commercial property on Ryland Avenue paid \$461 taxes per year. She stated that property had two bedrooms, a full bath, her property only had a half bath, and a land total of 7,231 square feet.

Appraiser Churchfield explained that the Petitioner was comparing the subject parcel to the front parcel, but the crux of the value came from the size of the subject parcel. He said the front parcel, which was valued at \$10 per square foot, was a 5,500 square foot parcel equating to a land value of \$55,000. He commented that appraisals had been completed on the subject parcel with the lowest appraisal coming in at \$135,000; however, the appraised value was \$190,000. He explained there had been a deduction on the land value, which was now valued at \$8 per square foot, minus a 20 percent deduction for shape. The improvement value the Petitioner referred to was based on the front parcel being larger with a higher improvement value. Appraiser Churchfield indicated there had been obsolescence on the subject property, which was a remodeled beauty salon, but that was removed because the market no longer supported the obsolescence. He said the comparable sales all supported the Assessor's value and noted that the most comparable property sold for \$271 per square foot.

Member Kizziah asked if the remodel of the building occurred during the past tax year. Appraiser Churchfield replied it had been remodeled before this last tax year. Member Kizziah asked if the improvement value doubled. Appraiser Churchfield said that was correct because the obsolescence was removed. He explained that obsolescence was placed on the parcel when the market warranted a lower value.

Chairman Covert asked if all the reductions warranted for the subject property were applied. Appraiser Churchfield stated that was correct.

In rebuttal, Ms. Voltl questioned some of the figures placed on her property. Appraiser Churchfield replied that the subject parcel was purchased August 9, 2010 for \$215,000. He said the price per square foot was \$354, which was derived by dividing the \$215,000 by the 609 square footage of the building, and what was truly paid per square foot.

Chairman Covert explained that the property was not being valued at \$354 per square foot for taxable value and was valued considerably less. He said the Appraiser needed to review similar properties with a similar use and location, which was used to compare the value of the subject property. He indicated that the Appraiser had made several adjustments to the property for a taxable value of \$90,318. Ms. Voltl restated that she wanted the value on the building reduced to \$10,000.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

Member Horan felt that the Appraiser had made many adjustments to the property and noted that the shape of the lot was a challenge. He said he supported the Appraiser's valuation of the property.

With regard to Parcel No. 013-021-33, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Brown, 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.

14-125E PARCEL NO. 222-042-09 – DZIURDA, DAVID J –
HEARING NO. 14-0204

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1860 Vintners Place, Washoe County, Nevada.

Member Kizziah stated that he had a previous business relationship with Mr. Dziurda and would abstain from the vote.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable Sales and Comparable Assessments, 6 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, Marilyn Skedner was sworn in by Deputy Clerk Jaime Deller. Ms. Skedner noted that she was co-owner of the property.

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

Ms. Skedner commented that she had the same comparable sales as provided by the Assessor's Office. She indicated there was a 35 percent increase in the subject's improvements making the total value \$836,662. Her estimate of value was \$700,000, and attached to her petition was a survey provided from Dickson Realty of all the sales in comparable locations. She said the selling price for 2.5 acre lots in South Reno was approximately \$166 per square foot. She noted that her property was not fully landscaped, felt it was over appraised for the area, and she did not see the justification. Ms. Skedner indicated that the parcel was a long, skinny lot and part of the Chardonnay Village subdivision that backed up to houses on Evans Creek. She indicated that the property line in the back yard was the division between the City of Reno and Washoe County and that the properties to the south of her property were located in the County.

Appraiser Sanders said the subject property was a custom, 4,965 square foot home situated on 2.74 acres with a 1,074 square foot attached garage. She said there were also a 2,720 square foot barn built in 2009 and fenced pasture land with a pond. She said a downward adjustment of 35 percent was recognized in the land value of the subject property for the location and access through the tract neighborhood. The comparable

sales were located in a custom home neighborhood consistent with parcels typically ranging in size from 2.5 acres to 5+ acres with pastured settings.

Appraiser Sanders said Improved Sale 1 (IS) was situated on 3.40 acres with a 1,376 square foot detached garage and had fenced pasture land with a pond. The 4,485 square foot residence on the sale property was comparable in size, age and quality as the subject parcel. She said the sale was superior in land area, but overall the outside amenities, residence size, age and quality were generally comparable. Appraiser Sanders said IS2 had fenced pasture land on 2.57 acres with a pond, a pool and tennis court. She said the 2,829 square foot residence was inferior in size to the subject parcel, but was comparable in quality. She said the residence was built in 1966, which made the sale inferior in age. The outside improvements, lot size and quality were comparable to the subject property, but the size and age of the residence made the sale inferior. She stated that IS3 was located in a superior neighborhood on 2.47 acres, had a 1,050 square foot barn built in 1968 and had fenced pasture land. The parcel had a residence of 3,105 square feet built in 1968, which was inferior to the subject parcel in size and age. Appraiser Sanders said the quality of the residence was generally comparable; however, the lot size, residence size and age made the sale inferior. She said IS4 was located on 2.55 acres with a 392 square foot barn built in 1976 and also had fenced pasture land. Appraiser Sanders said the 4,240 square foot residence was generally comparable in size and quality as the subject parcel, but was inferior in age. She said outside amenities included a pool and tennis court. Overall, the lot size and residence were comparable, but the age of the residence made the sale inferior. She said the taxable value per square foot of the subject property was well below the sale price per square foot of the comparable improved sales. Appraiser Sanders commented that the sale prices ranged between \$775,000 and \$1,380,000 or \$183 to \$382 per square foot and supported the taxable value of \$169 per square foot of the subject parcel. She reviewed the four land sales and said the land sales ranged between \$250,000 and \$449,000 and also supported the taxable value of the subject's land value. She said the recommendation was to uphold the taxable value of the subject property.

Appraiser Sanders said the increase in the improvement value was based on the obsolescence being removed from the subject property and that the sales did not warrant any obsolescence.

Chairman Covert said there was a 35 percent downward adjustment on the land. Appraiser Sanders stated that was correct.

In rebuttal, Ms. Skedner indicated that the Appraiser was representing the total square footage, but there was a 1,000 square foot unfinished basement and she believed that should not be included in the total square footage. She felt the most comparable property was located on Kinney Lane, which was a superior property, but valued lower. She said the land around the barn on her property was not in pasture and there was not much landscaping around the pond. She indicated that the adjoining parcel was fully landscaped, with a pond and other amenities, and that parcel recently appraised for \$550,000. She remarked that the two parcels were comparable.

Chairman Covert asked how the basement in the subject parcel was valued. Rigo Lopez, Senior Appraiser, replied that the Assessor's Office would conduct a physical inspection of the basement because the Record Card indicated an additional value for a finished basement. Ms. Skedner reiterated it was an unfinished basement. Chairman Covert asked if an adjustment would be made if the basement was determined to be unfinished. Appraiser Lopez stated that was correct.

Member Horan asked how an unfinished basement would impact the valuation. Appraiser Lopez indicated that approximately \$33,000 was being added for the finished basement.

Appraiser Sanders indicated that she spoke to the owners of the adjoining parcel who had also filed an appeal. She stated there was an appraisal completed, which she was able to review, and noted that appraisal was for \$619,000. She stated the owner for the adjoining property ultimately withdrew the appeal.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

With regard to Parcel No. 222-042-09, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried with Member Kizziah abstaining, 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.

It was noted that a physical inspection would be conducted of the basement and, if it were determined to be unfinished, an adjustment would be made to the valuation.

14-126E PARCEL NO. 232-071-09 – MENYHARTH FAMILY TRUST –
HEARING NO. 14-0234

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 7867 Morgan Pointe Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Photos, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Comparable Sales, 1 page.

On behalf of the Petitioner, G. Paul Menyharth was sworn in by Deputy Clerk Jaime Dellera.

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

Chairman Covert questioned the lack of an appeal form.

Mr. Menyharth explained in the past three years of pursuing the challenge of the Assessor's actions, he received every notice after the due date and said there was not enough time to respond. Chairman Covert indicated that the time limits were set by statute.

Mr. Menyharth indicated that he purchased the property in 2011 for \$184,000 and noted it was not a distressed sale. In 2012, he said the property was assessed at \$199,000 as the appraised value. He stated that he called the Assessor's Office after receiving the 2013 Assessment Card and was told that an appraiser would return his call; however, that never occurred. Mr. Menyharth reiterated that all the notices were received after the due date.

Chairman Covert explained that this Board did not deal in taxes, but dealt in assessed valuation, and to adjudicate the taxable value of a property.

Mr. Menyharth stated there was a problem with the process, which was based on land and improvement values. He said he asked if he should provide comparable sales and was told that was not necessary. He disagreed with the comparable sales provided by the Assessor's Office because those were not comparable properties and were not located on Somerset Parkway. He noted that one of the comparable sales located on Morgan Pointe Circle had an incredible view, superior interior and many amenities. He indicated that his parcel was built below the Industry Classification Benchmark (ICB) Code that was in affect in 2004. However, his property was being compared to other properties that were on a ridge, had a view and were superior. Based on the location of his property, he said there was traffic noise from Somerset Parkway and the rattle of large vehicles impacted the house. The parcel had been overvalued every year for the last three years and was the lowest priced parcel in an eight mile area, which the Assessor's Office did not take into consideration. He stated that he wanted the value lowered based on the original value.

Chairman Covert stated that the Board needed numbers. Based on the increases that should have gone with the original value, Mr. Menyharth felt that \$215,000 was the assessed amount that should be assigned to this parcel.

Chairman Covert asked for comment on the Petitioner's statement that the comparable sales were not comparable.

Appraiser Sanders said the subject property was a 1,879 square foot residence with a 499 square foot attached garage and was a Quality Class 3.5. She said Improved Sale 1 (IS) was smaller in size, but similar in age, lot size and quality. She said IS2 through IS4 were the same model, built by the same developer and had the same square footage and quality. Appraiser Sanders noted that IS4 was the most recent sale and was similar in age, location, lot size and quality. She explained that IS4 had the highest sale price due to the southerly, mountain golf course views. She said the value range of those comparable sales was between \$136 and \$171 per square foot, which supported the subject parcel's taxable value per square foot of \$130. It was recommended that the total taxable value for the property of \$245,000 be upheld.

Appraiser Sanders explained that she did speak to the Appellant about the comparable sales. Chairman Covert said the Petitioner indicated that the interior of IS4 was vastly superior to the subject parcel. Appraiser Sanders replied that she had not seen the inside of that parcel.

Member Kizziah said the indication on IS1, IS2 and IS3 was that they were newer than the subject parcel. He asked if there were any changes in the building phases from the developer. Appraiser Sanders replied that she reviewed the Master Plan and found that the same Plan was used for all three models. She was not aware of any upgrades to those parcels.

Member Brown noticed that the subject property was approximately 1,900 square feet with two bedrooms and asked if the bedrooms were oversized. Appraiser Sanders commented that there was an option in the Master Plan for one bedroom to be used as a den and the other as the master bedroom. She explained that the size of the bedrooms did not affect the value. Mr. Menyharth explained that the bedrooms were not oversized.

In response to Chairman Covert, Appraiser Sanders remarked that IS4 was across the street from the subject parcel and had a view of the mountains. Member Kizziah noted that the parcel across the street sold for \$322,000.

Member Kizziah said there was a land increase by \$10,000 on the subject parcel and asked if there were land sale comparables in the presentation. Appraiser Sanders said the allocation method was used for the Somerset area, and she did not use land sales. She submitted Assessor Exhibit II, Comparable Sales.

Member Kizziah questioned the increase in the improvement valuation. Appraiser Sanders explained that the subject parcel had a land adjustment, but the obsolescence was removed which increased the value. Member Kizziah asked if the obsolescence was due to the market value in that tax year. Appraiser Sanders stated that was correct.

In rebuttal, Mr. Menyharth said IS4 had a custom-built interior, remodeled after the house was built and was far superior to his property. He said that sale was based on the quality of the interior, not the location of the property. He explained when a large vehicle drove on Somerset Parkway there was a vibration felt in the house, but that vibration was not felt on the other side of the street. In speaking with the Appraiser, Mr. Menyharth stated that she denied they were talking about market value, and he felt he had a handicap because he was told not to bring comparable sales to the hearing. He explained that his property was in the low-land, had no view and heard and felt the vibration from Somerset Parkway. He stated there was no merit to the provided comparable sales.

Chairman Covert asked if any of the comparable sales had a view adjustment. Appraiser Sanders replied that Somerset had no view adjustments.

Mr. Menyharth remarked that the Appraiser just contradicted what she had said in an earlier response that IS4 had a view. Chairman Covert explained that he asked if there was a view adjustment, not if there was a view. Mr. Menyharth stated the reason that property sold for a higher price was because it had a view. Chairman Covert commented what a property sold for was what a willing buyer and a willing seller agreed upon for a price, not how the property was valued or benefitting from a view value adjustment. Mr. Menyharth felt that sale should not be included in the comparable sales. He commented that there were adjustments for frequently traveled roads and said a reduction should be applied to his property for location.

Chairman Covert asked if the statute allowed a location adjustment for traffic. Appraiser Sanders explained that a traffic study would be reviewed to see if a traffic adjustment was warranted; however, the data on Somerset Parkway was not available to warrant a traffic adjustment. She indicated that two of the comparable sales were located on the round-about off Somerset Parkway and about half a mile away from the subject property. She explained that the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) did not conduct a traffic study for Somerset Parkway.

Cori Burke, Senior Appraiser, noted that she was the Senior Appraiser overseeing Somerset and also lived above Somerset Parkway. She said that Somerset Parkway would not be a street that would receive a traffic adjustment.

Mr. Menyharth disagreed with that analysis since there were houses and gully's that deafened the noise level to some of the comparable sales.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

Member Brown stated he was satisfied with the comparable sales provided by the Assessor's Office.

Member Krolick said some of the adjacent properties were all assessed at the same level as the subject parcel.

Member Horan felt the Appellant now knew what to bring to the State Board of Equalization (SBOE) if he wished to further pursue the matter and did not agree with this Board's decision. At times, he said there were infrequent breakdowns in communication between the Assessor's Office and a petitioner, but those were infrequent and never intentional.

With regard to Parcel No. 232-071-09, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Horan, 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.

14-127E PARCEL NO. 088-241-02 – REHOLD RENO LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0034

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 850 North Hills Blvd., Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 3 pages.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 088-241-02, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$7,685,966, resulting in a total taxable value of \$9,314,304 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-128E **PARCEL NO. 148-062-10 – PORTO, VINCENT C –**
HEARING NO. 14-0043

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5740 Dijon Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 3 pages.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-062-10, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be reduced to \$150,000 and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$793,017 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-129E **PARCEL NO. 032-023-04 – GOUDY INVESTMENTS LLC –**
HEARING NO. 14-0073

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2100 Victorian Avenue, 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.

With regard to Parcel No. 032-023-04, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$154,243, resulting in a total taxable value of \$371,663 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-130E PARCEL NO. 008-171-38 – BHC HEALTH SERVICES OF NEVADA INC - HEARING NO. 14-0077

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1240 E 9th Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Financial information, 6 pages.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 008-171-38, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$3,824,645, resulting in a total taxable value of \$4,796,611 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-131E PARCEL NO. 020-221-22 – LEBOVITZ RENO TWO LLC – HEARING NO. 14-0126A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3270 Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 2 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor.

With regard to Parcel No. 020-221-22, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, 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 \$421,374 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-132E PARCEL NO. 020-221-23 – LEBOVITZ RENO TWO LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0126B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located on Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 2 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor.

With regard to Parcel No. 020-221-23, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, 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 \$67,093 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

**14-133E PARCEL NO. 020-221-35 – LEBOVITZ RENO TWO LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0126C**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 641 E Moana Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 2 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor.

With regard to Parcel No. 020-221-35, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$1,272,605, resulting in a total taxable value of \$2,361,533 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

**14-134E PARCEL NO. 538-120-10 – BH PROPERTIES LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0137**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 150 Isidor Court 101, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Sale description of subject property 3 pages.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 538-120-10, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$53,010, resulting in a total taxable value of \$87,885 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-135E PARCEL NO. 538-120-12 – BH PROPERTIES LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0138

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 150 Isidor Court 104, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Sale description of subject property, 3 pages.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 538-120-12, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$57,798, resulting in a total taxable value of \$95,823 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-136E PARCEL NO. 538-120-13 – BH PROPERTIES LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0139

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 150 Isidor Court 102, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Sale description of subject property, 3 pages.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 538-120-13, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$53,010, resulting in a total taxable value of \$87,885 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-137E PARCEL NO. 019-351-10 – ISBELL PARTNERS LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0186

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 639 Isbell Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Consolidated statement and comparable sales, 4 pages.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 019-351-10, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$2,011,092, resulting in a total taxable value of \$2,450,000 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-138E **PARCEL NO. 516-224-01 – SPANISH SPRINGS MEDICAL LLC – HEARING NO. 14-0211**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5070 Ion Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Commercial Rental Data, 1 page.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 516-224-01, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$1,600,177, resulting in a total taxable value of \$2,176,424 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-139E **PARCEL NO. 530-770-09 – PICCININI FAMILY REV LIVING TRUST – HEARING NO. 14-0213**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 135 Isidor Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable Sale, 1 page.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 530-770-09, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$167,248, resulting in a total taxable value of \$198,828 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-140E PARCEL NO. 538-120-08 – HAW FAMILY TRUST, JESSE & AMBER – HEARING NO. 14-0214

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 150 Isidor Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable Sale, 1 page.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 538-120-08, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$115,596, resulting in a total taxable value of \$191,646 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-141E PARCEL NO. 530-770-02 – TRIPLE J LLC – HEARING NO. 14-0215A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 145 Isidor Court D&E, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable Sale, 1 page.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 530-770-02, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$194,785, resulting in a total taxable value of \$231,525 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-142E PARCEL NO. 530-770-04 – TRIPLE J LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0215B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 145 Isidor Court A&B, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable Sale, 1 page.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 530-770-04, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$167,248, resulting in a total taxable value of \$198,828 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

**14-143E PARCEL NO. 530-770-06 – JH3 LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0216A**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 135 Isidor Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable property quick info, 1 page.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 530-770-06, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$99,345, resulting in a total taxable value of \$118,125 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

**14-144E PARCEL NO. 530-770-07 – JH3 LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0216B**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 135 Isidor Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable property quick info, 1 page.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 530-770-07, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$193,290, resulting in a total taxable value of \$229,950 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-145E PARCEL NO. 530-770-08 – JH3 LLC –
HEARING NO. 14-0216C

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 135 Isidor Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable property quick info, 1 page.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 530-770-08, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$90,090, resulting in a total taxable value of \$107,100 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-146E **PARCEL NO. 004-073-10 – UNIVERSITY VILLAGE CENTER LLC**
HEARING NO. 14-0217B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2900 Clear Acre Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Commercial Rental Data, 1 page.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 004-073-10, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$1,324,304, resulting in a total taxable value of \$2,997,434 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-147E **PARCEL NO. 040-971-06 – PLATINUM FIRST PROPERTIES LLC**
HEARING NO. 14-0208

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5441 Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Income/Expense Information and Comparable Sales, 4 pages.

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.

With regard to Parcel No. 040-971-06, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$8,193,396, resulting in a total taxable value of \$9,260,000 for tax year 2014-15. 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.

14-148E PARCEL NO. 090-090-08 – CBL ACQUISITION CORP –
HEARING NO. 14-0238

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2014-15 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 13755 Stead Blvd., Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and Comparable Sales, 2 pages.

Assessor

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

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Chris Sarman, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said a physical inspection was conducted on the property on January 23, 2014 and, based on qualitative and quantitative issues, the Record Card would be changed resulting in a reduction of the taxable value.

With regard to Parcel No. 090-090-08, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$6,764,164, resulting in a total taxable value of \$8,051,362 for tax year 2014-15. The reduction was based on a physical inspection. 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.

14-149E BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board member comments.

14-150E PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no response to the call for public comment.

* * * * * * * * *

10:15 a.m. There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Kizziah, which motion duly carried, the meeting was adjourned.

JAMES COVERT, Chairman
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

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

*Minutes prepared by
Stacy Gonzales, Deputy Clerk*