

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

MONDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 6, 2006

PRESENT:

Steven Sparks, Chairman
Pat McAlinden, Vice Chairman
Thomas Koziol, Member
John Krolick, Member*
Gary Schmidt, Member

Amy Harvey, County Clerk
Peter Simeoni, Deputy District Attorney
Ron Sauer, Senior Appraiser

The Board convened in the Washoe County Administration Complex, Health Department Conference Room B, 1001 E. 9th Street, Reno, Nevada. Chairman Sparks called the meeting to order, the Clerk called the Roll, and the Board conducted the following business:

9:00 A.M. - BLOCK 1

06-10E SWEARING IN OF THE ASSESSOR'S STAFF

County Clerk Amy Harvey swore in the following members of the Assessor's staff who will be presenting testimony for the 2006 Board of Equalization hearings:

Bozman, Michael	Sauer, Ron
DelGiudice, Cori	Shane, Ron
Diezel, Ivy	Stege, Keith
Dillon, Ginny	Stockton, Howard
Ettinger, Stacy	Vice, Gail
Goodlett, Sue	Warren, Gary
Johnson, Joe	Wilkins, Theresa
Lambert, Linda	Wilson, Josh
Lopez, Rigo	Wood, Ernie
O'Hair, Pat	Yates, Van
Regan, Patricia	

Member Schmidt read a statement objecting to the approval of the agenda. He stated he would not support the agenda because he believed it was not appropriately and/or legally constructed by the proper authorized and responsible authority that was the Board of Equalization.

***9:06 a.m.** Member Krolick arrived.

WITHDRAWN PETITIONS

The following petitions scheduled on today's agenda have been withdrawn by the Petitioners:

Hearing No. 0039, Hacienda Io Limited Ptnsp, Parcel No. 001-051-19
Hearing No. 0047A, Robert and Marjorie Stewart, Parcel No. 009-040-35,
Re-Open 2005 Roll
Hearing No. 0047B, Robert and Marjorie Stewart, Parcel No. 009-040-35
Hearing No. 0075, Jack H. and Debra L. Adler, Parcel No. 009-572-14
Hearing No. 0078A, Jeff Wanamaker, Etal, Parcel No. 150-062-09,
Re-Open 2005 Roll
Hearing No. 0078B, Jeff Wanamaker, Etal, Parcel No. 150-062-09
Hearing No. 0021, Durian D. Pingree, Tr., Parcel No. 230-032-02
Hearing No. 0016, William T. and Linda A. Walbey, Tr., 522-502-04
Hearing No. 0080, Donahue Schriber Realty Grp Lp Etal, Parcel No, 528-010-11

CONSOLIDATION OF HEARINGS

On motion by Member Koziol, seconded by Member McAlinden, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sparks ordered that hearings for petitioners in attendance be conducted in the order they appear on the agenda, hearings in which written evidence has been submitted will be heard next, and then petitions that have similar facts and issues where no petitioner was present would be consolidated under one hearing.

06-11E PETITIONS NOT TIMELY FILED

FRANK AND VIRGINIA MURNANE – UNTIMELY PETITION PARCEL NO. 122-132-13

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Frank and Virginia Murnane protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 547 Dale Drive, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, was received January 19, 2006.

On motion by Member Koziol, seconded by Member McAlinden, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the petition by Frank and Virginia Murnane be denied due to late filing based upon Nevada Revised Statute.

RON RANDOLPH-WALL - UNTIMELY PETITION PARCEL NO. 122-133-04

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Ron Randolph-Wall protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 564 Dale Drive, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, was received January 18, 2006.

On motion by Member Koziol, seconded by Member McAlinden, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the petition by Ron Randolph-Wall be denied due to late filing based upon Nevada Revised Statute.

06-12E HEARING NO. LT-0250 – DOUGLAS AND JANE PETERSON
ETAL TR – PARCEL NO. 124-043-04

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Douglas and Jane Peterson, protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 371 Willow Ct., Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned MDU and designated three or four units.

Rigo Lopez, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property.

Douglas Peterson, Petitioner, was sworn and testified their taxes were raised four times since 1998 and the property did not warrant an increase in rents. Mr. Peterson said the property could not add square footage because the building was overbuilt for the size of the lot.

Chairman Sparks asked when the property was purchased, and Mr. Peterson replied 1985. He said there had been no improvements except for maintenance items.

Josh Wilson, Appraiser III, stated the Assessor's Office prepared an Exhibit packet in response to the taxpayer's assertion that there was non-equalization of similarly situated properties and improvements, which would be marked as Assessor Exhibit I and entered for hearings citing said reason.

Appraiser Lopez submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit I, Assessor's response to the Taxpayers' assertion that there is non-equalization of similarly situated properties and improvements.

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 13.

Mr. Lopez reviewed sales of comparable properties substantiating that the Assessor's taxable land value does not exceed full cash value. He further testified that the Assessor's office compiled information on income for the multi family four units on the buildings.

Member Schmidt inquired on the formula or method used on two comparables that determined an estimated rent. Mr. Lopez replied he contacted several real estate brokers in the area and gathered listings of parcels for sale.

In rebuttal, Mr. Peterson remarked the values in Incline Village were higher than similar parcels in other areas of Washoe County.

Chairman Sparks asked if the three comparables had any additional renovations or upgrades the subject property may or may not have experienced. Mr. Peterson responded it had not.

Member Schmidt questioned when the petitioner received their notice of the hearing date. Mr. Peterson replied his partner had received notice approximately 3 weeks prior.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Member Schmidt stated rental income returns vary from season to season and the question as to whether properties in Incline Village were out of equalization to others in Washoe County was appropriate. He commented on comparing cap rates or rates of return for investment properties; however, there had been no evidence presented.

Based on the FINDINGS that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member Krolick, seconded by Member Schmidt, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land and improvements on Parcel No. 124-043-04 be upheld.

06-13E HEARING NO. LT-0375 - MERVYN AND JANICE SILBERBERG
PARCEL NO. 130-180-16

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Mervyn and Janice Silberberg, protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 120 Country Club Drive #16, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned GC and designated General Commercial: retail, mixed, parking, school.

Rigo Lopez, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

Mervyn Silberberg, Petitioner, was sworn and testified due to conditions in Incline Village not found in other parts of the County, a significant cost for repairs was evident. He said the streets in this complex were owned by the complex and not the County. Mr. Silberberg remarked there were plans to upgrade the parking lot for a cost of \$1 million. He said value based on sales was one thing, but going on an economic basis was difficult to succeed. Mr. Silberberg stated there were many problems with this complex.

Janice Silberberg, Petitioner, was sworn and testified that the upgrading of the parking lot was to be in compliance with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA).

Member Koziol asked what the vacancy rate was. Mr. Silberberg replied at times it could be a 20 to 30 percent rate.

Member Schmidt questioned when the lease would expire. Mr. Silberberg said the current tenants told him they would drop the lease and move out soon. Member Schmidt asked what the current rent was. Mr. Silberberg replied \$2,800 for the entire building. He said the rents he charged for the commercial units were far less than other parts of the complex. Mr. Silberberg said the facility was commercially zoned mixed-use development.

Appraiser Lopez submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit I, Assessor's response to the Taxpayers' assertion that there is non-equalization of similarly situated properties and improvements.

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 6.

Mr. Lopez reviewed sales of comparable properties substantiating that the Assessor's taxable land value does not exceed full cash value.

In response to Member Koziol, Mr. Lopez replied the 1992 sale would have followed the 1990 sale listed on the assessor packet.

Member Schmidt suggested a photograph could be useful for unusual parcels. He asked if these particular units were connected between the residential top floor and the commercial bottom floor. Mr. Lopez responded some of the units had a separate entrance to enter through the bottom floor to the residence located on the upper floor.

Mr. Silberberg clarified in the late 1990's the rear portion of the complex was strictly residential and the complex was endowed with the commercial space in the front. He said the property was mixed use.

Member Schmidt questioned if units 31-60 were strictly residential, and Mr. Silberberg stated they were. In response to Member Schmidt, Mr. Silberberg replied originally both associations were combined, but had since separated. He said the units in the rear had garages whereas the units in the front did not. Member Schmidt asked if the comparables were similar to the petitioner's property, and Mr. Silberberg said they were.

Chairman Sparks stated the petition indicated the land was \$63,000, but the Assessor put into evidence a taxable value of \$70,000. He said the Petitioner stated a total of \$148,968. Chairman Sparks asked if there was there any evidence to support

those numbers. Mr. Silberberg answered he had reduced the value to what he felt was a reasonable number and then deducted from the sale price.

Member Schmidt asked when the base value was established on the units and if that included complexes besides this particular one. Mr. Lopez replied there were sufficient sales within this complex to establish that base value.

Mr. Wilson said there were instructions on the web site from which these pre-printed forms were derived indicating how to fill out the form and what to state on those forms as values. He remarked that information was available upon the Board's request.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member Schmidt, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land and improvements on Parcel No. 130-180-16 be upheld.

06-14E HEARING NO. LT-0376 - MERVYN SILBERBERG
PARCEL NO. 130-180-18

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Mervyn Silberberg, protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 120 Country Club Drive, No. 18, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned GC and designated General Commercial.

Rigo Lopez, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

Mervyn Silberberg, Petitioner, was sworn and testified the rear residential units were built later because the original owners realized that they could not fill the complex commercially. He stated he preferred the upstairs be commercial rather than residential.

Member Schmidt asked if the subject parcel was the same size as the three comparables. Mr. Silberberg concurred and said those units did not have access off of Lakeshore Drive. Member Schmidt questioned the street exposure value of the subject parcel verses the exposure of the comparables in regard to the commercial portion of the unit. Mr. Silberberg replied he would like to see the front rather than the rear of the complex become residential.

Janice Silberberg, was sworn and testified originally the complex was called Country Club Mall and then changed to Country Club Center. She said the front

area received exposure making it more desirable for commercial purposes. Ms. Silberberg commented the subject unit was located in the back of the complex. She said the entire complex was to be developed at one time, but the previous owners developed the front portion as commercial. Ms. Silberberg remarked, when the back area was to be developed, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) came into existence and indicated that could not be done. She said TRPA eventually agreed to re-do the back of the complex but changed the plan to eliminate the top, walkways, and decks. Ms. Silberberg said the back area became two associations becoming more costly.

Member McAlinden inquired on the length of vacancy for the downstairs unit. Mr. Silberberg replied it had been vacant for 15 years.

Appraiser Rigo Lopez submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit I, Assessor's response to the Taxpayers' assertion that there is non-equalization of similarly situated properties and improvements

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 6.

Appraiser Lopez reviewed sales of comparable properties substantiating that the Assessor's taxable land value does not exceed full cash value.

Member Schmidt said the subject property had substantially less visibility from Country Club Drive than the comparable properties. Mr. Lopez said that was correct, but when driving down Country Club Drive, the visibility to Units 5, 6, 7 and 8 was comparable to units 17 and 18.

In rebuttal, Mr. Silberberg reviewed the parking arrangement for the complex.

Member Schmidt inquired on the efforts made to rent the commercial unit. Mr. Silberberg replied he had tried to rent it as a restaurant. Ms. Silberberg remarked a real estate company also tried to rent the property, but the restaurants interested had no capital to place up front, so the deals would ultimately fall through.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member Koziol, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried with Member Schmidt voting "no," it was ordered that the taxable value of the land and improvements on Parcel No. 130-180-18 be upheld.

06-15E

HEARING NO. LT-0471 - FLOYD AND VIRGINIA SCHWARTZ
TR - PARCEL NO. 124-043-30

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Floyd and Virginia Schwartz, protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 770 Northwood Blvd. Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned NC and designated General Commercial.

Rigo Lopez, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

Petitioners, Floyd and Virginia Schwartz were not present, but submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit A: A letter of protest for the 2006-2007 property tax assessment.

Appraiser Lopez submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 16.

Appraiser Lopez reviewed sales of comparable properties substantiating that the Assessor's taxable land value does not exceed full cash value.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member Schmidt, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land and improvements on Parcel No. 124-043-30 be upheld.

06-16E

HEARING NO. LT-0243 - MARIANNE CASINO
PARCEL NO. 130-082-01

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Marianne Casino, protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1064 Peace Pipe Lane, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned HDS and designated Duplex.

Rigo Lopez, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

Marianne Casino, Petitioner, was not present.

Appraiser Lopez submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit I, Assessor's response to the Taxpayers' assertion that there is non-equalization of similarly situated properties and improvements.

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 11.

Appraiser Lopez reviewed sales of comparable properties substantiating that the Assessor's taxable land value does not exceed full cash value.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member McAlinden seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land and improvements on Parcel No. 130-082-01 be upheld.

06-17E HEARING NO. LT-0057 - ROSALIE BACLET
PARCEL NO. 131-133-07

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Rosalie Baclet, protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 938 Wendy Lane, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned LDU and designated Duplex.

Rigo Lopez, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

Rosalie Baclet, Petitioner, was not present.

Appraiser Lopez submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit I, Assessor's response to the Taxpayers' assertion that there is non-equalization of similarly situated properties and improvements.

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 11.

Appraiser Lopez reviewed sales of comparable properties substantiating that the Assessor's taxable land value does not exceed full cash value.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member Koziol, seconded by Member Schmidt, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land and improvements on Parcel No. 131-133-07 be upheld.

**HEARING NOS. LT-0237, LT-0234, & LT-0236 – WALDMAN
INVESTMENTS INC.
PARCEL NOS. 132-231-20, 132-232-08, 132-232-09**

Discussion ensued concerning the status of these hearings. The Board inquired why the name "Hall" was written after the parcel numbers on the agenda. Amy Harvey, County Clerk, agreed to find out if the hearings were part of an earlier consolidation of hearings by Panel B that would be presented at a later meeting by Tom Hall, Esq. The Board agreed to decide the matter after the break.

11:35 a.m. The Board recessed.

1:00 p.m. The Board reconvened with all members present as in the morning session.

1:00 P.M. – BLOCK 2

**HEARING NOS. LT-0237, LT-0234, & LT-0236 – WALDMAN
INVESTMENTS INC.
PARCEL NOS. 132-231-20, 132-232-08, 132-232-09**

Amy Harvey, County Clerk, verified Waldman Investments, Inc. was represented by Tom Hall, Esq. She confirmed those hearings had been consolidated with the other hearings for his clients. She said Panel B would address the hearings on February 16, 2006, and she verified authorizations for representation were received. Ms. Harvey added Mr. Hall had been notified, and he was aware of the hearings. She noted the hearings appeared on the agenda today because the notices had to be sent out prior to the consolidation hearing.

* * * * *

Chairman Sparks explained the procedure the Board of Equalization (BOE) would follow for the hearings. He pointed out petitions should state specific reasons for protesting a valuation using additional information if necessary. He emphasized the role of the Assessor and the BOE was to equalize property valuations and not property tax rates. He offered examples petitioners could bring before the BOE to prove their property valuation was out of equalization. Chairman Sparks noted, at the conclusion of the appeal, the BOE may deliberate and consider the matter immediately or may defer the time of decision until other appeals were completed. He stated deferring a decision may ensure equitable treatment of appeals of similar substance and location. He stressed no appeal to a County Board that was filed on the grounds that the taxable value exceeded full cash value may result in an increase in the taxable value of the property.

HEARING NO. 0046 – PETER J. & JULIE A. SFERRAZZA
PARCEL NO. 003-541-11

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Peter J. and Julie A. Sferrazza, protesting the taxable valuation on land located at 932 University Ridge Court, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned PUD and designated single-family residence.

Peter Sferrazza, Petitioner, was sworn in.

Patricia Regan, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

Petitioner Sferrazza submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit A, University Ridge Unit One map and information summary data sheets of area parcels from the Assessor's website.

Exhibit B, University Ridge Units Five, Six, Seven, and Nine maps and information summary data sheets of area parcels from the Assessor's website.

Exhibit C, photographs of area parcels.

Petitioner Sferrazza testified that his property was appraised at a higher percentage of fair market value than comparable properties in the area and in Washoe County. He discussed the comparable land sales provided by the Assessor's Office and noted the appraised value of the properties. Petitioner Sferrazza addressed Exhibit A and pointed out that his property faced towards Peavine Mountain, there were houses behind his, and he did not have an unobstructed view. He said the parcels throughout the neighborhood that were appraised at \$170,000, as his property was appraised, had unobstructed, clean views of downtown with no houses behind them. He presented summary data sheets from the Assessor's website of parcels he believed were comparable to his parcel. He reviewed their taxable land values and stated they were all less than his taxable land value. Petitioner Sferrazza addressed Exhibit B and identified the land values of the homes. He confirmed they had unobstructed views of downtown, there were no homes behind them, the lots were large, and they were assessed from \$125,000 to \$150,000, which was lower than his parcel. He provided the summary data sheets on the homes that listed the taxable land values. Petitioner Sferrazza asked that he be appraised at \$125,000 or \$150,000 in order to be comparable to other homes that did not have unobstructed views of downtown. He presented photographs of area parcels. He questioned how it was determined which homes were set at \$150,000 and which homes were valued at \$170,000.

Appraiser Regan submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 10.

Exhibit III, University Ridge Unit Six map and sales data.

Appraiser Regan reviewed sales of comparable properties substantiating that the Assessor's total taxable value does not exceed full cash value. She further testified the three improved sales (IS) she addressed were the same quality class as the subject property, and they were similar in age and size. She explained IS-2 was not considered a view lot because a two-story house sat directly across the street from the parcel. Appraiser Regan said it was used as the base lot value within that subdivision and for the entire area. She discussed the land sales (LS) and verified the sales supported the base value that was set at \$100,000. She noted LS-4 was valued at \$80,000 because the lot was under development, and there was a discount placed on the parcel because the infrastructure was not in. She added an under development discount could be up to 80 percent. She described other reasons LS-4 was inferior to the subject parcel.

Appraiser Regan explained when land values were established for this reappraisal area this year, the sub-division going up to the north of the subject parcel was looked at. She said staff met with the developers and sales agents to see what they were charging for view premiums. She presented Exhibit III and reviewed the map of the new construction area. She talked about the view premiums placed on the lots and said they were much inferior to the city views offered by the Petitioner's area. She confirmed there were lots in the Petitioner's area that had unobstructed views. She noted the subject parcel had a nice backyard, the entire lot afforded a city view, it had level topography, and there was more usable space compared to many of the view lots that were located in that area. She further explained factors that impacted the taxable land values on area parcels.

Chairman Sparks commented the Petitioner was concerned about the relationship between the percentage of taxable value compared to the actual sales price. He asked if Appraiser Regan ran those calculations, and she said she did not. Chairman Sparks remarked the view premium of 70 percent combined view, topography, usable space, and off set it with the neighborhood. He asked if she had any percentage for topography and/or for view. Appraiser Regan said she did not.

Member Schmidt suggested the forms include the taxable land value for the comparables for improved and land sales in the future.

In response to Member Schmidt, Appraiser Regan stated she disagreed with the amount Petitioner Sferrazza presented concerning LS-4. She confirmed a base lot size was set for the area; and topography, view, and usable space were taken into consideration.

Member McAlinden asked about the view status of IS-3. Appraiser Regan explained the lot was across the street from the view lots, and there was an open space where the park was located; however, trees obstructed the view for that lot.

Chairman Sparks asked about the differences in the taxable values from 2005/06 to 2006/07 for the parcels in Exhibit A. Appraiser Regan explained the same base lot value was established for the entire area based on the sales and the market in the

area. She added it was the way the view was observed when the reappraisal was completed.

Member Schmidt asked Appraiser Regan to describe how the \$125,000 base value for the parcel adjacent to the subject parcel was determined. She explained it was determined to be a westerly view as compared to the subject parcel that was tilted out towards the city core view.

In rebuttal, Petitioner Sferrazza stated his house faced toward Peavine and the side of the house looked towards downtown. He pointed out the Appraiser did not address the lots that had a better view, but were assessed at a lower value than the subject parcel. He agreed his lot was improved, but he saw it as an improvement value and not a land value. He disagreed that the improvement should be part of the land value. Petitioner Sferrazza said he did not believe the Nevada Constitution allowed for a depreciated land value for construction purposes because that would create more than one class of property in Nevada. He requested clarification on that and how the discount would be calculated. He commented some properties up above the subject parcel were receiving discounts because homes were not selling the way they used to. He said his view should be in the \$150,000 view range.

Member Schmidt asked if the Petitioner was serviced by sewer, and Petitioner Sferrazza concurred. Petitioner Sferrazza commented on detriments concerning his connection to the sewer system, and he remarked on the services provided to the area parcels. Member Schmidt inquired about the subject parcel, and Petitioner Sferrazza described the views from different areas on the lot.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Chairman Sparks said he could support a reduction in the taxable land value. Member Schmidt commented on the orientation of the house and said he would support a reduction in the land value.

Based on the FINDINGS that the parcel was out of equalization with neighboring parcels, as evidenced by the Petitioner's Exhibits, on motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Schmidt, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land on Parcel No. 003-541-11 be reduced to \$150,000, and that the taxable value of the improvements be upheld, for a total taxable value of \$329,690. The Board also made the finding that, with this adjustment, the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

06-19E HEARING NOS. 0034 & 0029 – DANIEL & KATHLEEN CORNEIL
PARCEL NOS. 009-120-50, 009-120-51

Daniel Corneil, Petitioner, requested Hearing No. 0034, Parcel No. 009-120-50 be withdrawn.

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Daniel and Kathleen Corneil, protesting the taxable valuation on the improvements located at 4150 Basque Lane, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned HDR and designated single-family residence.

Daniel Corneil, Petitioner, was sworn in.

Josh Wilson, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

Petitioner Corneil testified that an appeal was filed on the parcel to keep it within the three percent tax cap, and the Assessor notified him that they would be asking for an increase on the property. He stated he did not understand why there would be an increase, and he did not understand the discrepancies in the numbers from the 2004 tax year. Petitioner Corneil acknowledged the Appraiser did not know why the numbers were inputted differently from the worksheet to the computer record. He asked that the numbers remain at the rate for this tax year because he had already received his notification.

Chairman Sparks asked if the Petitioner received a proposal to increase his improvements from \$831,474 to \$845,351 and if he was asking that the Board maintain the amount at \$831,474. The Petitioner agreed with Chairman Sparks.

Appraiser Wilson submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit I, Washoe County Assessor's response to the Taxpayers' assertion that there is Non-Equalization of similarly situated properties and improvements.

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 11.

Appraiser Wilson testified the subject property filed a request for information in January 2006. He confirmed staff carefully examined the costs and values associated with this property to ensure that they were correct as part of fulfilling that request for information. He reviewed Exhibit II and stated he could not verify how the wrong numbers were placed upon the record. He explained he went over this in detail with the Petitioner to verify how they arrived at the taxable value for the improvements. Appraiser Wilson added the number was identified on the high value residential costing sheet, which was included in Exhibit II. He said the error was brought to light as part of reviewing the information and preparing this appeal. He confirmed he was to identify and correct any errors to the Assessment Roll that were discovered, and that was why he recommended that the Board place the correct number back on the Assessment Roll. Appraiser Wilson noted all the improved sales listed supported the recommended value with the best indication of value being the sale of the subject in June 2002. He said the land sales listed also supported the land valuation established for the subject parcel.

Member Schmidt asked about the difference between a high value costing sheet and a costing sheet. Appraiser Wilson explained the Marshall & Swift Residential Costing Manual referred to quality classes low through excellent as numbered 1-6. He said Marshall & Swift had traditionally published a High Value Residential Handbook that covered quality classes numbered 7-12, and the subject parcel was a high value residence classed at 8.5.

In response to Chairman Sparks, Appraiser Wilson explained the depreciation schedule stated within Exhibit II was the correct depreciation to apply to the subject parcel for the 2006 year. He said this high value residence was costed two years ago for the 2004 role, and that was why the 46.5 percent depreciation was listed. He noted Marshall & Swift no longer published the High Value Residential Handbook, and staff was using the most current book published to apply the Marshall & Swift trend factors to arrive at the values.

In rebuttal, Petitioner Corneil stated he was not arguing any of the Marshall & Swift figures; however, he did not understand how the Assessor arrived at the differing numbers. He asked the Board to keep the improvement value at the same rate for this year, and the correction could be set for the following year.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Chairman Sparks commented the issue concerned an inputting, clerical error on the taxable value of the improvements; and the Assessor was asking the Board to correct the 2004 number. He favored holding the taxable value for the improvements at \$831,474 because the roll had already gone out. He stated the Assessor could correct the clerical error in the following year.

Member Schmidt voiced support for the Petitioner's request and said it was not an issue the BOE would normally address.

Based on the FINDINGS that there was a clerical error, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the improvements on Parcel No. 009-120-51 remain at \$831,474, and that the taxable value of the land be upheld, for a total taxable value \$1,312,474. The Board also made the finding that, with this adjustment, the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

2:12 p.m. The Board recessed.

2:25 p.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

HEARING NO. 0057 – GERALD J. AND ESTHER D. NIELSEN
PARCEL NO. 079-390-01

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Gerald J. and Esther D. Nielsen, protesting the taxable valuation on the land located at 1210 Bullion Hill Road, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned GR and designated vacant land and single-family residence.

Gerald Nielsen, Petitioner, was sworn in.

Michael Bozman, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

Petitioner Nielsen submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit A, a letter

Exhibit B, Washoe County Assessor's record card on the subject parcel.

Petitioner Nielsen testified that the parcel was purchased recently for less than the appraised value of the property. He said he was familiar with the property because it abuts another parcel he owned. He noted the subject parcel had been on the market for over three years when he purchased it. Petitioner Nielsen explained the majority of the property had slopes from 30 to 45 degrees, and it would be difficult to fence. He commented he purchased the property as a buffer, and he planned to raise animals on it. He talked about the history of the subject parcel and access issues. He added it was a large parcel, and he recognized that was favorable. Petitioner Nielsen acknowledged there was only one way in and out, and that was by a small access road that was deeded to the property. He said the terrain had many hills and gullies.

Appraiser Bozman submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 7.

Appraiser Bozman reviewed sales of comparable properties substantiating that the Assessor's total taxable value does not exceed full cash value. He further testified that the subject property had steep topography, and it was accessible.

In response to Member Schmidt, Appraiser Bozman confirmed he had seen the road, it was a 30-foot road, and it was possible to drive on either side of it.

Member McAlinden asked what kind of discount was given because the property was steep and rugged. Appraiser Bozman stated the subject property was given a five percent discount for access and 25 percent discount for topography.

Chairman Sparks inquired about the access to the parcel. Appraiser Bozman said there was dirt road access that went up a steep hill and then it flattened out. Chairman Sparks remarked LS-1 had access right off Bullion Hill Road, and the subject property had a quarter of a mile of road he had to construct to get back to the main portion of his property.

Member Schmidt asked if there was a reasonable building site on the property. Appraiser Bozman stated there was a flat spot on the parcel that was buildable.

In rebuttal, Petitioner Nielsen stated the area Appraiser Bozman was talking about was at the end of the access road, and it was at the bottom of a large canyon. He noted there was a lot of water in the area at times, and he would not put anything there unless it was built on stilts. He stated access for the other parcels was superior to the access for the subject parcel.

In response to Chairman Sparks, Petitioner Nielsen explained the sliver area on the map went to a dead end at the bottom of a canyon; and everything was steep from that point up. He said that was the only access to the property. He confirmed he would have to maintain the road if he did have a buildable site.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Chairman Sparks commented the land sales were not as impacted as the subject parcel, and the Petitioner owned a parcel that was adjacent to the subject parcel that he could provide access to it. He stated the Petitioner purchased the property in 2004 for \$40,000, and it should have a taxable value of the most current sale of \$40,000.

Based on the FINDINGS that adverse factors were not given enough weight by the Assessor (slope, topography), as evidenced by the Assessor's and Petitioner's Exhibits, on motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land on Parcel No. 079-390-01 be reduced to \$40,000. The Board also made the finding that, with this adjustment, the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

06-21E HEARING NO. 0038 – LEE J. & NANCY K. CARTER
PARCEL NO. 082-083-01

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Lee J. and Nancy K. Carter, protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 9906 N. Virginia Street, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned SP and designated single-family residence.

Lee Carter, Petitioner, was sworn in.

Howard Stockton, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

Petitioner Carter submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit A, aerial maps of the area.

Exhibit B, letters sent to the Assessor's Office.

Petitioner Carter testified that the subject parcel was impacted by Alturas Power lines, a 20-25 percent grade at the driveway, severe topography, freeway and power line noise, railroad tracks near the parcel that carried waste and chemicals, additional power lines and voltage, telephone and power poles on the parcel, and the close proximity of the power lines to the home. He said the lowest messenger on the volt line was eye-level height from his deck, and that was not the case for the other area parcels. Petitioner Carter stated the subject was overvalued from the time he purchased it. He requested a 20 percent reduction for the subject parcel.

Appraiser Stockton submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 9, and photographs, pages 1 through 7.

Appraiser Stockton reviewed sales of comparable properties substantiating that the Assessor's total taxable value does not exceed full cash value. He presented photographs taken from the vacant land sales and from the subject parcel to show the impacts of the power lines within the area of the subject parcel.

Member Schmidt commented on Exhibit II and asked for a definition of "OVLNDV." Appraiser Josh Wilson defined it as, "override land value." He stated it was important for describing the adjustments on parcels.

Member McAlinden inquired if any of the improved or land sales used as comparables had three major power lines that intersected, as did the subject parcel. Appraiser Stockton said none of them had three major power lines.

Appraiser Stockton then responded to additional questions from Board members.

In rebuttal, Petitioner Carter questioned the description of topography for the land sales presented on Exhibit II and asked if his parcel would be labeled severe topography also. He stated his property had a severe slope.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Member Schmidt stated he was concerned that there were no adjustments for topography, power lines, and slope. He remarked the Board was dealing with a land

value equalization issue, and there was no information in front of the Board as to whether any of the comparables had adjustments for topography.

Chairman Sparks confirmed the property had many problems, and there was no presentation by the Petitioner on other parcels in the area.

Based on the FINDINGS that adverse factors (slope, topography) were not given enough weight by the Assessor, as evidenced by the Assessor's and Petitioner's Exhibits, on motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land on Parcel No. 082-083-01 be reduced to \$41,898, and that the taxable value of the improvements be upheld, for a total taxable value of \$236,408. The Board also made the finding that, with this adjustment, the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

3:42 p.m. The Board recessed.

3:54 p.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

06-22E **HEARING NO. 0024A (2005 REOPEN) – LAZY FIVE COMPANY**
PARCEL NO. 083-021-87

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Lazy Five Company, protesting the taxable valuation on the land located at State Route 445/Sparks Blvd, Sparks, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned NUD and designated vacant, under development.

Cindy Lund Fogel, Johnson-Perkins and Associates, Inc., authorized representative for the Petitioner, was sworn in.

Ronald Shane, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property. He testified the owner was in agreement with the Assessor's recommended taxable value for the subject parcel of \$6.00 per square foot of land area for tax years 2005/06 and 2006/07, and he added the agreement was included in Exhibit II. He pointed out the explanation for having the same value for 2005 and 2006 was included in Exhibit II.

Chairman Sparks asked how the amount decreased from \$7.00 to \$6.00.

Ms. Lund Fogel explained the owner approached the Assessor's Office in August/September of 2005 and brought in numbers that were calculated regarding the cost of infrastructure to the site, and that was basically the reduction.

Appraiser Shane submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 11.

Appraiser Shane stated this hearing was for the 2005 reopen. He referenced the explanation of evaluation given in Exhibit II.

There was no rebuttal by the Petitioner.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS presented by the Assessor in Exhibit II, and as recommended by the Assessor, on motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land on Parcel No. 083-021-87 be reduced to \$9,680,252. The Board also made the finding that, with this adjustment, the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

06-23E HEARING NO. 0024B – LAZY FIVE COMPANY
PARCEL NO. 083-021-87

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Lazy Five Company, protesting the taxable valuation on the land located at State Route 445/Sparks Blvd, Sparks, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned NUD and designated vacant, under development.

Ronald Shane, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property. He testified the owner was in agreement with the Assessor's recommended taxable value for the subject parcel of \$6.00 per square foot of land area for tax years 2005/06 and 2006/07, and he added the agreement was included in Exhibit II.

Cindy Lund Fogel, Johnson-Perkins and Associates, Inc., authorized representative for the Petitioner, previously sworn, was in attendance at the hearing.

Appraiser Shane submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 11.

Appraiser Shane referenced the explanation in Exhibit II concerning why the factor would not go up to \$7.99, but would remain at \$6.00.

There was no rebuttal by the Petitioner.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS presented by the Assessor in Exhibit II, and as recommended by the Assessor, on motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land on Parcel No. 083-021-87 be reduced to \$9,680,252. The Board also made the finding that, with this adjustment, the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

06-24E HEARING NO. 0059 – MICHAEL P. & CAROLYN L. GINDER
PARCEL NO. 220-021-06

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Michael P. and Carolyn L. Ginder, protesting the taxable valuation on the land located at 4415 Sharps Road, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned LDS and designated single-family residence.

Michael Ginder, Petitioner, was sworn in.

Gail Vice, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

Petitioner Ginder submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit A, Eaglesnest property valuations, comparable land valuation/sales of Eaglesnest versus ArrowCreek/Field Creek, and ArcIMS Viewer of Eaglesnest parcels.

Exhibit B, photographs of area parcels.

Petitioner Ginder testified that his appeal addressed two inequities to be entered into the record. Petitioner Ginder said the first issue dealt with the slight variance with the land valuation of his property compared to immediate, adjacent properties experienced over the past three to four years. He stated between 2003 and 2006 the subject parcel's land value increased 71 percent, and the immediate, adjoining properties increased 66 percent. Petitioner Ginder confirmed the value stated in his appeal of \$250,000 was a fair land value adjusting for the neighborhood and the adjacent properties.

Petitioner Ginder stated his second issue concerned the inequity of property values that were directly caused by the manner Washoe County conducted physical land appraisals on a rotating five-year basis. He believed that violated the State Constitution, which clearly mandated equal and just valuation for all Nevada taxpayers. He believed the largest annual increase in taxable land values for the past 10 years was a 2004 assessment year applied to Area Two, which included Eaglesnest and Caughlin Ranch areas. He said land values in his neighborhood increased by 60 percent in one year. He argued that the Washoe County Assessor was possibly aware of the State tax debate in 2004/05 and was aware of the reality of the pending tax cap when appraising Area Two in 2004. He said, with the implementation of the State tax cap April 1, 2005,

those properties in Area Two received a 60-65 percent increase in property values and were currently fixed with a non-equal tax burden. He presented Exhibit A and pointed out like properties between Eaglesnest and Arrowcreek/Field Creek. He reviewed the statistics for average land sales in Eaglesnest versus Arrowcreek for 2002 through 2005, the land appraisals in 2006 for Eaglesnest as opposed to Arrowcreek/Field Creek, and the land appraisal to actual sales percentages. He said, if there was a rapidly escalating market in 2004, and if that appraisal was unfairly placed upon Area Two, then the tax cap was applied and from that point forward the taxable basis was much higher on his area compared to anyone else. He asked for a consideration of what he believed to be a disparate valuation of his land value compared to his neighbors for the last two years. He asked for equalization of a matter that was consistent with the State Constitution.

Appraiser Vice submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit I, Washoe County Assessor's response to the Taxpayers' assertion that there is Non-Equalization of similarly situated properties and improvements.

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 12.

Appraiser Vice reviewed sales of comparable properties substantiating that the Assessor's total taxable value does not exceed full cash value. She further testified that there was an upward view adjustment of 15 percent, a downward size adjustment of 15 percent because it was less than an acre, and 15 percent downward adjustment for topography due to a sloping lot. She commented the lot had a filtered city view.

In rebuttal, the Petitioner discussed the comparables and talked about the differences of the parcels in terms of view and size. He discussed the photographs and compared them to the subject parcel to point out size, view, and 2006 appraisal amounts. He stated he was not prepared to accept satisfaction of his appeal and disproportionate land values for his property if he had to waive any right before the State Board of Equalization (BOE). He said the method by which the County appraised property was unfair, and it should be addressed to the State.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Chairman Sparks said the BOE members had read NRS 361.624. He noted the BOE shall seek to equalize taxable valuation within the geographic vicinity of the subject property as well as the whole County. He said unequal valuations resulting solely for the effect of cyclical reappraisal authorized by law does not justify an adjustment to a valuation. He added the BOE could equalize in the area the Petitioner had given to the Board.

Member Schmidt stated because the NRS says "solely" one could argue that because of the spike in the real estate appreciation that there may be a disequalization based partly on the cyclical nature of the appraisal process every five years and based partly on a spike in appreciation values on that particular year.

Chairman Sparks stated the State BOE, the State Tax Commission, and the Legislature were going to have to deal with the issue of the tax cap. He said, as a BOE member, he did not have any direction to address how the Legislature would do that.

Member Koziol stated the Nevada State Constitution mandated equal and just valuations and left it in the hands of the Legislature.

Based on the FINDINGS that the taxable value does not exceed full cash value, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land and improvements on Parcel No. 220-021-06 be upheld.

06-25E CONSOLIDATED HEARING - HEARING NOS. – 0010, 0006, 0011, 0030, 0031, 0037, 0064
PARCEL NOS. 043-122-05, 049-431-08, 049-433-04, 152-213-06, 152-493-11, 208-161-06, 220-072-02

Petitions for Review of Assessed Valuation received from the Petitioners listed below, protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located in Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, were set for consideration at this time.

Discussion ensued about the following hearings to determine if they could be consolidated. Chairman Sparks confirmed no petitioners were present; and Amy Harvey, County Clerk, certified that no letters were received concerning the hearings.

Ms. Harvey called the hearings by hearing number, property owner's name, and parcel number.

On motion by Member Koziol, seconded by Member Schmidt, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the following hearings be consolidated.

Josh Wilson, Appraiser, duly sworn, submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit I, Washoe County Assessor's response to the Taxpayers' assertion that there is Non-Equalization of similarly situated properties and improvements.

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records each applicable to the individual hearings.

Appraiser Wilson commented the Assessor's Office had spoken with many petitioners who filed petitions at the direction of a special interest group and were told to place the land value at 10 percent less and the improvements at 20 percent less. He said they believed they were doing the right thing, and a good majority of them never intended to appear for a hearing. Appraiser Wilson noted, if the Assessor was out of equalization, how could the values be exactly 10 percent off on the land and 20 percent off on the improvements. He stated the Assessor would stand on their written submission.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS that the taxable value does not exceed full cash value as evidenced by Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of land and improvements on the following Assessor's Parcel Nos. be upheld:

HEARING NO.	PETITIONER	PARCEL NO.
0010	UH CORNEIL, TR	043-122-05
0006	ALEXANDER H CORNEIL	049-431-08
0011	UH CORNEIL, TR	049-433-04
0030	STEPHEN & MARGARET HENDERSON, TR	152-213-06
0031	WILLIAM E. & ANNE M. VIETS	152-493-11
0037	RICHARD A. & CHARLENE HOWDLE	208-161-06
0064	ROBERT M. & JO-ANNE DOXEY, TR	220-072-02

06-26E HEARING NO. 0077 – VINCENT & LYNN CANNIZZARO
PARCEL NO. 079-481-56

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Vincent and Lynn Cannizzaro, protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1215 Serpentine Road, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned LDR and designated single-family residence.

Michael Bozman, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

The Petitioner was not present.

In response to Member McAlinden, Appraiser Bozman confirmed the owner refused to allow access to the house for an onsite inspection.

Member McAlinden noted, based on NRS 361.345, if an owner refuses access to an appraiser and the appraiser has to estimate the value of the property, no reduction may be made.

Member Schmidt noted on the petition the value was listed as greater than the taxable value.

Appraiser Bozman submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 8.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS that the taxable value does not exceed full cash value, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member McAlinden, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land and improvements on Parcel No. 079-481-56 be upheld.

06-27E HEARING NO. 0033 – JAN & KIM A. SLUCHAK, TR.
PARCEL NO. 043-150-02

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Jan and Kim A. Sluchak, TR, protesting the taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 8102 Meadow Vista Drive, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned LLR2.5 and designated single-family residence.

Amy Harvey, County Clerk, commented a letter was received from the Petitioner requesting that her hearing be rescheduled in approximately one month.

Chairman Sparks confirmed the hearing notice was mailed to the Petitioner on January 27, 2006.

Member Schmidt commented the hearing could be opened and continued to avoid re-noticing. He stated it would not be a problem for the Board to reschedule the hearing.

Chairman Sparks stated he did not want to set a precedent concerning the rescheduling of hearings.

On motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried with Member Schmidt voting "no," it was ordered that the request for rescheduling of the hearing be denied.

The Petitioner was not present.

Josh Wilson, Appraiser, duly sworn, submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit I, Washoe County Assessor's response to the Taxpayers' assertion that there is Non-Equalization of similarly situated properties and improvements.

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 13.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS that the taxable value does not exceed full cash value, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, on motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land and improvements on Parcel No. 043-150-02 be upheld.

06-28E HEARING NO. 0002 – TERRY ROSS, ET AL
PARCEL NO. 148-081-12

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Terry Ross, et al, protesting the taxable valuation on the land located at 5890 Lausanne Drive, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned LDS and designated vacant, single-family residence.

Gail Vice, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

The Petitioner was not present.

Appraiser Vice submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit II, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 6.

Appraiser Vice said the Assessor recommended the land value be reduced from \$660,960 to \$600,000. She reviewed the land sales provided in Exhibit II and noted it was a vacant parcel. She said the subject parcel was valued at reappraisal at \$600,000 and factoring increased the value to \$660,960. She stated the recommendation was to reduce the value because the property fell within the range of the comparables and due to the recent sale of the subject property for that price in December 2004. Appraiser Vice verified the owner was in agreement with the recommendation.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS that the taxable value exceeds full cash value as evidenced by the recent sale of the subject, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, and as recommended by the Assessor, on motion by Member McAlinden, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land on Parcel No. 148-081-12 be reduced to \$600,000. The Board also made the finding that, with this adjustment, the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

06-29E HEARING NO. 0048 – STEPHEN & LINDA BALOGH, TR
PARCEL NO. 148-221-05

A petition for Review of Assessed Valuation received from Stephen and Linda Balogh, TR, protesting the taxable valuation on the land located at 20162 Bordeaux Drive, Reno, Washoe County, Nevada, was set for consideration at this time. The property is zoned LDS and designated single-family residence.

Gail Vice, Appraiser, duly sworn, oriented the Board as to the location of subject property.

The Petitioner was not present.

Appraiser Vice submitted the following documents into evidence:

Exhibit I, Assessor's Fact Sheet(s) including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal record, pages 1 through 12.

Appraiser Vice reviewed sales of comparable properties. She testified that the Assessor was recommending a reduction in the land value. Appraiser Vice noted it was purchased for \$600,000 in 2003, and all four of the land sales were located close to the subject. She said the values of land sales were listed under the amount of the subject property, and it was recommended the land be reduced to \$575,000. She verified the owner was in agreement with the recommendation.

The Chairman closed the hearing.

Based on the FINDINGS that the taxable value exceeds full cash value as evidenced by the recent sale of the subject, as evidenced by the Assessor's Exhibits, and as recommended by the Assessor, on motion by Member Sparks, seconded by Member Koziol, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable value of the land on Parcel No. 148-221-05 be reduced to \$575,000, and that the taxable value of the improvements be upheld, for a total taxable value of \$2,144,065. The Board also made the finding that, with this adjustment, the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Schmidt requested an item be placed on the next available agenda concerning scheduling, assignment of hearings, and the calling of meetings. He commented it was his understanding that the Chairman was to place items on the agenda that were requested by Board members.

Member Koziol asked for discussion about the inherent powers of the Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners. He based his request on a letter he received last week.

Member Schmidt voiced his support for Member Koziol's request, and he referenced the creation of an administrative chair position for the Board of Equalization. He noted that position was not authorized in statute.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was no response to the call for public comments.

* * * * *

4:50 p.m. There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, the Board recessed until February 7, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.

STEVEN SPARKS, Chairman
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

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

*Minutes prepared by
Stacy Gonzales and Lori Rowe,
Deputy Clerks*