

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

TUESDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 7, 2012

PRESENT:

James Covert, Chairman
John Krolick, Vice Chairman
James Brown, Member
Philip Horan, Member
Linda Woodland, 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 Chief Deputy Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

12-0176E PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

12-0177E WITHDRAWN PETITIONS

The following petition scheduled on today's agenda had been withdrawn by the Petitioners prior to the hearing:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
031-192-06	BURNEY TRUST, KENNETH JR. & LINDA R.	12-0104

12-0178E REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

The following petition scheduled on today's agenda was granted a continuance to February 24, 2012:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
148-081-16	CLIFFORD, DOUGLAS R. & LAURIE L.	12-0576

The following petition scheduled on today's agenda was granted a continuance to February 29, 2012:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
204-221-38	HARTZELL, DOUGLAS	12-0320

12-0179E CONSOLIDATION OF HEARINGS

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

Chairman Covert advised this was a citizen board whose job was to weigh evidence to determine who had the best evidence regarding the value of the property. The Petitioner's evidence had to outweigh the Assessor's evidence for the Board to rule in the Petitioner's favor. He said he just wanted to make sure everyone understood how the proceedings worked.

12-0180E PARCEL NO. 220-021-06 – GINDER FAMILY TRUST – HEARING NO. 12-0321

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4415 Sharps Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 8 pages.

Exhibit B: Photographs, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Assessor's response to *Marshall and Swift* cost increase dated February 1, 2012, 49 pages.

Exhibit III: Letter from State of Nevada, Department of Taxation to Mr. Galloway dated January 24, 2012 and Notice of Decision, 6 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Michael Ginder 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. He stated it was a 4,650 square foot single-family residence, the neighborhood could be found on page 4 of Exhibit I, and the subject could be found on page 5 of Exhibit I.

Mr. Ginder said he was requesting a reduction to the subject's building value as determined by the Assessor's Office for tax year 2012-13. He stated his community was gated and consisted of upper-end custom homes. He said he found it hard to accept a 7.8 percent increase in the subject's building value, even though he understood it was due to the replacement value. He said he had copies of letters from two

local home contractors stating building cost increases had been flat last year and would not increase next year, which were pages 9 and 10 in Exhibit A.

Mr. Ginder requested the \$693,000 building value be reduced to \$644,239 as stated in his arguments presented in Exhibit A. He believed his home was assessed at a higher relative value than the homes adjacent to the subject on Sharps Road, which were shown in the photos in Exhibit B. He said the subject was rated an excellent value (60 value), while the neighbors ranged from 75 to 80, which was a 20 percent higher valuation in quality class. He stated Exhibit 2 (page 3 of Exhibit A) showed the increase in building values for tax year 2012-13 for the subject and his neighbors. He stated with factoring in the adjustment for depreciation, the subject's increase was 6.3 percent and the neighbors' increases were 3.5 percent. He stated Exhibits 3 and 4 (pages 4 and 5 of Exhibit A) compared the interior square footage of the subject versus his neighbors. He said the subject's building value was \$149 per square foot and the neighbors' values ranged from \$116 to \$140 per square foot. He reiterated those were homes with quality classes 20 percent higher and had larger buildings, pools, double kitchens, and slab granite, while his house had none of that. He said his home was consistently appraised at a higher building value, which he did not understand.

Mr. Ginder said the home at 4375 Sharps Road, which was built a year after the subject, had a quality rating of 80, an outside elaborate pool, a gourmet kitchen, a separate private kitchen, and was valued at \$140 per square foot. He said the explanation given to him by the Assessor's Office was there were different applications by *Marshall and Swift* for excellent homes versus extremely high-value homes, which would vary the homes' calculations.

Mr. Ginder said his question was why his home, with a 25 percent lower quality value, commanded a 7 percent higher relative building value than his neighbors. He believed the answer was in the erroneous methodologies used by the Assessor based on *Marshall and Swift* when appraising buildings with quality ratings over 60, which were then unequally applied to buildings with quality ratings 60 and below like the subject.

Mr. Ginder said the last point he wanted to make regarding unequal valuations was that his rental property in D'Andrea was reduced by 4 percent for tax year 2012-13, which he did not understand.

Appraiser Johnson read the comments regarding the comparable sales on page 1 of Exhibit I.

Appraiser Johnson confirmed Mr. Ginder's home was a quality class 6 and that the *Marshall and Swift Residential Costing Handbook* was used to cost residential properties with quality classes from 1 through 6. He said the *Exceptional Homes Manual* was used for homes with a quality class of 7 and above, and its use was required by State statute. He explained that generated different numbers. He noted the Assessor's Office was also required to use the *Commercial Handbook* for commercial properties. He stated

different occupancies varied during the last reappraisal with some going up and some going down.

Appraiser Johnson explained the Petitioner's rental property in D'Andrea decreased because it was tested by the market and some obsolescence was applied to bring the properties down below market value. Chairman Covert advised the Petitioner's rental property in D'Andrea was not relevant. Appraiser Johnson said he was just addressing the Petitioner's concern.

Chairman Covert asked if the Assessor's Office could make an adjustment if something was found to be out of whack for whatever reason. Appraiser Johnson replied it could be adjusted through obsolescence if it was over market value. Chairman Covert said also an adjustment could be made if there was some other detriment to the property. He stated he was speaking theoretically because there had been so many comments on how the Assessor's Office arrived at its values. He stated he got the impression people thought the appraisers only looked at the handbooks and nothing else was considered. Appraiser Johnson said the subject had a downward adjustment for topography, which recognized that detriment.

Chairman Covert asked how far away from the subject the comparable sales were located. Appraiser Johnson said they were shown on the neighborhood map on page 4 of Exhibit I. He stated two were within the same gated community and the others were in the Juniper Ridge subdivision, which was less than a mile away.

Chairman Covert asked Appraiser Johnson to address the Petitioner's comparable sales. Appraiser Johnson said the *Exceptional Quality Custom Home Costing Handbook* was used for the next door neighbors, which was why they had different costs. Chairman Covert said they had a different cost per square foot, but they still had a higher valuation. Appraiser Johnson said there was an economy of scale because the larger the house the less the cost per square foot, which was due to generally little fluctuation in the land value. Chairman asked if things like swimming pools would be adjusted for. Appraiser Johnson said that was on the record.

Chairman Covert asked Appraiser Johnson to address the sale of Parcel No. 220-022-02, which sold in December 2011. Appraiser Johnson said that parcel was a quality class 80, which was not comparable to the Petitioner's house. He stated when setting his parameters, he usually went one quality class above and one below, and he also set certain parameters on the square footage. He advised the property was a distressed sale and the house was vacant because the owner had to move out due to medical reasons. He read from the MLS listing that indicated the seller was interested in any trade that would work.

Member Krolick asked if the sale demonstrated the neighborhood was trending downward. Appraiser Johnson believed all high-end homes were trending downward.

Member Horan asked for more information about the *Exceptional Homes Manual*. Josh Wilson, Assessor, previously sworn, said it was a different handbook published by *Marshall and Swift*.

Mr. Ginder indicated he had no further testimony.

Member Horan asked if the Assessor answered the Petitioner's question. Mr. Ginder said he understood about the two *Marshall and Swift* handbooks being used, but consistently year after year the spreads did not make sense for homes that were next door to each other and where a neighbor had a 20 percent higher value and was consistently appraised for a lower building cost per square foot than the subject. Chairman Covert asked if the Petitioner understood older homes benefited from the 1.5 percent yearly depreciation. Mr. Ginder said he did and that was why he brought the example of 4375 Sharps Road, which was appraised at a much lower per square foot value. He stated that did not make sense.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

Member Horan said this argument had been heard in previous arguments regarding costing the buildings. He stated while it might logically seem inconsistent, it was something that had to be lived with because it was embedded in Statute. He said there was nothing the Board could do about adjusting that portion of the value.

Chairman Covert asked if there was any logic in the cutoff at the 6 quality class for the two *Marshall and Swift* manuals. Mr. Wilson replied he did not know why that was the cutoff, except perhaps the quality of those properties was of such a higher standard than the quality class 6 in the general *Residential Handbook* that it was felt it was required to adequately estimate the cost of replacement for those properties. He noted *Marshall and Swift* gave a brief description of what was generally included in each type of home and, as the quality class grades got higher, the descriptions were more detailed. He stated he did not know why *Marshall and Swift* chose to create separate manuals, but he speculated the *Residential Costing Handbook* covered 90 percent of the homes.

Member Krolick felt the neighborhood was trending downward, so he felt an adjustment would be appropriate. Chairman Covert said he was looking at that also, but he also understood the economies of scale for an 8.0 quality class, which was a \$9 per square foot difference. He stated he was not convinced the difference was out of the ordinary.

With regard to Parcel No. 220-021-06, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried with Member Krolick voting "no," it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0181E PARCEL NO. 148-061-06 – RADOW, JULES J. & MARSHA S. –
HEARING NO. 12-0317

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5615 Foret Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Supporting documentation, 51 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Letter from Jules and Marsha Radow, 5 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Jules and Marc Radow were sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Marc Radow stated pages 2 and 3 of Exhibit A showed the 80 sales in Area 171 during the period of June 2010 through June 2011, but the Assessor's Office only used three sales as comparables. He stated the average selling price was \$661,205 or \$182 per square foot, and the average size was 3,491 square feet. He said the subject was 5,728 square feet. He stated using 5,728 square feet times the average selling price indicated a total value of \$1,047,986.

Marc Radow said a series of code violations led to casualty losses inside the house due to flooding and forced his parents to make drastic changes throughout the property. He stated given the trajectory of the economy in the last several years, his parents chose to make more affordable replacements than what was in the house when it was originally purchased.

Marc Radow stated the Assessor said the finished basement was considered as part of the house's living area, which it was not. He noted the picture on page 4 of Exhibit A showed the area was only used for storage because it was adjacent to the very noisy mechanical room. Chairman Covert asked if the basement was finished with wall board, paint, carpet, and cabinets. Jules Radow replied it was used for storage of paint and additional carpeting, but it was painted. Marc Radow clarified the basement had been finished with lighting and a pool table, but those were removed due to the

flooding. He said the Chubb Group of Insurance Companies report, on page 15 of Exhibit A, listed the living area as 5,728 square feet and the finished basement as 1,079 square feet. He noted in 2009 the finished basement was valued at \$138 per square foot, which was significantly closer to the attached garage at \$110 per square foot than the living area at \$275 per square foot. He explained the 2009 value was from before the occurrence of the casualty losses. He said he was trying to demonstrate the basement was only a storage area.

Marc Radow said the first code violation involved the in-ground pool. He explained the gas lines supplying the pool's heating elements had to be removed because they were undersized and were a threat to the entire house. He stated rather than spending \$100,000 to correct the code violation, the pool was removed and the area filled with cement. He noted the Assessor showed the subject had three custom fireplaces, but there were only two. He said the flooding ruined the six architectural beams, which were not replaced due to the \$50,000 replacement cost.

Marc Radow stated the kitchen was completely redone, but the 10-foot tall custom cabinets were replaced with shorter prefabricated cabinets. Chairman Covert asked if the Petitioner's homeowners insurance covered the loss. Jules Radow replied the insurance covered part of it. He said because the policy was written on a replacement cost basis, to get the full benefit items had to be replaced with the same materials, but he chose to downgrade the kitchen materials. He stated all of the problems evolved into litigation with the prior owner and the contractors who built the home. He said from the time the initial loss occurred until around six months ago, he was doing nothing but fixing the house. He stated a one-inch or a one and a half inch gas line was installed when a two-inch gas line was required and all of the appliances had to be replaced. He said the insurance company was located in Redding, California and they did not want to go back and forth to Reno. He said he thought the problems were taken care of except for the gas lines, but he needed more money to replace them.

Marc Radow hoped the Board got an idea of what his parents had been living through. He said he added up the items that had to be replaced and they totaled \$300,000. He stated based on the comparative sales, the actual size of the living area, and the diminished values; he was requesting the total taxable value be reduced to \$1,047,986.

Chairman Covert asked if the property would pass an inspection if it was put on the market. Marc Radow said considering today's market, he did not see why a buyer would be willing to accept the existing conditions and the value of the house would have to be significantly discounted.

Member Horan noted the subject was purchased in 2006, and he asked when the problems began. Jules Radow said they began on February 22, 2007. Member Woodland asked what caused the flood. Jules Radow stated the flooding of the crawl space was caused by the inept construction of the spa, which was not apparent until it was filled with water. He said because of the flood, rats were found. He stated the general

contractor would not address the issues, and he was suing him and all of the subcontractors who worked on the house. Marc Radow said his mother had medical conditions, which were exasperated by the problems with the house and which made it unlivable. He stated the problems were not disclosed by the original owner, and there was evidence the general contractor also knew of the problems but did not disclose them when his parents took ownership.

Appraiser Kinne stated the subject's taxable value was appealed in 2010-11, when it was discovered the property had many construction defects. He said the County Board of Equalization (BOE) ordered an interior inspection be done to reevaluate the quality class. He said as a result of that inspection, the quality class was reduced from a 10 to a 9. He stated that resulted in an approximately \$150,000 reduction to the building value from \$1,494,071 in 2009 to \$1,267,254 in 2010.

Appraiser Kinne said Exhibit II was a letter written by the Petitioner dated January 14, 2010, which documented the same problems being brought up during this hearing and which were also documented in Petitioner's Exhibit A. He stated those problems accounted for the quality class reduction in 2010-11. He said based on a conversation with the homeowner, all of the problems were cured in 2010. He believed a 9 quality class for the size of the property was more than fair to account for all of the detriments and the attached stigma.

Member Horan asked how a quality class was determined. Appraiser Kinne said everything from the roof design, interior finishes, volume of the interior, walls, floor coverings, and cabinets would be looked at to determine a quality class. He stated based on the interior inspection in February 2010, the house was very indicative of a 9 quality class.

Gail Vice, Sr. Appraiser, previously sworn, explained it took walking through a substantial number of homes to get comfortable with evaluating the quality class, especially for the high-end homes. She said the reduction in the height of the kitchen cabinets, the downsizing of the kitchen, the layout of the house, and the number of fixtures were some of the things considered. She advised a 7 quality class was the lowest allowed in Montroux. She said the quality classes started with a 7 and went up to 12, with the majority being from 9.5 to 10.5.

Chairman Covert stated even if everything was repaired to a lower quality class, he would have to disclose what was done. Member Krolick confirmed that was true. Chairman Covert said if he was a buyer in Montroux and that disclosure was made, he would walk away because nobody in their right mind would buy a house with that type of background. Sr. Appraiser Vice said she understood the problems were cured. Chairman Covert believed the mere disclosure of the problems would reduce the value.

Appraiser Kinne said based on the inspection, the basement met the definition of a finished basement with its floor coverings and its painted drywall. Member Horan noted the quality class of the basement was not the same as that of the upstairs

living area, and he asked how that would impact the valuation. Appraiser Kinne said page 2 of Exhibit I showed the actual cost for a finished basement, which was \$90 per square foot. He noted the living area of the house was over \$200 per square foot.

Appraiser Kinne noted the Petitioner's comparables were in Montroux, St. James's Village, Callahan Ranch, and Galena Forest. He said he tried to stay in Montroux when pulling comparable sales because Montroux was superior to those other neighborhoods. He reviewed the comments regarding the comparable sales on page 1 of Exhibit I. He stated the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's valuation.

In rebuttal, Jules Radow said Chubb Insurance cancelled his policy after the three or four losses that occurred within two years. He stated he paid Chubb \$5,000 a year for \$2 million in coverage and now he paid \$16,000 a year for less coverage. He said he could not get all of the coverage he wanted, which meant part of the house was self-insured. He stated there had been major problems when it rained, which would have to be disclosed along with insurance issues, even though he hoped any new floods would be contained. He said the noise from the mechanical room in the basement could not be contained. He felt the house was his prison instead of being his castle. He said he feared going away, because he was afraid another bomb would be dropped on the house. He stated it would cost \$26,000 to \$200,000 to open up the walls to access the gas lines and then to re-plaster and repaint the walls. He said the cost would depend on where the gas lines were located. Marc Radow stated his father's comment was regarding the Appraiser's statement that the problems were from the year before, which instead were ongoing.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

Member Krolick said he could see making a further reduction. He stated once it was known a house suffered from bad construction, buyers would not want to risk buying the property. Chairman Covert said that was his fear as well.

Chairman Covert suggested rolling the building value back to last year's \$1,127,748 value. Member Krolick felt that was appropriate.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-061-06, 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 taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$1,127,748, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,325,748 for tax year 2012-13. The reduction was based on obsolescence of \$187,169. 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.

12-0182E PARCEL NO. 148-223-01 – KEPKE, WILLIAM F. –
HEARING NO. 12-0008R11

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 630 Piney Creek Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter, supporting documentation and photographs, 6 pages.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted this was a 2011-12 reopen due to the home being finished.

Mr. Kepke stated the house was started in 2006-07, but it was abandoned by the builder during the market collapse. He said it was put up for sale as-is. He stated he walked through it and determined it needed 10 percent more work to complete the house, so he bought it. He stated he renewed the building permit, which expired because the house had been abandoned for so long. He felt his taxes should not be more than what he paid for the property plus what he spent to finish it, but the adjusted appraisal was for \$100,000 more than he put into the property. When he asked why it went up so much, it was explained it had been estimated the house was 30 percent incomplete as shown on page 8 of Exhibit I. He explained the Appraiser never came back to do the final appraisal between the time the 30 percent estimate was done and when the house was abandoned. He said it was really 90-92 percent complete when purchased, which was alluded to on page 1 of Exhibit I. He believed the mistake was the adjustment was made to the assessed value based on it being 30 percent unfinished rather than on the actual 10 percent unfinished. He noted the purchase price was \$725,000, he spent an additional \$56,000 to complete the house, and since then he put in around \$2,000 in trees. Chairman Covert asked when the house was finished. Mr. Kepke replied it was finished in November 2010.

Mr. Kepke said if the house had been 30 percent unfinished, he did not think he could have gotten that much work done in the two months before he received the Certificate of Occupancy because he did not have any contractors lined up when the property closed. He said the appraisal was higher than what he could sell it for, and he should only pay taxes on what he paid for it because it was a recent sale.

Mr. Kepke stated his house was located on a part of Piney Creek Road that was unfinished because it narrowed in front of his property to a one-lane paved road. He stated there was also a six-foot high rock and dirt debris pile that started in front of his house and ran down to the end of Piney Creek Road, which detracted from the value of the house. He said the houses the Assessor's Office used as a comparison were fully landscaped and the roads they were on were finished.

Appraiser Kinne read the comments on page 1 of Exhibit I.

Chairman Covert asked if the house was completed as of last year's appraisal date. Appraiser Kinne said the house was complete as of the Assessor's July 1st lien date.

Member Woodland stated she thought arrangements had been made for the Assessor's Office to conduct an inspection. Mr. Kepke said the Appraiser wanted to come in after everything was completed and he received the Certificate of Occupancy. He stated it was not a secret he was finishing the house, and the Appraiser could have come by anytime. He stated he asked the Appraiser if he viewed the house if there was chance he would lower the assessment, and the Appraiser said no. He felt there would not be any benefit to letting him in because the visit would be one-sided if its purpose was to raise the value. He said the property was valued at more than he paid for it and it was a current sale. He felt the comparables did not pertain to the subject because the sale price was actual data, and anything else was speculation. He said if the road was fixed, then the subject could be valued like the house up the street that it was being compared to.

Member Woodland asked if the subject was a distressed sale. Mr. Kepke replied it was a Multiple Listing Service (MLS) listing, and was not bank owned.

Josh Wilson, Assessor, previously sworn, said the Petitioner felt since he paid \$725,000 and put in another \$56,000, he had \$781,000 invested in the property; and the Petitioner did not understand how it could have been valued at \$861,678. He said the difference was due to *Marshall and Swift's* 10 percent increase as of the July 1, 2011 lien date for the 2011-12 fiscal year. He stated as of that date the house was 100 percent complete, which was what the Assessor's assessed value represented. He said the issue was if the taxable value exceeded market value based on the quality class assignment. He stated it was difficult to make a quality class assessment when being refused entry. He believed the Petitioner felt his value should be no greater than \$781,000 but, based on the *Marshall and Swift* calculation and the estimate of the quality class, the Assessor's valuation was \$861,678.

Chairman Covert asked how the quality class was estimated if the Appraiser was refused entry. Mr. Wilson said the building plans and information gathered using aerial photography were used. Mr. Kepke said the volume of the house was the same as when he bought it, and he felt the purchase price should establish a new baseline value. He said regardless of what the Assessor's Office was trying to compare the subject with, \$725,000 was what the property sold for and that was all it was worth.

Mr. Wilson said he had not heard the Petitioner objecting to the 6 quality class, but felt the computed taxable value exceeded market value.

In rebuttal, Mr. Kepke said if the Assessor's Office wanted to adjust the subject based on the neighborhood, then the Board needed to look at the pictures in Exhibit A showing all the debris that needed to be cleaned up. He said the Appraiser could come out at anytime and look in all of the windows. He stated other than some carpet, drapes and a fireplace, the house looked the same as it did when he purchased it.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

Member Horan said the taxable value was close to market prices. Chairman Covert stated when looking at the square footage range of \$137 to \$204, he felt \$197 was a little high and it should be closer to the \$160 range. He said kicking out the low and the high numbers and then calculating the average would eliminate any skewing.

Member Horan said he would support the Assessor's valuation.

Member Woodland made a motion to uphold the Assessor's valuation, which Member Horan seconded. Chairman Covert and Members Brown and Krolick were opposed. The motion did not carry.

Chairman Covert suggested reducing the improvement value by \$133,533 in obsolescence to \$578,145 and leaving land the same, resulting in a total taxable value of \$728,145.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-223-01, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried with Members Horan and Woodland voting "no," it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$578,145, resulting in a total taxable value of \$728,145 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on obsolescence of \$133,533. 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.

Chairman Covert said if the Petitioner came before the Board again, he wanted to make sure the Assessor's Office had access to the inside of the house.

Mr. Kepke asked if only this year's taxes would be adjusted to reflect the changes to the prior year. Chairman Covert replied the adjustment only applied to the year appealed and each year stood alone. Mr. Kepke noted it was too late to file an appeal for this year.

Mr. Wilson said the Petitioner should pay the taxes due in early March, and, once the Treasurer received the Decision Letter, any excess taxes between this

Board's decision and the originally established value would be refunded. He stated he did not show the 2012-13 value was appealed. Mr. Kepke advised he did not appeal because he assumed any change in value would adjust forward.

10:31 a.m. The Board recessed.

10:50 a.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0161PP AND 12-0161

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

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

Mr. Ruddock said he would stand on the \$325 value he put down on his petition.

Appraiser Kinne suggested Hearing No's 12-0161PP and 12-0161 be consolidated. Ms. Parent called Hearing No. 12-0161.

Appraiser Kinne stated there was a recommendation to reduce the land value to \$20,000 for a total taxable value of \$22,562 for Hearing No. 12-0161. He advised the reduction was based on the comparable land sales indicating the subject was over market value. He said the improvements of \$2,562 were the hookups for the personal property.

Mr. Ruddock said he had nothing further to add.

Appraiser Kinne said the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's taxable value of \$2,579 for Hearing No. 12-0161PP, which started on page 4 of Exhibit I.

Member Krolick asked if Mr. Ruddock had an opinion of value for the mobile home, and he asked when it was built. Mr. Ruddock replied it was built in 1972/1973. Member Krolick stated typically mobile homes lost value until they could not even be sold at \$500. He said he could see reducing the personal property value.

Member Woodland asked if anyone lived on the property. Mr. Ruddock stated he did. Member Woodland asked about the mobile home's size. Mr. Ruddock said it was a three bedroom, double-wide mobile home. Appraiser Kinne said the dimensions of the mobile home were 24 feet x 60 feet or 1,440 square feet.

Chairman Covert said he agreed with Member Krolick that there would not be much of a resale value on a mobile home that old. Member Krolick suggested reducing the value of the personal property to \$1,000.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

See 12-0183E and 12-0184E below for details concerning the petition, exhibits and decisions related to each of the properties in the consolidated group.

**12-0183E ROLL NO. 3100200 – RUDDOCK, GREGORY –
HEARING NO. 12-0161PP**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on personal property located in Washoe County, Nevada.

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0161PP THROUGH 12-0161 above.

With regard to Roll No. 3100200, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, it was ordered that the taxable value be reduced to \$1,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,000 for the 2011-12 Unsecured Roll Year. With this adjustment, it was found the personal property was valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**12-0184E PARCEL NO. 080-481-36 – RUDDOCK, GREGORY –
HEARING NO. 12-0161**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 9485 Fleetwood 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, 13 pages.

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0161PP THROUGH 12-0161 above.

With regard to Parcel No. 080-481-36, 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 \$20,000 and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$22,562 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0185E PARCEL NO. 009-432-18 – MCCOMBS, DALE AND LIANE –
HEARING NO. 12-0298

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 105 Greensburg Circle, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: November 30, 2011 *Reno Gazette-Journal* newspaper article, 2 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Assessor's response to *Marshall and Swift* cost increase dated February 1, 2012, 49 pages.

Exhibit III: Letter from State of Nevada, Department of Taxation to Mr. Galloway dated January 24, 2012 and Notice of Decision, 6 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Dale McCombs 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. McCombs said his concern was with his building's taxable value going up, even with the current economic conditions in the Reno area. He understood the Assessor's Office used *Marshall and Swift*, but he noted there were a few discrepancies on the Residential Record Card on page 3 of Exhibit I. He said the card indicated the house's exterior walls were stucco, but the exterior walls were actually hardboard siding costing \$3,000 instead of the \$35,000 for stucco. He confirmed the house had a stone veneer. He said there was a pool, but it was fiberglass and not gunite as shown on the card. He said the cost to build a fiberglass pool was less than half of the cost to build a

gunite pool. He stated those two corrections should bring his value closer to his request of \$500,000.

Appraiser Johnson read the comments regarding the comparable sales on page 1 of Exhibit I. He said the taxable value did not exceed full cash value, and the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's value.

Appraiser Johnson said regarding the incorrect data on the Residential Record Card, he would be glad to conduct an inspection. Chairman Covert asked if the stucco added or subtracted value. Appraiser Johnson said the stucco and the hardboard siding were costed according to *Marshall and Swift*, and there was no difference, but the difference in taxable value for the pool was approximately \$5,000. He stated the card was corrected for the 2012/13 roll based on a factual error. He said the pool would have to be inspected but, if the pool was not gunite, the value could be changed going back three years.

In rebuttal, Mr. McCombs said he contested the assertion that stucco did not add more value than siding, especially when the costs were so different. He stated he would like to see the *Marshall and Swift* manual showing there was no difference. He said if something cost more, it made no sense to say the values were the same. Chairman Covert stated the Assessor's Office was required to use *Marshall and Swift*, but in this case the pool was a perfect example of how adjustments could be made.

Mr. McCombs said he did not understand how increasing the original building value by \$25,000 could be justified with the economy the way it was and with housing values going down. He believed a lot of other people in the area were very upset with this. He stated he was happy with the land value, but the building value going up \$25,000 was absurd as was saying stucco did not add value to a house.

Member Horan said the Petitioner was not the first person to disagree with *Marshall and Swift*, but its use to determine value was embedded in Statute. He advised the Board was not in the position to change the *Marshall and Swift's* valuation.

Mr. McCombs said a \$5,000 decrease for a gunite pool was low. Appraiser Johnson advised the numbers came out of *Marshall and Swift*. Chairman Covert asked how old the pool was. Appraiser Johnson said the pool was built in 1988.

Member Horan said he believed since the changes would be taken care of as an error in the description, the Board did not need to make any adjustments. Appraiser Johnson replied that was correct, and he reiterated the descriptions were corrected for the 2012-13 roll. He said to go any further back would require an inspection. Mr. McCombs said he would like the Assessor's Office to go back as far as they legally could.

With regard to Parcel No. 009-432-18, 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 Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that

the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

**12-0186E PARCEL NO. 007-201-37 – MCCOMBS, DALE –
HEARING NO. 12-0431A**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located on University Terrace, 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, Dale McCombs was previously sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Mr. McCombs said the building should be shown as being located on the subject, Parcel No. 007-201-37, instead of on Parcel No. 007-201-38. He stated he was getting an extremely high tax bill because Parcel No. 007-201-38 was larger. He said he had been dealing with Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, for a couple of years regarding this issue, and recently the building was put on the right parcel. He stated the back lot had more square footage and was worth more than the front lot, and he wanted a refund on the overage charged on his taxes.

Mr. McCombs said the subject building was a four-plex, but he was being charged for 16 units. He believed Appraiser Churchfield had taken care of that, but he wanted to make sure how many units he was being charged for.

Chairman Covert asked for clarification on which parcel the building was located on. Mr. McCombs replied the building was on Parcel No. 007-201-37 and Parcel No. 007-201-38 was vacant, but he owned both parcels.

Appraiser Bozman explained the correction the Petitioner was talking about would be heard on February 17, 2012 as a Roll Change Request (RCR). He said he understood today's hearing was to discuss the value of the property and not the RCR.

Mr. McCombs reiterated he wanted to know how many units he was being assessed for. Appraiser Bozman said the building was identified as a four-plex. He explained there were 16 separate bedrooms and baths, which were rented separately, and each set of four bedrooms shared a common area. He said the income was based on the 16 rentals. Mr. McCombs said the Assessor's Office had been charging him as if it was 16 units. Appraiser Bozman reiterated that was being addressed on February 17th. Mr. McCombs asked if he should be present on February 17th. Chairman Covert replied that would be a good idea. Mr. McCombs asked if the Assessor's Office would be able to resolve the discrepancies on February 17th. Chairman Covert said not knowing what would be happening on February 17th, he could not address that question. Appraiser Bozman explained there was one RCR that would go before the Board of County Commissioners asking for a decrease. He said the RCR being heard on February 17th before this Board was for an increase. He stated the Petitioner could address any concerns he had regarding that issue at that time.

Appraiser Bozman said improved sale IS-1 was the most comparable sale because it was also a four-plex. He stated it sold for \$129,500 per four-plex unit. He said that sale substantiated the subject's value and the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's valuation.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-201-37, 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 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0187E PARCEL NO. 007-201-38 – MCCOMBS, DALE –
HEARING NO. 12-0431B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 400 University Terrace, 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, 10 pages.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Michael Bozman, Appraiser, said this parcel was being corrected to remove the improvement it used to contain.

Josh Wilson, Assessor, previously sworn, said there were two different Roll Change Requests (RCR's). He said one would be heard on February 17, 2012 by this Board to increase the building value for the parcel in the previous hearing, Hearing No. 12-0431A. He stated the RCR going before the Board of County Commissioners was to decrease the value on this parcel due to removing the improvement value from it. He stated he brought that up because he understood the Petitioner felt the vacant parcel's land value was incorrect. Mr. McCombs said that was correct, and the land was appraised per square foot. He stated he was being charged more taxes because the lot the building was incorrectly located on was a few thousand square feet larger.

Chairman Covert said the land was 8,715 square feet. Mr. McCombs believed the land on the front lot was 5,000 square feet. Chairman Covert said the Assessor's Office had valued this parcel as vacant land. Mr. Wilson said that was correct and was why there was a significant decline in its value from \$168,000 down to \$39,218 this year. He stated he believed the Petitioner did not have a problem with the parcel's current value, but was concerned with last year's value based on the assumption it had x number of units on it. He said his concern was RCR's were used to correct a factual error, such as the building's square footage. He stated he did not understand why the Petitioner had not appealed the land value on this parcel when he received his notice for a value of \$217,000 in 2009, \$176,000 in 2010, and \$168,000 in 2011. He said each of those years should have been appealed to the County Board of Equalization separately, which he wanted to make sure the taxpayer understood.

Mr. Wilson said the land value for Parcel No. 007-201-37 that the building was now put on was significantly lower than that of the parcel the building was erroneously put on (subject). Chairman Covert asked if that was because the property was smaller. Ms. Wilson advised it was because of the number of units the property could support. Chairman Covert said that would be heard later. Mr. Wilson said his concern was it would not be heard, because he did not know if 2009, 2010 or 2011 was ever appealed to this Board. He stated the Assessor's Office did not make opinion type adjustments before the Board of Equalization, which the land value was. He stated he would have to look at the RCR to see what it said.

Mr. Wilson said he understood today's appeal was for the \$39,218 land value on this vacant parcel. Chairman Covert agreed. Mr. McCombs said the Assessor made the mistake, and why did he have to appeal their mistake. He advised he pointed this out two years ago, and nothing was done. Chairman Covert said he could have appealed to this Board, which was what Mr. Wilson was saying. Mr. McCombs said he

thought he had it resolved with the Assessor's Office. Chairman Covert said the Board could not go back, but could only deal with what was in front of it.

Chairman Covert stated the vacant land was valued at \$39,218. Mr. Wilson said that was correct, and last year the value was \$168,000. Mr. McCombs explained that was his point. Mr. Wilson said he wanted to talk with Appraiser Churchfield because what happened was very unfortunate and unacceptable if it occurred the way the Petitioner indicated. He advised he did not know what to do about it without an appeal of the \$168,000 land value last year. He stated the factual error would be to remove three years of value for the apartment building that was located on the wrong parcel. He said it would not address the land value. Chairman Covert asked what the Petitioner's remedy for the land would be. Mr. Wilson said he did not know if there was one, but he wanted to look at the correspondence that occurred for the two years the Petitioner had been working with the Assessor's Office to get this corrected, especially since fixing the roll was happening two years later. He stated he was extremely concerned about that.

Chairman Covert said right now, the Board was dealing with the taxable value of the vacant land for Hearing 12-0431B. Member Krolick asked what the Petitioner felt the value of the land should be. Mr. McCombs believed the value currently was correct. He stated what happened was not his fault, and he just wanted his money back.

Member Krolick noted the property was for sale. Mr. McCombs said it was, but he had not received any offers at the listed amount of \$200,000. Member Krolick asked if he would sell it for \$39,218. Mr. McCombs replied he would not. Member Krolick asked if he would sell it for \$168,000. Mr. McCombs replied probably, but that did not make any difference.

Chairman Covert said the Board had to look at what was in front of it, and Mr. Wilson indicated he had to check out the facts before he could commit to anything. Mr. McCombs advised he was happy with that. Mr. Wilson said he wanted to make sure the Petitioner got a copy of the RCR that would be going to the Board of County Commissioners.

Mr. McCombs asked if the discrepancy would be refunded. Chairman Covert said he had no idea because that was not this Board's responsibility, and he called for a motion.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-201-38, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0188E PARCEL NO. 148-272-03 – RILEY FAMILY TRUST, DEIN P. –
HEARING NO. 12-0088

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 5370 Doublecreek Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales information, 8 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, Dein Riley was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Mr. Riley said he provided 11 comparables in Exhibit A and the pictures on page 1 of Exhibit A were of his 5.7 acre property. Chairman Covert asked if the box in the photo was electricity. Mr. Riley replied he believed it was electricity for the lot next to his. He noted the subject property was located in a flood zone and a creek ran along both sides of it. He said one side of the property sat below the creek and was always in danger of flooding. He noted the Army Corp of Engineers had to go in and change the dynamics of the creek. He said below the property was Jones Creek, which was eroding the bottom of the property. He stated the neighbor who shared his property line had to bring in some rock and fill to try to stop the erosion, but it continually happened; and he was not sure what could be done to stop it.

Mr. Riley said his comparable sales ranged from \$2,000 for a little over one acre to \$82,500 for a little over 15 acres, while many of the parcels were one or two acres in the \$50,000 range. He stated none of the properties were listings, but were all properties that sold in the vicinity of the subject.

Mr. Riley said since *Marshall and Swift* seemed to be the golden rule, he would try to use it as tool to gauge his property's value. He stated there were five houses in the same homeowners association (HOA), and the house on 2.91 acres on page 2 of Exhibit A just sold for \$445,600 after being on the market for 258 days. He said that was about half the acreage of the subject. He said he tried to get the *Marshall and Swift* numbers for the zip code, but was unable to do so. He stated he talked with a several builders who felt \$175 per square foot was a reasonable number for building costs. He noted that figure did not take into account putting in an above ground septic system costing in the \$30,000 to \$50,000 range, which would be required because the property was located in a flood zone. He said even though it was a very scenic lot, its being

located in a flood zone made it less desirable. He stated using \$1.17 per square foot, which he believed would be much less than the *Marshall and Swift* golden rule, he came up with \$400,000 in building costs for this home making the land value \$45,000. He said since it was approximately half the size of his property, the \$45,000 should be doubled to \$90,000. He stated he requested a total taxable value of \$90,000 for the subject parcel.

Appraiser Kinne read from the comments on page 1 of Exhibit I.

Member Horan said the Petitioner used 5385 Double Creek Court as a reference point, and he asked if there was a base lot land value in that area. Appraiser Kinne said the Double Creek Court base lot value was \$290,000 for five acres, and the parcel received a 25 percent discount due to its location in the flood zone and for its irregular shape. Member Horan said he wanted the land value for 5385 Double Creek Court, which was the Petitioner's comparable sale. Appraiser Kinne replied it was \$127,500 for 2.91 acres. Member Brown asked what the date of sale was. Appraiser Kinne replied it was November 28, 2011 and was an improved property.

In rebuttal, Mr. Riley advised the property had been on the market for 258 days. He said it got a lot of people looking at it and there were a lot of opportunities for people to buy it, so it was not like someone stole the property. He stated Appraiser Kinne used a comparable sale on Franktown Road, which was in Washoe Valley. He said his Washoe Valley comparable was a gated 15-acre parcel listed for \$99,500 and sold for \$82,500. He stated the gated parcel was a pasture-type property with great views. He said he wanted to get his property on par with what properties were actually selling for and not what they were selling for a few years ago.

Chairman Covert asked Appraiser Kinne to address the Petitioner's comparable sale, and he also asked if there was anything unusual about the sale. Appraiser Kinne said Bank of America was the owner after it was taken back as a foreclosure. He said not much weight was being given to the Petitioner's comparable sales.

Chairman Covert said on page 2 of Exhibit I, there was a base-lot value of \$50,000 and he assumed that was per acre. Appraiser Kinne said that was correct. Chairman Covert asked if 25 percent was a normal reduction for being in a flood zone. Appraiser Kinne said it was a minus 10 percent reduction for being in a flood zone and minus 10 for the parcel's shape. He said there was also a minus five percent reduction for access, which was an error, and it should be minus 15 percent for the flood zone. He advised 15 percent was a typical adjustment for being in a flood zone. He said the 25 percent reduction was correct, but it was not allocated correctly because there were no access issues. Member Horan asked if the allocation would be changed. Appraiser Kinne verified he would change the allocation.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-272-03, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member

Woodland, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

Mr. Riley asked how much more evidence he had to bring beyond that of the house right across the street from his, which was on property half the size of his. He also asked why *Marshall and Swift* was not used because it was the Board's golden rule and was used for everyone else, but it did not apply to him. He said the comparable was right next to him, and he could not get one any closer if it fell on top of him from the moon. Member Horan said *Marshall and Swift* did not apply to land. Mr. Riley felt he explained pretty clearly if the property was taken off the land, it was identical to his land and size was doubled. Mr. Horan said the land on the adjoining property, per the Assessor, was appraised at half the size.

Chairman Covert advised the hearing was closed.

12-0189E PARCEL NO. 148-180-10 – RUSH FAMILY TRUST –
HEARING NO. 12-0318

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6638 Gebser Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter, comparable sales and supporting documentation, 7 pages.

Exhibit B: Comparable information, 37 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, Lori Gabriella-Rush was sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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

Ms. Rush stated she did not agree with the Assessor's recommendation. She said the subject's land value went down and the building's value increased 62 percent, which equated to an overall value increase of over 42 percent in one year. She stated Exhibit B (page 2) showed the homes sold in Montrux had an average sales price of \$853,156 or \$199 per square foot. She said a few of the comparable sales were smaller and a few were exactly the same size. She discussed her three comparables shown in

Exhibit B (pages 2A through 4) and noted their square footage was almost identical to the subject's square footage.

Ms. Rush said the subject was listed at \$880,000 and was bank owned. She said she offered \$800,000 and the bank accepted the offer. She said information about the subject was shown in Exhibit B (pages 5 through 9). She stated the map in Exhibit B (page 10) showed prices in Nevada decreased 12.6 percent. She said the Reno market did not support the subject's 42 percent increase.

Ms. Rush said homes in Montroux were not purchased based on their square footage, but based on their interior appointments. She stated the subject was built in 2001 as a speculative home with very basic features. She noted the Appraiser had never been in the house even though she said he could inspect it. She said the home inspection she had done was documented in Exhibit B (pages 12 through 28) and it detailed numerous construction defects. She stated she had a French drain constructed to alleviate the water problem under the house, but it did not work meaning additional work would have to be done. She said she could not sell the house for its \$1.135 million value due to all of disclosures that must be made, especially when homes down the street sold for \$975,940 and \$900,000. She noted homes in the Lausanne area of Montroux were valued higher and sold for a higher price. She stated she had not made any improvements to the outside of the house. She said even though *Marshall and Swift* indicated there was an increase in the building value, she based her premise on the fact that the State did not allow taxable value to exceed market value, which she believed was the case with her home. She stated she would be happy to sell her home at \$1.135 million, because she could go down the street and buy another house for \$950,000.

Member Woodland asked if there were rats. Ms. Rush said she did have them, but pest control services kept them at bay. Chairman Covert asked if the construction defects were cured. Ms. Rush said not all of them were cured, but she did fix the shower, put in light fixtures, and constructed the French drain. She stated the stucco still had to be repaired and the pillars were rotting. She said her repairs so far had been very basic.

Appraiser Kinne reviewed the comments regarding the comparable sales on page 1 of Exhibit I. He stated he was recommending \$60,499 in additional obsolescence be applied to the improvement value.

Member Horan asked what the cause was of the big swing in the building value from 2010 through 2012. Appraiser Kinne said it was because of the obsolescence placed on the property for the 2011/12 tax year. He stated that adjustment was removed, and the property was still receiving obsolescence, but not as much. Member Horan noted that was a huge amount of obsolescence. Appraiser Kinne said last year he had roughly 10 sales to work with and the subject's total taxable value exceeded market value. He said this year he had information on over 20 sales to work with. Chairman Covert asked if Appraiser Kinne had been in the house. Appraiser Kinne replied he had not, but he would be happy to inspect it. Member Horan said the only thing inspecting the house

might accomplish would be to decrease the quality class and what would that mean. Appraiser Kinne said he did not have the information on what it would mean if the subject went from a quality class of 10 to a 9. Chairman Covert asked what the highest quality class was. Appraiser Kinne replied it was a 12.

Member Horan asked if reducing the quality class was something the Assessor's Office could do because it would be a factual error. Ron Sauer, Chief Property Appraiser, previously sworn, said changing the quality class could lower the value, but it would not lower it enough to make it lower than what was being recommended for obsolescence. He advised the record would be changed if it was incorrect.

Member Krolick asked for more information regarding improved sale IS-5. Appraiser Kinne said it was an 8 quality class, because it was one of the more inferior homes in Montroux. He stated discussions with builders indicated the downturn in the market was the only reason lower quality class homes were allowed to be built in Montroux. Member Krolick said the defects made the subject somewhat inferior also. Appraiser Kinne stated he only found out about the defects when the Petitioner mentioned them at the beginning of this hearing.

In rebuttal, Ms. Rush said the Appraiser had not been in the house to judge the construction quality. She stated if her house was a 10 quality class, she would not have to correct all of its defects. She said her home was valued at \$249 per square foot, while most of the homes in the area were going for \$199 per square foot. She said she could not sell her home in its condition for its assessed value.

Chief Appraiser Sauer said a 10 quality class would not have been put on the house unless an appraiser went into it at some point during its construction. Chairman Covert noted that was before all of the problems occurred.

Chairman Covert asked if it would be beneficial to inspect the home for next year. Appraiser Kinne replied it would. Ms. Rush agreed. Member Horan said if it was factual it could be adjusted. Josh Wilson, Assessor, previously sworn, said the Assessor's Office wanted the data on the home to be correct. He stated if the home upon re-inspection was not indicative of a quality class 10, a correction would be made. He said Chief Appraiser Sauer indicated that, if such an adjustment occurred, it would not offset the additional obsolescence already being recommended.

Ms. Rush said she did not understand where obsolescence had anything to do with how State law said the assessed value could not exceed market value. Mr. Wilson stated the only reason to apply obsolescence would be to bring the property's total taxable value down to what the Assessor's Office felt it was worth. He noted the additional obsolescence would bring the value down to \$1,074,980. He said the taxpayer stated she paid \$800,000 for the property, but he believed it would also be worth the cost she put into it to fix the deficiencies. He said Appraiser Kinne felt that by applying the recommended obsolescence to bring the total taxable value down to \$1,074,980, the property could sell for that amount on today's open market; but the taxpayer felt there

was no way it would sell for that amount given the disclosures and the economic conditions in Montruex.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

Chairman Covert said he understood all of the defects had not been corrected. Ms. Rush said that was correct. Chairman Covert stated even if they were corrected, there would be the disclosure issue. He said if there were two identical houses with one having disclosure issues, he suspected they would be priced differently. He said with all of the defects, he did not see the value even with the recommended obsolescence. He suggested increasing the obsolescence by \$100,000 to \$150,000 to adjust for all of the defects. Member Krolick agreed with \$100,000. Member Horan suggested bringing the total taxable value down to \$1 million. Member Woodland agreed with the total value of \$1 million.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-180-10, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Chairman Covert, which motion duly carried with Members Horan and Woodland voting "no," it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$839,980, resulting in a total taxable value of \$974,980 for tax year 2012-13. The reduction was based on obsolescence. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

12-0190E PARCEL NO. 046-153-05 – PANKOPF, TORY –
HEARING NO. 12-0256

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 50 Bennington Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal and other supporting documentation, 60 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Assessor's response to *Marshall and Swift* cost increase dated February 1, 2012, 49 pages.

Exhibit III: Letter from State of Nevada, Department of Taxation to Mr. Galloway dated January 24, 2012 and Notice of Decision, 6 pages.

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

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

Mr. Pankopf said the property valuation study on page 5 of Exhibit A compared the assessments for all of the houses on Bennington Court and indicated the reductions in the taxable values of the land were fairly consistent at 53.3 percent. He discussed the varied building taxable values and noted the subject increased from \$1,096,460 to \$1,429,871, which was a 30.5 percent increase. He stated he was told by the Assessor's Office the increase was due to *Marshall and Swift*. He discussed the Builders' Construction Cost Indexes on page 46 of Exhibit A, which indicated the average increase was 3.1 percent and construction costs would repeat what they were in 2011. He said there was not a 30 percent increase in construction costs, because at most the increase would have been 3.1 percent. He stated only 1 percent of the homeowners in St. James's Village had a radical increase of 30.5 percent. He said No. 9 on page 5 of Exhibit A cost more to construct than the subject because it was over 7,000 square feet, which was 1,000 square feet larger than the subject, and had a stone exterior. He stated he had an appraiser do a *Marshall and Swift* analysis of the subject, and the appraiser arrived at a value of \$959,785, which was almost half a million dollars less than Assessor's value.

Mr. Pankopf said his house had construction defects, which were currently in litigation. He stated the contractor did not install the French drains around the entire parameter of the house or the one that should have been adjacent to the basement to keep water from going under the foundation. He said the contractor just put sand under the concrete slab and did not put down the proper base, which was causing significant cracking in the finished basement. He stated the rock exterior was unfinished, the three decks were leaking water, water was coming in through several windows, and several windows had unexplained cracking in the window panes. He discussed many more construction defects, and advised the estimate to correct the defects was approximately \$250,000.

Mr. Pankopf said in addition to the *Marshall and Swift* valuation he commissioned, he had three recent comparable sales. He stated the \$1 million sale at 82 Bennington Court was from the last quarter of 2011 and was the same type of house as the subject. He said 120 West Willis was a similar house, which sold for \$905,000; and 4770 Pinewild sold for \$950,000. He said the proposed adjustment of \$1,200,017 in his Exhibit C on page 5 of Exhibit B did not factor in the construction defects, but did show a 3.1 percent building increase, which would be an overall decrease of 3.7 percent.

Appraiser Kinne reviewed the comments regarding the subject and the comparable sales on page 1 of Exhibit I.

Member Brown noted improved sale IS-3 was very similar to the subject, except it had a 7 quality class. He asked if the quality class accounted for the difference in the sale price of \$1 million versus the subject's value of \$1,499,871. Appraiser Kinne

said IS-3 was inferior to the subject by two quality class points, but what IS-3 sold for was not what the replacement cost new minus depreciation would be.

Member Krolick asked why IS-1 had two sales prices. Appraiser Kinne replied one price was the time-adjusted sales price.

Member Horan asked if Appraiser Kinne was attributing the difference between IS-3 and the subject to the difference in quality class with a little depreciation thrown in. Appraiser Kinne said he understood the question was the sale price for IS-3 was \$1 million and why was there a difference of \$499,871. He stated the total taxable value for IS-3 was \$839,712, but he did not know why there was that difference.

In rebuttal, Mr. Pankopf stated he objected to the quality rating on his house. He stated he had been inside IS-3, which had the same fixtures as the subject, was designed by the same designer, and was of the same quality. He repeated his discussion regarding the attributes of 70 Bennington Court, which was valued \$50,000 less than the subject in 2011, and did not go up nearly as much as the subject did.

Chairman Covert asked the Assessor's staff to check the quality class on 70 Bennington Court. Gail Vice, Sr. Appraiser, previously sworn, replied it was an 11. She said it was inspected when it was 70 percent complete, but the homeowner would not let the Appraiser look at it when it was completed. She stated after finally being allowed to walk through the house, the quality class was reduced substantially.

Mr. Pankopf advised the Assessor's valuation did not take into account all of the construction defects that still had to be fixed.

Member Horan noted last year there was a decrease to the building's value, but now there had been a big increase. Appraiser Kinne advised for the 2011-12 tax year all of St. James's Village had 20 percent in obsolescence applied. This year the lower quality homes still received the 20 percent obsolescence based on sales. He stated as the quality and the size of the home increased, the obsolescence adjustment was removed. The subject property and a lot of the other homes on Bennington Court that went up 30 percent or more had the obsolescence adjustment totally removed for the 2012-13 tax year. He said that was based on the comparable sales in the St. James's Village community of higher quality large homes.

Mr. Pankopf said the Assessor's Office stated the increase was based on recent sales, but the data he saw indicated it was based on sales up to July 1, 2011. Member Horan advised the Board could consider sales until December 31, 2011.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

Chairman Covert stated he was concerned about the huge increase, and he believed the Assessor's valuation was high. Members Brown and Woodland felt a

reduction was in order. Member Horan suggested adding an additional \$100,000 in obsolescence.

With regard to Parcel No. 046-153-05, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$1,329,871, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,399,871 for tax year 2012-13. The reduction was based on obsolescence of \$100,000. 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.

12-0191E PARCEL NO. 018-362-05 – OMAYE 1990 TRUST –
HEARING NO. 12-0308

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1846 Three Mile Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable sales, 6 pages.

Exhibit B: Letter, 1 page.

Assessor

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

On behalf of the Petitioner, Annie Omaye 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.

Ms. Omaye said her Attachment 1 in Exhibit A was a description of the subject and Attachments 2 through 6 were for her neighbors on the same street. She stated she had been inside those semi-custom homes and they had similar exteriors, but had slight variations so the neighborhood did not look so much like a tract development. She said everyone picked out their floor plan from a book the developer had. She stated her comparables were very comparable to the subject. She said her house was very basic and had linoleum floors. She stated her basement was a daylight basement, but it was not fancy and had a lot of cracks in the cement. She said her house was 20 years old and the builder built it cheaply. She stated she redid her driveway after a year and she spent thousands of dollars fixing the roof over the years. She said the major problem was the house sank five years ago and that still needed to be fixed. She stated she would either

sell it at a fire-sale price or would have fix it up when she was ready to sell. She believed the house was overvalued compared to her neighbors.

Member Brown noted there was a premium for the view, and he asked if the view had changed over the years. Ms. Omaye said there was no longer much of a view because the trees had grown. She said the view was a slanted view instead of a direct view because of how the property was situated. Member Brown asked if it was a 30 percent view. Ms. Omaye replied she did not know what that meant.

Appraiser Johnson read the comments regarding the subject and the comparable sales on page 1 of Exhibit I. He stated regarding the deferred maintenance on the subject, it had 30 percent depreciation applied to the house. Chairman Covert asked about the 30 percent view premium. Appraiser Johnson said page 6 of Exhibit I had an analysis of the view properties in the AC neighborhood and page 7 was the same analysis for a different area, which supported the previous analysis. Chairman Covert asked how long it had been since Appraiser Johnson had been in the area. Appraiser Johnson said he was in the area every year, but he had never been to the subject. He stated he could go out to adjust the view premium if necessary. Ms. Omaye replied he could come out anytime.

Member Horan felt the Petitioner's Attachments 1-6 in Exhibit A (pages 1 through 6) seemed to compare favorably. Appraiser Johnson said the property in Attachment 2 was on the opposite side of the street from the subject, which meant it did not have the subject's view premium. He stated it had an easement along the back side of the property resulting in a downward adjustment of 15 percent off the base-lot value. He said the quality of the comparable's improvements was inferior and was at \$62 per square foot; while the subject was larger, was of superior quality, and was at \$65 per square foot. He stated the subject was at \$80 per square foot and Attachment 2 was at \$72 per square foot if the land was included, which took into account the easement and the lack of view. Chairman Covert asked what the easement was for. Appraiser Johnson said it was an access road that he believed was there for fire access.

Appraiser Johnson pointed out the differences between the subject and the properties in Attachments 3 through 6. He said when looking at the Petitioner's comparables on the same side of the street, they were equal to or greater in value than the subject. He said the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's value.

In rebuttal, Ms. Omaye said the views for properties in Attachments 3 and 5 were better than her view because her trees had grown. She felt saying one house was better than another was subjective. She said the earlier built houses had better materials and facades because they were built by a different builder. She wished her house had stucco instead of siding, because painting the house every five years was not fun. She believed her house was overvalued based on what the neighbors had. She noted Three Mile Drive was a private street, which the residents had to maintain, and would be a detriment when selling. She believed the Assessor's comparables had a better cash value than the subject because she was sure the Assessor's comparables were all custom houses, while the homes in her development were built from a book of floor plans.

Chairman Covert said the Petitioner testified the house settled and what would that mean when selling. Member Woodland stated it would have to be disclosed and it would devalue the house a little.

Chairman Covert recommended the Appraiser check the view and the settling of the house. Appraiser Johnson said there would generally be an engineer's report showing what the problem was and what it would cost to fix it, and often obsolescence would be put on the property. He said obtaining the report would be up to the homeowner. Ms. Omaye said she hired an engineer five to six years ago, and she did all of the recommended repairs except for the problem in the basement where the concrete erupted resulting in an uneven floor.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

With regard to Parcel No. 018-362-05, 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 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

1:33 p.m. The Board recessed.

2:07 p.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

12-0192E **PARCEL NO. 234-490-09 – LEWIS INVESTMENT COMPANY OF NV LLC – HEARING NO. 12-0077**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at Del Webb Parkway East, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 234-490-09, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be reduced to \$649,078 and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$650,611 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

**12-0193E PARCEL NO. 028-061-51 – CRONEY LIVING TRUST –
HEARING NO. 12-0081**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3575 Rocky Ridge Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 028-061-51, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$351,300, resulting in a total taxable value of \$399,150 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

**12-0194E PARCEL NO. 148-192-02 – FARNSWORTH, MICHAEL A. –
HEARING NO. 12-0085**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 20042 Bordeaux Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Information on subject property, 2 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-192-02, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$976,515, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,138,515 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

**12-0195E PARCEL NO. 085-155-59 – SUN VALLEY LAND OWNERS CORP.
– HEARING NO. 12-0141**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5360 Sun Valley Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 085-155-59, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$13,258, resulting in a total taxable value of

\$214,300 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

**12-0196E PARCEL NO. 035-301-45 – HOWE, DON C. –
HEARING NO. 12-0254**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3290 Spanish Springs Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Surrounding area parcel information, 7 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 035-301-45, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$268,700, resulting in a total taxable value of \$305,000 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

**12-0197E PARCEL NO. 148-081-13 – BOWLBY, CHIP L. –
HEARING NO. 12-0272**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5880 Lausanne Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and 2011 Montreux home sales, 2 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-081-13, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$2,802,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$3,000,000 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0198E PARCEL NO. 009-471-09 – FISHER, ROBERT L. TRUSTEE –
HEARING NO. 12-0432

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4120 Longknife Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 009-471-09, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$439,581, resulting in a total taxable value of \$515,581 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0199E **PARCEL NO. 013-391-10 – BLUE VALLEY APARTMENTS INC – HEARING NO. 12-0444A**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1355 Cordone Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel information and appraisal report, 16 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 013-391-10, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$253,572, resulting in a total taxable value of \$293,622 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0200E **PARCEL NO. 013-391-11 – BLUE VALLEY APARTMENTS INC – HEARING NO. 12-0444B**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1355 Cordone Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel information and appraisal report, 16 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 013-391-11, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in an unchanged total taxable value of \$84,987 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

**12-0201E PARCEL NO. 013-391-12 – BLUE VALLEY APARTMENTS INC –
HEARING NO. 12-0444C**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1355 Cordone Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel information and appraisal report, 16 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 013-391-12, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in an unchanged total taxable value of \$321,357 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0202E PARCEL NO. 013-391-13 – BLUE VALLEY APARTMENTS INC – HEARING NO. 12-0444D

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1355 Cordone Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel information and appraisal report, 16 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor, no one testified.

With regard to Parcel No. 013-391-13, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be upheld, resulting in an unchanged total taxable value of \$420,034 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0203E PARCEL NO. 148-232-04 – GESCHWIND FAMILY TRUST, MAC & SHERRI – HEARING NO. 12-0050

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 20442 Bordeaux Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Comparable Montreux home sales, 1 page.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said there was a stipulation on this parcel, and the Petitioner was in agreement with the new total taxable value.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-232-04, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$1,568,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,775,000 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0204E PARCEL NO. 148-061-47 – WILLARD TRUST –
HEARING NO. 12-0132

Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent said there was a request to continue this hearing until February 29, 2012 by the Petitioner. Chairman Covert replied that would be fine.

12-0205E PARCEL NO. 148-092-08 – SERIO, ROBERT L. –
HEARING NO. 12-0152

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5835 Lausanne Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Newspaper article and Washoe County Quick Info, 4 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said there was a stipulation on this parcel, and the Petitioner was in agreement with the new total taxable value.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-092-08, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$2,026,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$2,146,000 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0206E PARCEL NO. 148-092-09 – EWING MONTREUX LLC –
HEARING NO. 12-0153

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5845 Lausanne Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Newspaper article and Washoe County Quick Info, 4 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said there was a stipulation on this parcel, and the Petitioner was in agreement with the new total taxable value.

With regard to Parcel No. 148-092-09, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$1,761,600, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,881,600 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0207E PARCEL NO. 200-033-05 – LUY LLC –
HEARING NO. 12-0172

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 6353 Park Place, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Owner statement and residential lease, 5 pages.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori DelGiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She noted the property was developer owned. She said the Petitioner claimed the rent went down so the value should go down. She stated the comparable sales supported the total taxable value and the recommendation was to uphold.

Chairman Covert said the Petitioner requested a total property value of \$110,000.

Member Woodland asked if the subject being near a school was a plus or a detriment. Sr. Appraiser DelGiudice said it depended on whether or not the buyer had children.

Member Horan said the Petitioner supplied no evidence to support his opinion of value. Chairman Covert asked if this was a rental property. Sr. Appraiser DelGiudice replied it was, but not much data was provided. Member Horan said the lack of data would mean upholding the Assessor's valuation.

With regard to Parcel No. 200-033-05, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

**12-0208E PARCEL NO. 204-161-02 – FALO LLC –
HEARING NO. 12-0173**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5421 Morning Star Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

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

Member Horan said the Petitioner supplied no evidence to support his opinion of value.

With regard to Parcel No. 204-161-02, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

**12-0209E PARCEL NO. 204-221-39 – GULY LLC –
HEARING NO. 12-0174**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5780 Golden Eagle Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Owner statement and residential lease, 5 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Chairman Covert said the Petitioner had not provided any additional evidence to support the owner's opinion of value.

With regard to Parcel No. 204-221-39, 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 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0210E PARCEL NO. 204-280-11 – FALO LLC –
HEARING NO. 12-0175

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2130 Soldier Pass Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Owner statement and residential lease, 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 sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

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.

Chairman Covert said the Petitioner had not provided much evidence to support the owner's opinion of value.

With regard to Parcel No. 204-280-11, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0211E PARCEL NO. 204-742-01 – ROSSI LIVING TRUST –
HEARING NO. 12-0240

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3260 Diamond Ridge Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori DelGiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She noted a stipulation had been signed by the Petitioner on this property.

With regard to Parcel No. 204-742-01, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$242,318, resulting in a total taxable value of \$317,243 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0212E PARCEL NO. 148-061-21 – SDA INC –
HEARING NO. 12-0271

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5550 Lausanne Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 6 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Assessor's response to *Marshall and Swift* cost increase dated February 1, 2012, 49 pages.

Exhibit III: Letter from State of Nevada, Department of Taxation to Mr. Galloway dated January 24, 2012 and Notice of Decision, 6 pages.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated based on the improved comparable sales, the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's valuation.

Member Horan said the basis of the Petitioner's argument was the valuation of the building and the *Marshall and Swift* adjustment.

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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0213E PARCEL NO. 234-091-05 – LEE TRUST, DORIS J. – HEARING NO. 12-0273

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1850 Evergreen Ridge 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, 7 pages.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori DelGiudice, Sr. Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated improved sale IS-1 on page 1 of Exhibit I was the same model as the subject. She said IS-1 sold for \$165 per square foot and the subject's taxable value was \$121 per square foot. She stated the Assessor's comparable sales were in inferior locations to the subject. She said one of the comparable sales was located on Del Webb Parkway West.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board. He said the Petitioner did not provide any specific evidence.

With regard to Parcel No. 234-091-05, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0214E PARCEL NO. 047-087-06 – BOWEN, MINDY –
HEARING NO. 12-0303

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 200 Black Pine Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Minutes, Board of Equalization meeting of February 3, 2011 and Notice of Action, 4 pages.

Assessor

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

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

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

Member Woodland said there was a recommendation.

Chairman Covert noted the minutes from last year's hearing. Appraiser Kinne said the hearing last year had to do with a finished, versus an unfinished, basement.

Chairman Covert asked if the Appellant was in agreement with the recommendation. Appraiser Kinne said he tried several times to call her, but he never reached her, so he did not know whether or not she would be in agreement with the recommendation to reduce the taxable value to \$176 per square foot.

With regard to Parcel No. 047-087-06, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$327,120, resulting in a total taxable value of \$417,120 for tax year 2012-13. The reduction was based on obsolescence of \$11,001. 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.

DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0422A THROUGH 12-0422F

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori DelGiudice, Sr. Appraiser, suggested consolidating the hearings for Fratelli Fortunati, LLC. She stated the Assessor's Office would stand on its written record, Exhibit I, submitted for Hearing No's 12-0422A through 12-422F. She said the Petitioner supplied no evidence for any of the hearings. She oriented the Board as to the location of the subject properties.

Chairman Covert said the Petitioner presented no evidence to support his position that property values had declined 13 percent and his values were too high.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion to the Board.

See 12-0215E through 12-0220E below for details concerning the petition, exhibits and decisions related to each of the properties in the consolidated group.

12-0215E PARCEL NO. 006-041-04 – FRATELLI FORTUNATI LLC, DANIEL GIUDICI – HEARING NO. 12-0422A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 835 Ruby Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0422A THROUGH 12-0422F above.

With regard to Parcel No. 006-041-04, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

**12-0216E PARCEL NO. 008-191-44 – FRATELLI FORTUNATI LLC,
DANIEL GIUDICI – HEARING NO. 12-0422B**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 625 Morrill Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0422A THROUGH 12-0422F above.

With regard to Parcel No. 008-191-44, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0217E **PARCEL NO. 008-191-45 – FRATELLI FORTUNATI LLC,**
DANIEL GIUDICI – HEARING NO. 12-0422C

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 637 Morrill Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0422A THROUGH 12-0422F above.

With regard to Parcel No. 008-191-45, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0218E **PARCEL NO. 032-113-11 – FRATELLI FORTUNATI LLC,**
DANIEL GIUDICI – HEARING NO. 12-0422D

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1834 A 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 subject's appraisal records, 12 pages.

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0422A THROUGH 12-0422F above.

With regard to Parcel No. 032-113-11, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

**12-0219E PARCEL NO. 032-113-12 – FRATELLI FORTUNATI LLC,
DANIEL GIUDICI – HEARING NO. 12-0422E**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1842 A 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 subject's appraisal records, 11 pages.

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0422A THROUGH 12-0422F above.

With regard to Parcel No. 032-113-12, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

**12-0220E PARCEL NO. 085-780-31 – FRATELLI FORTUNATI LLC,
DANIEL GIUDICI – HEARING NO. 12-0422F**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 5670 Leon 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, 14 pages.

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0422A THROUGH 12-0422F above.

With regard to Parcel No. 085-780-31, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0221E PARCEL NO. 031-111-19 – KG PK ENTERPRISES LLC –
HEARING NO. 12-0426

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2325 Pauline Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Ken Johns, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted all of the comparable sales were clustered tightly on the same street or one street over from the subject.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

With regard to Parcel No. 031-111-19, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

**12-0222E PARCEL NO. 032-093-14 – SIERRA FOOTHILLS PROPERTIES –
HEARING NO. 12-0411**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1136 E. 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 subject's appraisal records, 12 pages.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Ken Johns, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's value.

Chairman Covert stated he did not see any evidence provided on the Petitioner's behalf. Appraiser Johns said he made repeated attempts to contact the Petitioner, but he did not return his calls or e-mails.

Chairman Covert brought the discussion back to the Board.

With regard to Parcel No. 032-093-14, 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 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

**12-0223E PARCEL NO. 046-060-01 – WALTERS, BRIEN B. & MIRTA B. –
HEARING NO. 12-0094**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 24525 S. US 395 Highway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Plat map and Quick Info, 2 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said there was a stipulation with which the Petitioner was in agreement.

With regard to Parcel No. 046-060-01, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed 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 stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be reduced to \$134,600, resulting in a total taxable value of \$134,600 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

12-0224E PARCEL NO. 156-071-04 – KRUEGER FAMILY TRUST –
HEARING NO. 12-0164

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 345 Timbercreek Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Sale Comparables, 1 page.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Pete Kinne, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said the Petitioner was in agreement with the stipulation.

With regard to Parcel No. 156-071-04, pursuant to NRS 361.345 based on the stipulation signed 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 stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be reduced to \$57,000 and the taxable, resulting in a total taxable value of \$57,000 for tax year 2012-13. 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.

DISCUSSION FOR HEARINGS 12-0412A THROUGH 12-0412E

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Michael Bozman, Appraiser, said the hearings for 12-0412A through 12-0412E and 12-0413A through 12-0413K could be consolidated because they were similar in size, in the same area and had the same owner, even though the names were different. Chairman Covert advised he wanted to keep the Cooper Trust hearings separate from the Red Rock Ranches hearings.

Appraiser Bozman oriented the Board as to the location of the subject properties, and read the comments on page 1 of Exhibit I for Hearing 12-0412A. He noted the appraisals were done for estate purposes on January 18, 2010, even though the appraisal reports (Exhibit A) stated the values were market values. He said the recommendation was to uphold the Assessor's values.

See 12-0225E through 12-0229E below for details concerning the petition, exhibits and decisions related to each of the properties in the consolidated group.

12-0225E PARCEL NO. 079-450-54 – COOPER TRUST, JANET –
HEARING NO. 12-0412A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located on Antelope Valley Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 7 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0412A THROUGH 12-0412E above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-450-54, 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 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

**12-0226E PARCEL NO. 079-450-55 – COOPER TRUST, JANET –
HEARING NO. 12-0412B**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located on Antelope Valley Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 7 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0412A THROUGH 12-0412E above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-450-55, 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 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

**12-0227E PARCEL NO. 079-481-05 – COOPER TRUST, JANET –
HEARING NO. 12-0412C**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 1450 Bronze Hill Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0412A THROUGH 12-0412E above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-481-05, 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 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0228E PARCEL NO. 079-481-06 – COOPER TRUST, JANET –
HEARING NO. 12-0412D

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 1700 Bronze Hill Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0412A THROUGH 12-0412E above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-481-06, 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 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0229E PARCEL NO. 079-481-07 – COOPER TRUST, JANET –
HEARING NO. 12-0412E

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 1830 Bronze Hill Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0412A THROUGH 12-0412E above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-481-07, 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 Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

DISCUSSION FOR HEARINGS 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K

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

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Michael Bozman, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject properties. He advised the parcel in Hearing No. 12-0413A was 40 acres. Chairman Covert noted the Petitioner's evidence was dated appraisals.

See 12-0230E through 12-0240E below for details concerning the petition, exhibits and decisions related to each of the properties in the consolidated group.

12-0230E PARCEL NO. 079-332-30 – RED ROCK RANCHES, INC –
HEARING NO. 12-0413A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 13965 Red Rock Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-332-30, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0231E PARCEL NO. 079-382-34 – RED ROCK RANCHES, INC – HEARING NO. 12-0413B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 225 Gorham Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-382-34, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0232E PARCEL NO. 079-382-57 – RED ROCK RANCHES – HEARING NO. 12-0413C

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located on Deerlodge Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-382-57, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0233E PARCEL NO. 079-440-46 – RED ROCK RANCHES, INC – HEARING NO. 12-0413D

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 7610 Matterhorn Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-440-46, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0234E **PARCEL NO. 079-440-47 – RED ROCK RANCHES, INC –
HEARING NO. 12-0413E**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 8110 Matterhorn Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-440-47, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0235E **PARCEL NO. 079-450-60 – RED ROCK RANCHES, INC –
HEARING NO. 12-0413F**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located on Antelope Valley Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-450-60, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0236E PARCEL NO. 079-450-61 – RED ROCK RANCHES, INC. –
HEARING NO. 12-0413G

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located on Antelope Valley Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-450-61, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0237E PARCEL NO. 079-450-62 – RED ROCK RANCHES, INC –
HEARING NO. 12-0413H

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located on Antelope Valley Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-450-62, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0238E PARCEL NO. 079-450-63 – RED ROCK RANCHES, INC –
HEARING NO. 12-0413I

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located on Antelope Valley Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-450-63, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0239E PARCEL NO. 079-470-39 – RED ROCK RANCHES, INC –
HEARING NO. 12-0413J

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located at 1444 Comity Court, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-470-39, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0240E PARCEL NO. 079-470-54 – RED ROCK RANCHES –
HEARING NO. 12-0413K

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2012-13 taxable valuation on land located on Elkhorn Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal, 8 pages.

Assessor

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

For the discussion that took place for this hearing, see DISCUSSION FOR HEARING NO'S 12-0413A THROUGH 12-0413K above.

With regard to Parcel No. 079-470-54, 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 Horan, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2012-13. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the land and improvements are valued incorrectly or that the total taxable value exceeded full cash value.

12-0241E ROLL CHANGE REQUESTS

Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent said the Roll Change Requests were increases, which required setting a hearing date. She stated direction to the Clerk’s Office to notify the property owners was required, and the date suggested for the hearings was February 22, 2012.

Assessor’s Parcel No.	Petitioner	Roll No.
016-475-07	KOLIASTASIS, TED & CHRISTINA	987F08
016-475-07	KOLIASTASIS, TED & CHRISTINA	987F09
016-475-07	KOLIASTASIS, TED & CHRISTINA	987F10
050-520-21	RATHBUN,DANIEL C B & SHIRLEY A	1079F08
050-520-21	RATHBUN,DANIEL C B & SHIRLEY A	1079F09
050-520-21	RATHBUN,DANIEL C B & SHIRLEY A	1079F10

Chairman Covert gave direction to the Clerk’s Office, and agreed with the suggested hearing date.

12-0242E BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board Member comments.

12-0243E PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

* * * * * * * * * *

2:45 p.m. There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, on motion by Member Horan, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, the meeting was adjourned.

JAMES COVERT, Chairman
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

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

*Minutes prepared by
Jan Frazzetta, Deputy Clerk*