

**BOARD OF EQUALIZATION  
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

FRIDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 23, 2024

PRESENT:

**Eugenia Bonnenfant, Vice Chair**  
**James Ainsworth, Member**  
**Dennis George, Member**  
**Rob Pierce, Member**

**Janis Galassini, County Clerk**  
**Herb Kaplan, Deputy District Attorney**

ABSENT:

**Daren McDonald, Chair**

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. Vice Chair Bonnenfant called the meeting to order, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

**24-065E      PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**24-066E      SWEARING IN**

County Clerk Jan Galassini swore in the appraisal staff.

**24-067E      WITHDRAWN PETITIONS**

The following petition scheduled on the agenda was withdrawn by the Petitioner prior to the hearing:

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>	<b>Hearing No.</b>
510-481-06	HD DEVELOPMENT OF MARYLAND INC	24-0030

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Pierce, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the hearing be withdrawn.

**24-068E      CONTINUANCES**

County Clerk Jan Galassini noted the following petitions were continued during the meeting of February 21, 2024, to the meeting scheduled for February 28, 2024:

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>	<b>Hearing No.</b>
025-021-20	SMITHRIDGE PROPERTY LLC	24-0078
163-073-04	BP CAPITAL I LLC	24-0079

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**24-069E      PARCEL NO. 140-010-42 – DAMONTE VILLAGE LLC – HEARING NO. 24-0020**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 70 Damonte Ranch Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Aerial photograph, comparables, and supporting documentation, 27 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 6 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 140-010-42 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member George, seconded by Member Pierce, 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 \$5,477,992, resulting in a total taxable value of \$11,877,975 for tax year 2024-25. 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.

**24-070E**      **PARCEL NO. 140-213-51 – RC WILLEY HOME FURNISHINGS – HEARING NO. 24-0045**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1201 Steamboat Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Property Summary, photographs, sales comparables, cost analysis, and supporting materials, 46 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, subject's appraisal records, letter from property appraiser, photographs, and storage warehouse and warehouse showroom store valuations, 37 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

**Exhibit III:** Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 140-213-51 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member George, seconded by Member Pierce, 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 \$15,490,096, resulting in a total taxable value of \$22,390,000 for tax year 2024-25. 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.

**24-071E**      **PARCEL NO. 024-055-52 – SAMS REAL ESTATE BUSINESS TRUST – HEARING NO. 24-0050**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4835 Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Comparable sales, Clark County equity analysis, and lease comps summary and supporting materials, 32 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, subject's appraisal records, rent survey table, capitalization rate survey chart, Washoe County taxable sales chart, photographs, and warehouse discount store valuation, 26 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Benji Thompkins was sworn in by County Clerk Janis Galassini.

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

Mr. Thompkins indicated he had a summary to present regarding the stores and the position for Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 024-055-52, 024-055-53, 039-051-08, 086-380-32, and 510-381-07. He stated the testimony provided for the current petition would establish the basis for the other related petitions he was representing. Furthermore, he would refer to previous testimony during the hearings for the subsequent petitions.

Appraiser Rivadeneyra noted hearing numbers 24-0050 through 24-0054 involved Walmart-owned properties. He explained the same comparable sales were used for each hearing due to the similarities of the properties. He added the income assumptions were similar for each hearing other than hearing number 24-0053, as that property was much smaller and newer than the other subject properties. The Assessor's Office used a 10 percent market rent for the property related to hearing number 24-0053. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the values for all of the related hearings except for hearing number 24-0053, for which the Assessor's Office recommended a lower valuation. Appraiser Rivadeneyra reviewed page 1 of the hearing evidence packet (HEP).

Ms. Galassini distributed documents to the Board from the Petitioner and placed them on file as Petitioner's Exhibit A (PE-A).

Mr. Thompkins explained he was a manager for Walmart's property tax department, and Nevada was one of the states he supervised. He believed the properties he appealed were over-assessed. He disclosed all the stores related to hearing numbers 24-0050 through 24-0054 were owner-operated. It was Mr. Thompkins' opinion that there was a significant difference or variance in the value that one of the stores would sell for on the open market based on the presence or absence of a lease agreement. He observed there were examples of this throughout the United States (US). He stated most of the stores owned by Walmart would sell with no lease in place. Walmart and Sam's Club store sales were provided on pages 12 through 15 of PE-A. Mr. Thompkins asserted stores sold in the Country that were leased differed in sale price compared to those that sold without a lease.

Mr. Thompkins briefly divulged his background in appraisal and consulting work. He noted there were three approaches when determining the value of property, including the cost, the income, and the sales. He thought in an unobstructed open market, sales were the most significant factor in determining a property's value.

Mr. Thompkins informed the subject stores were known to have deed restrictions on them. He acknowledged the County might consider how deed restrictions factored into the amount those stores would sell for when the use was restricted before and after the sale. He referenced a report pertaining to US big box sales that was completed by SitusAMC in 2019, portions of which were included in PE-A. Mr. Thompkins mentioned that Walmart stores had an average size of 180,000 square feet. He further explained that if a store was built for a specific purpose, there would be a discount in the market if someone could not offer the same use or the same standards. He did not believe the property owner should be penalized for this, noting fair market value did not refer only to what the property owner was willing to pay. He added fair market value referred to the value that the next market participant was also willing to pay for a property. Referencing pages 22 through 32 of the PE-A, Mr. Thompkins stated the report included 30 big box stores under 50,000 square feet in size and those that were above 50,000 square feet in size. He clarified that at 50,000 square feet, there was a distinct change in variance in the sale prices that the surveyed properties were selling for in the market. He said the report concluded that the difference with deed restrictions was negligible and not worth applying an adjustment for when evaluating the sales.

Mr. Thompkins referenced page 1 of the PE-A and indicated he created a pro forma for direct capitalization (CAP). He talked about how Washoe County differed from Clark County in that Clark County did not expand its search when analyzing CAP rates (CRs). He noted there were not many big box properties that would sell. He explained he examined big box sales for states to the west that shared borders and were similar to Nevada, which included Colorado and Arizona. Because he did not want to make adjustments for them, he searched for fee-simple properties. Mr. Thompkins clarified two of the nine sales he used as comparables were from the same property. He explained the wholesaler purchased that property and double-escrowed it, so once a buyer was found, there was no need to disclose how much profit was made to the buyer or seller. He indicated there was a discount whenever Walmart-owned stores were offered for purchase.

Mr. Thompkins referred to the value comparison for Clark County and Washoe County, located on page 3 of the PE-A. He commented that the properties' highest and best use was not suited for a retail store, noting the high land value in the equity grid for Clark County. He pointed out that a property referenced on page 1 of the PE-A had improvements that were being dismantled so the developer could build an industrial facility. He believed this showed that the increase in the value of stores did not necessarily mean the improvements on the properties were worth more. He added the value of the improvements decreased as the land value excessively increased because the highest and best use for the next owner of the property needed to change. Mr. Thompkins stated he obtained the traffic count and the median incomes within a ten-mile radius of Walmart and Sam's Club properties referenced on page 1 of the PE-A. He noted the sales average was

\$53.73 per square foot, and the median for sales was \$54.60 per square foot. Additionally, the internal list for Walmart sales from Arizona, Colorado, and Nevada indicated a median of approximately \$38 per square foot and an average of approximately \$31 per square foot. He mentioned three of the realty transaction memorandums of the internal sales were included in the PE-A, which were provided on pages 5 through 7. Mr. Thompkins explained the memorandums included the commissions that were paid to the buying and selling parties in addition to the market and broking transactions. He added the commissions were from 4 percent to 6 percent. He clarified the information pertained to fee simple sales. Mr. Thompkins pointed out the median was approximately \$47, and the average was approximately \$57 when the fee simple sales were adjusted by 50 percent. He informed there was an outlier on the internal sales list for a property in Scottsdale, Arizona that was priced at approximately \$118 per square foot. Based on research, he determined one of the buyers of many of the Walmart and Sam's Club stores was the company At Home, which performed a sale-leaseback to itself upon being purchased. He indicated that was why the value was out of range of the other internal sales throughout the Country.

Mr. Thompkins reviewed page 2 of the PE-A and described the process of calculating the values produced for APN 086-380-32. He clarified he applied 5 percent for vacancy and calculated the operating expense at 5 percent only for reserves and a CR of 7 percent, which computed a pro forma value of \$78.80 per square foot.

Mr. Thompkins stated the average cost of all five subject properties, hearing numbers 24-0050 through 24-0054, was \$86 per square foot. He mentioned he had some successful appeals in Clark County. He remarked that Clark County calculated much lower taxable values than Washoe County had. He cited market data from pages 20 and 21 of the PE-A, comparing cumulative rent and price growth in the City of Reno and Las Vegas. He noted Las Vegas's cumulative rent and price growth were higher.

Mr. Thompkins believed cost data was skewed, as it was more accurate to use cost during a timeframe close to a property's construction date. He stated the data would become less relevant after a progression away from the prices that the properties would have sold for. Furthermore, a market obsolescence feasibility study would be favorable so the obsolescence could be quantified and applied to the cost. He used the pro forma net operating income (NOI) and referenced page 4 of the PE-A showing his calculations applied to the cost figures using the land value for each property as well as the CR of 7 percent. He explained that doing so made the costs comparable to the pro forma and the properties' value in the market. Mr. Thompkins clarified the Board would be considering that the property was leased. He wanted to calculate the cost so it was more reflective of the pro forma and the income. Addressing the Clark County equity data on page 3 of the PE-A, he noted the minimum value was \$70.56 per square foot, the median value was \$82.49 per square foot, and the maximum value was \$88.26 per square foot. Mr. Thompkins pointed out the current values per square foot for the subject properties for hearing numbers 24-0050 through 24-0054 were \$102, \$97, \$113, \$131, and \$114, respectively. He believed the City of Reno was an inferior market to Las Vegas and mentioned cost data from CoreLogic's Marshall and Swift and CoStar Group confirmed his belief. He indicated the multipliers for Las Vegas were approximately 1.16 to 1.19,

whereas the reports from the CoreLogic cost data, located on pages 5 through 9 of the PE-A, provided a multiplier of about 1.10. Mr. Thompkins commented that the City of Reno was roughly 10 percent over the market. He explained the process he used for calculating the County tier values of each subject property. The County tier values were \$75, \$71, \$81, \$94, and \$82 per square foot, respectively, and noted the suggested values, all of which were listed on page 3 of the PE-A.

Mr. Thompkins believed the sales approach was the most appropriate method for assessing the properties' values. He stated the average he obtained for the sales of big box or regional stores that were not exclusively Walmart was \$54. He said the average for the Walmarts, when adjusted by a 50 percent increase from their fee simple state for market transactions, was \$57.20. He concluded a starting amount of \$65 per square foot by averaging the cost number and the average per square foot for sales at a 50 percent markup adding more weight to the sales. For the properties related to hearing numbers 24-0050 through 24-0054, the values when applying the same percentage difference were \$68.25, \$65, \$74.39, \$85.66, and \$75.14 per square foot. Those values were identified on page 1 of the PE-A. He compared the market relationship between Tucson and Phoenix, Arizona to that of the City of Reno and Las Vegas. Mr. Thompkins did not think any of the subject properties were worth more than \$65 per square foot; however, he believed the values he calculated were reasonable. He also believed he supplied a lot of data to the Board to support the values he was suggesting for the total taxable values. He mentioned, based on email correspondence related to Walmart's real estate team, that the deed restrictions would be removed for the Walmarts.

Appraiser Rivadeneyra believed Mr. Thompkins addressed the main issues between the Assessor's Office's analysis and the analysis performed by the Petitioner. He clarified the Assessor's Office was valuing the properties for hearing numbers 24-0050 through 24-0054 pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 361.227. The Assessor's Office valued the land at market value based on the use of the improvements. He read the conclusions located on page 1 of the HEP and reviewed the improved sales (IS) and land sales (LS) comparables outlined on pages 2 and 3 of the HEP. He also reviewed the income approach analysis located on page 5 of the HEP.

Appraiser Rivadeneyra indicated a survey of big box rents was available on page 9 of the HEP and explained a survey was conducted in Washoe County to estimate the potential gross income for the subject property, APN 024-055-52. The rents for big box retail space per square foot ranged from \$0.54 to \$1.42 on a triple net basis. The subject property's location, access, and visibility would command a rent at the high end of the range; however, it was somewhat offset by the relatively large size of the retail space. Appraiser Rivadeneyra stated that \$0.67 per square foot, or \$8 for annual rent, was reasonable for the discount warehouse store. He clarified while the Sam's Club buildings were smaller than a typical Walmart supercenter and would command a higher relative rent, this was somewhat offset by the lower level of interior finish. He concluded the same market rent that was used for the Walmart supercenters' effective gross income was also applied to the subject property. Appraiser Rivadeneyra further explained triple net lease structures were standard when Walmart and Sam's Club were the tenants despite them

being owner-occupied. Additionally, initial lease terms of at least ten years with multiple renewal options were common for high-performing, well-located stores.

Appraiser Rivadeneyra informed Walmart was a well-capitalized, double-A (AA) credit-rated tenant. Because the risk of faulting on lease terms was minimal, a vacancy and credit loss deduction was not necessary. He stated for NOI, single-tenant retail properties were typically leased on a triple net basis, with the tenant paying the maintenance, taxes, and insurance expenses for the property. He clarified a 5 percent deduction for non-reimbursed operating expenses and reserves for replacements was applied to account for the expenses incurred by the owner. Appraiser Rivadeneyra referenced the CR charts for the local and national markets, which were included in the HEP on pages 10 and 11. He indicated the transactions for CR-2 and CR-4 represented freestanding single-tenant net lease properties. He noted the CR for the properties varied from 6.11 percent and 7.29 percent. He said the low contract rent, the second-generation use, and the inferior credit profile made the sale for CR-4 a high indicator for the subject's CAP despite the better market conditions at the time of sale. Appraiser Rivadeneyra added that Cabela's sale was a better indicator of the CR for the subject; however, that sale occurred during more favorable market conditions and was a low indicator of the current CR for the subject. He mentioned regional and national sales were considered due to the limited data for CR comparables. The CR for the regional big box sales, outlined on page 11 of the HEP, ranged from 7.94 percent to 3.23 percent, with a median of 5.76 percent. Furthermore, the CR for the subject property was conservatively estimated to be 6.5 percent.

Appraiser Rivadeneyra noted the value indicated by the income approach was reconciled to \$17,600,000, or \$117 per square foot. He stated that as of January 1, 2024, the subject building was fully functioning and serving its highest and best use as designed by the owner. No under-utilization, functional obsolescence, or deferred maintenance was observed at the property. Additionally, the leased fee interest at market rates was equivalent to the fee simple interest. He read from the conclusions section, located on page 1 of the HEP. Appraiser Rivadeneyra added upholding the Assessor's value was recommended.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant provided Mr. Thompkins the opportunity to rebut Appraiser Rivadeneyra's presentation. Mr. Thompkins referenced the IS used by the Assessor's Office and clarified Walmart had not adjusted for the rights in place or the lease. He asserted there needed to be an adjustment for the difference when using sales with leases in place for a fee simple appraisal and evaluating improved sales. He said there would need to be an adjustment for the income stream on the property. Mr. Thompkins shared an anecdote involving the appraisal of a property in Kentucky, during which the appraiser made several adjustments when selecting the sales. He reiterated that, for the most part, there were no leases in place for stores owned by Walmart, and he indicated that the extent of the property needed to be appraised.

Mr. Thompkins did not think discussing net sales was a significant point. He informed Walmart built its own stores and did not enter into leases because of the



possibility of being taken advantage of for creating a market. He pointed out Walmart was not the only market participant and talked about the company's efforts to sell its products. He noted the quality of Walmart's fixtures and branding and indicated they were Walmart's branding and likeness. He advised there was an important distinction between Walmart's business value and its real estate value. Mr. Thompkins questioned whether the market for the City of Reno was better than that of Las Vegas by 25 percent. He observed the average for the City of Reno was 25 percent higher than the average for Clark County, which was the reason for appealing the appraisals related to hearing numbers 24-0050 through 24-0054.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Member George observed a multimillion-dollar difference between the Assessor's Office's and Mr. Thompkins' valuations for the properties related to hearing numbers 24-0050 through 24-0054. He remarked on the significance of the Board's decision and commented that the Board was obligated to be fair and equitable.

Member Ainsworth clarified the Board did not compare sales to Las Vegas; all the comparables were from within the County. He stated the purpose of the Board was to ensure equalization, and he believed the Assessor's Office staff proved there was equalization based on the figures that were presented.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant acknowledged the difficulty in treating the properties differently with there being a single-owner tenant. She observed the matter was being considered from the advantages that Walmart was receiving due to its current location and sales opportunity in the community. Conversely, she questioned what would happen to the property if a Walmart was not there, and the property had to be sold. She believed the matter was an issue of equalization. She disagreed that the City of Reno was an inferior market compared to Las Vegas from an economic perspective and noted Las Vegas had a 5 percent unemployment rate. Vice Chair Bonnenfant placed greater importance on the local data.

Member George agreed with Vice Chair Bonnenfant's feedback and stated the quality of life in the City of Reno was significantly better than that in Las Vegas. He advised Las Vegas could not be used as a credible comparison because it was different. He was not aware of the other markets used in Mr. Thompkins's presentation. Member George complimented Mr. Thompkins for the amount and depth of his research; however, he was uncertain how valuable his research was when related strongly to other communities. He praised the work of the Assessor's Office.

Member Pierce concurred with the previous input provided by other Members. He thought the Assessor's Office's appraisal was fair and stated he would uphold the staff's decision.

With regard to Parcel No. 024-055-52, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the

Petitioner, on motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Pierce, 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 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.

**24-072E      PARCEL NO. 024-055-53 – WAL-MART REAL ESTATE**  
**BUSINESS TRUST – HEARING NO. 24-0051**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4855 Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Comparable sales, Clark County equity analysis, and lease comps summary and supporting materials, 32 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, subject's appraisal records, rent survey table, capitalization rate survey chart, Washoe County taxable sales chart, photographs, and mega warehouse discount store valuation, 29 pages.

Benji Thompkins, having already been sworn in, appeared on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

In response to Vice Chair Bonnenfant's invitation to present on hearing number 24-0051, Mr. Thompkins referred to his testimony for hearing number 24-0050.

Appraiser Rivadeneyra indicated the same data, including sales and income analysis, was used for hearing numbers 24-0050 and 24-0051. Additionally, the Assessor's Office was reconciling to the same per square foot values. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 024-055-53, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Pierce, 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 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.

**24-073E**      **PARCEL NO. 039-051-08 – WAL-MART STORES INC # 3254 – HEARING NO. 24-0052**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5260 W 7th Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Comparable sales, Clark County equity analysis, and lease comps summary and supporting materials, 32 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, subject's appraisal records, rent survey table, capitalization rate survey tables, Washoe County taxable sales chart, photographs, and mega warehouse discount store valuation, 29 pages.

Benji Thompkins, having already been sworn in, appeared on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

In response to Vice Chair Bonnenfant's invitation to present additional information, Mr. Thompkins referred to his testimony for hearing number 24-0050.

Appraiser Rivadeneyra indicated the same data, including improved sales (IS) and land sales (LS), was used for hearing numbers 24-0050 and 24-0052. Additionally, the Assessor's Office was reconciling to the same per square foot values. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value.

Member George observed the Assessor's Office seemed to recommend values that were somewhat lower than the calculated values of each case. He believed it worked toward the notion of fairness and equity.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 039-051-08, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Pierce, 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 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.

24-074E

**PARCEL NO. 086-380-32 – WAL-MART REAL ESTATE  
BUSINESS TRUST – HEARING NO. 24-0053**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 250 Vista Knoll Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Comparable sales, Clark County equity analysis, and lease comps summary and supporting materials, 32 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, subject's appraisal records, rent survey table, capitalization rate survey chart, Washoe County taxable sales chart, photographs, and discount warehouse store valuation, 30 pages.

Benji Thompkins, having already been sworn in, appeared on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joel Rivadeneyra, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. Referencing the hearing evidence packet (HEP), he informed the sales comparison approach reconciled to \$122 per square foot, and the income approach reconciled to \$129 per square foot. He indicated the full cash value was reconciled down to \$126 per square foot, or \$20,200,000, which required \$936,787 in obsolescence. The Assessor's Office recognized it was overmarket on the property based on the staff's analysis and was recommending a lower value.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant invited Mr. Thompkins to present additional information, but he declined.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Assessor's Office Chief Property Appraiser Steve Clement pointed out an error on the recommended taxable value on page 1 of the HEP. He clarified the \$936,787 should be subtracted from the improvement value of \$14,509,349 for the resulting total taxable value of \$20,200,000.

With regard to Parcel No. 086-380-32, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Pierce, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable improvement value be reduced by \$936,787 and the taxable land value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$20,200,000 for

tax year 2024-25. The reduction was based on obsolescence. 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.

**24-075E      PARCEL NO. 510-381-07 – WAL-MART REAL ESTATE**  
**BUSINESS TRUST – HEARING NO. 24-0054**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5065 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Comparable sales, Clark County equity analysis, and lease comps summary and supporting materials, 32 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, subject's appraisal records, rent survey table, capitalization rate survey chart, Washoe County taxable sales chart, photographs, mega warehouse discount store valuation, 29 pages.

Benji Thompkins, having already been sworn in, appeared on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joel Rivadeneyra, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value. Referencing the hearing evidence packet (HEP), he stated the sales comparison approach reconciled to \$115 per square foot, and the income approach reconciled to \$117 per square foot.

In response to Vice Chair Bonnenfant's question regarding whether Mr. Thompkins had additional information to offer, he indicated he did not.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 510-381-07, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Pierce, 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 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.

**10:11 a.m.**      **The Board recessed.**

**10:26 a.m.**    **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

**24-076E**    **PARCEL NO. 025-570-01 – REALTY INCOME PROPERTIES 16  
LLC – HEARING NO. 24-0026**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6590 S Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:**    Property Description and The Cost Approach, 3 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:**    Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, retail capitalization rate chart, big box store rent survey table, national freestanding sales table, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and discount warehouse store valuation, 40 pages.

**Exhibit II:**    Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 025-570-01 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member George, 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 \$6,173,094, resulting in a total taxable value of \$11,397,678 for tax year 2024-25. 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.

**24-077E**    **PARCEL NO. 026-031-42 – HOME DEPOT USA INC – HEARING  
NO. 24-0027**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2955 Northtowne Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Property Description and Cost Approach, 3 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, retail capitalization rate chart, big box store rent table, national freestanding sales table, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and warehouse discount store valuation, 40 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 026-031-42 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member George, 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 \$6,459,867, resulting in a total taxable value of \$11,194,901 for tax year 2024-25. 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.

**24-078E      PARCEL NO. 140-213-18 – HOME DEPOT USA INC – HEARING NO. 24-0028**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1001 Steamboat Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Real property tax valuation package, Property Description, and Cost Approach, 4 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, charts, big box store rent survey table, national freestanding sales table, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and warehouse discount store valuation, 38 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 140-213-18 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member George, 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 \$7,365,271, resulting in a total taxable value of \$13,132,435 for tax year 2024-25. 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.

**24-079E      PARCEL NO. 212-010-08 – HD DEVELOPMENT OF MARYLAND INC – HEARING NO. 24-0029**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5125 Summit Ridge Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Property description and the cost approach, 3 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, retail capitalization rate chart, rent sales table, national freestanding sales table, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and discount warehouse store valuation, 40 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 212-010-08 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member George, 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 \$7,094,294, resulting in a total taxable value of \$11,644,794 for tax



year 2024-25. 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.

**24-080E      PARCEL NO. 015-291-09 – MAIDSTONE ASSOCIATES –**  
**HEARING NO. 24-0036**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 900 E Plumb Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Property Summary, photographs, maps, sales comparables, and cost analysis, 49 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, rent survey table, vacancy rate analysis, CAP rate analysis table, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and automobile showroom and service repair garage valuations, 24 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Wendy Jauregui-Jackins, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. She stated the hearing evidence packet (HEP) contained a sales comparison approach analysis and an income approach to value analysis, both of which supported the Assessor's taxable value and confirmed the property did not exceed market value. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 015-291-09, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member George, 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.

**24-081E**      **PARCEL NO. 015-301-36 – LITHIA REAL ESTATE INC –**  
**HEARING NO. 24-0037A**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2270 Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Value Summary, assessed value breakdown, maps, photographs, cost analysis, and supporting materials, 35 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, rent survey table, vacancy rate analysis, CAP rate analysis table, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and automobile showroom and service repair garage valuations, 30 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Wendy Jauregui-Jackins, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. She reviewed page 1 of the hearing evidence packet (HEP). She informed the petitioner sent the Assessor's Office packets, which were essentially a cost approach analysis. The values included in the HEPs were based on the Assessor's Office's cost approach to value with all the building attributes. She noted there was minimal information for the parcels she was responsible for valuing, which were related to hearing numbers 24-0037A and 24-0037B through 24-0039. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant observed there was sufficient information and analysis provided in the HEPs that supported the valuations.

With regard to Parcel No. 015-301-36, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion

duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year. The Assessor's Office recommended that the total taxable value be upheld.

**24-082E      PARCEL NO. 015-301-38 – LITHIA REAL ESTATE INC –  
HEARING NO. 24-0037B**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 657 E Grove Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Value Summary, assessed value breakdown, maps, photographs, cost analysis, and supporting materials, 35 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, rent survey table, vacancy rate analysis, CAP rate analysis table, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and automobile showroom and service repair garage valuations, 30 pages.

Exhibit II: Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Wendy Jauregui-Jackins, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 015-301-38, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**24-083E      PARCEL NO. 015-303-14 – LITHIA REAL ESTATE INC –  
HEARING NO. 24-0038**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2620 Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Value Summary, maps, photographs, cost analysis, land sales comparables, and supporting materials, 33 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, rent survey table, vacancy rate analysis, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and automobile showroom and service repair garage valuations, 26 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Wendy Jauregui-Jackins, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 015-303-14, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**24-084E      PARCEL NO. 034-021-48 – LITHIA REAL ESTATE INC –**  
**HEARING NO. 24-0039**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1825 Freeport Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Value Summary, maps, cost analysis, and comparable sales, 12 pages.

**Assessor**

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

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.  
No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Wendy Jauregui-Jackins, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 034-021-48, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**24-085E      PARCEL NO. 032-302-58 – CASHMAN EQUIPMENT COMPANY  
LLC – HEARING NO. 24-0040**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 401 Dermody Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Value Summary, maps, photographs, cost analysis, land sales comparables, and calculated property value, 19 pages.

**Assessor**

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

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Al Holwill, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He stated the hearing evidence packet (HEP) contained a sales comparison approach that supported the

Assessor's Office's determination that the taxable value did not exceed full cash value. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Mr. Holwill mentioned the Petitioner provided additional information, including land sales (LS); however, they were inferior in location and various other attributes. He added the LS located in the HEP were from the immediate area of the subject property and supported the value.

With regard to Parcel No. 032-302-58, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member George, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**24-086E      PARCEL NO. 032-312-41 – CASHMAN EQUIPMENT COMPANY  
LLC – HEARING NO. 24-0041**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 620 Glendale Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Value Summary, maps, photographs, sales comparables, cost analysis, and supporting materials, 58 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales; CAP rate and lease comparables; market CAP rate and vacancy rate charts; maps; subject's appraisal records; photographs; and industrial engineering building, service repair garage, industrial light manufacturing, storage warehouse, and equipment building valuations, 65 pages.

Exhibit II: Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Al Holwill, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He indicated the hearing evidence packet (HEP) contained a sales comparison approach and an income comparison approach, both of which showed the taxable value did not exceed full cash

value. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value. Appraiser Holwill added the Petitioner provided a packet that included inferior land sales (LS), inferior locations, and a generic cost approach. The cost approach only included the base cost value for one of the buildings. He stated approximately 100,000 square feet were excluded from the building in the Petitioner's cost approach, so the value proposed by the Petitioner was incorrect. He mentioned the LS and locations included in the HEP were within the main City of Reno area.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant expressed satisfaction with the information supporting the Assessor's Office's valuation.

With regard to Parcel No. 032-312-41, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Pierce, 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.

**24-087E      PARCEL NO. 034-341-24 – ICON RENO PROPERTY OWNER**  
**POOL 3 NEVADA LLC – HEARING NO. 24-0042**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 605 Glendale Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Value Summary, maps, photographs, land sales comparables, calculated value, and supporting materials, 24 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, industrial rent and industrial CAM comparables, vacancy rate chart, industrial CAP rate survey table, supermarket sales trends, maps, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and industrial flex building valuation, 24 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jeff Cronin, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He indicated the hearing evidence packet (HEP) contained a sales comparison approach and an income approach to value, and both supported the total taxable value not exceeding the market value. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 034-341-24, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member George, 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.

**24-088E      PARCEL NO. 034-342-15 – 155 JC GLENDALE LLC – HEARING NO. 24-0043**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 155 Glendale Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, industrial flex rents table, industrial flex CAM chart, vacancy rate chart, industrial flex CAP rate chart, supermarket sales trends, market CAP rate chart, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and industrial flex building valuation, 26 pages.

Exhibit II: Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jeff Cronin, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He indicated aerial images were located on pages 16 and 18 of the hearing evidence packet (HEP). Additionally, the HEP included a sales comparison approach and an income approach to value.

There was no response to the call for public comment.



Vice Chair Bonnenfant noted the Assessor's Office provided an analysis that supported the value, and she supported upholding it.

Member George commented that the value determined by the Assessor's Office was substantially lower than the comparisons when referring to the sales and income approaches. He remarked that the property had some characteristics that indicated it had less value. Appraiser Cronin clarified the taxable value was often below market value, and the values for commercial and industrial real estate had increased substantially.

With regard to Parcel No. 034-342-15, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member George, seconded by Member Pierce, 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.

**24-089E      PARCEL NO. 040-162-78 – TEDDY BEAR HAVAS MOTORS INC – HEARING NO. 24-0044**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 7063 S Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Value Summary, maps, photographs, cost analysis, and supporting materials, 14 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, CAP rate analysis table, rent survey table, vacancy rate analysis, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and automobile showroom and automotive center valuations, 26 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Harley Maughan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. She indicated maps and photographs of the subject property were located on pages 12 through 15 of the hearing evidence packet (HEP). The sales comparison approach and the income approach were provided in the HEP, which supported the total taxable value of the subject and did not exceed full cash value. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value of \$3,040,000, or \$154 per square foot. Appraiser Maughan noted

the improvement value currently had a downward adjustment of \$570,000 for obsolescence.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant believed the Assessor's Office's analysis supported the current value. Member Pierce agreed with Vice Chair Bonnenfant's feedback.

With regard to Parcel No. 040-162-78, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

Member George asked if the Assessor's Office had contacted the Petitioner, and Appraiser Maughan said she had not received a response to an email she sent to the Petitioner.

**24-090E      PARCEL NO. 163-160-06 – FINDLAY-SHACK PROPERTIES LLC**  
**– HEARING NO. 24-0046**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 9200 S Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Value Summary, maps, photographs, sales comparables, calculated value, and supporting materials, 47 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, CAP rate discussion, rent survey table, maps, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and office building and material storage building valuations, 24 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Ken Johns, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He noted Assessor's parcel numbers (APNs) 163-160-06, 163-160-08, 163-160-13, 163-160-14, and

163-160-15 comprised a five-parcel package. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the taxable values for all five parcels. Appraiser Johns stated an analysis was conducted of the land for the two vacant parcels. The Assessor's Office believed the taxable value was supported by the comparables.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant stated the Board was provided with sufficient analysis of the sales and the income approaches for each parcel, and she believed the standards for upholding the taxable values were satisfied.

Member Pierce agreed with the Assessor's Office's assessment.

With regard to Parcel No. 163-160-06, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**24-091E      PARCEL NO. 163-160-08 – FINDLAY-SHACK PROPERTIES LLC  
– HEARING NO. 24-0047**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 150 Gallian 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, subject's appraisal records, letter from appraiser, and photographs, 11 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 163-160-08, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**24-092E      PARCEL NO. 163-160-13 – FINDLAY-SHACK PROPERTIES LLC**  
**– HEARING NO. 24-0048A**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 9150 S Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Property Summary, Assessed Value Breakdown, maps, sales comparables, cost analysis, and supporting materials, 43 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, income approach discussion, rent survey table, value conclusions, subject's appraisal records, a letter, photographs, automobile showroom and service repair garage valuations, 43 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 163-160-13, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**24-093E**      **PARCEL NO. 163-160-14 – FINDLAY-SHACK PROPERTIES LLC**  
**– HEARING NO. 24-0048B**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 9190 S Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Property Summary, Assessed Value Breakdown, maps, sales comparables, cost analysis, and supporting materials, 43 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, income approach discussion, rent survey table, value conclusions, subject's appraisal records, a letter, photographs, and automobile showroom and service repair garage valuations, 43 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 163-160-14, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**24-094E**      **PARCEL NO. 163-160-15 – FINDLAY-SHACK PROPERTIES LLC**  
**– HEARING NO. 24-0049**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 152 Gallian 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, letter from appraiser, subject's appraisal records, and photographs, 11 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 163-160-15, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**24-095E      PARCEL NO. 034-257-20 – PARAGON INDUSTRIES II INC – HEARING NO. 24-0064**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 535 E Glendale Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, in.-line warehouse and office rents, storage warehouse CAM chart, industrial market report, CAP rate analysis chart, industrial flex/storage warehouse OER chart, supermarket sales trends, maps, subject's appraisal records, photographs, storage warehouse and office building valuations, and a letter, 24 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Sean Moses, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He reviewed page 3 of the hearing evidence packet (HEP). He indicated the HEP contained an income comparison approach and a sales comparison approach to value. He stated the taxable value did not exceed market value, and the Assessor's Office recommended upholding it.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant noted the analysis of the sales and income approaches were provided to support the existing value. She observed the two approaches resulted in an amount that was significantly higher than the existing value, so she supported upholding it.

With regard to Parcel No. 034-257-20, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member George, 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.

**24-096E      PARCEL NO. 164-333-02 – PARAGON INDUSTRIES II INC – HEARING NO. 24-0065**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6970 Longley Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Value Summary, maps, photographs, cost analysis, land sales comparables, calculated value, and supporting materials, 26 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, in-line industrial flex and storage warehouse rents tables, 2023 industrial market reports, industrial flex and storage warehouse CAP rates tables, supermarket sales trends, maps, subject's appraisal records, photographs, industrial flex building and storage warehouse valuations, and letter from appraiser, 21 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Nevada Department of Taxation letter, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Sean Moses, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He reviewed page 1 of the hearing evidence packet (HEP). He mentioned the HEP contained an income comparison approach and a sales comparison approach to value. He concluded the taxable value did not exceed market value. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value. Appraiser Moses noted the Petitioner's cost analysis was not comparable to the Assessor's Office's Marshall and Swift costing approach. Additionally, the Petitioner's land sales (LS) were not comparable to the subject. He referenced LS, located on page 2 of the HEP, which were used to support the value of the subject property. Appraiser Moses stated no weight was given to the Petitioner's cost method or LS.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant noted the Board reviewed the HEP, which included an analysis of local and Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) appropriate methods. She supported upholding the taxable value.

With regard to Parcel No. 164-333-02, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Pierce, seconded by Member Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**24-097E      PARCEL NO. 037-031-06 – LOWE'S HIW INC – HEARING NO. 24-0076**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1355 Scheels Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Property summary with photo, income analysis, comparables, investor survey, and supporting documentation, 27 pages.

**Assessor**

**Exhibit I:** Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, retail capitalization rate chart, big box store rent survey table, national freestanding sales table, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and warehouse discount store valuation, 39 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Corrected income approach page, 1 page.



No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jeff Lewis, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He referenced page 3 of the hearing evidence packet (HEP). He informed an analysis was completed on the property prior to receiving the petition, and the analysis compared the total taxable value to market value. The Assessor's Office determined the subject property was over market value, so \$1,484,232 of obsolescence was applied, resulting in a total taxable value of \$15,200,000. Appraiser Lewis indicated a sales comparison approach and an income comparison approach were included in the HEP, and both approaches supported the total taxable value. The Assessor's Office recommended upholding the total taxable value. He addressed the Petitioner's income approach, stating that most of the data that was used was obtained outside of the City of Reno/Washoe County market. He added the Petitioner used an investor survey to calculate the capitalization rate (CR) of 8 percent. Appraiser Lewis noted the Petitioner included some sales to support the CR, one of which was located in Henderson, and another was a partial sale for a 41 percent ownership in Damonte Ranch. He stated buying a 41 percent ownership was riskier; therefore, it had a much higher CR. Another sale that was used was a vacant property located in a distressed area of Carson City. It was vacant since at least 2018, so it would have had a higher CR. Appraiser Lewis said the Petitioner's lease comparison, Flooring Liquidators, was located on Northtowne Lane in the City of Reno. He added it was a second generation. It was also vacant and located in a somewhat distressed area. He stated the second comparison used by the Petitioner was a Burlington Coat Factory located in Las Vegas, which was a different market, and he did not attribute significance to the rents or CR derived outside of the County's market. Appraiser Lewis explained the Petitioner was using a rate of \$7 per square foot per month, which equated to \$0.50 and was significantly low according to the Assessor's Office's data.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant supported the Assessor's Office's response to the Petitioner's evidence. She noted the Board did not give much importance to out-of-area information, especially from Las Vegas.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-031-06, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Pierce, 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.

**24-098E      PARCEL NO. 040-951-08 – RS EAGLE FEDERAL WAY LLC /  
PACIFIC WEST HOTELS INC – HEARING NO. 24-0077**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5075 Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Property summary with photo, income analysis, comparables, investor survey, and supporting documentation, 27 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, retail capitalization rate chart, rent survey table, national freestanding sales table, subject's appraisal records, photographs, and material storage building and discount warehouse store valuations, 37 pages.

Exhibit II: Photographs, 4 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jeff Lewis, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He reviewed page 3 of the hearing evidence packet (HEP). He indicated a sales comparison and an income analysis were prepared and provided in the HEP. He stated both approaches to value supported the total taxable value, and the Assessor's Office recommended upholding it. He stated the income approach and additional data provided by the Petitioner were the same as the those supplied for hearing number 24-0076. Appraiser Lewis mentioned the Assessor's Office did not give much weight to the capitalization rates (CR) used by the Petitioner, which were based in Las Vegas. The Assessor's Office used local data for its analysis of the property. Additionally, the Assessor's Office's analysis supported the total taxable value.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant supported upholding the taxable value based on the evidence provided.

With regard to Parcel No. 040-951-08, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member George, seconded by Member Pierce, 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.

**24-099E ROLL CHANGE REQUEST – PERSONAL PROPERTY ACCOUNTS**

**DECREASE** – consideration of and action to approve or deny RCR No. 1 for Personal Property Accounts (RCR 1-1 THROUGH 1-22) based on incorrect assessments for fiscal years 2020/2021, 2021/2022, 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 due to clerical errors, reporting errors, business closures and assets located outside of Washoe County.

<b>Assessor’s Parcel No.</b>	<b>Property Owner</b>	<b>RCR No.</b>
5101364	GARRARD, MARK E	1-1
3121548	TUTTLE, CYNTHIA L	1-2
3121548	TUTTLE, CYNTHIA L	1-3
3200168	HERNANDEZ, EMILIA	1-4
2105085	INTEGRITY SERVICE INTERNATIONAL INC	1-5
2005710	RITA A CARLSON PSY D PLLC	1-6
2130452	TAHOE GIFTING CO	1-7
2007100	WELK RESORTS/SOLEIL	1-8
2129858	AMERIFIRST HOME	1-9
2006858	MARICHUYS TEQUILERIA	1-10
2229746	THE FIX	1-11
2005719	MAID BRIGADE OF NORTHERN NEVADA	1-12
2304129	TAHOE EQUIPMENT COMPANY LLC	1-13
2209444	S TILE	1-14
2005908	AERUS ELECTROLUX RENO	1-15
2680630	BAILE AEROBICS CON MATY	1-16
2680630	BAILE AEROBICS CON MATY	1-17
2680630	BAILE AEROBICS CON MATY	1-18
2680630	BAILE AEROBICS CON MATY	1-19
2212474	PORT OF SUBS #216	1-20
2121764	REDHORSE CORPORATION	1-21
2020005	PLUMAS RENTALS	1-22

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Ainsworth, seconded by Member Pierce, which motion duly carried, it was ordered to approve the recommendation of the Assessor’s Office to decrease the values for RCR Nos. 1-1 through 1-22. With those adjustments, it

was found that the subject properties were valued correctly, and the total taxable value did not exceed full cash value.

**24-100E      BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

There were no Board member comments.

**24-101E      PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

**11:16 a.m.**      There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

---

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

ATTEST:

---

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

*Minutes prepared by  
Danielle Howard, Deputy County Clerk*