

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

FRIDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 5, 2010

PRESENT:

James Covert, Chairperson
John Krolick, Vice Chairperson
Benjamin Green, Member
James Brown, Member
Philip Horan, Alternate Member

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

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

WITHDRAWN PETITIONS

The following petitions scheduled on today's agenda had been withdrawn from the agenda:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
050-550-12	KAUFFMANN, DYKE	10-0792C
050-550-14	KAUFFMANN, DYKE	10-0792D
050-550-15	KAUFFMANN, DYKE	10-0792E
077-440-06	LEGGE, THEODORE	10-0847
013-371-27	VALLEY TECH INVESTING	10-0580
088-202-13	ALT, JOSEPH L	10-0717

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE

Based on a request received for continuance, Chairman Covert requested the representative for One Four Eight Five Five Pyramid Way Land Trust, Hearing No. 10-0567 be contacted to verify if either February 25th or 26th would be convenient.

Chairman Covert requested the Assessor's Office explain the well valuation changes to any petitioners present that were protesting the value of their wells. Ron Sauer, Chief Appraiser, indicated one petitioner was present and an adjustment for that property was being calculated and would be presented to the property owner.

10-0217E PARCEL NO. 018-292-25 – LOGAN FAMILY TRUST
HEARING NO. 10-0755

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land located at 3275 Lapwing Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Paired sales, 24 pages.

Exhibit B: Map, 1 page.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Map, 1 page.

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

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

Mr. Logan stated he was contesting the view assessment for the subject property and requested consideration for the easement amendment to the property. He reviewed the paired city views assembled within Exhibit A and stated he arrived at different results than presented in the Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet (HEP). Mr. Logan said the sales data for the County during 2007, 2008 and 2009 indicated that during 2007, 2 percent of the sales listed were foreclosures; in 2008, 20 percent were foreclosures, and, in 2009, 39 percent listed on the sales data were foreclosures. He remarked to state that foreclosures were not a valid component of values was ignoring the reality of the market.

Mr. Logan said he was informed that the size of the lot and the size of the easement on the subject property did not qualify for relief. He explained the easement was an access easement for the adjacent property owners.

Appraiser Lambert reviewed the comparable sales which represented the most recent sales in the area. She said based upon the comparable sales the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in the County. Appraiser Lambert stated the paired sales analysis was located in the HEP and reviewed that data. She said County maps noted all of the easements in this subdivision were for utilities; however, there was a dotted line on the back of the subject property and, if that was an easement, it would be a secondary access since there was a fence. Appraiser Lambert said if the square footage of the easement was

taken and subtracted from the total square footage of the property it would still be within the base lot square footage. She said after base lot adjustments, 11,151 square feet to 20,909 square feet were an average size lot for this subdivision.

Chairman Covert asked if the Petitioner had a panoramic view of the City. Appraiser Lambert stated all of the lights of the City could be seen from the main living area. Chairman Covert remarked the easement had to be recorded and whether used or not an easement was an impairment to a piece of property.

Mr. Logan said page 18 of Exhibit A indicated that the easement was recorded, and page 17 outlined the subject property that noted an adjacent property also had an access easement. Appraiser Lambert remarked the recorded document stated that the easements in the subdivision were for public utilities. Chairman Covert said noted on evidence from the Petitioner, the grant of easement was for secondary access. Appraiser Lambert remarked that was not the one that was recorded. Member Green read page 19 from Petitioner's Exhibit A, which explained the type and function of the easement in question. Chairman Covert said there were restrictions based on that explanation; however, he was uncomfortable with any restrictions on the use of a property and believed that would be a detriment to that property.

In rebuttal, Mr. Logan said he took exception to the panoramic view position of the County because trees limited the view. He said his argument was that in this market a view did not have a strong impact and asked that be considered.

Member Green said for this subdivision the view properties were all view protected and noted the subject property had a good view. He noted even in the current market, a view did add value. Member Green disagreed that the easement impacted the property, but based on the view specification recommended a reduction.

With regard to Parcel No. 018-292-25, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Green, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$141,900 and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$409,144 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0218E PARCEL NO. 020-313-29 – SHIRLEY A MAZOLEWSKI TRUSTEE
HEARING NO. 10-0764

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1230-32 Virbel Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 11 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Ms. Mazolewski stated the assessed value on the subject had raised and felt the value should decrease. She remarked the surrounding area had deteriorated making it difficult to rent the property.

Chairman Covert commented the current taxable value of \$75,595 was below market value. Ms. Mazolewski agreed; however, felt that was still high and should be reduced.

Appraiser Bozman reviewed the comparable sales and upon review stated the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in the County. Chairman Covert asked if the recent sale prices reflected the depreciation of the neighborhood. Appraiser Bozman stated that was correct.

In rebuttal, Ms. Mazolewski reiterated that the neighborhood had deteriorated and felt the taxes were too high.

With regard to Parcel No. 020-313-29, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0219E PARCEL NO. 013-114-20 – SHIRLEY A MAZOLEWSKI TRUSTEE
HEARING NO. 10-0767

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 340 Cheney Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 14 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, Shirley Mazolewski was present and previously sworn.

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

Ms. Mazolewski commented the assessment increased rather than decreased. She said sidewalks had been replaced in front of the building that now allowed water to remain standing on the sidewalk, making it difficult for prospective tenants to have access.

Appraiser Bozman said the subject property was an eight-unit multifamily structure. He reviewed the comparable sales and upon review stated the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in the County.

Chairman Covert inquired on the increase of the assessment for the land value. Appraiser Bozman reminded the Board about the 15 percent County-wide reduction that occurred last year. He explained this year the sales were analyzed, which justified the 25 percent allocation as shown, culminating in the new land value.

In rebuttal, Ms. Mazolewski said all of the property values in the area had decreased and noted three of the units were empty. Chairman Covert explained last year an appraisal was conducted where land values were reduced by 15 percent. He said this year each individual property was reviewed and comparable sales used to determine the value.

With regard to Parcel No. 013-114-20, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0220E **PARCEL NO. 049-752-12– POLIKALAS, STEVEN T**
HEARING NO. 10-0720

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land located at 6445 Legend Vista, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 13 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Listing for January 29, 2010, 2 pages.

Exhibit III: Listing for February 2, 2010, 2 pages.

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

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

Mr. Polikalas said the subject property was located off the Mt. Rose Highway in a subdivision that had gone bust. He said every lot was either owned by the developer or in foreclosure. He indicated the subject lot had been on the market since May 2007 and felt the assessment could not keep up with the fair market value because of the decline in the market. Mr. Polikalas explained there was no community, amenities, or landscaping just large empty lots with a lack of marketability. He said he reviewed comparable sales located in the Montreux area, which were smaller lots, but that subdivision had a number of upgraded amenities. Mr. Polikalas said the reality of the current real estate market indicated there was no market for vacant lot sales, particularly in this subdivision.

Appraiser Anacker reviewed the comparable sales and upon review stated the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in the County.

Member Brown said there were no actual sales, just listings, in the subdivision of the subject property. Appraiser Anacker indicated there was one foreclosed home sale.

In rebuttal, Mr. Polikalas felt it was not an appropriate analysis to review. In terms of the marketability, there was no established community and felt that should decrease the taxable valuation.

Member Green said the Petitioner gave the Board a copy of a listing which was the subject property. Mr. Polikalas clarified that listing came from the Appraiser, but confirmed it was the subject property. Member Green said the date showed January 29, 2010 as the most recent reduction and indicated a list price of \$399,000. Appraiser Anacker explained that flyer was posted on the subject property on January 29, 2010. Mr. Polikalas said the property was listed through Dickson Realty and had been reduced in price since 2007. He added there had never been any inquiries to purchase the lot. Member Green said the Petitioner originally purchased the lot for \$475,000 and understood the consternation since the price reduced so drastically. However, if the Petitioner were so desperate to sell, he felt the price could be adjusted to show that intention. Mr. Polikalas said there could be taxable consequences and a forgiveness of debt associated. He said at the present time there were no refinancing options available for lots. Member Green asked what the Petitioner thought would be a fair taxable value. Mr. Polikalas replied when he filed the appeal he placed \$120,000 as a recommended taxable value.

Member Horan asked if the current listing was \$199,000. Mr. Polikalas stated that was correct and he would accept \$199,000.

Chairman Covert commented he did not think the subject property was comparable to Montreux and noted the Arrowcreek subdivision currently had a tremendous amount of legal issues that affected the ability to sell those parcels.

Member Krolick said the motion should indicate that under oath the Petitioner stated he would sell the property for \$199,000, which was not based on comparable sales.

With regard to Parcel No. 049-752-12, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$199,000 resulting in a total taxable value of \$199,000 for tax year 2010/11. 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. It was noted that the Petitioner agreed under oath to sell the property for \$199,000, which was not based on comparable sales.

10-0221E PARCEL NO. 082-493-01– LANCASTER APARTMENTS LLC
HEARING NO. 10-0547A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at Lancaster Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, Steven Polikalas was present and previously sworn.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Michael Bozman, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced in the form of economic obsolescence and noted the Petitioner was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 082-493-01, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$368,600, resulting in a total taxable value of \$465,000 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0222E PARCEL NO. 082-493-02 – LANCASTER APARTMENTS LLC
HEARING NO. 10-0547B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at Lancaster Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, Steven Polikalas was present and previously sworn.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Michael Bozman, Appraiser III, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced in the form of economic obsolescence and noted the Petitioner was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 082-493-02, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$368,600, resulting in a total taxable value of \$465,000 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

Mr. Polikalas requested a continuance for a hearing scheduled for a future date. Josh Wilson, Assessor, stated the next available day for continuance was February 25, 2010 and would oblige the Petitioner with that request.

10-0223E PARCEL NO. 050-351-11- KAUFFMANN, DYKE –
HEARING NO. 10-0792A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4320 Eastlake Blvd., Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

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

Mr. Kauffmann stated he did not agree with the comparable sales that were used and felt the valuation had changed drastically in the seven years since the property had been purchased. He noted the assessment had increased since the previous year. He said it would be difficult to find a comparable because there was not "of like kind" to compare the property and indicated there were no water rights associated with the property.

Appraiser Stafford stated the subject parcel was 152 acres with a moderate slope to topography. She said since there were no comparable sales in the neighborhood, sales were located outside of the neighborhood. Appraiser Stafford commented \$1,000 an acre value was placed on the parcel, which was the same value placed on open-space,

wherever that open-space may be located. Appraiser Stafford stated the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in the County. Member Krolick did not agree with that reasoning. He said property should not be valued in the middle of the desert at \$1,000 an acre.

Ron Sauer, Chief Appraiser, explained the open-space value was \$1,000 an acre as a token value since there were no sales of open-space parcels. He said that amount was the lowest acre value on hillside moderate property. Josh Wilson, Assessor, further explained \$1,000 an acre was not the value in the area of Vya. He said the \$1,000 an acre would be closer to town.

In rebuttal, Mr. Kauffmann felt that the valuation for the type of land had increased more than applicable.

Member Green said in reviewing the past valuations on the subject property he noticed that the value in 2006 was \$87,000; the value in 2007 was \$101,000, the value in 2008 was \$375,000 and the value in 2009 was reduced to \$129,200. He asked if the Petitioner appeared before the Board in 2008 to lower the value. Mr. Kauffmann replied he did not. After speaking to the Assessor's Office, he was told that did not matter because the tax amount did not increase and felt he would attend to that in the future. Member Green was concerned that the property was now worth \$1,000 an acre because he did not have evidence to substantiate that value. He suggested placing the value back to the 2009 value of \$129,000.

Member Krolick said in 2006 there was a value of \$87,000 and asked if the property was worth more in 2006 than it was today. Appraiser Stafford stated she did not have any comparables from 2006, but in 2009 the 15 percent County-wide reduction occurred.

Chairman Covert felt there was no evidence to make a decision. Member Krolick said the property had decreased substantially since 2006 so there was no justification to increase it from 2006. Herb Kaplan, Legal Counsel, noted it was the Petitioner's burden to show that the Assessor's value was inappropriate. Chairman Covert agreed the Petitioner had to prove that the value was less than was assessed.

Member Green stated the area where the subject property was located was expanding and, in time, there would be some value to the property. He said since the burden was on the Petitioner the opinion of Legal Counsel tied the hands of the Board. Member Krolick asked if the parcel was sub-dividable. Appraiser Stafford stated the property was zoned General Rural (GR). Member Krolick felt a reduction was needed.

In response to Member Krolick, Mr. Kauffmann replied the property was purchased for \$325,000 and comprised of three parcels.

With regard to Parcel No. 050-351-11, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the

Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried with Member Krolick voting "no," it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

10-0224E PARCEL NO. 050-550-10 – KAUFFMANN, DYKE –
HEARING NO. 10-0792B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4320 Eastlake Blvd, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, Dyke Kauffmann was present and previously sworn.

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

Mr. Kauffmann said the taxable value on the property was \$107,000 and felt this property should be decreased in value because of the shape of the lot and poor access.

Appraiser Stafford reviewed the comparable sales and upon review stated the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in the County.

Chairman Covert indicated there was a minus 5 percent reduction because the property was located in a flood zone. Appraiser Stafford concurred. Mr. Kauffmann confirmed a creek was located in the back of the property.

Member Green asked if the lot was sub-dividable. Mr. Kauffmann indicated the property in the area was zoned for one-acre, but nothing could be split under five-acres unless there was a sewer plan in place. He said the property did not have street frontage and noted there was an easement that provided access.

Mr. Kauffmann was requesting the same land value as was placed on another of his parcels.

Appraiser Stafford explained the difference between the subject property and the property that the Petitioner referenced was size; however, both received a minus 5 percent reduction. Ron Sauer, Chief Appraiser, explained Hearing No. 10-0792C had a base lot value of \$105,000 with a 5 percent downward adjustment for traffic, had street frontage, and was 4.55 acres. He said this parcel had a base lot value of \$112,500, a minus 5 percent adjustment for the flood zone, no street frontage and was 5.9 acres. Chairman Covert clarified then the base lot difference was due to the size of the properties.

With regard to Parcel No. 050-550-10, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 Green voting "no," it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0225E PARCEL NOS. 050-550-12, 14 AND 15– KAUFFMANN, DYKE – HEARING NOS. 10-0792C, D AND E

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4320 Eastlake Blvd., Washoe County, Nevada.

**The Petitioner, Dyke Kauffmann,
requested Hearing Nos. 10-0792C, D and E
be withdrawn from the agenda.**

10:50 a.m. The Board recessed.

11:00 a.m. The Board returned.

10-0226E PARCEL NO. 020-231-14 – VALLEY TECH INVESTMENT GR LLC – HEARING NO. 10-0558

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3245 Neil Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

**The Petitioner, Margaret Mazolewski, requested
Hearing No. 10-0558 be rescheduled.**

Following discussion, it was determined that Hearing No. 10-0558 would be rescheduled to February 25, 2010 and no new noticing would be needed.

**10-0227E PARCEL NO. 013-371-27 – VALLEY TECH INVESTING –
HEARING NO. 10-0580**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 420 Vassar Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

**The Petitioner, Margaret Mazolewski, requested
Hearing No. 10-0580 be withdrawn
from the agenda.**

**10-0228E PARCEL NO. 081-031-16 – VALLEY TECH INVESTMENTS
GROUP LLC – HEARING NO. 10-0581**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 111 Mer Mac Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

**The Petitioner, Margaret Mazolewski, requested
Hearing No. 10-0581 be rescheduled.**

Following discussion, it was determined that Hearing No. 10-0581 would be rescheduled to February 25, 2010 and no new noticing would be needed.

**10-0229E PARCEL NO. 013-371-26 – VALLEY TECH INVESTMENTS
GROUP LLC – HEARING NO. 10-0579**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 418 Vassar Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Property profile, tract and comparable sales, 4 pages.

Exhibit B: Property information, 3 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subjects appraisal records, 16 pages.

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

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

Ms. Mazolewski explained two of the units were livable; however, one unit was not livable and had not been rented for three years. Due to the condition of the property, she requested an assessed improvement value of \$56,036 as opposed to the \$84,055 currently assessed on the parcel.

Appraiser Bozman reviewed the comparable sales and upon review stated the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in the County. He remarked he was unaware that one unit was not rentable and would need to inspect the property in order to see if a reduction was warranted. Chairman Covert asked if the Appraiser could meet with the Petitioner. Appraiser Bozman said if the Petitioner stated the unit was not rentable, he had no reason to doubt that statement and, if so, based on an income approach the property would be valued lower. However, based on the sales comparison approach it would not. Chairman Covert asked how the determination could be made.

Josh Wilson, Assessor, said an alternative was to arrange for an interior inspection to review the components rendering the property unrentable and adjust the building cost based on the inspection. He said since it would be a factual error the roll could be reopened. Chairman Covert clarified that the Board could make a decision, but that could be adjusted on a future inspection. Mr. Wilson stated an adjustment would be made if there was an error in the calculation of the square footage.

Member Green asked for a description of the units. Ms. Mazolewski explained the square footage of the units and the condition of the unrentable unit. Member Green suggested because of the unrentable unit some relief should be given to the Petitioner.

Chairman Covert asked if there was a distinction for unit value between a one bedroom and a two bedroom unit. Appraiser Bozman indicated that was determined by rental units.

Member Horan suggested an interior inspection be completed and, if an adjustment needed to be done, it would be remedied as a factual error through a roll change request. Mr. Wilson commented because of the property being a fully depreciated 1940's building the adjustment would be unknown.

With regard to Parcel No. 013-371-26, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable. It was noted that the Petitioner and the Assessor's Office agreed to verify facts on the property and make any adjustments if necessary.

10-0230E PARCEL NO. 200-052-08 – JIMENEZ, YVONNE –
HEARING NO. 10-0351

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1411 Plainview Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 7 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Ms. Jimenez said she was appealing the value of the home because with the depreciation of the neighborhood, 50 percent of the value had been lost on the subject property. She indicated many homes in the area were foreclosed.

Appraiser Sutherland reviewed the comparable sales and upon review stated the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in the County.

In rebuttal, Ms. Jimenez reiterated her comments and disagreed with the comparable sales.

Member Green reviewed the improved sales brought by the Assessor's Office and agreed with the comparable sales used. He said the current conditions were unfortunate, but the Board dealt with the numbers and did not see anything that would substantiate lowering the value of the property.

With regard to Parcel No. 200-052-08, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0231E PARCEL NO. 212-079-16 – SPANIOL, DENNIS J –
HEARING NO. 10-0742

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6850 Sharlands Ave., No. J-2055, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 1 page.

Assessor

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

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

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

Mr. Spaniol stated he purchased the subject property on December 9, 2009 for \$67,500 and noted that the sale was a fair market transaction. He discussed comparable sales for the complex for the last four months of 2009 and commented the low-end was \$79,900 and the high-end was \$109,000. Mr. Spaniol said of the nine comparable sales that he provided; seven were for \$90,000 or less. He said after speaking with the Assessor's Office, he learned that sales were dropping by 3.5 percent a month.

Appraiser Sutherland reviewed the comparable sales and upon review stated the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in the County. She commented the sales through December 31, 2009 were utilized; however, the recent sale of the subject was not considered in the analysis. Chairman Covert asked if the current sale was considered market value for the property. Appraiser Sutherland indicated it was a bank-owned property. Chairman Covert restated his question if the sale was considered an arms-length transaction and was it a fair market value of the property. Appraiser Sutherland explained the sale was not considered.

Member Green said the Petitioner referenced nine sales with seven of those selling for less than \$90,000. He asked if any of those sales were used for the comparable sales. Appraiser Sutherland said she had a sales analysis with sales all similar units to the subject, and noted five of those were over \$90,000.

Josh Wilson, Assessor, said if the Petitioner would provide parcel numbers for the sales that were below \$90,000, it could be determined if they occurred after the January 1, 2010 deadline.

Mr. Spaniol stated he had a comparable sale with a closing date of November 12, 2009 that sold for \$79,900; another closed on December 14, 2009 for \$84,000 and another sale occurred on December 5, 2009 that sold for \$79,900. He noted those were all similar units to the subject property.

Member Horan said the comparable sales provided by the Petitioner supplied a diverse range and were either short-sales or bank-owned; however, did support a lower valuation. Member Krolick said in this situation, that was the market and, if the Petitioner attempted to sell the property, that property would be competing against short-sales and the bank-owned properties.

With regard to Parcel No. 212-079-16, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$54,800, resulting in a total taxable value of \$80,000 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0232E PARCEL NO. 011-315-06 – HUMBOLDT LLC –
HEARING NO. 10-0221

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 975 Humboldt Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Summary of Salient Facts, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, Charles Christianson and Larry Haskell, were sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Mr. Haskell reviewed the Summary of Salient Facts and commented the land value had increased from 2009. He said after reviewing the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office in the HEP, he felt those comparable sales proved that the value was incorrect. Mr. Haskell disagreed with the taxable value placed on the square footage and said the comparable sales provided by the Petitioner were from 2009, bank-owned, but on the market and good sales. He said he also found eight MLS listings with a range on the market of 175 days to as long as 658 days. Mr. Christianson indicated five of those eight current listings were either short-sales or foreclosures which were what the subject property, if placed on the market, would be up against.

Appraiser Bozman stated there were no sales within the neighborhood of the subject property. He said the comparable sales were in a competing neighborhood with similar properties, but inferior to the subject neighborhood. He reviewed the comparable sales and upon review stated the taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in the County. Appraiser Bozman explained the comparable sales provided by the Petitioner were in inferior neighborhoods.

Member Green commented last year the land value was listed as \$59,500 and asked if that was due to the 15 percent County-wide reduction. Appraiser Bozman stated that was correct; however, each year was individual. He said the sales were analyzed for similar units. Member Green remarked it may be best to review properties on an income approach for some values. Appraiser Bozman said the information needed to be provided by the Petitioner to the Assessor's Office.

In rebuttal, Mr. Haskell believed the comparable sales he provided were in similar neighborhoods as the comparable sales provided by the Assessor's Office; however, the Petitioner comparables were newer units.

Member Green stated the location of the rental units did make a difference in determining how much rent was generated and how long the units remained vacant.

Member Krolick asked if the Petitioner felt it would be beneficial to use an income approach to value the property. Mr. Christianson replied if the market data was used to reflect the market then it would be beneficial.

Mr. Haskell said he was in disagreement with the taxable value used for the square footage. Appraiser Bozman explained the sales prices run differently. He said the age of the structure and the amenities would show a lower taxable value per square foot, which was based on the *Marshall and Swift Cost Manual*.

Chairman Covert agreed that two of the comparable sales were lower than the taxable value and felt some adjustment was needed.

Member Krolick said the comparables were a fair market value. He asked if the owner would be willing to sell the unit for \$272,726. Mr. Haskell did not know if the owner would consider such a sale.

Josh Wilson, Assessor, asked if the Summary of Salient Facts was an appraisal and was that a licensed appraisal as a market indication. Mr. Christianson explained he collected the data and provided the information to the property owner, who arrived with their own conclusion.

Member Krolick felt the value was current.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-315-06, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented 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 Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0233E PARCEL NO. 082-361-60 – EQUITY ASSET GROUP LLC –
HEARING NO. 10-0205

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5305 Hoge Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Photos, 7 pages.

Exhibit B: Property detail, 5 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Mr. McCombs believed the subject property was higher than the market value based upon comparable sales he had found. He said the Assessor's Office used three comparable sales located in the neighborhood, but those sales were dated back to 2008. He supplied and reviewed comparable sales and photographs and said those sales

all occurred within the past six months. He said the price per square foot averaged about \$70. Mr. McCombs stated the subject property was 2,448 square feet and felt with the comparable sales that he supplied the fair market value price was approximately \$171,360. He added there were no improvements located on the subject property and an easement was present that ran the perimeter of the property. Mr. McCombs felt the taxable value exceeded the fair market value by \$79,000 and requested the property be valued at \$171,360.

Appraiser Thompson stated no sales had occurred in the subject property's neighborhood for two years. He said comparable sales were used from an adjoining neighborhood. He reviewed the comparable sales and due to the poor location of the subject and lower quality of neighboring homes, he recommended \$30,000 be added to this parcel based on economic obsolescence. Appraiser Thompson said the majority of the comparable sales used by the Petitioner were from neighborhoods that were two to three miles away from the subject's neighborhood.

Chairman Covert asked if the improved sales had paved roads to their properties. Appraiser Thompson replied Hoge Road was paved to the top where the 2.5 acre lots began. He indicated the lower end of Hoge Road had a more robust infrastructure. He also noted there was a well located on the subject property and would also receive a reduction as a result of reverting to the 2009 well-costing calculation.

In rebuttal, Mr. McCombs indicated the comparables he used were approximately one-third of a mile away from the subject parcel. He said this was a difficult area and requested the Board review the comparables for a downward adjustment.

Member Brown suggested reducing the improvement value by \$50,000 in economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 082-361-60, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 \$160,511, resulting in a total taxable value of \$231,311 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0234E PARCEL NO. 224-092-15 – MCLAUGHLIN, LINDA ETAL –
HEARING NO. 10-0408

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2630 Spearpoint Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Fax cover sheet with attachments, 11 pages.

Exhibit B: Petition with attachments, 10 pages.

Exhibit C: Comparable sales, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Mr. Croteau said there was a disagreement with the valuation on the subject property. He stated the house was a 3,009 square foot single-story house built in 2000 and had been valued at \$185 per square foot. Mr. Croteau said in the evidence provided, outside sources were used that were relevant to the standpoint of comparable sales. He reviewed the evidence and stated the sales provided were less than the appraised value placed on the property by the Assessor's Office. He remarked the square foot price of one comparable was \$138 per square foot. The subject property was valued at \$185 a square foot and submitted that the \$138 square foot price should be the price for the subject property arriving at a current market value of \$416,204.

Appraiser Lambert reviewed the comparable sales and recommended the application of \$36,671 in the form of obsolescence be applied to the building value.

Member Green asked about the comparable sale that the Petitioner used, which was located near the subject property. Appraiser Lambert said that was a bank-owned sale and those sales did not always consider a view. She indicated there were three sales in the neighborhood and went with the most recent sale, which sold in November of 2009.

In rebuttal, Mr. Croteau commented on the September 2009 sale, and stated the other two comparables occurred on July 22, 2009 and July 29, 2009. He could not explain the November 2009 sale for \$500,000, but the lot size on one comparable was larger than the subject property. He reiterated the request to reduce the taxable value to \$416,204.

In response to Member Horan, Appraiser Lambert stated one sale did not make the entire market. She explained it was across the street from the subject property, the land was smaller and that parcel did not have a view. She reiterated that Improved Sale One (IS1) was similar to the subject with the exception of view.

In response to comments made by Mr. Croteau, Member Krolick felt it would not be professional for the Board to consider *Zillow.com* and *Zestimates.com* since those numbers could be extremely skewed. Mr. Croteau replied those were provided because they provided a broad range that picked up actual sales.

Member Brown suggested a reduction for a total taxable value of \$500,557.

With regard to Parcel No. 224-092-15, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 \$368,257, resulting in a total taxable value of \$500,557 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

Mr. Croteau asked the Board if Hearing No. 10-0418, APN 035-073-19, scheduled for February 8, 2010 could be rescheduled for another date. Josh Wilson, Assessor, indicated the appraiser handling that hearing would be presenting before the Board of February 23, 2010.

Herb Kaplan, Legal Counsel, remarked it would need to be noted on February 8, 2010 that Hearing No. 10-0148 would be rescheduled to February 23, 2010.

1:18 p.m. The Board recessed.

1:48 p.m. The Board returned.

10-0235E **PARCEL NO. 050-470-12 – EGSTROM, DOUGLAS C –**
HEARING NO. 10-0344

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4940 Leo Bingo Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced in the form of economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 050-470-12, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$590,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$800,000 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0236E PARCEL NO. 003-772-05 – D & M HOUSING ENTERPRISES LLC
HEARING NO. 10-0125

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 200 Talus Way, No. 324, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: 2010/11 Assessment notice and comparables, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced in the form of economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 003-772-05, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$45,217, resulting in a total taxable value of \$84,617 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0237E **PARCEL NO. 142-241-36 – DICKERSON, KAREN R –**
HEARING NO. 10-0267

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 14000 Raider Run Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Corrected first page, 1 page.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced as a result of reverting to the 2009 well-costing calculation and also in the form of economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 142-241-36, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 \$307,257, resulting in a total taxable value of \$442,257 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0238E **PARCEL NO. 076-190-10 – FRELIN, LOUIS P & LYNN R –**
HEARING NO. 10-0528

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 200 Curnow Canyon Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Kenneth Johns, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced as a result of reverting to the 2009 well-costing calculation.

With regard to Parcel No. 076-190-10, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$163,601, resulting in a total taxable value of \$273,901 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0239E PARCEL NO. 024-200-36 – GILBERT, ZACHARY & KACEY – HEARING NO. 10-0531

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4179 Baker Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced in the form of economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 024-200-36, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable

improvement value be reduced to \$37,600, resulting in a total taxable value of \$59,000 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0240E PARCEL NO. 145-010-05 – FUTURE LANDS LLC –
HEARING NO. 10-0538

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at Western Skies Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 145-010-05, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0241E PARCEL NO. 145-020-06 – FUTURE LANDS LLC –
HEARING NO. 10-0539

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 8230 Desert Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 145-020-06, which was brought 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

10-0242E PARCEL NO. 076-120-22 – TYLER AUSTIN INC –
HEARING NO. 10-0540

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6400 Peak Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Kenneth Johns, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced as a result of reverting to the 2009 well-costing calculation.

With regard to Parcel No. 076-120-22, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$248,677, resulting in a total taxable value of \$350,677

for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0243E PARCEL NO. 076-110-22 – TYLER AUSTIN VENTURES LLC – HEARING NO. 10-0541

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5800 Rebel Cause Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Kenneth Johns, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced as a result of reverting to the 2009 well-costing calculation.

With regard to Parcel No. 076-110-22, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$29,031, resulting in a total taxable value of \$114,031 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0244E CONSOLIDATION AND DISCUSSION – FIRST INDEPENDENT BANK OF NEVADA – HEARING NOS. 10-0552A THROUGH 10-0552Z

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 26 various locations, in Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal and supporting documentation, 84 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject properties. She recommended that a 20 percent subdivision discount be applied to the vacant parcels based on an inventory of 26 vacant parcels and 16 sales since July 1, 2009.

With regard to the list of parcels below, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 reduced to \$27,200 per lot for a total of \$707,200 and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$726,862 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0244E: FIRST INDEPENDENT BANK OF NEVADA

026-761-02	026-761-04	026-761-06	026-761-08
026-761-09	026-761-10	026-761-11	026-761-14
026-761-15	026-761-16	026-761-17	026-761-18
026-761-19	026-761-20	026-761-21	026-761-22
026-761-23	026-761-27	026-761-29	026-761-31
026-761-33	026-761-35	026-761-36	026-761-37
026-761-38	026-761-39		

10-0245E PARCEL NO. 208-702-11 – BOWDEN, WILLIAM & MARILYN – HEARING NO. 10-0557

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2290 Glen Eagles Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 1 page.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori, Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 208-702-11, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

**10-0246E PARCEL NO. 017-360-24 – REPTILE RIDGE –
HEARING NO. 10-0595**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 315 Neilson Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 017-360-24, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

**10-0247E PARCEL NO. 017-360-22 – REPTILE RIDGE –
HEARING NO. 10-0596**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 305 Neilson Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 017-360-22, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

**10-0248E PARCEL NO. 017-360-25 – REPTILE RIDGE –
HEARING NO. 10-0597**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at Neilson Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 017-360-25, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0249E PARCEL NO. 017-360-21 – REPTILE RIDGE –
HEARING NO. 10-0598

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at Neilson Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Rigo Lopez, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 017-360-21, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year

2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

**10-0250E PARCEL NO. 002-401-22 – LAZZARONE, DALE –
HEARING NO. 10-0701**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1565 Majestic Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 002-401-22, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

**10-0251E PARCEL NO. 076-281-30 – PATTERSON, TIMOTHY W ETAL –
HEARING NO. 10-0724**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 7285 Sage Canyon Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter, 1 page.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subjects appraisal records, 19 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Kenneth Johns, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced as a result of reverting to the 2009 well-costing calculation and also in the form of economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 076-281-30, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$589,108, resulting in a total taxable value of \$714,108 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0252E PARCEL NO. 076-150-18 – PETERSON, ROBERT A JR –
HEARING NO. 10-0737

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4820 Cactus Canyon Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 45 pages.

Exhibit B: Letter and supporting documentation, 24 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subjects appraisal records, 20 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Kenneth Johns, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced as a result of reverting to the 2009 well-costing calculation.

With regard to Parcel No. 076-150-18, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$490,263, resulting in a total taxable value of \$574,263 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0253E PARCEL NO. 076-150-17– PETERSON, ANDREW & MARY –
HEARING NO. 10-0738

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4690 Cactus Canyon Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 13 pages.

Exhibit B: Letter and supporting documentation, 27 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Kenneth Johns, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 076-150-17, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0254E PARCEL NO. 076-120-20 – PETRIK ESTATE TRUST –
HEARING NO. 10-0790

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6200 Winnemucca Ranch Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 5 pages.

Exhibit B: Supporting documentation, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Kenneth Johns, Appraiser II, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced as a result of reverting to the 2009 well-costing calculation.

With regard to Parcel No. 076-120-20, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$147,607, resulting in a total taxable value of \$249,607 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0255E PARCEL NO. 003-773-11 – DICKINSON, KATHRYN S – HEARING NO. 10-0801

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 200 Talus Way, No. 532, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 1 page.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced in the form of economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 003-773-11, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$45,891, resulting in a total taxable value of \$85,291 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0256E PARCEL NO. 023-390-04 – LEGGE, THEODORE –
HEARING NO. 10-0850

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4807 Lakeridge Terrace W, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced in the form of economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 023-390-04, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Green, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$96,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$172,000 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0257E PARCEL NO. 003-651-19 – LAW, RONALD –
HEARING NO. 10-0933

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 692 Mt. Diablo Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced in the form of economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 003-651-19, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$32,092, resulting in a total taxable value of \$59,492 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0258E PARCEL NO. 023-460-18 – GREATHOUSE, KAREN S – HEARING NO. 10-0934

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4220 Swanson Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

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

She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 023-460-18, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Green, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0259E PARCEL NO. 019-171-02 – WARFIELD, JASON –
HEARING NO. 10-0938

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1001 Skyline Blvd., Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 019-171-02, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0260E PARCEL NO. 020-315-10 – ACCRETION PROPERTIES LLC –
HEARING NO. 10-0091

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3573 Carlos Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Income and comparable sales information, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced in the form of economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 020-315-10, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Green, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$85,624, resulting in a total taxable value of \$141,624 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0261E PARCEL NO. 007-224-07 – BG ENTERPRISES LLC –
HEARING NO. 10-0316

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 125 E. 7th Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 3 pages.

Exhibit B: Letter dated February 4, 2010, 3 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subjects appraisal records, 16 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-224-07, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0262E PARCEL NO. 007-361-02 – BG ENTERPRISES LLC –
HEARING NO. 10-0317

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 653 Lake Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 2 pages.

Exhibit B: Letter dated February 4, 2010, 3 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subjects appraisal records, 17 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property is equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-361-02, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

**10-0263E PARCEL NO. 007-361-05 – QUANTUM INVESTMENTS LLC –
HEARING NO. 10-0318**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 619 Lake Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and assessment data, 2 pages.

Exhibit B: Letter dated February 4, 2010, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-361-05, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

**10-0264E PARCEL NO. 007-362-15 – QUANTUM INVESTMENTS LLC –
HEARING NO. 10-0319**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 646 lake Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 3 pages.

Exhibit B: Letter dated February 4, 2010, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-362-15, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0265E PARCEL NO. 007-361-01– QUANTUM INVESTMENTS LLC –
HEARING NO. 10-0320

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 661 Lake Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 3 pages.

Exhibit B: Letter dated February 4, 2010, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-361-01, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0266E PARCEL NO. 007-361-10 – QUANTUM INVESTMENTS LLC – HEARING NO. 10-0321

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 616 Center Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 2 pages.

Exhibit B: Letter dated February 4, 2010, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-361-10, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0267E PARCEL NO. 020-361-30 – HENSELMAN, DAVID & MARILY –
HEARING NO. 10-0380

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4220 Neil Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 13 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: New HEP sheets, 2 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based on the comparable sales it was recommended to lower the land value to \$5.00 per square foot.

With regard to Parcel No. 020-361-30, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be reduced to \$214,095 resulting in a total taxable value of \$214,095 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

10-0268E PARCEL NO. 014-104-10 – WARFIELD, JASON –
HEARING NO. 10-0937

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1461-1471 Lander Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She said based upon the comparable sales, taxable value does not exceed full cash value and this property is equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County.

With regard to Parcel No. 014-104-10, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 for tax year 2010/11. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

10-0269E PARCEL NO. 012-121-09 – WARFIELD, JASON –
HEARING NO. 10-0939

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2010/11 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 785 Aitken Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori Delgiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She recommended that the taxable improvement value be reduced in the form of economic obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 012-121-09, which was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable

improvement value be reduced to \$28,300, resulting in a total taxable value of \$58,500 for tax year 2010/11. 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.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board member comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no response to the call for public comment.

* * * * *

3:40 p.m. There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, the meeting was adjourned.

JAMES COVERT, Chairperson
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

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

*Minutes prepared by
Stacy Gonzales, Deputy Clerk*