

**BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

FRIDAY

9:00 A.M.

JANUARY 28, 2011

PRESENT:

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

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

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

**11-0098E      SWEARING IN**

There were no staff members to be sworn in.

**11-0099E      WITHDRAWALS**

The following petitions scheduled on the day's agenda had been withdrawn by the Petitioner prior to the hearing:

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>	<b>Hearing No.</b>
011-342-01	Harsh, Antoinette	11-0284

**11-0100E      REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE**

At the request of the Petitioner, the following hearings were rescheduled for February 8, 2011:

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>	<b>Hearing No.</b>
009-703-02	Nicholson, R. Lawrence	11-0190
514-335-05	& Patricia Y	11-0191

**10-0101E      CONSOLIDATION OF HEARINGS**

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

**\*9:04 a.m.** Member Krolick arrived at the meeting.

**11-0102E** **PARCEL NO. 526-362-16 – PRZYBYLA, PAUL R**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0269**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6481 Sandy Rock Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Short sale listings as of 1/26/2011, 1 page.

**Assessor**

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

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

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

Mr. Przybyla said he was distressed that his taxable value had gone up from the previous year, even though home prices had been going down. He was told by the Assessor's Office that three current sales in the area were used to arrive at the total taxable value. He investigated and found that all three sales occurred prior to July 1, 2010. According to an article he read in the newspaper, home values had dropped by 10 percent. He referenced the current MLS listing information for homes in his area that was provided in Exhibit A. He noted the property at 6457 Sandy Rock Road was located two doors down from the subject property and had the same square footage. It was listed at \$225,000 (\$74.36 per square foot) and had a pending offer on it. He did not know the final sales price because the transaction had not yet closed but he assumed it was either equal to or less than the asking price. He compared the average price of \$69.28 per square foot for the homes provided in Exhibit A to the total taxable value of \$80.30 per square foot for the subject property. He requested that his property be brought in line with the pending sales in his area by lowering the taxable improvement value to \$82,100 and the total taxable value to \$230,000 for 2011-12. He indicated the resulting value of \$77.57 per square foot was well above the average and well above the listing price of the house located two doors down from his property.

Appraiser Churchfield reviewed the comparable sales provided in Exhibit I. He indicated IS-1 was located within one block of the subject property and sold for \$245,000 in December 2010. He stated the subject's total taxable value of \$238,000 was

well supported. He noted the listings presented by the Petitioner would be factored into the following year's valuation.

Member Green inquired about the sales date for the Petitioner's comparable on Sandy Rock Road. Appraiser Churchfield stated it was a pending sale that had not yet closed.

Mr. Przybyla clarified the comparable was listed in October 2010 and the sale had only been pending for two weeks. He commented that foreclosures and short sales were currently setting the market. He suggested recent listings were more representative of the current market.

Member Green remarked that the Assessor typically used closed sales. He noted the Assessor's comparable IS-3 sold for \$245,000 in August 2010 and there were other comparables that sold in November and December 2010. Chairperson Covert explained the Board could consider closed sales up to December 31, 2010. He agreed the Petitioner's pending sale should be reflected on the next year's assessment.

Josh Wilson, County Assessor, discussed the regulations governing the appraisal timeframe in NAC 361.118. He stated the Board could consider listings as an indication of value. However, he noted there were closed sales supporting the subject's value that had taken place right up to the lien date.

Based on the comparable sales, Member Green said the Assessor's Office had done a pretty good job valuing the subject property. He indicated a great many pending short sales did not close; they just went on and on before coming back on the market. He observed foreclosure sales were a little bit cleaner.

With regard to Parcel No. 526-362-16, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0103E      PARCEL NO. 234-161-16 – FOX, WAYNE**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0201**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2300 Maple Leaf Trail, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Letter and supporting documentation, 16 pages.

**Assessor**

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

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

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

Mr. Fox read from the letter submitted in Exhibit A. He indicated the subject property's value had been increased by 9.3 percent from 2010-11 to 2011-12. He noted the model home at 8720 Oak Hollow Way was identical to the subject but was appraised at \$33,750 less. He offered two other comparable sales in the area. He stated market values continued to decline in the Somerset area. He provided data from the Reno-Sparks Association of Realtors to illustrate declining trends in the median sales price, price per square foot, number of units sold, and days on the market. He pointed out several surrounding lots had been sold for \$6,000 by the Washoe County Tax Assessor, although there was a \$67,500 taxable land value placed on the subject property.

Member Woodland asked whether the vacant lots were sold for back taxes. Mr. Fox said he believed they were tax sales. He suggested the sales prices were an indication of value if the owners were letting the lots go for that amount instead of paying the taxes.

Appraiser Dillon reviewed the comparable sales provided in Exhibit I. She stated the home at 8720 Oak Hollow Way was currently owned by the developer. Its taxable improvement value was identical to that of the subject but the Oak Hollow property was receiving a 50 percent subdivision discount as a developer-owned property. She clarified for Chairperson Covert that the discount would be taken off if the property was sold. She explained the City of Reno sold 11 vacant lots to the developer for \$34,500 in a bulk sale. The lots had been part of a Special Assessment District and were also receiving a 50 percent subdivision discount. She recommended the Board uphold the Assessor's values.

Member Green observed the taxable value on the subject property had increased by about \$24,000 from the previous year. He pointed out the Assessor's comparable sales were all greater than six months old. He wondered why there had been such a large increase in the subject's taxable value. Appraiser Dillon explained the area was valued based on allocation. Based on a market analysis, the obsolescence applied to the subject's neighborhood had been reduced from \$70,000 in 2010-11 to \$50,000 in 2011-12.

Chairperson Covert noted the property at 2335 Roanoke Trail was presented as a comparable by the Petitioner and by the Assessor. He wondered what

justified the difference in value at \$132 per square foot for the subject and \$124 per square foot for the comparable. Appraiser Dillon indicated the subject property had a stucco wall and lattice that the other property did not have as well as a slightly larger garage. Member Green asked if there was any kind of view. Appraiser Dillon said there was not.

Mr. Fox pointed out the subject property had a higher taxable value per square foot when compared with all of the Assessor's comparables IS-1, IS-2 and IS-3. He indicated the home at 8720 Oak Hollow Way had a view of the Sierras. He said it should have a higher taxable value regardless of who owned the property.

Member Green suggested the subject property should be rolled back to its 2010-11 value. He said he had a hard time with an increase in value from the previous year. He noted the closest comparable was sold in June 2010 and there had been a big change in values since then. Member Brown concurred.

With regard to Parcel No. 234-161-16, pursuant to NRS 361.356 or 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Green, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$67,300 and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$192,131, resulting in a total taxable value of \$259,431 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0104E      PARCEL NO. 524-372-13 – FURTADO, JOHN B & CAROL**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0245**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3472 Asturius Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Supporting documentation, 5 pages.

Exhibit B: Copy of petition, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Photos, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Comparison of values, 1 page.

Exhibit E: Tax history, 1 page.

Exhibit F: Recent sales, 1 page.

**Assessor**

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

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

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

Mr. Furtado indicated he purchased the subject property in 2009 for \$352,000 and the home was valued by the Assessor at \$375,000 for the first year. He stated a house down the street at 7995 Tres Arroyos sold in November 2010 for \$365,000 or \$102 per square foot. He requested a total taxable value of \$322,000 for the subject property based on the value of the comparable property. He noted the two homes were built in the same year and were sold one year apart. He said he did not understand why his taxes had gone up when property values had gone down. He indicated the vacant lots behind his property were purchased for \$38,000 but had no market value because it was too expensive to build on them. He stated his taxable land value should be somewhere between \$30,000 and \$35,000 for the 2011-12 tax year.

Appraiser Churchfield reviewed the comparable sales provided in Exhibit I. He pointed out another comparable sale for \$400,000 that was included in Exhibit F (7915 Tres Arroyos). He stated the \$365,000 comparable sale presented by the Petitioner was a short sale with the lowest price per square foot among those listed on Exhibit F. He indicated it would be considered for the next year's valuation. He said the Assessor's taxable values were supported by the comparable sales data.

Mr. Furtado pointed out the house at 7915 Tres Arroyo sold in April 2010 and property values had dropped severely since then. He stated the house that sold for \$365,000 in November was more representative of the market and was more comparable to the subject.

Member Woodland observed the taxable values on the subject property had gone down from the previous year. Mr. Furtado replied the current taxable value was still more than what the subject and its closest comparable sold for.

Member Woodland said the Assessor had done a good job on the subject property's appraisal.

Chairperson Covert stated the evidence brought forward by the Petitioner was good evidence for the next tax year. He explained the Assessor's value was based on the sales that occurred prior to July 1, 2010.

Member Green noted that larger homes often sold for less per square foot. He indicated property values did not necessarily correspond on a square foot basis unless the same size and quality class were compared.

With regard to Parcel No. 524-372-13, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member

Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0105E      PARCEL NO. 222-171-06 – LIOU, LONG S TTEE ET AL**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0178**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4906 Sierra Pine Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Letter and newspaper article, 2 pages.

**Assessor**

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

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

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

Mr. Liou pointed out the taxable improvement value of the subject property had significantly increased from the previous year (\$864,049 in 2010-11 to \$1,022,109 in 2011-12). He observed all of the comparables used by the Assessor were two or three miles from his house and on larger lots of one acre or more. He suggested there were many houses on the market that were located in his subdivision and in the Manzanita area about one-half mile away. He indicated half of his home's square footage was in the basement and the basement quality was much lower than that of the house.

Josh Wilson, County Assessor, explained his staff discovered and corrected an error that affected high value residences with quality classes between 6.5 and 12.0. He indicated there was a separate Marshall & Swift cost manual for such homes. A floor covering allowance was left out of the Assessor's costing system when it was implemented in 2009. Chairperson Covert asked for a definition of "floor covering allowance." Mr. Wilson stated there were certain allowances in Marshall & Swift for the typical quality of improvements based on a per square foot value. Chairperson Covert observed a typical house did not have the same floor covering throughout the house. Mr. Wilson indicated that was why it was based on the quality. He noted typical quality homes had a similar relationship based on the kinds of materials that were used. For example, high value homes tended to have slate rather than ceramic tile. An error was

made in the 2009 costing of all high value properties. Re-costing would have increased the values in 2010 but the Nevada Tax Commission was applying a negative factor during that year, so the Assessor chose to factor the improvements. This prolonged correction of the error until the entire County was re-costed for 2011-12. He acknowledged it seemed crazy to increase values given the economic times, but said he could not direct staff to perpetuate an error once it had been discovered.

Appraiser Johnson reviewed the comparable sales provided by the Assessor in Exhibit I. He indicated the most weight was given to IS-2 and IS-3 based on quality and age. Of the land sales, LS-1 was given the most weight because of its more recent sales date. Based on the sales, he indicated taxable value did not exceed full cash value and the subject property was equalized with similarly situated properties in Washoe County. He said he looked at other neighborhoods because he wanted to compare with houses of similar quality. The houses located closer to the Petitioner had quality classes of 5.0 to 6.0, whereas the subject had a quality class of 8.0.

Chairperson Covert asked if the appraiser had been in the house or was just assuming the basement was completely finished. Mr. Johnson replied he had not been inside but the finished basement was based on an inspection by a previous appraiser from the Assessor's Office. Ron Sauer, Chief Appraiser, indicated the Assessor's Office would be more than happy to visit the home and verify any appraisal information.

Mr. Long said he could understand the reason for an adjustment but the amount of the increase was excessive for flooring. Chairperson Covert wondered if the basement was finished. Mr. Long stated it was a finished walk-out basement.

Chairperson Covert inquired if the increased value was in line with similar homes after correction of the error. Mr. Wilson said he felt the costs had been corrected. He noted the square footage and the quality class influenced how much of an adjustment was made for each home. He pointed out the subject's improvement value had gone down significantly in 2009 when the error occurred.

With regard to Parcel No. 222-171-06, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**10:21 a.m.** Chairperson Covert declared a brief recess.

**10:31 a.m.** The Board reconvened with all members present.

**11-0106E      PARCEL NO. 018-043-20 – JOE & JOY PANICARO**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0285**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2255 Koldewey Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Letter and appraisal record cards, 44 pages.

Exhibit B: Correspondence and appraisal record cards, 69 pages.

Exhibit C: Vacant land analysis and information, 31 pages.

Exhibit D: Excerpts from *The Appraisal of Real Estate, 12th Edition*, 27 pages.

Exhibit E: Photographs and appraisal record cards, 45 pages.

Exhibit F: Land listing, 2 pages.

Exhibit G: Listing information on property for sale by owner, 3 pages.

Exhibit H: Land listing, 2 pages.

**Assessor**

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

Exhibit II: Appraiser's explanation in response to Petitioner's letter dated January 21, 2011, 1 page.

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

Having been previously sworn, Josh Wilson, County Assessor, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Mr. Panicaro read the letter he sent to the County Assessor that was dated January 21, 2011 and shown on page 2 of Exhibit A. He noted his property had a taxable land value of \$56,610 or \$2.95 per square foot. He stated the value was erroneous, contrary to fundamental appraisal principles, and exceeded market value. He cited NRS 361.345, 361.356 and 361.357 as well as Article 10, Section 1 of the Nevada State Constitution. Mr. Panicaro read several other citations, as listed below.

*State Board of Equalization v. Barta* 124 Nevada 58 (2008):  
“Applications of methods used in assessing property taxes must be just, equal, and uniform, not only from within the county, but from county to county throughout the state. When these applications are unjust or inconsistent with one another they violate the Nevada Constitution and the taxes levied are invalid. The taxpayer's burden of showing by clear and convincing evidence that the valuation is unjust and inequitable is

established when he shows that the board has applied a fundamentally wrong principle in determining the validity of the taxpayer's property assessment. Merely establishing the cash values were not exceeded does not establish that the values were just and equal. Uniform assessment methods, properly applied, will necessarily produce the same measure of taxable values for like properties. Nevada's Constitution guarantees a uniform and equal rate of assessment and taxation. That guarantee of equality should be a board of equalization's predominant concern, and that concern is not satisfied by merely ensuring that a property's taxable value does not exceed its full cash value."

*State Board of Equalization v. Sierra Pacific Power Company*, 97 Nevada 461 (1981): "The courts will declare a government action invalid if it violates the constitution."

*Appraisal of Real Estate, 12th edition* (see Exhibit D): "Comparable sales are a factor normally used in determining cash value. Sale offerings are data used by appraisers in making this determination."

NRS 361.227 and NAC 361.131: "The taxable value of property must not exceed its full cash value and each person determining the taxable value of property shall reduce it if necessary to comply with this requirement. The county assessor is required to make the reduction if the property owner calls to attention the facts warranting it."

NAC 361.624: "County boards have a duty to equalize taxable value within the geographical vicinity of the subject property as well as the county as a whole."

*Appraisal of Real Estate, 12th edition* (see Exhibit D): "In valuing any type of property, the appraiser must provide a detailed description and analysis of the land. The land description consists of information on pertinent physical characteristics such as topography. The appraiser should review any available surveys or topographical data provided by the client."

NRS 361.227, NAC 361.116, NAC 361.118, and *Sun City Summerlin Community Association v. State Department of Taxation* 113 Nevada 835 (1997): "When determining taxable value one must appraise the full cash value of the vacant land by considering any legal or physical restrictions upon the use of the property, including the character of the property's terrain."

NAC 361.118: "Adjustments must be made to eliminate differences between comparable properties and the subject property."

*Appraisal of Real Estate, 12th edition* (see Exhibit D): “In the sales comparison approach, an opinion of market value is developed by comparing with properties similar to the subject property that have recently sold or are listed for sale. The comparative analysis of properties and transactions focuses on similarities and differences that affect value, including variations in location and physical features. The appraiser must look for differences and adjust the price for each comparable property to reflect these differences.”

Mr. Panicaro indicated there was no adjustment given for many of the disparities on his property, including no adjustment for the parcel being a key lot. He pointed out the intersection of Yuma Lane with his property on a satellite map shown on the overhead display. He said automobile lights shined in his windows and motorists had mistaken his driveway for a continuation of Yuma Lane. He suggested there was a much greater possibility of a motorist failing to make the turn and crashing into his property than there was for differently situated properties.

Mr. Panicaro referenced the appraisal record cards provided on pages 7 through 51 of Exhibit B. He stated the comparable properties used by the Assessor during his 2011-12 valuation were all located on paved streets, and the majority of them had sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and storm drains. He indicated the street in front of his house had never been paved, and there were no sidewalks, curbs, gutters, or culvert drainage system to divert stormwater. He said he had severe drainage problems because the land in front of his house sloped from the street down to the house. He noted the land to the rear of his property sloped drastically downward from the house to the property line below. His property was on a septic system rather than a municipal sewer system, and there was a roadway easement in front of the house. He provided several citations to illustrate that such factors reduced his property value.

Mr. Panicaro talked about a slope analysis that he had compiled with the assistance of architect Robert Scheel. He pointed out there was a 10 percent downward adjustment on the subject property for a 20 percent slope. He compared his slope adjustment to those on other properties (see chart below). He stated his property had suffered inequity because no adjustments were made by the Assessor to eliminate differences between the comparable properties and the subject property.

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Percent Slope</b>	<b>Percent Reduction</b>
018-273-40	18	35
216-040-16	20	30
216-040-17	23	40
009-301-08	21	25
009-421-06	20	30
216-040-18	25	40
(See pages 9 through 32, Exhibit E)		

Mr. Panicaro indicated that NAC 361.146 required the Assessor to “indicate all the data necessary to determine the taxable value of the property.” He suggested it was good practice for an appraiser to explain why elements such as poor location, unpaved roads, dust, poor street maintenance, drainage, sidewalks, curbs, and gutters did not require any adjustments. He remarked that a review of the Assessor’s records on the subject property revealed no such explanation.

Mr. Panicaro observed there had been a 14.6 percent reduction in his taxable land value from 2010-11 to 2011-12, but other properties received reductions ranging from 15 to 63 percent. He reviewed the percent reductions in land value received by the subject property and by several other properties, as shown on the appraisal record cards in Exhibit A. He noted the properties shown on pages 27 and 28 and pages 37 and 38 had been used by the Assessor as comparable lots during the subject’s 2009-10 reappraisal.

Mr. Panicaro referred to Exhibit B, which contained his letter to the Assessor’s Office requesting the records used in arriving at his 2011-12 appraisal values. He noted pages 7 through 51 of Exhibit B were documents supplied by the Assessor’s Office in response to the letter. He observed a notation on the subject property’s appraisal record (page 5 of Exhibit B), which incorrectly indicated the street was paved. He called attention to the Assessor’s Conclusions section on page 7, which characterized a \$15,000 listing for vacant land located on Markridge Drive as obsolete. He stated the same lot was not considered obsolete when it was used as a comparable parcel during the 2009-10 reappraisal. He noted the Assessor’s base lot value of \$76,500 represented a 15 percent decrease in base land value from the previous year.

Mr. Panicaro said he personally visited the vacant land sales and listings used in the Assessor’s analysis to see if they were comparable to his property. He reviewed the features, differences, and taxable land values per square foot between the subject property and the properties listed on pages 10 and 11 of Exhibit B. Although the appraiser from the Assessor’s Office had provided the list of sales, he observed no Deeds of Trust or other supporting documents had been provided. He suggested there was no evidence and the sales prices were “just something he made up.” Based on information he received from real estate agent Lewis Green at Dickson Realty, Mr. Panicaro said the listing information provided by the Assessor was no longer current. He submitted updated listing information in Exhibits F, G and H. He stated the listing information demonstrated that his property was valued above its market value.

Member Woodland wondered if the Petitioner was asking for a 15 percent reduction in total land value. Mr. Panicaro replied that at least a 15 percent reduction was one argument.

Mr. Panicaro reviewed land values for each of the properties shown in the Assessor’s analysis on pages 8 through 11 of Exhibit B. He indicated each of the properties received 15 percent or greater reductions in taxable land value over the previous year, which was more than the reduction for the subject property. He reviewed

the reductions on properties owned by the Assessor and several members of the Assessor's staff. He reviewed the features, listing prices, and taxable land values per square foot for several vacant land listings in his neighborhood that were shown in Exhibit C.

Mr. Panicaro discussed the photographs of the subject property that were submitted in Exhibit E. Pages 1 and 8 illustrated the subject property's steep topography. Page 7 showed the subject's key lot features at the intersection of Yuma Lane, as well as some topography information. Pages 9 through 32 were provided to support the topography adjustments and slope information compiled for several neighboring properties (see chart above). Pages 34 through 37 highlighted the subject property's unpaved road. He pointed out notations on three appraisal record cards that indicated Markridge Drive was unpaved (pages 38 through 43). He called attention to the photographs on pages 44 and 45 to show it was paved.

Chairperson Covert said he was not sure what the Appellant was asking for. He observed a notation on the petition that said "less than \$56,100." Mr. Panicaro suggested several possible scenarios for arriving at a taxable land value:

- \$56,355 based on a full 15 percent reduction to the previous year's taxable land value
- \$26,167 based on an average of the comparable lots on Thornhill, Markridge, and La Fond
- \$27,790 based on an average of the listings provided in Exhibit C (excluding the \$12,000 pending sale on Markridge Drive)
- \$45,084 based on a 30 percent downward adjustment for topography rather than the 10 percent adjustment that was already in place
- \$33,813 based on downward adjustments of 30 percent for topography and 20 percent for the key lot and lack of amenities
- \$13,750 based on an average of the \$15,500 sale on Thornhill and the \$12,000 pending sale on Markridge;
- \$33,250 based on an average of the two 2010 vacant land sales on La Fond and Thornhill
- \$10,150 based on the \$0.53 per square foot pending sale price of the comparable Markridge lot

He commented the scenario to be used would depend on what the Board agreed with. Chairperson Covert said the Board could not look at multiple sets of numbers to determine what the Appellant was asking for. Mr. Panicaro stated he wanted the lowest value but did not believe the Board would give that to him. Chairperson

Covert requested it be put on the record that the Appellant had failed to give the Board a value he felt was reasonable for his property.

Josh Wilson, County Assessor, noted a taxable land value of \$56,355 amounted to less than a \$300 reduction. He explained the subject property had a unique 26 percent downward adjustment from the base lot value, which included 10 percent for a road easement, 10 percent for topography, and 6 percent based on a previous decision by the State Board of Equalization. He pointed out the subject's taxable land value was lower than any of the neighbors referenced in the Petitioner's exhibits. He indicated the properties in the subject's immediate neighborhood were all above \$56,000 in taxable land value.

With respect to the letter in Exhibit A, Mr. Wilson said he had not responded to it because it seemed like the Appellant wanted to talk about the Assessor's staff. He knew at the time that a hearing had already been scheduled to address the subject's property values. He read Appraiser Joe Johnson's explanation in response to the Petitioner's letter and submitted it as Exhibit II.

Mr. Wilson suggested the Appellant did not know the appropriate full cash value of his land or he would have told the Board what he was asking for. He stated the method of assessment in Nevada was to determine the full cash value of the land as specified in NAC 361.227. The replacement cost new of the improvements was depreciated by 1.5 percent per year based on the age of the improvements. The full cash value of the land was added to the depreciated replacement cost of the improvements in order to determine a property's total taxable value.

Mr. Wilson said the Assessor's Office referenced the *Appraisal of Real Estate* from time to time, but primarily used a textbook and attended classes from the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO). He noted the textbooks were very similar with respect to appraisal logic, but the IAAO placed more emphasis on the mass appraisal approach used by most assessors across the country.

With respect to equalization, Mr. Wilson indicated the subject's taxable land value was already lower than any of his immediate neighbors. He stated the Assessor's Office had looked at the key lot issue for the subject property but could find no verifiable evidence that such a configuration resulted in a reduction in value in the marketplace (NAC 361.118). He did not know if that was the basis for the 6 percent reduction granted by the State Board. The previous year's 26 percent downward adjustment on the subject property had been left in place for the 2011-12 tax year. He suggested the Board could direct the Assessor to change the record card to say the Appellant's street was unpaved based on the photographs submitted in Exhibit E. Mr. Wilson noted the appraisal record card contained the data used during an appraisal, such as property characteristics and neighborhood codes. He explained the County previously had five districts that were each reappraised every five years, but the Assessor's Office currently reappraised all property in the County each and every year. The revaluation district codes shown on appraisal record cards were old data that had been carried over.

He indicated comparable sales in an immediate neighborhood were used for valuation if they were available. If not, the appraisers went outside of the immediate neighborhood to find the best and most appropriate estimate of land value. He remarked that any opinion of value was an estimate.

Mr. Wilson stated the 14.6 percent decrease in the Petitioner's taxable land value was not an error when compared to the 15 percent decrease received by his neighbors. It was a function of the odd percentage of downward adjustment on the subject property. He said the Assessor's Office did not value land in Washoe County on a per square foot basis. He acknowledged the appraisers might look at the price per square foot when looking for correlations in the data, but residential properties were appraised based on a site value. A residential site was defined as the area on which a home could be built. He pointed out that all of the comparables for which the Appellant provided per square foot values were valued by the Assessor on a site basis.

Mr. Wilson talked about the Petitioner's reference to Deeds of Trust as supporting documentation. He explained each and every appraisal record card included a document number for each sales transaction. The document number was assigned by the County Recorder when a Deed of Trust was recorded. He encouraged the Petitioner to go to the Recorder's website to investigate any Deeds of Trust or Declaration of Value documents associated with any property he was interested in. He indicated the documents were in the County Recorder's possession and were available to the public, but the Assessor's Office did not typically provide them.

Mr. Wilson said the information provided by the Appellant in Exhibit B simply showed that the Assessor and many of his staff members lived in tract home subdivisions. He stated there were comparable sales and land sales provided in Exhibit I to justify the subject's taxable values. The vacant land listings provided in the analysis were as of the Assessor's cut-off date of July 1, 2010. He noted sales after July 1st were brought to the Board for consideration but the Assessor's Office could not use them to establish values. He indicated sales that occurred after July 1, 2010 would be used for the following year's reappraisal.

Member Green asked whether or not the road in front of the Petitioner's house was paved. Mr. Wilson said he had not personally been to the property. Based on a satellite map of the property that was shown on the overhead display, Yuma Lane appeared to be paved up to the Appellant's property line. He noted the subject was receiving an easement adjustment for encroachment where the road began at Koldewey Drive. He stated the matter was questionable.

Mr. Panicaro indicated the in-office email in Exhibit II was never forwarded to him and the Assessor had never responded to his letter in Exhibit A. Chairperson Covert stated the Board was there to deal with the taxable value of the subject property rather than the correspondence between the Petitioner and the Assessor's Office. He pointed out Mr. Panicaro's appearance before the Board was his remedy to

any alleged non-response by the Assessor's Office. He remarked that he had heard nothing from the Petitioner about what he was asking the Board to do.

Mr. Panicaro observed the Assessor's comparables were all outside of the subject's neighborhood. He noted the Assessor had offered no NRS, NAC, or appraisal manual to back up the use of a site value as opposed to a per square foot value when appraising land. He said he had demonstrated there were properties with lesser slopes that were getting greater adjustments for topography. He emphasized he was asking for the lowest possible value among those he had provided. He indicated many scenarios were provided depending on whether the Board felt the topography adjustment was not properly applied, or vacant land sales in 2010 should be considered, or current listings should be considered. He stated it was up to the Board to decide what was correct. He said the taxable land value of \$56,610 was beyond market value and was inequitable, and he had met his burden of proof.

Member Krolick remarked that the subject property had already been given substantial adjustments, and further adjustments were not warranted. Chairperson Covert expressed concern about the various ranges in value suggested by the Appellant. Member Green said the Board was charged with working on property values and could not deal with any enmity between the Appellant and the Assessor's Office. He agreed that too many numbers clouded the issue in a presentation. He questioned whether a base lot value of \$76,500 was appropriate for the subject's neighborhood. Chairperson Covert indicated the base lot value had not been challenged during the hearing.

With regard to Parcel No. 018-043-20, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**12:08 p.m.** Chairperson Covert declared a brief recess.

**12:45 p.m.** The Board reconvened with all members present.

**11-0107E** **PARCEL NO. 041-130-14 – VOGT, COROLYNN**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0127**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3640 Lone Tree Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Letter and supporting documentation, 2 pages.

**Assessor**

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

**Exhibit II:** Updated hearing evidence packet, 12 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She noted the neighborhood was characterized by 2.5 to 5 acre parcels. She reviewed three comparable sales provided in Exhibit I. She indicated only IS-2 was comparable in terms of lot size. She pointed out the land sales in Exhibit I were also for smaller sized parcels, but still supported the taxable value on the 5-acre parcel. She referenced three sales provided by the Petitioner on page 2 of Exhibit A, and said they were all inferior for lot size and living area. One of the properties was a land sale. She stated the range of comparable sales provided in Exhibit I supported the taxable value and requested the Board uphold the Assessor's values.

Member Green asked about the Petitioner's comparables. Appraiser Regan stated all of them involved 2.5-acre parcels, whereas the subject parcel was nearly 5 acres. Two of the petitioner's comparables were for much smaller homes. The third one was actually a land purchase in which the small older residence would be razed. She indicated the Assessor had used the sale in an abstraction analysis to determine land values.

With regard to Parcel No. 041-130-14, pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements were valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

**11-0108E      PARCEL NO. 142-123-28 – BULLENTINI-KUZANEK, PATRICIA**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0130**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1323 Wolf Run Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Assessment Notice and CMA Summary Report, 3 pages.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She presented the Assessor's recommendation to reduce the total taxable value by applying \$92,496 in obsolescence to the improvements. She indicated the comparable sales showed the taxable value to be at the high end of the range of sales. She said the Petitioner had been present earlier in the day and was in agreement with the recommendation.

With regard to Parcel No. 142-123-28, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$767,845, resulting in a total taxable value of \$858,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0109E      PARCEL NO. 160-134-08 – FRANK, GLORIA J  
– HEARING NO. 11-0139**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 9995 Moccasin Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Comparable sales, 13 pages.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. Chairperson Covert asked if the information submitted by the Petitioner had been reviewed. Appraiser Regan stated the Assessor's Office had looked at the information and it supported the taxable value of \$90 per square foot. She indicated the comparable sales in Exhibit I also supported the Assessor's values.

With regard to Parcel No. 160-134-08, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0110E      PARCEL NO. 041-640-02 – MOSSER, PIERRE JR & PATRICIA – HEARING NO. 11-0153**

Appraiser Pat Regan stated the Petitioner had requested the hearing be rescheduled. Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk, indicated there was no copy of the request on file. Chairperson Covert continued the hearing to February 24, 2011.

**11-0111E      PARCEL NO. 142-123-07 – SOFOS, ANDRINA & ARISTIDES – HEARING NO. 11-0165**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 362 Wolf Run Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 3 pages.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She presented the Assessor's recommendation to reduce the taxable value by applying \$67,559 in total obsolescence. She noted the recommendation was based on the comparable sales provided in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 142-123-07, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced for obsolescence to \$436,975, resulting in a total taxable value of \$555,600 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0112E      PARCEL NO. 043-263-05 – HINNERS, FREDERICK JR & TERRY**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0174**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1010 Country Estates Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Letter and listing, 5 pages.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. Chairperson Covert asked if the information submitted by the Petitioner had been reviewed. Appraiser Regan indicated that it had. She said the Petitioner was referencing a property that was very inferior in location. She stated the Petitioner's comparable was essentially the same model as the subject, but the subject property was located on Crystal Lake. She noted the comparable sales provided in Exhibit I were inferior with respect to location but the subject's taxable value was well supported.

Member Brown asked if the quality class should remain at 3.5 for the comparable characterized as a "fixer upper" (IS-3). Appraiser Regan said there were deferred maintenance issues before the property had been purchased and gutted by the next door neighbors. She stated it represented the very low end of the market. She explained the quality class was not changed because the basic structure was still there.

With regard to Parcel No. 043-263-05, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0113E      PARCEL NO. 049-782-12 – MURPHY FAMILY TRUST, PHILLIP L & JOFRAN M – HEARING NO. 11-0175**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 12735 Buckthorn Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Assessment notice, appraisal report and newspaper articles, 14 pages.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She indicated the Petitioner was in agreement with the Assessor's recommendation to reduce the total taxable value by applying \$93,532 in obsolescence to the improvements. She noted the sales prices for the comparables in Exhibit I were lower than the taxable value. The Petitioner had also provided an appraisal on the subject property.

With regard to Parcel No. 049-782-12, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced for obsolescence to \$465,100, resulting in a total taxable value of \$560,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0114E      PARCEL NO. 148-061-21 – SDA INC – HEARING NO. 11-0176**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5550 Lausanne Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Assessment notice, 1 page.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gail Vice, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She described the subject property's features. She stated the taxable value was well supported based on the comparable sales and one listing provided in Exhibit I. She noted the listing was for the subject property and it was listed for more than its total taxable value.

Chairperson Covert said he had reviewed the Petitioner's information. He observed an opinion of value was given but no supporting evidence was provided.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-061-21, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0115E      PARCEL NO. 520-371-11 – HUMPHREYS, DENIS M & ROCKLYN K – HEARING NO. 11-0180**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2550 Old Waverly Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Appraisal report, 3 pages.

**Exhibit B:** Letter and appraisal report, 4 pages.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gary Warren, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He pointed out a clerical error was made in marking the "uphold" box in Exhibit I. He said the Petitioner was aware but had not responded to the Assessor's recommendation to reduce the taxable value. He stated the house on the subject property was an over

improvement for the neighborhood. The closest comparable (IS-1) was on the same street, sold for \$600,000, and had a significantly lower quality class. He noted comparables IS-2 and IS-3 were similar in quality but located in a different subdivision. The Somersett subdivision was used to provide comparisons to a similar quality class in a golf course community. He indicated the median sales price of \$142 per square foot was given the most weight when establishing the subject's values.

Member Green observed an appraisal for \$800,000 had been done in October. He asked whether it had been done for a loan or as a fee appraisal. Appraiser Warren could not state for sure but thought it was probably for a lender.

With regard to Parcel No. 520-371-11, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$771,000 for obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$840,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0116E      PARCEL NO. 538-067-05 – HOBBS, RICHARD**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0181**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 160 Landmark 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 subject's appraisal records, 10 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gary Warren, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted four comparable sales from the subject property's subdivision all supported the Assessor's taxable values and were provided in Exhibit I. He recommended the values be upheld. Chairperson Covert asked if he had looked at the most recent sales in the Pebble Creek subdivision that were provided by the Petitioner. Appraiser Warren said the Assessor's Office had provided the list submitted by the Petitioner and had included a lot of the same sales that were referenced. He noted one of the Petitioner's issues was that his total taxable value had been increased from last year. He explained the Pebble Creek

subdivision was one of the few areas where the median sales price had increased. He attributed it to more market stabilization in the neighborhood based on what buyers could get for the dollar.

Member Brown requested more clarification about the increase. Appraiser Warren pointed out the sales analysis showed a higher overall median sales price of \$408,042 based on more current sales. He noted ten recent sales were included in the analysis and there had been 19 sales in the previous year. The median size of the houses was about 8,800 square feet for both years. Although it was not a custom neighborhood, he characterized it as an upper scale tract neighborhood with large lots. He indicated many of the properties had detached casitas or recreational vehicle garages.

Member Woodland asked if the original builder was still there. Appraiser Warren stated the original builder was still there for the Hamilton Homes subdivision. He said he had visited the subdivision recently. Although there had not been any active new construction the last time he was out there, there were a number of partially completed homes that the builder finished as they went into a contract.

Member Green wondered if the house on Ocean Avenue was the same as the subject. Appraiser Warren replied it was a model match.

With regard to Parcel No. 538-067-05, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0117E      PARCEL NO. 234-161-01 – KELLY TRUST, EILEEN**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0189**

Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk, indicated the Petitioner had submitted a signed withdrawal for the appeal.

**11-0118E      PARCEL NO. 041-361-10 – BURRIS FAMILY TRUST**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0193**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3881 Cashill Boulevard, 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 subject's appraisal records, 10 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joe Johnson, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said he had reviewed the comparables submitted in Petitioner's Exhibit A. He did not believe they were relevant because they were all bank-owned short sales and were not located in the subject's neighborhood.

With regard to Parcel No. 041-361-10, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0119E      PARCEL NO. 042-300-11 – JOHNSON, STEWART & PAULA**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0194**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6119 Carriage House 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 subject's appraisal records, 8 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pat Regan, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. Chairperson Covert noted a clerical error in Exhibit I. Appraiser Regan agreed the Assessor's recommendation was to reduce rather than to uphold the subject's taxable land value. She indicated the subject property's view had diminished and recommended the view adjustment be removed.

With regard to Parcel No. 042-300-11, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$66,100 for removal of the view adjustment and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$292,814 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0120E      PARCEL NO. 527-064-04 – SCHERBERT, JACK A & CARLA J**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0202**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4569 Barbados Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gary Warren, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. Chairperson Covert asked if the Petitioner's information had been reviewed. Appraiser Warren stated that it had. He reviewed the comparable sales presented in Exhibit I. He noted IS-1 was a model match to the subject property, but the subject had a higher view adjustment and a second fireplace. Based on the other two comparables in the subdivision that sold for a higher price, he indicated IS-1 appeared to be a low sale.

With regard to Parcel No. 527-064-04, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0121E      PARCEL NO. 023-731-10 – J F N & M G N FAMILY TRUST**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0209**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2565 Manzanita Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Assessment Notice and appraisal, 18 pages.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She indicated the Appellant was in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value by adding obsolescence. She noted the reduction was based on an appraisal provided by the Petitioner.

With regard to Parcel No. 023-731-10, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$492,420 for obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$600,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0122E      PARCEL NO. 045-721-05 – HAMILTON, PAULINE**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0212**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5280 Cross Creek Ln, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gail Vice, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated the Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value based on the subject property's list price.

With regard to Parcel No. 045-721-05, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced for obsolescence to \$414,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$594,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0123E      PARCEL NO. 234-352-46 – MYERS, PETER J**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0217**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1370 Meridian Ranch 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 subject's appraisal records, 10 pages.

**Exhibit II:** Updated Assessor's recommendation, 1 page.

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She indicated the recommendation of the Assessor's Office was to reduce the total taxable value based on the subject property's sales price. She noted the Petitioner was in China and the Assessor's Office staff had not spoken to him directly.

With regard to Parcel No. 234-352-46, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member

Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced for obsolescence to \$133,260, resulting in a total taxable value of \$180,000 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0124E      PARCEL NO. 218-162-05 – DI FRANCESCO, JOHN & CAROLINE  
A – HEARING NO. 11-0233**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4845 Buckhaven Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Letter and supporting documentation, 5 pages.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Joe Johnson, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated the Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value based on a sales analysis.

With regard to Parcel No. 218-162-05, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$524,368, resulting in a total taxable value of \$639,468 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0125E      PARCEL NO. 526-111-39 – MESI, ERIC  
– HEARING NO. 11-0253**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6865 Quantum Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Supporting documentation, 5 pages.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gary Warren, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He recommended that the Board uphold the Assessor's taxable values based on the comparable sales provided in Exhibit I. Of the five sales provided by the Petitioner, he noted that two were similar in quality class and were in the same vicinity as the subject property. Chairperson Covert asked if the appraiser thought a reduction was warranted based on the Petitioner's information. Appraiser Warren stated there was a lot of variation in the sales and volatility in housing prices. He indicated the more recent sales data would be considered when the neighborhood was reappraised for the 2012-13 tax year.

With regard to Parcel No. 526-111-39, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0126E      PARCEL NO. 089-182-06 – BRYANT, SCOTT M**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0289**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6580 David James Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gary Warren, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated there were a number of comparable sales provided in Exhibit I that clearly supported the Assessor's taxable values. Chairperson Covert observed the Petitioner had not requested a specific value.

With regard to Parcel No. 089-182-06, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0127E      PARCEL NO. 148-041-18 – GRAY LIVING TRUST**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0290**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5830 Mountain Shadow Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

**Exhibit A:** Letter and supporting documentation, 49 pages.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gail Vice, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She reviewed the recent comparable sales provided in Exhibit I. She stated the Assessor's Office was not in agreement with the recent appraisal submitted by the Petitioner. She noted there were better comparables right down the street from the subject property that had not been used in the appraisal.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-041-18, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0128E      PARCEL NO. 047-010-03 – LODESTAR FINANCIAL GROUP**  
**– HEARING NO. 11-0273**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 Mount Rose Highway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

None.

**Assessor**

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, no one was present to offer testimony.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Gail Vice, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She presented the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to decrease the taxable land value based on an adjustment for lack of accessibility. She explained a bridge would have to be constructed to gain access to a home site. She identified a creek running through the southwest corner of the property that inhibited its access from Joy Lake Road. She said there was currently an easement at the top of the property but it was not dedicated and a tremendous amount of infrastructure would be required to access a home site from that direction. She stated the Appellant was in agreement with the recommendation. Chairperson Covert asked about the improvements. Appraiser Vice replied there was a well on the property. She thought it had been placed there in 1999 and subsequently ran into problems. Chairperson Covert observed there was City water available in the area.

With regard to Parcel No. 047-010-03, pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$280,000 and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$282,296 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on a 50 percent detriment for lack of access and inability to build a home site without first constructing a bridge. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0129E      BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

There were no Board member comments.

**11-0130E      PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

**1:47 p.m.**      There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, the meeting was adjourned.

---

**JAMES COVERT**, Chairperson  
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

---

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

*Minutes prepared by  
Lisa McNeill, Deputy Clerk*