

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

FRIDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 18, 2011

PRESENT:

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

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

The Board of Equalization convened at 9:03 a.m. in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Chairperson Covert called the meeting to order, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

11-0547E WITHDRAWALS

The following petitions scheduled on today's agenda had been withdrawn by the Petitioners prior to the hearing:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
007-202-24	Catholic Healthcare West	11-0182

11-0548E REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCE

There were no requests for continuance.

CONSOLIDATION OF HEARINGS

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

11-0549E CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST TO REOPEN HEARINGS

Agenda Subject: “Consideration and possible action with regard to request to reopen hearings noticed for and conducted on January 31, 2011 for Reptile Ridge Properties, Parcel Nos. 017-360-25, 017-360-24, 017-360-22, and 017-360-21, and hearing noticed for and conducted on February 1, 2011, for Rodney Campbell, Parcel No. 078-221-13.”

Gary Schmidt was sworn in by Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and supporting documentation, 9 pages.

Exhibit B: E-mail request to reopen, 2 pages.

Mr. Schmidt requested the Board reopen five hearings conducted in his absence. He said his request was based on alleged faulty notice for the hearings as well as a general faulty process with respect to who was authorized to do the noticing, what the process was to request rescheduling, and how information was obtained about the scheduling.

Mr. Schmidt reviewed a copy of his petition form for the Reptile Ridge properties (page 2 of Exhibit A). He said he did not fill out the owner/agent/attorney mailing address on the form because he was mobile and unable to access his mail on a timely basis. He put his phone number on the petition but received no phone call to notice him of the hearing dates. He noted it had been said he was seeking special privileges to be noticed by phone rather than by mail. Prior to 2005, he explained the County Board of Equalization noticed petitioners by telephone and had not used written notices. He had served on the Board at that time and raised the issue that there should be written notices. Although the Board adopted a policy of sending written notices, he stated phone calls and e-mail notices were not prohibited. He suggested any such prohibition would require Board action and it would then be appropriate to remove the contact phone number from the appeal form. He indicated he could have been contacted by phone if it was felt that his petition was faulty or incomplete. He stated there was no reason to have a contact number on the form if it was not to be used, so it was a reasonable assumption on his part that he would be contacted. He indicated he was never contacted by phone.

Mr. Schmidt referenced an authorization for representation on the Rodney Campbell property (page 3 of Exhibit A). He said the form was signed by Rodney Campbell and designated Mr. Schmidt as the contact person. He noted that Mr. Campbell provided his own mailing address on the petition form. The petition form did not specify whether the address was for an owner, agent, or attorney, and there was no indication that the address had to be identified. Mr. Schmidt stated he had received no e-mail notification of the hearing date, although his e-mail address was shown at the top of the authorization form. He acknowledged the law was a little bit silent on the issue, but indicated it was a reasonable assumption that the representative would be contacted under such circumstances.

Mr. Schmidt characterized the whole process as faulty. Chairperson Covert indicated Mr. Schmidt could use the public comment period if he wanted to talk about the entire system. Mr. Schmidt stated it was relevant to the hearing. Chairperson Covert cautioned him to stick to the agenda item, which related to a request to reopen his

hearings. He said he did not want to hear how faulty the system was and how bad everyone was, but he wanted to hear anything else Mr. Schmidt had to say regarding the request to reopen his hearings.

Mr. Schmidt stated the Board was charged by law with scheduling hearings, creating agendas, and posting agendas. He said he attempted to get contact information for the Board in late December 2010 and early January 2011 in order to request hearing dates in late February 2011. He indicated he made a public records request of Chairperson Covert (page 7 of Exhibit A) asking for all rules and guidelines pertaining to the scheduling of hearings. He noted he was representing over 100 parcels and wanted to work within the system to get hearings scheduled at a reasonably convenient time or even at a time he could attend. He sent the request to the County Manager because he was unable to obtain any Board contact information from the Manager's Office, the Clerk's Office, or the Assessor's Office. He said he attended a few early Board meetings and arrived at the end of a meeting on January 27, 2011. Among the records he requested were 31 pages from the Board's organizational meeting on December 1, 2010.

Chairperson Covert asked how such discussion applied and suggested the Board's organizational meeting had nothing to do with the request to reopen Mr. Schmidt's hearings. Mr. Schmidt said he was trying to explain his efforts to get information about the process, about how to request rescheduling, and about who had the authority to schedule.

Mr. Schmidt indicated the law granted scheduling authority to the Board and not to the Chair, but he was unable to get contact information for the Board. He ultimately received backup documents from the Board's December 1, 2010 organizational meeting. He stated there were conflicts because the Assessor's Office was doing the rescheduling. He noted the backup documents from the December meeting talked about the Board doing the scheduling and rescheduling, but his review of the minutes showed the Board never adopted that as policy. He said he made lots of effort in advance of the agendas being posted. He did not necessarily have access to a computer when he was traveling, but he made multiple trips and multiple phone calls to the Assessor's Office and the Clerk's Office. He spoke with Chairperson Covert after the meeting on January 27, 2011 to express his frustration. He noted there was no authority in the law for the Assessor's Office to do scheduling and rescheduling. He indicated the hearings were adversarial between the Assessor's Office and the Appellant, and Supreme Court rules would say tasks could not be assigned to a person or entity that had a conflict of interest. He said it was his position the Board could not assign their responsibility or duty to the Assessor's Office. Apart from that legal position, he stated there was nothing on record to show that the Board assigned responsibility to the Assessor's Office. He asserted that the Assessor's Office usurped the Board's authority, so all of the noticing for the year was faulty.

Chairperson Covert said he had searched the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) for guidance, but they were silent on the issue. He indicated the Nevada

Administrative Code (NAC) was not specific but did address the issue of notice. The NAC said the County Clerk's noticing responsibility was by mail or in person. He stated "in person" referred to giving notices over the counter at the Clerk's Office. He pointed out there was no NAC or NRS that required the Clerk to call anyone, and any calls were strictly a courtesy. He noted the Board held Mr. Schmidt's hearings and was fair during the hearings. He said it was his opinion that Mr. Schmidt's remedy was to appeal the County Board's decisions to the State Board of Equalization.

Ms. Parent clarified the NAC required the County Clerk to maintain adequate proof of noticing but did not really require the Clerk's Office to be the entity sending the notice.

Member Woodland agreed with Chairperson Covert and stated that everyone had been noticed. She observed Mr. Schmidt had served on the Washoe County Board of Equalization for many years and knew how to fill out the petition form. She questioned why he would simply put down a phone number if he had been the one to convince the Board to adopt notices by mail. She suggested he should have noted on the petition form that he could only be contacted by phone. She stated the Board gave a fair hearing for each of the appeals and had even granted a reduction for the Rodney Campbell property. She agreed that Mr. Schmidt should appeal to the State Board.

Member Brown pointed out it was up to the Board's discretion as to whether a hearing date could be rescheduled.

Member Woodland made a motion to deny Mr. Schmidt's request. She noted his remedy was to the State Board. Member Brown seconded the motion.

Member Krolick said he would support the motion. He indicated the hearings had been appropriately agendized and the agendas had been posted. He stated there was a process for petitioners to write in and request rescheduling of their hearings, but he saw no evidence that Mr. Schmidt had done that. He observed Mr. Schmidt still had an opportunity to appeal to the State Board. He indicated he had seconded the Board's motion to grant a \$35,000 reduction in taxable value on the Rodney Campbell property. He said he thought the Board had handled the hearings appropriately.

Member Woodland commented that all of the information was online and was easy to obtain.

On motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried with Member Green absent, it was ordered that the request to reopen the hearings identified under Agenda Item 5 be denied.

**DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH’S
OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T**

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, stated the hearings could be consolidated because the parcels were treated as one economic unit. He oriented the Board as to the location of the subject properties and identified them as a 928-room hotel-casino.

Chairperson Covert observed there was a recommendation by the Assessor’s Office to reduce the total taxable value (see Exhibit I). Appraiser Stafford said the Appellant was not in agreement with the recommendation.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroesch were sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

Mr. Sullivan indicated the fundamental disagreement between the Petitioner and the Assessor’s Office came down to the income number to be used. He was not sure what capitalization rate the Assessor’s Office had applied. He stated Harrah’s was a publically traded company and its income had been provided through September 2010 as EBITDA (Earnings before Interest, Taxes, Depreciation, and Amortization). He commented the numbers through December 2010 were not yet available. He said applying the appropriate capitalization rate to the EBITDA would demonstrate a total value close to what the Petitioner had requested on the appeal form (\$27,900,000).

Chairperson Covert asked when the numbers were made available to the Assessor’s Office. Mr. Sullivan replied the Assessor’s Office requested information from Kit Floyd, Director of Taxes for Harrah’s, and was given information through June 2010. Mr. Sullivan’s office provided updated information through September 2010 about one month prior to the hearing.

Mr. Piroesch noted Harrah’s had an EBITDA of \$5.1 million for the trailing twelve months through September 2010 and an EBITDA of \$7.9 million for the 2009 calendar year. He stated the Petitioner felt the Assessor was using imperfect information, and that there were some different accounting treatments between the Nevada Gaming Commission’s NGC-17 report and the actual revenue and income generated by the property. Mr. Sullivan pointed out the Clark County Board of Equalization had heard 25 or 30 similar types of appeals. He asserted both the Clark County and the State Boards of Equalization had agreed that the methodology used by the companies and by the Petitioner to determine the EBITDA was correct and that it was the way the market dealt with value. He said the Petitioner had strong faith that its calculations were correct and were the ones normally used in valuing casino properties.

Appraiser Stafford reviewed the analysis of comparable sales from the northern Nevada market, as provided on page 5 of Exhibit I. He identified Treasure Island (HC-7) as the most recent sale of a major hotel-casino from the Las Vegas market.

He noted it sold with an EBITDA multiplier of 7.5 and an overall capitalization rate of 13.4 percent. He indicated capitalization rates for sales of Reno properties generally ranged from 17 to 21 percent. He discussed Fitzgerald's Hotel-Casino (HC-3), which sold in 2007 with a capitalization rate of 21 percent. He stated Fitzgerald's was notably inferior to the subject property, in that minimal remodeling and updating had been done since it was built in 1976. In contrast, the Harrah's Reno property had been well maintained, had no need for repairs or updating, and was a well-run operation.

Appraiser Stafford referenced a compilation of information published by the Nevada Gaming Commission, which was provided on page 8 of Exhibit I. He compared income and expenses for the subject property to averages for seven Reno-Sparks properties (including the subject) with gaming revenues of \$36 million or more during fiscal year 2009. He noted the average EBITDAR (Earnings before Interest, Taxes, Depreciation, Amortization, and Rent) margin was 13.5 percent, whereas the margin for Harrah's was 3.9 percent. If the numbers for the subject were removed, the resulting average margin was 16 percent for the remaining six properties. He questioned why the subject had an EBITDAR margin that was so much lower than its competitors. He said he had looked in more detail at the corporate allocations charged back to the subject property and concluded the allocations were quite excessive. He pointed out page 9 of Exhibit I, which showed that the actual corporate allocation for the subject amounted to 7.2 percent of gross revenue. He compared the subject's allocation to three comparable sales that had allocations ranging from 1.7 to 4.4 percent. He stated the subject appeared to have an overcharge for corporate allocations and he suspected there were items such as depreciation, interest or debt service that should not have been included in the EBITDAR calculation.

Appraiser Stafford turned to page 7 of Exhibit I, which contained the subject property's EBITDAR calculations for the past four years. He noted the 2010 data represented the twelve months ending June 30, 2010, and was obtained from NGC-17 reports provided by Harrah's in October 2010. He pointed out the initial EBITDAR calculation of \$5,362,000 for 2010 was only 4.8 percent of total revenue and was "off the charts" when compared to other properties that were closer to 16 percent. He therefore allowed 2.7 percent of total revenue for the corporate allocation, which resulted in an adjusted EBITDAR of \$10.4 million. He stated the adjusted EBITDAR amounted to only 9.3 percent of total revenue and was still well below the 16 percent demonstrated by the other six properties in the market. He indicated he was trying to adjust to a market norm and trying to adjust out what he believed to be interest and depreciation charges. The application of a capitalization rate of 18 percent to the EBITDAR of \$10.4 million resulted in the Assessor's indicated value of approximately \$58 million.

Appraiser Stafford said the Assessor's cap rate of 18 percent was greater than the most recent sale of the Treasure Island property in Las Vegas, which sold at a capitalization rate of 13.4 percent in 2009. He referred to the listing of capitalization rates and multipliers for different calendar years that was provided in Exhibit II. He explained the list tried to identify some trends that might be present in the market place. He stated the Petitioner had seen the list when it was presented by the Clark County Assessor at

hearings before the State Board of Equalization. He said he thought the Petitioner had argued that the Assessors needed to start moving capitalization rates downward as time went on, but the matrix in Exhibit II did not necessarily support such a position. He pointed out the comparable sales he had presented had capitalization rates ranging as high as 21 percent. He noted the subject was clearly superior to the Fitzgerald's property that sold at a 21 percent capitalization rate. He concluded the capitalization rate used by the Assessor's Office to value the subject property was appropriate for a destination property in the Reno-Sparks market.

Chairperson Covert asked what the Assessor's Office was recommending. Appraiser Stafford indicated the recommendation was to reduce the total taxable value from \$64 million to \$58 million, as shown on page 10 of Exhibit I. He clarified for Member Woodland that the recommendation suggested applying obsolescence to three parcels and upholding the remaining parcels in the consolidated hearings.

Appraiser Stafford talked about evidence submitted by the Petitioner that contained a list of properties and the capitalization rates applied to them. He stated he read the decision letters from the State Board of Equalization on some of the properties and the following capitalization rates were utilized: 16.67 percent for the Rio, 14.5 percent for Bally's, 15.8 percent for Caesars, 16.67 for the Imperial Palace, and 16.67 for Paris. He concluded the 18 percent capitalization rate used for the subject property was higher than the range of capitalization rates that were applied by the State Board of Equalization. *[Please note the Petitioner submitted no evidence to the Washoe County Board of Equalization. Mr. Stafford's reference appears to be for evidence submitted to the Clark County and/or State Boards of Equalization.]*

Mr. Sullivan observed that Mr. Stafford's arguments were the same as those made by the Clark County Assessor in front of the Clark County and State Boards of Equalization. He stated the Boards' responses ranged from simple disagreement to incredulity about the use of market averages or implied EBITDA and expense ratios to determine the full cash value of an operating entity. He indicated the market dealt with income producing property by applying an appropriate capitalization rate to the income it produced. With respect to the assertion that an 18 percent capitalization rate was realistic when compared to the 21 percent rate for Fitzgerald's, he noted a similar argument could be made by looking at the previous year's decisions for Clark County properties like the Green Valley Ranch and the Red Rock Hotel & Casino. He explained they were both high-end local casinos that were given a 17.5 percent capitalization rate. He pointed out the capitalization rates applied in Clark County went as high as 18 percent, and there was even one in Laughlin for 22.5 percent that was probably not relevant. He said he would leave it to the Board to decide what capitalization rate was appropriate to apply to the subject property.

Mr. Sullivan reiterated the actual income for the subject property was \$5.1 million for the trailing twelve months through September 2010. He indicated both the Clark County and the State Boards used the most recent twelve months of income rather than a three-year average or income as of June. He emphasized the most recent numbers

were the most appropriate ones for determining the full cash value of a property, especially in a declining market. He suggested it did not make sense to argue that the income provided by the Petitioner was not its income. He noted Harrah's was one of the most respected gaming operators in the world. He said the Petitioner disagreed with any adjustment of the actual numbers that had been provided. He stated the taxable value should be determined by using the actual income and applying an appropriate capitalization rate.

Mr. Pirosch talked about the Treasure Island transaction, which was the last sale for which public data was available. He explained the multiplier was close to 7 when the transaction was negotiated, resulting in a figure of about \$775 million before a discount was given. He indicated the property had been doing about \$110 million in EBIDTA at the time the transaction was started. Additionally, the MGM/Mirage had just completed an \$84 million room renovation on the property that the buyer essentially reimbursed them for. He suggested the multiplier for the transaction was really closer to 6.3 after the \$84 million was backed out, and both the County and State Boards had looked at it that way. He stated there were transactions shown in Exhibit II that had never closed, such as the Trump Marina. He said a deal had just been signed on the Trump Marina in the past week for \$38 million and he knew about it because his team helped to negotiate the transaction. He pointed out many of the other capitalization rates in Exhibit II were for companies that had gone bankrupt within a few years of the transactions.

9:57 a.m. Member Green arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Pirosch referenced the Assessor's discussions from page 5 of Exhibit I. He observed the Fitzgerald's sale (HC-3) occurred toward the top of the market. He questioned whether anyone would argue that things had gotten better or that capitalization rates had declined when the market continued to experience decreased gaming revenue and EBITDA.

Chairperson Covert asked the Petitioner to address the issue of corporate charge backs. Mr. Pirosch replied that actual operating data had been presented for the subject property in order to avoid any kind of mental mathematics related to corporate depreciation, expenses and interest. He indicated the income was \$5.1 million for the trailing twelve months through September 2010 and the kinds of adjustments the Assessor was making were not reasonable. He recalled that the Assessor's Office characterized Harrah's as a well-run property operated by a respected company, but then went on to say they were trying to overcharge and were not being reasonable. He agreed with Mr. Stafford's comment that there were few Reno properties like Harrah's, which operated under a strong corporate structure. Mr. Pirosch said the different properties had different cost structures and there was nothing inappropriate about what was being charged back to the subject. Mr. Sullivan observed that someone else coming in to operate the subject property was not likely to be as successful as Harrah's. He noted the company's intellectual property, expertise, supply chains, and customer lists were not things that would go to a new buyer. In determining the full cash value of the property, he stated the Petitioner should not be punished for being one of the best operators out there.

Member Krolick asked the Assessor to review how the capitalization rate had been determined. Appraiser Stafford discussed the capitalization rates and some of the conditions surrounding the sales of each of the properties shown on page 5 of Exhibit I. He stated Harrah's was easily among the top five hotel-casinos in the Reno-Sparks area. Member Krolick asked what value the Assessor had on the Grand Sierra property that had gone bankrupt and was in receivership. Appraiser Stafford indicated it was being operated by Chase Manhattan and he was not sure of its taxable value. Member Krolick observed it was hard to figure out from the dated sales data where things were in 2010-2011. Appraiser Stafford said that was why he added the Treasure Island sale from 2009. He explained he relied on data developed by the Clark County Assessor's Office, which indicated a capitalization rate of 13.4 percent for a major hotel-casino on the strip in 2009. He noted the 18 percent rate on the subject property was enough to adjust for location and possibly for time. He commented that he would expect higher capitalization rates on local's casinos and properties with no rooms, and would expect a lower capitalization rate for a destination hotel-casino like Harrah's Reno.

Member Krolick stated it was safe to say the sales comparison approach did not work well in the subject property's situation. Appraiser Stafford reviewed his sales comparison approach on page 6 of Exhibit I that was broken down using several types of unit values. He acknowledged the data showed some pretty wild swings and said it came down to the subject's income.

Member Krolick requested a review of the Assessor's income approach. Appraiser Stafford discussed page 7 of Exhibit I, which included four years of revenue, expenses, EBIDTAR, and adjusted EBIDTAR. He noted the data was provided by the Petitioner from their NGC-17 report. He pointed out the 2010 EBIDTAR of \$5,362,006 represented 4.8 percent of total revenue and was well off the mark compared to other casinos. He indicated corporate charge backs had been much less for the corporate properties he was able to find. He arrived at an adjusted EBITDAR of \$10,425,669 by applying 2.7 percent of the total revenue as a corporate allocation. The adjusted EBITDAR was capitalized at 18 percent to find an indicated value of \$57,916,667 (rounded to \$58 million). He explained the capitalization rate of 18 percent was equivalent to a 5.5 multiplier and the multiplier was a reciprocal of the capitalization rate. He noted the State Board had generally used multipliers of 6 and 6.5 when they affirmed decisions of the Clark County Board. He indicated the highest capitalization rate applied by the State Board was 16.68 and the lowest was 15.4 percent.

Member Brown asked Chairperson Covert what he thought was an appropriate capitalization rate. Chairperson Covert said the problem was that there were not really any comparable properties. He indicated the corporate allocation was 4.5 percent of sales for 2010 and that did not seem excessive to him, although he did not know whether it was high or low. He stated he had run some numbers but had not come up with anything definitive. He suggested the value was somewhere between what the Appellant was requesting and what the Assessor was recommending.

Member Krolick wondered how long ago the Caesar's sale at South Lake Tahoe had taken place. He recalled it had been somewhat of a forced transaction. Appraiser Stafford indicated the sale took place because of the merger between Harrah's and Caesar's. Based on conversations with the Douglas County Assessor, he said it had been difficult to get meaningful data because the property was on leased land. He had been told the condition of the property was very poor.

Member Krolick said he found it difficult to believe that someone would pay \$58 million for the Harrah's Reno operation, given what other casino transactions had gone for in the past and where things were currently. Appraiser Stafford observed the subject had been valued at \$116 million two years ago and the Assessor was proposing a current value of \$58 million. He recognized that properties were facing tremendous challenges and there had been a significant decline in gaming revenue and in EBITDAR since 2001.

After doing some calculations, Chairperson Covert said he would be comfortable with a reduction down to \$52 million but not any more than that. Member Krolick agreed based on his rough calculation of \$51.5 million. Appraiser Stafford noted there would be an appeal to the State Board and the State Board would review the County's methodology and calculation. For the record, he asked for clarification of the EBITDAR and capitalization rate leading to the Board's value.

Chairperson Covert asked what capitalization rate the Petitioner had used. Mr. Sullivan suggested a rate of 18 percent applied to the income of \$5.1 million would give a value somewhere in the neighborhood of \$28 million. While the Petitioner thought a higher rate should have been applied, he said they would leave it up to the Board. Chairperson Covert noted the EBITDAR of \$5.3 million that was reflected on page 7 of Exhibit I had come from reports to the Nevada Gaming Commission. Mr. Pirotsch said he did not know what the Assessor had used but the number provided by Harrah's was \$5.1 million. Mr. Sullivan clarified the \$5.3 million might have been through June rather than through September 2010. Mr. Pirotsch stated there was some rent that had to be backed out to get to \$5.1 million.

Chairperson Covert observed the Assessor used an EBITDAR of \$10.4 million after adjusting for corporate allocation. He asked if the entire corporate allocation had been adjusted. Appraiser Stafford pointed out a corporate allocation of \$8 million on page 7 of Exhibit I. He allowed an allocation of 2.7 percent of total revenue, which would put about \$5 million back into EBITDAR. Chairperson Covert asked how the 2.7 percent was determined. Appraiser Stafford replied it was the median derived from three comparables shown on page 9 of Exhibit I. He noted the allocation would have been 7.2 percent without adjustment.

Chairperson Covert stated he disagreed somewhat with how the Assessor came up with the allocation. He said he did not have a problem with the Petitioner's corporate allocation. Without knowing what went into it, he suggested the Assessor's allocation was probably a little low and Harrah's might be a little high.

Chairperson Covert asked the Petitioner to reconcile their \$5.3 million number against the \$5.1 million. Mr. Pirosh stated rent expense of \$313,930 would be taken out of the EBITDAR of \$5.326 million. Chairperson Covert wondered what the rental expense was for. Mr. Pirosh replied the expense was for rental of the Mill Street warehouse, for Cal Neva parking, and for an off-site laundry building. Chairperson Covert questioned whether the Assessor's analysis had been that detailed. Appraiser Stafford indicated it would show up as rental expense on the NGC-17 and he would then add it back to EBITDAR. He remarked that he had assumed the expense to be a land lease. Chairperson Covert suggested that parking and laundry were normal expenses used for the convenience of the operation. Mr. Pirosh said he did not know the exact detail but it sounded reasonable. Appraiser Stafford pointed out he had a figure from the NGC-17 that showed rent on premises to be \$1,352,000 for 2010. He clarified that rent on premises should be a category for leased land.

Chairperson Covert ran some calculations. He referenced the adjustments to corporate allocation shown on page 7 of Exhibit I. He allowed 75 percent of the \$5,063,663 difference, which amounted to \$3,798,000 added back to the EBITDAR of \$5,362,006, resulting in an adjusted EBITDAR of \$9,160,000. He said he did not think the capitalization rate was in real contention, so he used the Assessor's rate of 18 percent to arrive at \$50,888,000 as an indicated value. He stated he was not comfortable with the Assessor picking one of the corporate allocation rates from some other properties. He indicated there was no question that Harrah's was a well run property. He suspected the corporate operation had a large hand in that and it was therefore reasonable that all of their properties would absorb some of the corporate expense.

Chairperson Covert inquired as to how the charge back was allocated for various properties. Mr. Pirosh believed it to be a percentage of revenue. Chairperson Covert remarked that properties with larger revenue would absorb more corporate service. Member Krolick pointed out the percentage of revenue was actually less in 2010 than it had been during the higher income year of 2007. He indicated he would not have a problem with leaving the allocation as reported at \$8,088,949 because it seemed to fall in line with the Petitioner's operating practices.

Chairperson Covert observed \$10,425,669 was the adjusted EBITDAR used by the Assessor. He referenced page 7 of Exhibit I. He explained his logic was to take the EBITDAR of \$5,362,000 (4.8 percent of revenue), drop the difference in the corporate charge back from \$5,063,663 to \$3,798,000 for a total adjusted EBITDAR of \$9,160,000, and divide that by the 18 percent capitalization rate to get to \$50,888,000 as the total taxable value. Ron Sauer, Chief Appraiser, stated the Assessor's Office had asked the Board to apply obsolescence to three parcels, as noted on page 10 of Exhibit I. He hoped any decision made by the Board would adjust those three parcels. Chairperson Covert indicated he would do so on a percentage basis.

Please see 11-0550E through 11-0569E below for the details concerning the petition, exhibits and decision related to each of the parcels in the consolidated hearing.

**11-0550E PARCEL NO. 011-052-36 – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY
INC – HEARING NO. 11-0546D**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 209 N Center St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Pirosh were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-36, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Chairperson Covert, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion carried on a 3-1 vote with Member Green abstaining and Member Woodland voting "no," it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the total obsolescence applied to the taxable improvement value be increased to \$10,417,720 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was made to achieve a combined total taxable value of \$50,888,000 based on the income approach for the parcels shown on page 10 of Assessor's Exhibit I under Hearing Nos. 11-0546A through 11-0546T. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0551E **PARCEL NO. 011-052-44 – HARRAHS OPERATING COMPANY
INC – HEARING NO. 11-0546E**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 219 N Center St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Pirosh were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-44, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Chairperson Covert, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion carried on a 3-1 vote with Member Green abstaining and Member Woodland voting "no," it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the total obsolescence applied to the taxable improvement value be increased to \$21,586,356 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was made to achieve a combined total taxable value of \$50,888,000 based on the income approach for the parcels shown on page 10 of Assessor's Exhibit I under Hearing Nos. 11-0546A through 11-0546T. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0552E **PARCEL NO. 011-071-26 – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY
INC – HEARING NO. 11-0546H**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 200 N Center St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-071-26, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Chairperson Covert, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion carried on a 3-1 vote with Member Green abstaining and Member Woodland voting "no," it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the total obsolescence applied to the taxable improvement value be increased to \$32,392,792 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was made to achieve a combined total taxable value of \$50,888,000 based on the income approach for the parcels shown on page 10 of Assessor's Exhibit I under Hearing Nos. 11-0546A through 11-0546T. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0553E PARCEL NO. 011-052-32 – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC – HEARING NO. 11-0546A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 210 N Virginia St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-32, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0554E PARCEL NO. 011-052-33 – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC – HEARING NO. 11-0546B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 206 N Virginia St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-33, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0555E PARCEL NO. 011-052-35 – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC – HEARING NO. 11-0546C

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 201 N Center St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Pirosh were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-35, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with

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

**11-0556E PARCEL NO. 011-071-09 – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY
INC – HEARING NO. 11-0546F**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 210 N Center St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroesch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-071-09, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0557E PARCEL NO. 011-071-25 – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY
INC – HEARING NO. 11-0546G**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 225 Lake St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Pirosh were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-071-25, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0558E PARCEL NO. 011-052-37 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546I**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 236 N Virginia St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Pirosh were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-37, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0559E PARCEL NO. 011-052-38 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546J

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 E Commercial Row, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroesch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-38, 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 Brown, which motion carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0560E PARCEL NO. 011-052-39 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546K

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 E Commercial Row, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroesch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-39, 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 Brown, which motion carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0561E PARCEL NO. 011-052-40 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546L

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 E Commercial Row, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-40, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0562E PARCEL NO. 011-052-41 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546M

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 E Commercial Row, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Pirosh were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-41, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0563E PARCEL NO. 011-052-42 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546N

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 E Commercial Row, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Pirosh were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-42, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0564E PARCEL NO. 011-052-43 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546O

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 46 E Commercial Row, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroesch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-43, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0565E PARCEL NO. 011-052-45 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546P

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 224 N Virginia St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroesch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-45, 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 Brown, which motion carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0566E PARCEL NO. 011-052-46 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546Q

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 224 N Virginia St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-46, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0567E PARCEL NO. 011-052-47 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546R

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 N Virginia St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-47, 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 Brown, which motion carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0568E PARCEL NO. 011-052-48 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546S

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 236 N Virginia St, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Pirosh were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-052-48, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0569E PARCEL NO. 011-370-50 – RENO CROSSROADS LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0546T

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 E Commercial Row, 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, 74 pages.

Exhibit II: Cap Rate/Multiplier study prepared by Clark County Assessor, 2 pages.

Steven Sullivan and Brent Piroesch were present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mark Stafford, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – HARRAH'S OPERATING COMPANY INC & RENO CROSSROADS LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0546A THROUGH 11-0546T.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-370-50, 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 carried on a 4-0 vote with Member Green abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11:05 a.m. Chairperson Covert declared a brief recess.

11:15 a.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

11-0570E **PARCEL NO. 083-830-69 – KILEY RANCH LLC**
– HEARING NO. 11-0314E

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

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter with updated market analysis as of December 21, 2010, from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: *[Not presented at hearing.]*

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted there was a small single family residential dwelling on the parcel.

Chairperson Covert asked if the Assessor's Office was recommending reduced values on all of the Kiley Ranch/Lazy Five parcels. Appraiser Churchfield stated there would be recommendations on some parcels but not on others. He referenced Exhibit II, which was put together to explain that some of the property values had been increased from the previous year to keep equalization throughout the Spanish Springs valley. He indicated the Assessor's Office did not recommend a reduction on the subject property.

Chairperson Covert noted the subject's total taxable value was \$170,040 but the owner's opinion of value was shown as \$4,900,718 on the petition form. Mr. Vasquez explained the Petitioner was asking the Board to consider one value for all of the parcels identified in Exhibit A. He stated two different appraisals and a letter were provided to support the owner's opinion of value. One of the appraisals was commissioned by the receiver for Colonial Bank (Exhibit D) and the second was commissioned by the Kiley family (Exhibits E and F). He pointed out the two appraisals came within a few percentage points of each other at approximately \$10 million.

Chairperson Covert observed that each parcel would be considered individually. Mr. Vasquez said the two appraisals indicated a value of \$93,357 for the subject parcel. Exhibit B allocated the appraised values to each parcel according to the types of uses allowed within the PUD Handbook approved for Kiley Ranch and the size of each parcel. The owner's opinion of value for each parcel was shown in the column labeled "price/parcel." Mr. Vasquez drew the Board's attention to page 29 of Exhibit D and page 100 of Exhibit F. (*The Petitioner incorrectly stated during the hearing that the allocated owner's values for each parcel were shown on Exhibit C.*)

Appraiser Churchfield read from page 2 of Exhibit D and page 3 of Exhibit F regarding the intended uses for each appraisal. He suggested both appraisals provided a wholesale liquidation value for the combined parcels, whereas the Assessor's Office looked at each parcel individually to determine an arm's length market value. He noted the subject property was currently valued at \$170,040. He said the Assessor's comparable improved sales indicated a range from \$96,000 to \$141,000 for similar-sized homes on small parcels. Two comparable land sales at \$100,000 and \$90,000 were used to support the value of the excess land on the 5.22-acre subject parcel. Both of the Assessor's comparable land sales were 10-acre single family parcels in the Spanish Springs Ranches with dirt road access. He characterized the land sales as inferior to the subject in location. He stated the subject's values were well supported based on the comparable sales.

Mr. Vasquez said all of the Kiley properties had been listed for sale for the better part of six years. Offers received in the last four years had been far below the appraised values and there had been no offers or letters of intent for the last three years. He indicated the appraisals were not done to establish liquidation value, but to accurately establish value for a collateralized loan. He stated the Assessor's comparables were located further down the Pyramid Highway and in more developed areas than the subject. He emphasized that two different appraisers working for two different entities had concluded nearly identical values. He explained the house on the subject property was a condemned shell with no water and no gas. He referenced the appraiser's December 2010 update letter (Exhibit E), which indicated property values had dropped another 10 percent since the two appraisals were done in March and May 2010. He requested a reduction in the subject's total value to \$93,357, based on two appraisals that he felt were accurate to the current market.

Chairperson Covert asked if the Assessor's Office had been out to look at the subject property. Appraiser Churchfield indicated the property was blocked off and a prior appraiser had been denied access to the parcel. He noted there was a depreciated improvement value of \$37,927 for some large structures on the property such as barns. Chairperson Covert commented the house would normally be the highest valued structure on a residential property. He wondered if the house on the subject property was inhabitable. Appraiser Churchfield said he did not know.

Member Krolick questioned whether there was any documentation or evidence to show the house had been condemned. Mr. Vasquez replied the house was not officially condemned but had been abandoned for ten years. He stated the Petitioner could not tear the house down because the banks had removed their lines of credit.

Member Woodland asked if the subject property was the old Kiley homestead. Mr. Vasquez indicated it was. He said the intent had been to remove all of the structures but the Petitioner's projects could not be completed after the economic crash hit.

Member Woodland stated there was nothing livable on the property, although the land still had a lot of value. She remarked she would not even put a horse in the barn. Chairperson Covert asked if she thought the structures were only worth their scrap value. Member Woodland replied that was how she looked at it. Member Green noted the subject property was close to the intersection of the Pyramid Highway and Sparks Boulevard, and a number of apartments had been built nearby. He stated it was closer to town and would probably be developed more quickly than some of the other Kiley parcels, but nothing was currently moving or selling. He said he was inclined to agree with the Petitioner. Chairperson Covert recommended the improvements be reduced in value.

Member Green wondered if any of the barns or structures were being rented. Mr. Vasquez replied they were not.

Chairperson Covert said he did not like hearing the Assessor's Office had been denied access. Mr. Vasquez indicated he had no knowledge of anyone being denied access and it was not the Petitioner's intent to deny access. He noted there were no employees on the property and it was all wide open land. He stated he would be happy to grant full access to all of the Kiley Ranch, Lazy Five and Zozac properties.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-830-69, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$18,357 by applying obsolescence, resulting in a total taxable value of \$93,357 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0571E PARCEL NO. 083-830-73 – KILEY RANCH LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0314F

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

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the residential property currently had a taxable land value of \$22,500 per acre. Member Green asked how close the property was to Vista Boulevard. Appraiser

Churchfield said it was near the Waterstone Apartments at the intersection of Kiley Parkway and Sparks Boulevard. Member Green observed the Henry Orr Parkway went up to the edge of the parcel.

Mr. Vasquez stated the subject property's value should be based on the two appraisals submitted in Exhibits D and F. He referenced the Petitioner's allocation of value per acre as indicated on Exhibit B.

Chairperson Covert noted there was a recommendation by the Assessor to reduce the taxable land value.

Appraiser Churchfield reviewed the comparable land sales provided in Exhibit I. He indicated the most weight was given to LS-1, which included water rights and was valued at \$15,378 per acre. He noted LS-1 was a bank foreclosure sale located on Horizon View Avenue across from the Pebble Creek Subdivision, and it was further from town than the subject property. He referenced the information provided in Exhibit II that related to equalization. He pointed out the Assessor valued each of the Kiley parcels on an individual basis, which resulted in a higher value than what was indicated by the Petitioner's wholesale appraisals.

Member Woodland asked if the subject property still had water rights attached. Appraiser Churchfield stated that it did. Mr. Vasquez pointed out the appraised values accounted for all of the water rights associated with the subject property.

Chairperson Covert inquired as to the subject's improvements. Appraiser Churchfield indicated there were two homes – a 2,490 square foot house built in 1910 and a 1,522 square foot house built in 1932. Mr. Vasquez noted the houses were abandoned and people had broken in to strip out the sinks, copper wire and pipes. He stated the Petitioner did not have the ability to take the structures down. Chairperson Covert wondered if the homes were fully depreciated. Appraiser Churchfield explained the structures had the maximum allowable depreciation of 75 percent, based on a 50-year life at 1.5 percent per year. He said there was some value remaining in the improvements. Chairperson Covert indicated he was not comfortable with the \$95,361 improvement value. Appraiser Churchfield stated the recommendation of the Assessor's Office was supported based on the land sales.

Member Krolick asked what price the Assessor was putting on water rights. Appraiser Churchfield said he avoided putting a price on water rights because there were so many variables involved. Chairperson Covert wondered if the subject's rights were for ground water. Appraiser Churchfield indicated they were not.

Member Woodland suggested the improvement value should be upheld because there were water rights on the property. Chairperson Covert said he thought the water rights were reflected in the land value.

Member Green asked if the houses were occupied. Mr. Vasquez replied the houses had been vacant for many years and were not generating any income. He noted there was nothing left other than the basic shells of the structures. Vandals had taken the light fixtures and the switches, all the windows were broken, and they were covered in rat excrement. Member Green commented the structures represented a cost for demolition rather than any improvement value. He suggested taking the improvement value off and leaving the land alone.

Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, pointed out the Assessor's Office was recommending a reduction in the taxable land value.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-830-73, 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 \$1,273,575 and the taxable improvement value be reduced to zero, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,273,575 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0572E PARCEL NO. 083-024-10 – KILEY RANCH LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0314A**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. Chairperson Covert observed access to the parcel was through a dirt road. Appraiser Churchfield indicated it was near the intersection of Kiley Parkway and Fortunado Loop.

Mr. Vasquez stated the subject parcel was problematic. He indicated there was no access. He noted an industrial building on the site was an abandoned grain silo. He stated most of the parcel was in a flood plain and 600,000 yards of filler at a cost of \$3 to \$4 million would be required to make the land marketable.

Appraiser Churchfield reviewed the comparable land sales provided in Exhibit I. He noted LS-1 was a foreclosure land sale priced at approximately \$15,000 per acre and located further from town than the subject parcel. He stated the subject was residential land that was valued at \$25,000 per acre, and there was no improvement value on the grain silo. He said it was equalized with nearby parcels owned by Lennar, which needed fill just like the subject. He referenced the equalization issues presented in Exhibit II and emphasized the Petitioner's parcels were valued by the Assessor on an individual basis. He indicated the subject's taxable land value was supported by the comparable sales and was equalized with residential land in the area.

Chairperson Covert requested clarification of the flood plain issue. Appraiser Churchfield said he did not know what was involved but would assume the Lennar parcels had the same issue. Chairperson Covert pointed out a nearby body of water on the satellite map display. Appraiser Churchfield identified it as a retention pond for drainage.

Mr. Vasquez stated the subject had no infrastructure, utilities or roads, but the Lennar properties had roads and utilities. He clarified the body of water on the map was not a retention pond, but an amenity put in by Lennar. He said dirt from the lake had been used as fill, and Lennar's plan had been to establish premium home sites around the lake at some point. He noted Lennar had recently gone before the Sparks City Council and was denied because they had not corrected some issues associated with the lake. Mr. Vasquez stated there was no road and the subject parcel was accessed by driving through an open field. Member Woodland said it looked like pasture land. Appraiser Churchfield observed there was an easement at the front of the parcel where a road could be built.

Chairperson Covert confirmed with Appraiser Churchfield that the properties owned by Lennar were valued at \$25,000 per acre. He observed the subject did not have utilities right up to the property but utilities were available close to the property. He wondered if Lennar had utilities up to their property. Appraiser Churchfield indicated the Lennar properties had not been developed. He said he was not comparing the subject to Lennar's graded area around the lake.

Member Woodland suggested reducing the value to \$1.5 million. Chairperson Covert said he was concerned about getting out of equalization with similar properties. He questioned whether Lennar had paved roads right up to their property.

Appraiser Churchfield replied that they did. He said the Lennar property was not graded and they would have to put in more roads as it was developed. He pointed out several paved roads and dirt roads on the overhead map display.

Member Green observed the subject's taxable land value had been reduced from \$3.1 million in the previous year to \$1.9 million. He asked if the subject was located behind the library and the public skate park. Mr. Vasquez confirmed that it was.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-024-10, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0573E PARCEL NO. 083-024-15 – KILEY RANCH LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0314B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Mr. Vasquez questioned how the subject property could have increased in value from \$1.4 million in 2010-11 to \$5.8 million in 2011-12. He stated the Petitioner had been unable to get buyers interested in looking at the property, and had received no letters of intent or offers to purchase. He pointed out the subject's taxable value amounted to 50 percent of the total appraised value for several combined Kiley Ranch/Lazy Five properties. He referenced two appraisals done by two different appraisers that were provided in Exhibits D and F. He indicated there were no improvements on the subject property.

Appraiser Churchfield referred to the explanation provided in Exhibit II. He indicated the Assessor's Office had worked with Kiley Ranch representatives the previous year to recommend an overall 2010-11 value for all of the Kiley Ranch and Lazy Five properties. The recommendation was approved by the Board, but the adjustments required to reach an overall number placed some parcels out of equalization. As outlined in Exhibit II, he noted the combined 2011-12 total taxable value for all of the parcels had been reduced from the previous tax year, but some individual parcels such as the subject had been increased in taxable value. He stated the increase on the subject was based strictly on equalization, and not on any market changes or changes to the parcel. Appraiser Churchfield said the subject parcel was a fully graded site. The maps on pages 4 and 5 of Exhibit II were provided to illustrate the significant amount of dirt work that was done between 2007 and 2008. He noted a nearby commercial parcel for the Lazy 8 Hotel-Casino had no grading and was valued at \$3.50 per square foot. He said the subject parcel was valued at \$2.70 per square foot because of its commercial use and grading. He reviewed the comparable sales provided in Exhibit I.

Chairperson Covert remarked that the subject's taxable value had gone up and down like a yo-yo over the years. Appraiser Churchfield indicated the Assessor's Office was trying to maintain equalization in the current tax year after adjustments were made to reach an overall combined value in the previous tax year.

Mr. Vasquez stated Assessor's comparable LS-1 (Exhibit I) was not comparable to the subject. He said the Petitioners talked to the buyer, Old Dominion Freight Line, prior to the sale. They required access to I-80 and were not interested in any Spanish Springs property. He noted the City of Sparks would not permit trucks running up and down the Pyramid Highway, which was the most congested roadway in the community. He said some site work was done on the subject parcel to relocate the Orr Ditch underground, but the parcel was not fully graded. He indicated the Lazy 8 Hotel-Casino parcel in the Tierra Del Sol development had a Tourist-Commercial (TC) designation and could not be compared to the subject parcel.

Member Green commented he was having a hard time with a \$5 million value on the subject parcel.

Member Woodland asked what properties the subject was being equalized with. Appraiser Churchfield indicated it was equalized with all of the commercial parcels along the Pyramid Highway, but primarily with parcels owned by the Wingfield Nevada

Group that were valued at \$3.00 per square foot. The Lazy 8 parcel was zoned for a casino and was valued at \$3.50 per square foot. He noted comparable LS-3 was a June 2009 sale from Kiley to Belimo at over \$6.55 per square foot. Although it would not have worked for Old Dominion, he stated the subject parcel could work for other commercial users. Member Green suggested the best use for the parcel was probably residential or multi-family at some point in the future. He said he did not see its value as a commercial or industrial use.

Member Woodland wondered if the subject's value had gone up and down over the years because of rezoning to commercial use. Appraiser Churchfield noted some value was added between 2007 and 2008 when the parcel was graded. He pointed out the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Handbook designated the subject as a commercial parcel, as shown on page 6 of Exhibit II. He indicated there were other commercial properties further up the Pyramid Highway on Isidor Court that had been very successful in an industrial park.

Chairperson Covert suggested the subject's value was somewhere between the values suggested by the Assessor and the Appellant. He calculated that \$1.50 per square foot would produce a taxable land value of \$3.2 million. Member Green said he did not want to go down that far. Mr. Vasquez stated the property would be unmarketable if it was valued at \$1.50 per square foot. He said there could be some market potential in the future but there was none at the current time and had been none during the previous year. He characterized the sale to Belimo (LS-3) as an aberration. He explained the sales price was deceiving because it included the cost of building roads. He indicated nothing had happened since that time because there was no market.

Member Green recommended \$25,000 per acre for the subject property. Member Krolick observed the resulting taxable value would be lower than the previous year's value.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-024-15, 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 carried on a 4-1 vote with Member Green voting "no," it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$1,237,500, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,237,500 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0574E PARCEL NO. 083-024-16 – KILEY RANCH LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0314C

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Mr. Vasquez stated there were two separate appraisals (Exhibits D and F), which indicated the taxable land value should be between \$17,000 and \$20,000 per acre.

Appraiser Churchfield referenced the Kiley Ranch Handbook zoning map on page 6 of Exhibit II. He stated the Kileys had invested a lot of money to get the zoning and the grading to its current state. He indicated the Assessor's Office was trying to maintain equalization throughout the master planned community as well as within the entire basin. He noted the subject was a residential parcel similar to the Lennar parcels discussed during previous hearings. He said he understood that the combined Kiley properties represented a very large chunk of land, but the Assessor's Office looked at each parcel on an individual basis. He pointed out there were for sale signs on the property, but he could not find it listed on LoopNet, Grubb and Ellis, or other commercial real estate sites. He indicated the subject's value of \$25,000 per acre was equalized with other properties in the area. He called attention to comparable land sale LS-1 that was provided in Exhibit I. He noted LS-1 was located on Horizon View Avenue, which was much further from town than the subject property.

Chairperson Covert wondered if there were improvements on the property. Appraiser Churchfield replied there were no improvements currently assessed on the subject. He indicated the previous parcel that was reduced by the Board to \$25,000 per acre (Minute Item No. 11-0573E) had been graded. He stated neither the subject parcel nor the Lennar parcels were graded.

Mr. Vasquez stated the Assessor's Office was incorrect. He explained the previously heard parcel was not graded, although some dirt had been disturbed when the Orr Ditch was relocated to run underground.

Appraiser Churchfield recommended the subject's taxable land value of \$25,000 per acre be upheld.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-024-16, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

12:49 p.m. Chairperson Covert declared a brief recess.

1:37 p.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

DISCUSSION TO CONSIDER CONSOLIDATION

Appraiser Churchfield suggested the possible consolidation of Parcel Nos. 510-071-20, 083-024-14 and 510-071-34. He stated all three parcels were valued at \$25,000 per acre and would have the same basic arguments. Following an attempt at consolidation and some discussion, it was determined that each of the appeals would be heard on an individual basis. (Please see Minute Item Nos. 11-0575E through 11-0577E below.)

11-0575E PARCEL NO. 083-024-14 – LAZY FIVE COMPANY **– HEARING NO. 11-0310D**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Based on the two appraisals provided in Exhibits D and F, Mr. Vasquez requested a taxable land value between \$17,000 and \$20,000 per acre.

Appraiser Churchfield noted the subject was closer to town than the comparable land sale LS-1 on Horizon View Avenue (Exhibit I). He stated the parcel was equalized with neighboring properties at \$25,000 per acre. He indicated some site work had been done on the subject parcel and recommended the taxable land value be upheld.

Mr. Vasquez said the land on the subject parcel had been disturbed but was not graded. He characterized the parcel as landlocked, with no roads, no utilities, and no water. He suggested the subject was comparable to the Horizon View parcel shown by the Assessor as LS-1 in Exhibit I.

Chairperson Covert observed that Petitioner's Exhibit B requested a value of \$17,953 per acre based on two appraisals. Member Green remarked that flat buildable land was worth \$25,000 per acre, even during hard times.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-024-14, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0576E PARCEL NO. 510-071-20 – KILEY RANCH LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0314H

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Vista Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Based on the two appraisals provided in Exhibits D and F, Mr. Vasquez requested a taxable land value between \$17,000 and \$20,000 per acre.

Appraiser Churchfield noted the subject was closer to town than the comparable land sale LS-1 on Horizon View Avenue (Exhibit I). He stated the parcel was equalized with neighboring properties at \$25,000 per acre. He indicated some site work had been done on the subject parcel and recommended the taxable land value be upheld.

Mr. Vasquez said the land on the subject parcel had been disturbed but was not graded. He characterized the parcel as landlocked, with no roads, no utilities, and no water. He suggested the subject was comparable to the Horizon View parcel shown by the Assessor as LS-1 in Exhibit I.

Chairperson Covert observed that Petitioner's Exhibit B requested a value of \$17,953 per acre based on two appraisals. Member Krolick said he would support a reduction. Chairperson Covert noted the subject parcel was isolated. Member Green asked if the subject adjoined the golf course. Mr. Vasquez indicated it did not. He said it adjoined a drainage channel. Chairperson Covert and Member Green agreed with Member Krolick.

With regard to Parcel No. 510-071-20, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Krolick, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$425,493, resulting in a total taxable value of \$425,493 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0577E PARCEL NO. 510-071-34 – ZOZAC LAND COMPANY LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0318

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Sparks Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Mr. Vasquez noted the Assessor had compared the subject to Parcel No. 534-450-12 on Horizon View Avenue (LS-1 in Exhibit I). He stated the Horizon View parcel had water rights and was valued at \$15,378 per acre, but the subject parcel was valued at \$25,000 per acre and did not have water rights. He said he bought the property for \$400,000 two years ago, but his bank would not even order an appraisal to put a loan on the property at the current time. He requested the taxable land value be reduced to \$15,378 per acre.

Appraiser Churchfield stated there were streets in and around the subject property, and it was in very close proximity to the Pyramid Highway and Sparks Boulevard. Its location was a very developed area next to the Waterstone and Caviata Apartments. He pointed out the parcel was purchased for \$400,000 from the Kiley family but was never marketed, so he did not deem the sale as an arm's length transaction. He indicated the Horizon View parcel was much further away from town than the subject.

Mr. Vasquez indicated the parcel was completely undeveloped and on undisturbed land. He noted the two apartment complexes next to the subject had both gone back to the banks, which had decreased the appraised values in the area and made it impossible to get a loan. He said the parcel was unsuccessfully marketed for several years, first through Mark Krueger of Grubb & Ellis and then through another broker. He stated the subject parcel was located 150 feet from the previously heard parcel that had been reduced to \$17,953 per acre. He noted the parcel between them was supposed to

have been a school site but the School District was not currently building schools. He requested a reduction in taxable land value to \$17,953 per acre.

Chairperson Covert said he did not believe the subject was similar to the previously heard parcel because it had access on two sides.

With regard to Parcel No. 510-071-34, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0578E PARCEL NO. 083-830-59 – KILEY RANCH LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0314D

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Sparks Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated the parcel was valued at \$20,000 per acre after a 20 percent downward adjustment for shape and drainage issues.

Chairperson Covert observed that Petitioner's Exhibit B requested a value of \$17,953 per acre based on the two appraisals in Exhibits D and F.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-830-59, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0579E PARCEL NO. 510-071-19 – KILEY RANCH LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0314G

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Vista Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Chairperson Covert observed there was a recommendation by the Assessor's Office to reduce the taxable land value to \$25,000 per acre. Appraiser Churchfield indicated the reduction was intended to equalize the property with its neighbors. He said the subject had commercial zoning because it was supposed to have been a school site, but the parcel was more likely to be used as residential land.

Chairperson Covert noted the subject parcel did not have negative access issues. Appraiser Churchfield agreed there were paved streets and utilities in close proximity. He pointed out a nearby office building known as the Kiley Community Center.

Mr. Vasquez indicated the conditions in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Handbook gave the School District five more years to exercise their option to build on the subject property.

Chairperson Covert noted the Petitioner was requesting a value of \$17,593 per acre (Exhibit B).

Member Woodland observed that land owned by the School District was not taxed. Mr. Vasquez explained the School District did not own the land. The Petitioner had been conditioned by the City of Sparks to set aside and carry the land as part of their PUD approval. Member Green wondered if that was an accommodation based on other things the City felt it gave to the Petitioner. Mr. Vasquez stated there were State guidelines that required a school facility to be provided if a developer was building more than 700 housing units. He said the Petitioner would be happy to give the land to the School District, but they would not accept it.

Chairperson Covert remarked that the Petitioner was stuck for the next five years or until the School District released them from the condition. He stated he would support a reduction because the subject property was not equal to the surrounding properties that had no such condition.

With regard to Parcel No. 510-071-19, 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 Brown, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$17,909 per acre, resulting in a taxable land value of \$145,421 and a total taxable value of \$145,421 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on an option for the school district to use the land. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0580E PARCEL NO. 083-830-45 – KILEY RANCH LLC ET AL
– HEARING NO. 11-0312A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Sparks Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He indicated the commercial parcel was currently valued at \$4.32 per square foot.

Mr. Vasquez noted the Assessor's value amounted to more per square foot than the Lazy 8 Casino/Tierra Del Sol parcel up the street that had a Tourist-Commercial gaming entitlement. He pointed out a drainage ditch running through the parcel and indicated the land would have to be raised up before it could be developed. He said it was currently undeveloped land. He suggested the equalization argument should work in both directions.

Chairperson Covert noted the Assessor's value amounted to \$188,000 per acre. Appraiser Churchfield indicated the parcel was a commercial site with corner frontage on the Pyramid Highway and Sparks Boulevard.

Member Green said there was a signal at the intersection but no real ingress and egress from Pyramid because of the tremendous amount of traffic. He stated access would have to be from Sparks Boulevard for any commercial site. Mr. Vasquez agreed. He explained the Pyramid Highway was scheduled for expansion to six and then eight lanes as part of the Regional Transportation Commission's (RTC) 2040 Plan. The easements were already in place and no right-in or left-out access was granted anymore along the Pyramid Highway. Member Green suggested the Petitioner might benefit if the RTC took the subject property for widening of the Pyramid Highway. Mr. Vasquez said the RTC no longer paid cash to acquire properties; it gave credits that equated to "Monopoly money." Member Green said it might be a good visible location for billboards. Mr. Vasquez indicated he had tried but there was a City of Sparks ordinance against billboards.

Chairperson Covert indicated he was not comfortable with the Petitioner's request for \$17,953 per acre because of the commercial zoning. Member Green and Chairperson Covert stated they were not comfortable with the Assessor's value either.

Mr. Vasquez remarked that the Tourist-Commercial zoning on the nearby Lazy 8/Tierra Del Sol property had been the most difficult and sought after entitlement in the community. It took five years, cost \$6.8 million, and was challenged all the way to the State Supreme Court. He pointed out the Tierra Del Sol property was valued at \$3.50 per square foot.

Member Krolick observed the area did not have the same number of people and properties were worth pennies on the dollar compared to where they had been three years ago. Mr. Vasquez stated there were only eight new construction homes in January 2011 for all of Sparks.

Chairperson Covert suggested \$2.50 per square foot. Member Krolick agreed.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-830-45, 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 carried on a 4-1 vote with Member Green voting "no," it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$1,524,380 (\$2.50 per square foot), resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,524,380 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

2:33 p.m. Member Woodland temporarily left the meeting.

11-0581E **PARCEL NO. 083-830-56 – KILEY RANCH LLC ET AL**
– HEARING NO. 11-0312B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Sparks Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the commercial parcel was directly adjacent to the one that was previously heard by the Board (Minute Item No. 11-0580E).

Mr. Vasquez said he did not understand why the Assessor considered the previously heard parcel to be so valuable at \$4.32 per square foot, when compared to the subject parcel's value of \$2.88 per square foot. He stated that equalization had to work both ways. He pointed out no buyers had shown any interest in the previously heard parcel but there had been some interest in the subject property. He stated the values made no logical sense to him.

Appraiser Churchfield discussed the comparable land sales provided in Exhibit I. He noted LS-3 was purchased from Kiley by Belimo for \$6.44 per square foot in June 2009. The improved pad sites on LS-4 sold for \$18.52 per square foot but were given less weight because the sites were improved. He indicated the subject had a lower taxable value than Parcel No. 083-830-45 (Minute Item No. 11-0580E) because of the differences in site work and traffic count. He stated the traffic counts were important when tenants signed a lease for commercial property. With respect to the Lazy 8/Tierra Del Sol property, he observed the casino would not go forward until a gaming license was obtained and approved. He said \$2.88 per square foot was a fair value for the subject property.

Chairperson Covert noted the Lazy 8/Tierra Del Sol property was zoned for a casino. Appraiser Churchfield stated the gaming license was still questionable. Mr. Vasquez disagreed. He said the Peppermill already held multiple gaming licenses as well as a grandfathered license. He explained a new gaming license was required for any newly constructed hotel-casino, but it went back in time only to the point of the last licensure. He remarked there was no risk of the gaming license not happening. He pointed out that traffic counts in the area had dropped by 8.5 percent over the past two years. He commented that all of the Assessor's comparable land sales had taken place in 2009, whereas 2010 had been "a wasteland" and 2011 was not looking any better.

Member Green said he would prefer the subject parcel over Parcel No. 083-830-45 if he were going to develop commercial property because the access was

better from Kiley Parkway and Sparks Boulevard. He observed the two parcels together would have made an ideal location for the casino. He reasoned the subject property was probably worth the Assessor's total taxable value of \$2.88 per square foot in comparison to \$2.50 per square foot for the parcel that had ingress and egress problems.

Mr. Vasquez indicated the subject parcel had a major drainage way running through it. Chairperson Covert wondered if drainage ditches could be placed underground. Mr. Vasquez indicated it might have made sense to do that in 2005, but it had become impossibly expensive in the current economic climate.

Chairperson Covert said he tended to agree with Member Green except for the drainage ditches. He noted the drainage issues could make it much more expensive to develop the property. Member Green stated there was a lot of acreage and he thought it could be worked around, although he would have to see the engineering on the parcel. He said it was his opinion the subject was worth the Assessor's total taxable value. Member Krolick commented that the roundabout shown on the map looked like it was engineered for traffic access. Chairperson Covert indicated he would defer to the real estate expertise of Members Green and Krolick.

2:40 p.m. Member Woodland returned to the meeting.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-830-56, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried with Member Woodland abstaining, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0582E PARCEL NO. 083-023-25 – LAZY FIVE COMPANY
– HEARING NO. 11-0310A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Mr. Vasquez stated he was in concurrence with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the taxable land value. Appraiser Churchfield indicated the recommendation in Exhibit I was to reduce the taxable land value to \$15,000 per acre.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-023-25, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$143,656, resulting in a total taxable value of \$143,656 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0583E WITHDRAWALS

The following appeals were withdrawn by the Petitioners:

Assessor's Parcel No.	Petitioner	Hearing No.
083-023-29	Lazy Five Company	11-0310B
083-023-31	Lazy Five Company	11-0310C
510-591-04	Kiley Ranch North Maint Corp	11-0322

**11-0584E PARCEL NOS. 032-182-16, 032-182-17, 032-184-31, 032-191-17, 032-202-33, 032-184-28 & 032-184-29
– NORTHERN NV ASSET HOLDINGS, LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0635A THROUGH 11-0635G**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1040 C Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter and financial data, 5 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 36 pages.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject properties. She identified the properties as the Silver Club Hotel and Casino.

On behalf of the Petitioner, Jack Byce and Gosia Clark were sworn in by Chief Deputy Clerk Nancy Parent. The Petitioners were in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office.

Appraiser DelGiudice discussed the recommendation in Exhibit I to reduce the total taxable value of the subject properties to a combined value of \$5 million.

With regard to Hearing Nos. 11-0635A through 11-0635G, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried, the following was ordered for tax year 2011-12. The decisions were based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to achieve a combined total taxable value of \$5,000,000 for the parcels, as listed on page 8 of Assessor's Exhibit I. With those adjustments, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

Hearing No.	Assessor's Parcel No.	Taxable Land Value	Taxable Improvement Value	Total Taxable Value	Total Obsolescence Applied
11-0635B	032-182-17	Upheld	Reduced to \$1,333,851	\$1,753,851	\$2,921,222
11-0635C	032-184-31	Upheld	Reduced to \$418,250	\$1,919,324	\$8,362,577
11-0635A	032-182-16	Upheld	Upheld	\$159,031	
11-0635D	032-191-17	Upheld	Upheld	\$467,130	
11-0635E	032-202-33	Upheld	Upheld	\$419,565	
11-0635F	032-184-28	Upheld	Upheld	\$74,467	
11-0635G	032-184-29	Upheld	Upheld	\$206,632	
				\$5,000,000	

2:58 p.m. Chairperson Covert declared a brief recess.

3:05 p.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

11-0585E PARCEL NO. 083-741-04 – LAZY FIVE COMPANY
– HEARING NO. 11-0310E

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Lazy Five Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He pointed out that the aerial map did not show several paved streets that had been put in. He stated the subject property was a graded pad that was zoned for commercial use. He indicated the total taxable value of \$4.00 per square foot was based on the June 2009 Belimo sale at \$6.44 per square foot (LS-2 on page 1 of Exhibit I). He noted LS-2 was adjacent to the subject property.

Mr. Vasquez said the Petitioner was about to go into contract on the subject property at a sales price of \$1.25 per square foot.

Appraiser Churchfield stated the Assessor's Office worked from closed sales, but would take the new sale into account for the next tax year.

Member Krolick indicated the market was set by the Petitioner's testimony and willingness to sell the property for \$1.25 per square foot. He clarified for Chairperson Covert that he would suggest a reduction in value for the subject.

Appraiser Churchfield noted the subject property was a relatively small parcel and the Assessor's Office was trying to keep equalization in the area. He indicated it was already past the statutory deadline of December 31, 2010. He stated the Petitioner might be willing to sell the parcel for \$1.25 per square foot, but it was not a sale until the transaction closed.

Mr. Vasquez stated it did not seem fair and did not seem right to look back at 2009 sales that occurred in a completely different economic environment, but to be unable to look at current sales. He said the Petitioner did not want to accept \$1.25 per square foot but would do so because there was no choice. Chairperson Covert indicated the Board did not necessarily give much weight to 2009 sales.

Chairperson Covert observed the taxable land value would be \$91,751 at \$1.25 per square foot. He indicated he was not comfortable with such a large reduction. Member Green agreed. Member Krolick commented that it was similar to a hearing earlier in the month for a property that had been a "bank giveaway." Chairperson Covert questioned what would happen if the deal fell through at \$1.25 per square foot. Member Woodland pointed out the taxable values were to be based on the previous year's sales. Member Green said he was not happy with the Assessor's value of \$4.00 per square foot. Member Krolick suggested the subject could be based on a previously considered parcel that was bordered by Sparks Boulevard and the Pyramid Highway. Appraiser Churchfield indicated the previously heard parcel was valued at \$2.88 per square foot for 17 acres with no grading. He noted the subject was a 1.68-acre parcel. He said he had no data to support a lower value, but there were 2010 comparables ranging from \$10.00 to \$18.52 per square foot.

Chairperson Covert said he was willing to support the Assessor's value, which was considerably less than all of the comparables. Member Krolick stated it was difficult. He acknowledged the subject was sited for development and had finished streets on either side of it, so it was in a better situation than some of the others the Board had already dealt with.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-741-04, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion carried on a 4-1 vote with Member Krolick voting "no," it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0586E PARCEL NO. 083-741-06 – LAZY FIVE COMPANY
– HEARING NO. 11-0310F

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Lazy Five Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He outlined the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the taxable land value as shown in Exhibit I. He noted half of the parcel would receive a 20 percent downward adjustment because of an easement for the Orr Ditch. He pointed out the location of the Orr Ditch on an overhead map display.

Mr. Vasquez pointed out that the taxable value on the subject property represented 70 percent of the combined value for all of the Kiley Ranch and Lazy Five parcels, according to two different appraisals (Exhibits D and F). He observed two different appraisers from two different companies were less than 5 percent apart in their opinions of value. He noted the subject property was valued at more per square foot than Parcel No. 083-741-04 (Minute Item No. 11-0585E).

Appraiser Churchfield indicated the subject was receiving downward adjustments of 20 percent for the easement and 10 percent for underdevelopment. He stated Parcel No. 083-741-04 was valued at \$4.00 per square foot without any adjustments, so the subject property had a lower taxable value. He noted the appraisals in Exhibits D and F were both done on a bulk scale. He suggested there would have been different appraised values if each parcel had been appraised on an individual basis.

Chairperson Covert stated the Petitioner's two appraisals were not specific to the individual parcels the Board had to deal with. He said he was not sure that interpolation of the combined value was going to work.

Mr. Vasquez said two appraisers had agreed the group of parcels were worth about \$10 million. Although it was debatable as to how the value was carved up in the middle, he stated the combined value should not be greater than \$10 million. He remarked that there were hundred million dollar lawsuits going on. He suggested judges at the Supreme Court and in other courts were going to accept the two appraisals. Chairperson Covert indicated he certainly could not tell what the judges were going to do. He said it would be easier to deal with the appraisals if the parcels were all single use. Member Krolick noted the appraisals were the kind used by banks to generate quick liquidation of the properties on their balance sheets. Mr. Vasquez said the Petitioner commissioned one of the appraisals in order to get as much value as possible out of the properties. He disagreed that the bank was looking for a liquidation value. He stated the loss-share agreement between the bank and the FDIC required the properties to be considered as a collateralized basket.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-741-06, 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 reduced to \$7,586,440 (\$2.64 per square foot), resulting in a total taxable value of \$7,586,440 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0587E PARCEL NO. 083-024-01 – LAZY FIVE COMPANY ET AL
– HEARING NO. 11-0308A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted some dirt work had been done on the parcel.

Mr. Vasquez said he had nothing new to add to what he had already presented at previous hearings throughout the day.

Appraiser Churchfield indicated the subject was a commercial parcel and the Assessor's Office was trying to maintain equalization. He reviewed the 2010 comparable sales that were provided in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-024-01, 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 Woodland, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0588E PARCEL NO. 083-024-02 – LAZY FIVE COMPANY ET AL
– HEARING NO. 11-0308B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the parcel was valued at \$2.70 per square foot after receiving a 10 percent downward adjustment for underdevelopment.

Member Green asked about access to the parcel. Based on the appearance of the map display, Appraiser Churchfield said the parcel probably had an easement where a road could be cut in.

Mr. Vasquez stated there was no access from the Pyramid Highway. He explained the Regional Transportation Commission's 2040 Plan prevented ingress or egress to any properties from the Pyramid Highway. He noted the original plan had been to use the subject and an adjoining parcel directly to the north for a small shopping center. Egress was to have come from the corner of the more northerly parcel. He clarified the location of the parcels on the overhead map display.

Member Woodland asked if the parcel had access to David Allen Parkway. Mr. Vasquez said such access was originally planned for the future. Chairperson Covert observed it was currently a separate parcel so it had no access. Member Green said the subject appeared to be landlocked.

Appraiser Churchfield suggested there would be easements where the Lazy Five Parkway came in. He noted the lines were already cut and the Petitioner could put in a road. He stated there had to be easements in place because owners could not create landlocked parcels. He indicated the subject already had a lower value than some of the other nearby parcels because of the access issue and because it did not have any direct corner frontage.

Member Green suggested a taxable land value between \$2.10 and \$2.20 per square foot. He noted the subject parcel did not appear to be as valuable as Parcel Nos. 083-024-01 or 083-024-03. He indicated it would be different if all three parcels were combined together, but it was not clear if that would happen.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-024-02, 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 Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$2,140,538 (\$2.10 per square foot), resulting in a total taxable value of \$2,140,538 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0589E PARCEL NO. 083-024-03 – LAZY FIVE COMPANY ET AL
– HEARING NO. 11-0308C

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the parcel was on a corner with access to the Lazy Five Parkway.

Mr. Vasquez indicated he had nothing new to add to what he had already presented at previous hearings throughout the day.

Member Green asked if the subject was receiving any adjustments. Appraiser Churchfield said there was a 10 percent downward adjustment, which placed the parcel at \$2.76 per square foot.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-024-03, 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 Green, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0590E PARCEL NO. 083-023-18 – LAZY FIVE COMPANY
– HEARING NO. 11-0316

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Photo and Assessor's information for subject property and comparable property, 4 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Mr. David Kiley stated the Assessor's comparable sales (Exhibit I) had all included commercial zoning, landscaping, paved streets, public streets, and graded plots in place. He indicated the Belimo sale (L2) should be discounted because it also included a traffic light and some Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) credits in the sale.

Mr. David Kiley provided some background history on the subject parcel. The Kileys owned a larger parcel before the Highland Ranch Parkway was built. Granite Construction Company had a haul road that connected to the Pyramid Highway and was required to put in a traffic light because their trucks were obstructing traffic. The Kileys provided land through their parcel, Lifestyle Homes built the Highland Ranch Parkway, and Granite Construction put in the traffic signal. Jack Jackling provided an easement to the remaining subject parcel from his adjacent parcel. Mr. David Kiley identified the easement as a dotted white line on page 1 of Exhibit A. He noted it was 600 feet from the intersection of the Highland Ranch Parkway and the Pyramid Highway, and was the only access to the subject property. He indicated there was a 600-foot access restriction from the main intersection. Chairperson Covert observed the access easement was quite a ways north of the subject parcel.

Mr. David Kiley stated the subject was zoned for commercial use within a neighborhood unit development (NUD) center. He said the parcel really had no commercial use because it was not near a commercial center. He noted the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) had expressed their intent to get a landscape easement when the Highland Ranch Parkway was built, and a 25-foot landscape

easement would make the subject parcel too small to utilize. Additionally, he indicated the parcel was currently a collection basin for drainage coming off of the mountain above it.

Mr. David Kiley referenced the Assessor's photo provided on page 3 of Exhibit A. He said the photo was taken from a road identified by a star on page 1 of Exhibit A. He suggested the photo was misleading because it was taken on property owned by NDOT and did not show the topography and drainage basin on the subject property. He indicated his son had tried unsuccessfully to find the recorded access easement for the subject property, so it was uncertain as to whether there was still any access. He identified Parcel No. 083-023-27 as being comparable to the subject parcel. He noted the comparable parcel was located to the north of the subject, and was valued at \$500 as a landscape easement. He stated NDOT was interested in the subject property as a landscape easement but had no current budget to buy it. He remarked that he was 85 years old and did not think he would ever see the subject parcel sold.

Appraiser Churchfield indicated the Assessor's Office had not known where the access point would be at the time the subject parcel was valued. Consequently, the subject was valued with the assumption that there was an access easement and the parcel could be developed as a gas station or for some other commercial use. He noted the drainage and detention basin was newly presented evidence for the Assessor's Office and he did not know how it affected the subject parcel.

Member Woodland said she traveled by the subject parcel several times a week. She characterized the traffic at the intersection as "horrendous." She stated she would probably not stop at any business located there because of the traffic, especially at certain times of the day.

Based on the Appellant's testimony, Chairperson Covert said it was unlikely the subject parcel could be developed for any commercial use.

Mr. Matt Kiley talked about plans for a future freeway. Although it had not yet been mapped, he indicated the plan would reduce the size of the subject parcel to a very thin strip of land.

Chairperson Covert said he did not necessarily agree the parcel was worth \$500, but was willing to grant a reduction. Member Green stated he passed that way often. He characterized the subject parcel as "a terrible piece of property" and noted it was way over-assessed. Chairperson Covert suggested a value of \$1 per square foot. Member Krolick agreed.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-023-18, 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 taxable land value be reduced to \$114,562 (\$1.00 per square foot), resulting in a total

taxable value of \$114,562 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

3:52 p.m. Chairperson Covert turned the gavel over to Vice Chairperson Krolick and left the meeting.

11-0591E **PARCEL NO. 516-511-02 – NEVADA AGENCIES INC**
– HEARING NO. 11-0323

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Los Altos Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Map and Assessor's information for subject parcel, 2 pages.

Exhibit B: Map and Assessor's information for comparable parcel, 2 pages.

Assessor

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

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He indicated the parcel was currently valued at \$9.00 per square foot and had a downward adjustment for an access easement because of a driveway into the property. He noted a land sale for the Les Schwab Tire Center located next door had been completed in February 2010 for \$10.23 per square foot (LS-1). He reviewed the other comparable land sales that were provided in Exhibit I. He stated the subject was an improved parcel.

Mr. Matt Kiley indicated the subject was zoned for office professional and not for retail use. He identified the Goddard Preschool on the adjoining parcel to the west of the subject (page 1 of Exhibit A). He noted there was a driveway access easement for the Preschool that took up a large portion of the subject parcel. He said the only access to the subject was from Ion Drive, which was very limiting during school hours. He provided a comparable for the subject, as shown in Exhibit B. He stated the comparable was raw land located across the street from the subject that was owned by the Spanish Springs Medical Group. The comparable was valued by the Assessor's Office at \$7.00 per square foot. He suggested the comparable was a better piece of property because a larger building could be built on it and it had more versatility than the subject. He requested that the subject's taxable land value be reduced to \$7.00 per square foot.

Member Green asked if the parcel to the south of the subject was Sepulveda Elementary School. Mr. Matt Kiley indicated that it was. Member Green wondered if proximity to the school would limit the types of retail uses allowed for the subject property. Mr. Matt Kiley clarified the subject property was zoned for office professional use. He said there were likely to be limitations if the subject's use were to be changed to retail.

Following some discussion, Appraiser Churchfield acknowledged he was mistaken about the location of the Les Schwab Tire Center. It was located down the street rather than next door to the subject.

Member Krolick requested clarification about the Assessor's value on the comparable presented by the Petitioner. He suggested a medical office use would have a higher value than the subject property. Appraiser Churchfield said medical office use would not necessarily be valued higher than a retail use. Mr. Matt Kiley referenced page 2 of Exhibit B, which showed the Assessor's values and the square footage on the comparable property. Appraiser Churchfield stated the subject was valued higher than the Petitioner's comparable parcel because of the difference in size.

Member Green recommended reducing the subject parcel from \$9.00 per square foot to \$7.00 per square foot, which was \$0.50 per square foot less than the Petitioner's comparable parcel. He stated the difference would also take the driveway easement into account. Members Woodland and Krolick agreed.

With regard to Parcel No. 516-511-02, 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 Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$227,962 (\$7.00 per square foot), resulting in a total taxable value of \$227,962 for tax year 2011-12. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0592E PARCEL NO. 510-071-29 – KILEY RANCH LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0321

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Vista Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel maps and Assessor's information, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the property was currently zoned for residential use and valued at \$25,000 per acre.

Mr. Matt Kiley observed the subject was outside of the Kiley Ranch North master planned community and had never been part of any recorded handbook. He said the parcel had very little frontage along Henry Orr Parkway and there was currently no cut-in access. He stated the Sun Valley diversion channel formed the southern boundary of the parcel and the right boundary of the parcel was in a flood plain. He referenced page 3 of Exhibit A, which showed a sewer main trunk line (effluent line) going through the east side and cutting the parcel in half. He pointed out the Petitioner's comparable Parcel No. 083-083-70, as shown on page 1 of Exhibit A. He noted the comparable parcel was valued at \$5,000 per acre. He indicated Parcel No. 510-072-20, located to the north of the subject, had been reduced by the Board earlier in the day to \$17,953 per acre. He requested the subject property be reduced to a taxable land value of \$10,000 per acre.

Member Green asked the Petitioner to point out the sewer line on the overhead map display. Mr. Matt Kiley did so. He indicated building was not allowed on the sewer line, but he was not sure if it was possible to drive over it. He stated the east side of the parcel was all within a flood plain.

Appraiser Churchfield said the subject parcel had been valued as a residential parcel at \$25,000 per acre because the Assessor's Office had no data regarding the flood plain. He stated the parcel appeared to have access from Henry Orr Parkway, and the parcel was equalized with parcels owned by Lennar.

Member Krolick wondered if the subject property was receiving any adjustments for easements or for the flood plain. Appraiser Churchfield indicated there were no adjustments.

Members Green and Woodland inquired as to adjustments that would be typical for a sewer easement. Appraiser Churchfield replied downward adjustments of 10 percent were typical for each detriment such as a sewer line or a flood zone. Member Krolick observed that everything to the east of the sewer line easement was undevelopable because it was in a flood plain. Appraiser Churchfield said he would have to see documentation to verify that. Member Green questioned whether there was a tentative map filed on the subject parcel. Appraiser Churchfield stated he was not aware

of any tentative map. Ron Sauer, Chief Appraiser, remarked that detriments such as ditches, easements, or flood plains that had been mapped only needed to be brought to the attention of the Assessor's Office to receive adjustments. Appraiser Churchfield agreed the Assessor's Office had been more than happy to work with the Appellant.

Mr. Matt Kiley compared the subject property to Parcel No. 510-071-20 (Parcel -20) to the north, which had been reduced by the Board to \$17,953 per acre. He noted Parcel -20 was in the master planned community under Neighborhood Unit Development (NUD) zoning, whereas the subject was not part of the master plan and had some problems associated with it. He said he did not see how the subject could be valued at more than Parcel -20 to the north. Member Green recalled the reduction on Parcel -20 was granted because of an access problem. He pointed out the subject did not have an access problem. He suggested a 10 percent downward adjustment for the sewer easement. Member Woodland stated she wanted to see verification of the easement. Mr. Matt Kiley called attention to the easement shown on page 3 of Exhibit A.

Member Green noted the subject could also have problems related to the flood zone. Appraiser Churchfield stated there was no documentation related to the flood plain. Member Green asked what was usually done for a flood plain. Appraiser Churchfield said it usually depended on how the building envelope was affected. Mr. Matt Kiley pointed out a dam built by the City of Sparks on the overhead map display. He indicated the dam was shown as a cut-out on page 1 of Exhibit A.

Member Green said he would like to give a 10 percent downward adjustment for the flood plain as well as 10 percent for the sewer line. Member Krolick recommended the Appellant provide documentation to the Assessor's Office. Member Woodland suggested an adjustment for the sewer easement alone until the Appellant followed up with the Assessor's Office regarding the flood plain.

With regard to Parcel No. 510-071-29, 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 carried on a 3-1 vote with Chairperson Covert absent and Member Green voting "no," it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$499,275, resulting in a total taxable value of \$499,275 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on a minus 10 percent easement adjustment. It was recommended that the Petitioner demonstrate the existence of a flood zone to the Assessor's Office to obtain a minus 10 percent flood adjustment. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0593E PARCEL NO. 083-830-67 – ZOZAC LAND COMPANY LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0320

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1000 Kiley Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Parcel map, 1 page.

Exhibit B: Spreadsheet of values, 1 page.

Exhibit C: Parcels excluded from appraisal, 1 page.

Exhibit D: Appraisal report as of May 11, 2010, for Branch Bank & Trust, by Archer Valuation Services, 82 pages.

Exhibit E: Letter dated December 21, 2010 from Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 4 pages.

Exhibit F: Appraisal report as of March 4, 2010, for Kiley Ranch LLC and Lazy Five Company, by Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc., 119 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Kiley Ranch Summary, 9 pages.

Matt Kiley, L. David Kiley, Carlos Vasquez, and Richard Hamilton were present to testify on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Mike Churchfield, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the property was built out as the Kiley Community Center.

Mr. Vasquez indicated the subject property was being compared with commercial properties in Exhibit I, but was not zoned for commercial use. He stated the subject was designated as Public Institutional (PI) use in the community's Planned Unit Development (PUD) Handbook. He explained Kiley Ranch was originally designed around a live-work-play lifestyle and the subject parcel was to have been the heart of that concept. Under the guidelines of the Handbook, the parcel could only be used for public institutional uses such as a school, church, public pool, or public amphitheater. He noted an income approach was presented by the Assessor's Office in Exhibit I, but the property could not be leased or built out for commercial use. Mr. Vasquez stated the Kiley Community Center was a temporary building with a temporary permit. It was not entitled to be there beyond the term of the PUD, and had no permanent entitlement or building permits from the City of Sparks. He said the building had been delivered in four separate pieces and was to have been disassembled after being used to market and showcase the raw land in the surrounding area.

Member Green asked if the back side of the building was used for the golf course. Mr. Vasquez said the golf course was about one-half mile away. He indicated the building backed up to a parking lot and some unimproved land. Member Green wondered if anything could be done with the land after the building was removed. Mr. Vasquez

stated there had once been talk of building lifestyle interpretive centers, public pools and public amphitheaters.

Member Green questioned who had been entitled before the Petitioner had foreclosed for \$100,000 on the subject parcel. Mr. Vasquez indicated Kiley Ranch Communities previously held title. Member Green noted it was a good looking building. Mr. Vasquez said it had been put together at a time when Kiley Ranch could afford to do such things, but was built to temporary standards. Member Green asked what the Appellant planed to do with the 12 acres. Mr. Vasquez replied it had been part of a bigger picture that fell apart and the land no longer had a purpose. He indicated there might be churches that were willing to accept a donation of land but the parcel was laid out during a different economic time. He said he had tried to donate it to the City but they did not want to accept it.

Appraiser Churchfield stated he had not realized the subject would stay under PI zoning after ownership transferred to Mr. Vasquez. He commented the restriction on use was new data that was never brought to the attention of the Assessor's Office. Because the property traded hands, he had been under the impression it could be leased as commercial property with the excess land someday being usable for residential development.

Member Woodland questioned why the property was purchased out of foreclosure by the Petitioner. Mr. Vasquez said he had no choice after Kiley Ranch Communities could no longer afford to service it. Member Krolick clarified the Petitioner foreclosed on the property but did not purchase it.

Member Green asked if the Assessor's Office was comfortable with the taxable value after hearing the Appellant's testimony. Appraiser Churchfield replied he had no documentation on which to make a determination. Member Green noted the Board could only act on what was in front of it. He suggested reducing the total taxable value to \$500,000 by increasing the obsolescence applied to the subject property.

Vice Chairperson Krolick asked what the building was currently being used for. Mr. Vasquez indicated it was completely vacant. He noted the heat was kept on to keep pipes from freezing. Vice Chairperson Krolick inquired as to the contractual obligation to the City of Sparks before the temporary structure had to be removed. Mr. Vasquez replied there was another six or seven years until the end of the PUD.

Member Brown said he was willing to entertain more obsolescence. Member Green suggested a reduction to \$100,000 in taxable improvement value.

With regard to Parcel No. 083-830-67, 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 with Chairperson Covert absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and \$336,672 in total obsolescence be applied, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$100,000 and a

total taxable value of \$521,015 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the building being a temporary structure under Public Institutional zoning. 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.

4:40 p.m. Vice Chairperson Krolick declared a brief recess.

4:48 p.m. The Board reconvened with Chairperson Covert absent. Vice Chairperson Krolick passed the gavel to Member Green and left the meeting.

**11-0594E PARCEL NO. 011-051-01 – DRW FITZGERALD REAL PROP LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0110**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 98 West Commercial Row, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: E-mail and photograph, 3 pages.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She indicated the Petitioner was not in agreement with the Assessor's recommendation to uphold the taxable values. She identified the subject as one of the oldest buildings in downtown Reno. She said the building was currently vacant and was being used by the owner for warehouse storage. She stated the Assessor's Office would stand on the written presentation provided in Exhibit I.

Acting Chairperson Green noted a comment in Exhibit A that the building was ripe for demolition. Member Woodland questioned whether it could be demolished given its historical significance.

Member Brown asked how much land there would be if the building were to be demolished. Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, indicated the subject was on 0.075 acres.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-051-01, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0595E PARCEL NO. 011-051-02 – FITZGERALD OLD RENO LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0111

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 44 West Commercial Row, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: E-mail, 2 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 18 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She indicated the Petitioner was in agreement with the Assessor's recommendation to reduce the total taxable value, as outlined in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-051-02, 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 Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and total obsolescence of \$95,008 be applied to the improvements, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$62,575 and a total taxable value of \$168,000 for the 2011-12 tax year. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0596E PARCEL NO. 011-051-10 – SIERRA & VIRGINIA PROPERTY LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0113

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 241 North Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: E-mail, 2 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 26 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated the property was one of four parcels formerly known as the Golden Phoenix Casino. She indicated the Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value, as outlined in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-051-10, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and \$548,919 in total obsolescence be applied to the improvements, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$102,910 and a total taxable value of \$326,910 for the 2011-12 tax year. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0597E PARCEL NO. 011-051-11 – SIERRA & VIRGINIA PROPERTY LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0114

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 237 North Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: E-mail, 2 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 26 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated the property was one of four parcels formerly known as the Golden Phoenix Casino. She indicated the Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value, as outlined in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-051-11, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and total obsolescence of \$387,484 be applied to the improvements, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$84,821 and a total taxable value of \$266,821 for the 2011-12 tax year. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0598E PARCEL NO. 011-051-23 – SIERRA & VIRGINIA PROPERTY LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0115

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 236 North Sierra Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: E-mail, 2 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 26 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated the property was one of four parcels formerly known as the Golden Phoenix Casino. She indicated the Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value, as outlined in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-051-23, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and total obsolescence of \$527,779 be applied to the improvements, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$210,262 and a total taxable value of \$298,312 for the 2011-12 tax

year. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0599E PARCEL NO. 011-051-24 – SIERRA & VIRGINIA PROPERTY LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0116**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 236 North Sierra Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: E-mail, 2 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 26 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She stated the property was one of four parcels formerly known as the Golden Phoenix Casino. She indicated the Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value, as outlined in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-051-24, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and total obsolescence of \$532,289 be applied to the improvements, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$424,707 and a total taxable value of \$607,957 for the 2011-12 tax year. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0600E PARCEL NO. 011-051-19 – BYINGTON BUILDING LLC –
HEARING NO. 11-0146**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 201 North Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Letter, property appraisal, lease agreement with addendums, history of rent, and profit and loss statements for 2009 and 2010, 96 pages.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She indicated the Petitioner had submitted an appraisal and income information. The Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value, as outlined in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-051-19, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and total obsolescence of \$115,143 be applied to the improvements, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$450,000 and a total taxable value of \$800,000 for the 2011-12 tax year. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office after reviewing an appraisal submitted by the Petitioner. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0601E PARCEL NO. 014-251-07 – NEVADA INVESTMENTS 5 LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0208

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1885 South Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: 2010 Income Statement and supporting documents, 13 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 24 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jana Spoor, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. She indicated the Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value, as outlined in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 014-251-07, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and total obsolescence of \$1,003,447 be applied to the improvements, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$981,360 and a total taxable value of \$2,400,000 for the 2011-12 tax year. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. 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 AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS.
142-330-07 & 142-390-01 – RENO RETAIL COMPANY LLC
– HEARING NOS. 11-0612 & 11-0632

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He identified the properties as the line shop portion of the Summit Sierra Mall. Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, recommended the Assessor's values be upheld. She stated the Assessor's Office would stand on its written presentation, as outlined in Exhibit I.

Acting Chairperson Green asked if the Petitioner was in agreement with the Assessor's Office. Appraiser Oliphint said he had been unable to make contact with the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

Please see 11-0602E and 11-0603E below for the details concerning the petition, exhibits and decision related to each of the properties in the consolidated hearing.

11-0602E **PARCEL NO. 142-330-07 – RENO RETAIL COMPANY LLC**
– HEARING NO. 11-0612

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 13987 South Virginia 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, 57 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Appraiser Paul Oliphint offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 142-330-07 & 142-390-01 – RENO RETAIL COMPANY LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0612 & 11-0632.

With regard to Parcel No. 142-330-07, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0603E PARCEL NO. 142-390-01 – RENO RETAIL COMPANY LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0632

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 13935 South Virginia 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, 57 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Appraiser Paul Oliphint offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 142-330-07 & 142-390-01 – RENO RETAIL COMPANY LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0612 & 11-0632.

With regard to Parcel No. 142-390-01, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0604E PARCEL NO. 049-384-03 – RENO RETAIL COMPANY LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0608

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 1660 Whites Creek Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He said the Assessor's Office would stand on the written presentation provided in Exhibit I.

Acting Chairperson Green reviewed the Petitioner's opinion of value as stated on the appeal form. Member Brown noted the Assessor's comparable sales were not recent. Member Woodland stated no evidence was offered to support the Petitioner's opinion of value.

With regard to Parcel No. 049-384-03, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION

- PARCEL NOS. 123-031-01, 123-044-06 & 123-031-09

- CANPARTNERS REALTY HOLDING CO, IV CAL-NEVA LLC

- HEARING NOS. 11-0613, 11-0630 & 11-0631

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject properties. She identified the properties as the Cal Neva Resort. She reviewed the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value on Parcel No. 123-031-01 and to uphold the Assessor's values on the other two parcels, as outlined in Exhibit I. She stated the Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation.

Please see 11-0605E, 11-0606E and 11-0607E below for the details concerning the petition, exhibits and decision related to each of the properties in the consolidated hearing.

11-0605E PARCEL NO. 123-031-01 – CANPARTNERS REALTY HOLDING CO, IV CAL-NEVA LLC – HEARING NO. 11-0613

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2 Stateline Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Financial information, 36 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 44 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Senior Appraiser Cori DelGiudice offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 123-031-01, 123-044-06 & 123-031-09 – CANPARTNERS REALTY HOLDING CO, IV CAL-NEVA LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0613, 11-0630 & 11-0631.

With regard to Parcel No. 123-031-01, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and total obsolescence of \$5,175,297 be applied to the improvements, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$3,562,649 and a total taxable value of \$7,432,088 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0606E PARCEL NO. 123-044-06 – CANPARTNERS REALTY HOLDING CO, IV CAL-NEVA LLC – HEARING NO. 11-0630

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 18 Stateline Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Financial Information, 36 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 44 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Senior Appraiser Cori DelGiudice offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 123-031-01, 123-044-06 & 123-031-09 – CANPARTNERS REALTY HOLDING CO, IV CAL-NEVA LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0613, 11-0630 & 11-0631.

With regard to Parcel No. 123-044-06, 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 Green, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0607E **PARCEL NO. 123-031-09 – CANPARTNERS REALTY HOLDING CO, IV CAL-NEVA LLC – HEARING NO. 11-0631**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 0 Crystal Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Financial information, 36 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps and subject's appraisal records, 44 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Senior Appraiser Cori DelGiudice offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 123-031-01, 123-044-06 & 123-031-09 – CANPARTNERS REALTY HOLDING CO, IV CAL-NEVA LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0613, 11-0630 & 11-0631.

With regard to Parcel No. 123-031-09, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Green, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0608E **PARCEL NO. 510-481-06 – HOME DEPOT USA INC – HEARING NO. 11-0633**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 4755 Galleria Parkway, 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.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Acting Chairperson Green reviewed the total taxable value requested by the Petitioner on the appeal form.

Appraiser Oliphint outlined the comparable sales and income approaches that were provided in Exhibit I. He said he had spoken with the Petitioner's tax representative, who had not provided evidence but said he was seeking equalization with the Home Depot property located on Northtowne Lane. Acting Chairperson Green observed the two locations were not comparable.

With regard to Parcel No. 510-481-06, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0609E PARCEL NO. 037-030-48 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1200 Scheels 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, 21 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

identified the property as the Scheel's store. Acting Chairperson Green asked if the Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office that was provided in Exhibit I. Appraiser Oliphint stated he had not received any data and was not successful in making contact with the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-030-48, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and total obsolescence of \$2,215,915 be applied to the improvements, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$32,085,028 and a total taxable value of \$34,270,000 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0610E PARCEL NO. 037-030-53 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 1289 East Lincoln 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.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Ron Sauer, Chief Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated the Assessor's Office would stand on the written presentation provided in Exhibit I. Acting Chairperson Green noted there was no evidence submitted by the Petitioner.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-030-53, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**DISCUSSION TO CONSIDER CONSOLIDATION – SPARKS
LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT INC.**

Gary Warren, Senior Appraiser, indicated there were recommendations to reduce the value on many of the improved parcels and to uphold the value on all of the vacant land parcels. He suggested the vacant land parcels could be consolidated to one hearing.

Member Woodland noted there was no evidence provided by the Petitioner on any of the properties.

Acting Chairperson Green said he preferred to hear each parcel individually because the Petitioner was not present and was not necessarily in agreement with the recommendations of the Assessor's Office.

**11-0611E PARCEL NO. 037-030-54 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT,
INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637C**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 1299 East Lincoln Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He reviewed the comparable sales provided in Exhibit I and recommended the Assessor's values be upheld.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-030-54, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0612E PARCEL NO. 037-030-55 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637D

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 1311 East Lincoln 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.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Acting Chairperson Green asked if any additional information was provided by the Petitioner. Appraiser Oliphint stated nothing was submitted by the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-030-55, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0613E PARCEL NO. 037-030-70 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637E

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1315 Scheels 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, 16 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He identified the property as the Best Buy store and its associated parking area. He indicated no additional information was provided by the Petitioner. He stated the Assessor's Office would stand on the written presentation provided in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-030-70, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0614E PARCEL NO. 037-030-74 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637F

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1310 East Lincoln 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, 5 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He identified the property as a traffic circle with a \$500 token land value. He indicated no additional information was provided by the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-030-74, 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 with Chairperson

Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0615E PARCEL NO. 037-030-77 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637G

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1520 East Lincoln 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, 5 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He identified the property as a traffic circle with a giant air racing tower and extensive signage that resulted in substantial improvement value.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-030-77, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0616E PARCEL NO. 037-030-83 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637H

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1415 Scheels 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, 17 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He identified the property as the line shop area that contained a Fudruckers Restaurant. He noted there was a substantial amount of additional land area where significant improvements were planned. He stated he had obtained a rent roll from the property management firm, which indicated relatively stable rents and high occupancy.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-030-83, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0617E PARCEL NO. 037-030-87 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637I

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1190 Scheels 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, 36 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He described the property as a line shop area that wrapped around the Scheel's store. He indicated there was a substantial amount of land area with minimal additional build-out

potential. He noted there was a relatively high vacancy rate because of the property's location towards the back of the mall and away from any parking. He stated the layout did not offer as much warmth and security as other areas of the shopping mall. He reviewed the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value, as outlined in Exhibit I.

Acting Chairperson Green asked if the Petitioner was aware of the Assessor's recommendation. Appraiser Oliphint stated he had not been in contact with the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-030-87, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and total obsolescence of \$5,943,380 be applied to the improvements, resulting in a taxable improvement value of \$36,145,610 and a total taxable value of \$49,600,000 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0618E PARCEL NO. 037-400-04 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637J

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1560 East Lincoln Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He indicated there was asphalt and lighting located on the parcel that contributed to its improvement value. He stated the Assessor's Office would stand on the written presentation provided in Exhibit I.

Acting Chairperson Green asked if there had been any response from the Petitioner. Appraiser Oliphint said there had not been any contact with the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-400-04, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Brown, seconded by Member Woodland, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0619E PARCEL NO. 037-400-07 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637K

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 1320 East Lincoln Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He indicated there had been no contact with the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative. He stated the Assessor's Office would stand on the written presentation provided in Exhibit I.

Acting Chairperson Green noted it was difficult for the Board to grant any kind of relief when the Petitioners did not provide any information for the Board to review.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-400-07, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden

to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0620E PARCEL NO. 037-400-08 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637L

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1440 East Lincoln 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.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He identified it as a high visibility parcel. He stated he had not had any contact from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

Member Brown noted the comparable land sales in Exhibit I were recent but the subject's taxable value was higher than that of the comparables. Appraiser Oliphint explained the subject had quite a few improvements in the form of lighting, landscaping, signage, and paving.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-400-08, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0621E PARCEL NO. 037-400-09 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637M

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1530 East Lincoln Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the property was located next to the Target store and might actually encroach on its footprint. He stated there were significant site improvements such as parking and lighting. He indicated the Assessor's Office would stand on the written record submitted in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-400-09, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0622E PARCEL NO. 037-400-10 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637N

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 485 Sparks Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

stated the Assessor's Office would stand on the written record submitted in Exhibit I. He indicated there had been no contact from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-400-10, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0623E PARCEL NO. 037-400-11 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-06370

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 475 Sparks Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He indicated there had been no contact from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative. He recommended the Assessor's taxable values be upheld based on the written record submitted in Exhibit I.

Acting Chairperson Green noted there had been an increase in taxable value from the previous year. Appraiser Oliphint stated the parcel was entirely paved and the amount of asphalt had raised the improvement value.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-400-11, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0624E PARCEL NO. 037-400-12 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637P

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 435 Sparks Boulevard, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated the Assessor's Office would stand on the written record provided in Exhibit I. He indicated there had been no contact with or evidence from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-400-12, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0625E PARCEL NO. 037-411-01 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637Q

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1321 East Lincoln 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, 9 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He indicated there was a little bit of fencing on the parcel. He recommended the Assessor's taxable values be upheld based on the written record submitted in Exhibit I. He stated there had been no contact from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-411-01, 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 Woodland, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0626E PARCEL NO. 037-411-03 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637R

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1481 East Lincoln 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, 17 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He identified the property as the Olive Garden restaurant. He stated there had been no contact from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative. He recommended the Assessor's taxable values be upheld based on the written record submitted in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-411-03, 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 Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0627E PARCEL NO. 037-411-04 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637S

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 0 East Lincoln 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, 9 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He indicated the Assessor's Office would stand on the written record submitted in Exhibit I. He noted there were a fair number of site improvements. He stated there had been no evidence or contact from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-411-04, 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 Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0628E PARCEL NO. 037-412-01 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637T

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 300 Legends Bay Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He identified the property as the future site of an I-Max theater located behind the main shopping mall. He noted there were no site improvements. He recommended the Assessor's taxable values be upheld based on the written record submitted in Exhibit I. He stated there had been no contact from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-412-01, 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 Woodland, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0629E PARCEL NO. 037-421-01 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637U

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1385 Big Fish 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, 15 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He identified the property as the newly constructed Popeye's Chicken. He discussed three

comparable sales that were provided in Exhibit I. He stated there had been no contact from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-421-01, 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 Woodland, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0630E PARCEL NO. 037-421-02 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637V

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

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He stated no evidence and no comments had been received from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-421-02, 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 Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0631E PUBLIC COMMENT

Herb Kaplan, Legal Counsel, provided written comments that were submitted by Gary Schmidt. Mr. Schmidt had asked that his comments be placed into the record.

11-0632E PARCEL NO. 037-421-03 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637W

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

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted the property was soon to be developed as a discount tire store. He stated there had been no contact from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative. He recommended the Assessor's taxable values be upheld based on the written record submitted in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-421-03, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

11-0633E PARCEL NO. 037-421-04 – SPARKS LEGENDS DEVELOPMENT, INC – HEARING NO. 11-0637X

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

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Paul Oliphint, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject property. He noted there had been no contact from the Petitioner or the Petitioner's representative. He recommended the Assessor's taxable values be upheld based on the written record submitted in Exhibit I.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-421-04, 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 Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION

- PARCEL NOS. 007-285-21, 007-285-13, 007-285-14 & 007-285-20

- NORTH RIVER DEVELOPMENT LLC

- HEARING NOS. 11-0651A, 11-0651B, 11-0651C & 11-0651D

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject properties. She reviewed the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the total taxable value by applying obsolescence to the improvements on Parcel No. 007-285-21. She requested the Assessor's taxable values be upheld on the other three parcels, as outlined in Exhibit I.

Acting Chairperson Green asked if the Petitioners were in agreement with the Assessor's recommendation. Appraiser DelGiudice stated that they were.

Please see 11-0634E through 11-0637E below for the details concerning the petition, exhibits and decision related to each of the parcels in the consolidated hearing.

11-0634E PARCEL NO. 007-285-21 – NORTH RIVER DEVELOPMENT LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0651D

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 303 3rd 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, 15 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, please see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 007-285-21, 007-285-13, 007-285-14 & 007-285-20 – NORTH RIVER DEVELOPMENT LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0651A, 11-0651B, 11-0651C & 11-0651D.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-285-21, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be upheld and additional obsolescence of \$746,142 be applied to the improvements, resulting in a total obsolescence of \$5,173,925, a taxable improvement value of \$250,000, and a total taxable value of \$476,500 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office. With that adjustment, it was found that the land and improvements are valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0635E PARCEL NO. 007-285-13 – NORTH RIVER DEVELOPMENT LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0651A**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 237 3rd 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, 15 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, please see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 007-285-21, 007-285-13, 007-285-14 & 007-285-20 – NORTH RIVER DEVELOPMENT LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0651A, 11-0651B, 11-0651C & 11-0651D.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-285-13, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0636E PARCEL NO. 007-285-14 – NORTH RIVER DEVELOPMENT LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0651B**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 308 North Arlington 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, 15 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, please see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 007-285-21, 007-285-13,

007-285-14 & 007-285-20 – NORTH RIVER DEVELOPMENT LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0651A, 11-0651B, 11-0651C & 11-0651D.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-285-14, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

**11-0637E PARCEL NO. 007-285-20 – NORTH RIVER DEVELOPMENT LLC
– HEARING NO. 11-0651C**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 231 3rd 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, 15 pages.

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, please see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 007-285-21, 007-285-13, 007-285-14 & 007-285-20 – NORTH RIVER DEVELOPMENT LLC – HEARING NOS. 11-0651A, 11-0651B, 11-0651C & 11-0651D.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-285-20, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld for tax year 2011-12. It was found that the Petitioner failed to meet his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property.

DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION

- PARCEL NOS. 011-193-08, 011-193-09, 011-193-10 & 011-193-11

- AMR PROPERTIES LTD

- HEARING NOS. 11-0617A, 11-0617B, 11-0617C & 11-0617D

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject properties. She reviewed the recommendation of the Assessor's Office to reduce the taxable land value on each of the subject properties, as outlined in Exhibit I. She stated the Petitioner was in agreement with the recommendation.

Please see 11-0638E through 11-0641E below for the details concerning the petition, exhibits and decision related to each of the parcels in the consolidated hearing.

11-0638E PARCEL NO. 011-193-08 – AMR PROPERTIES LTD
– HEARING NO. 11-0617A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 536 South Center Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal report, 10 pages.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, please see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 011-193-08, 011-193-09, 011-193-10 & 011-193-11 – AMR PROPERTIES LTD – HEARING NOS. 11-0617A, 11-0617B, 11-0617C & 11-0617D.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-193-08, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson

Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$42,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$42,000 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office after their review of an appraisal submitted by the Petitioner. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0639E PARCEL NO. 011-193-09 – AMR PROPERTIES LTD
– HEARING NO. 11-0617B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 526 South Center Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal report, 10 pages.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, please see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 011-193-08, 011-193-09, 011-193-10 & 011-193-11 – AMR PROPERTIES LTD – HEARING NOS. 11-0617A, 11-0617B, 11-0617C & 11-0617D.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-193-09, 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 with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$42,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$42,000 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office after their review of an appraisal submitted by the Petitioner. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0640E PARCEL NO. 011-193-10 – AMR PROPERTIES LTD
– HEARING NO. 11-0617C**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 520 South Center Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal report, 10 pages.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, please see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 011-193-08, 011-193-09, 011-193-10 & 011-193-11 – AMR PROPERTIES LTD – HEARING NOS. 11-0617A, 11-0617B, 11-0617C & 11-0617D.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-193-10, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$42,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$42,000 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office after their review of an appraisal submitted by the Petitioner. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

**11-0641E PARCEL NO. 011-193-11 – AMR PROPERTIES LTD
– HEARING NO. 11-0617D**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2011-12 taxable valuation on land located at 512 South Center Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal report, 10 pages.

Assessor

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

No one was present to offer testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

Cori DelGiudice, Senior Appraiser, offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

For the discussion that took place on this hearing, please see DISCUSSION AND CONSOLIDATION – PARCEL NOS. 011-193-08, 011-193-09, 011-193-10 & 011-193-11 – AMR PROPERTIES LTD – HEARING NOS. 11-0617A, 11-0617B, 11-0617C & 11-0617D.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-193-11, pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, it was ordered that the taxable land value be reduced to \$42,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$42,000 for tax year 2011-12. The reduction was based on the recommendation of the Assessor's Office after their review of an appraisal submitted by the Petitioner. With that adjustment, it was found that the land is valued correctly and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

11-0642E BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board member comments.

* * * * *

6:17 p.m. There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, on motion by Member Woodland, seconded by Member Brown, which motion duly carried with Chairperson Covert and Member Krolick absent, the meeting was adjourned.

JAMES COVERT, Chairperson
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

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

*Minutes prepared by
Lisa McNeill, Deputy Clerk*