

**BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

WEDNESDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 19, 2025

PRESENT:

Daren McDonald, Chair
James Ainsworth, Vice Chair
Rost Olsen, Member

Catherine Smith, Chief Deputy County Clerk
Trenton Ross, Deputy District Attorney

ABSENT:

Eugenia Bonnenfant, Member
Michael Gratz, Member

The Board of Equalization convened at 9:06 a.m. in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Chair McDonald called the meeting to order, the Clerk called the roll, and the Board conducted the following business:

25-082E PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no response to the call for public comment.

25-083E SWEARING IN

Chief Deputy County Clerk Cathy Smith swore in the appraisal staff.

25-084E WITHDRAWN PETITIONS

There were no petitions to be withdrawn.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

25-085E CONTINUANCES

There were no requests for continuance.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**25-086E PARCEL NO. 160-220-38 – ARBELBIDE LIVING TRUST C/O
BANK OF AMERICA – HEARING NO. 25-0042**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the

2025-26 taxable valuation on property located at 710 South Meadows Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Property tax analysis, photos, and supporting documents, 34 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation and supporting documentation, 12 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 160-220-38 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Olsen, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed, that the taxable land value be upheld, and that the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$1,038,332, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,906,000 for tax year 2025-26. 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.

25-087E PARCEL NO. 510-381-04 – SIMON TRUST, VERNE
HEARING NO. 25-0043

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2025-26 taxable valuation on property located at 5005 Pyramid Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Analysis including comparable properties and photographs, 34 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, original petition, and comparables, 12 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 510-381-04 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Olsen, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed, that the taxable land value be upheld, and that the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$1,125,500, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,711,000 for tax year 2025-26. 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.

25-088E **PARCEL NO. 140-213-18 – BLAKE NELON**
HEARING NO. 25-0059

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2025-26 taxable valuation on property located at 1001 Steamboat Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal and supporting documents, 6 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation and supporting documentation, 6 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 140-213-18 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Olsen, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed, that the taxable land value be upheld, and that the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$6,589,836, resulting in a total taxable value of \$12,357,000 for tax year 2025-26. 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.

25-089E **PARCEL NO. 510-481-06 – BLAKE NELON**
HEARING NO. 25-0061

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the

2025-26 taxable valuation on property located at 4755 Galleria Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appraisal and supporting documents, 6 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation and supporting documentation, 7 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 510-481-06 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Olsen, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed, that the taxable land value be upheld, and that the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$7,154,760, resulting in a total taxable value of \$11,942,000 for tax year 2025-26. 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.

25-090E PARCEL NO. 011-360-27 – LEW J HUMPHREY
HEARING NO. 25-0078A

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2025-26 taxable valuation on property located at 0 Ralston Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 011-360-27 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Olsen, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed, that the taxable land value be upheld, and that the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$57,617, resulting in a total taxable value of \$1,965,399 for tax year 2025-26. 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.

PARCEL NO. 007-542-15 – LEW J HUMPHREY
HEARING NO. 25-0078B

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2025-26 taxable valuation on property located at 345 N Arlington Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 007-542-15 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Olsen, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed, that the taxable land value be upheld, and that the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$25,500,637, resulting in a total taxable value of \$31,034,601 for tax year 2025-26. 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.

25-091E **ROLL NO. 2287030 – JESR LLC, JACOBS ENTERTAINMENT, J**
RESORT – HEARING NO. 25-0079P24

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on personal property located at 345 N Arlington Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Account No. 2287030 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Olsen, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable personal property value be reduced to \$27,564,089, resulting in a total taxable value of \$27,564,089 for tax year 2024-25. With that adjustment, it was found that the personal property value is valued correctly, and the total taxable value does not exceed full cash value.

25-092E PARCEL NO. 037-031-06 – ALISON TOMS
HEARING NO. 25-0029

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2025-26 taxable valuation on property located at 1355 Scheels Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Photographs and appraisal, 23 pages.

Exhibit B: Comparable leases summary and analysis, 43 pages.

Exhibit C: Lease comps details, 4 pages.

Exhibit D: Real estate report, 3 pages.

Exhibit E: Trepp Cap rates, 1 page.

Exhibit F: Letter for consideration of Petitioner's Information, 25 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet (HEP) including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 48 pages.

Chief Deputy County Clerk Cathy Smith distributed documents to the Board from the Petitioner and placed them on file as Petitioner's Exhibit F (PE-F).

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Chair McDonald advised that the Board would take a few minutes to review PE-F.

Appraiser Lewis spoke about the sales comparison approach outlined on page 2 of the HEP he provided. He read from the descriptions provided on pages 3 and 4 of his HEP. In addition to the details included in his HEP narrative, he mentioned that Improved Sale (IS) 2, as shown on page 2 of the HEP, was being operated as an Airstream Recreational Vehicle (RV) dealership.

Chair McDonald commented that one of the elements predominantly argued by the Petitioner was that the land sale comparisons were not appropriate because the subject property was being assessed closer to \$12.20 per square foot as compared to the \$9.90 per square foot indicated for Walmart and Sam's Club. Appraiser Lewis shared that the Walmart and Sam's Club were located in the Firecreek Shopping Center and had lower square foot values, primarily due to their location. He explained those stores were in the back of the Firecreek Shopping Center, which he added the Assessor's Office (AO) had researched. He summarized that access was difficult and there were major visibility issues due to the location of the property behind all of the other nearby retailers. He said that was why the AO believed Walmart and Sam's Club should have lower land values. He described that the location of the subject parcel in the Legends Shopping Mall was a prime retail location. He determined that the sales within the Legends Shopping Mall and other sales in prime retail locations supported the value determined by the AO for the subject parcel.

Vice Chair Ainsworth noted that Appraiser Lewis recommended a \$500,000 reduction, and he questioned what that was based on.

Appraiser Lewis responded that the discount he recommended was primarily informed by the income approach, which he proceeded to review on page 5 of the HEP.

Chair McDonald observed that the Petitioner used a variety of lease comparables both outside and inside the area to argue for a rate of closer to \$8 per square foot. He asked Appraiser Lewis to speak about that.

Appraiser Lewis asked if Chair McDonald was referencing information included in PE-F, which Chair McDonald affirmed. Appraiser Lewis revealed that the \$8.40 per square foot rent was drawn from Need 2 Speed, which he described as located in

the Northtowne Shopping Center. He said the AO discerned Need 2 Speed provided good data for rent from a recently signed lease, but it was located in a weaker retail location. He disclosed that the AO used the Flooring Liquidators near that location as a comparable but believed those properties were low indicators of value because of their location.

Appraiser Lewis stated that the two approaches to value indicated a range of \$124 per square foot to \$125 per square foot. He informed that the AO gave the most weight to the income approach at \$124 per square foot and recommended that the total taxable value of the property be reduced to \$14,800,000 so that the total taxable value would not exceed full cash value.

Chair McDonald was confident that the land value was fairly stated because of the marketplace that it was in. He observed that the subject parcel was in a nice complex, and he thought the rent cost per foot was fair for the location. He admitted that he could be persuaded to support a slightly lower assessment. Member Olsen noted that the subject parcel was in a prime location and was a newer construction than some of the other comparable properties in the area. He viewed the AO assessment as fair.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-031-06, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Olsen, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the taxable improvement value be reduced by \$500,000 and the taxable land value be upheld, resulting in a total taxable value of \$14,800,000 for tax year 2025-26. The reduction was based on the income approach to value. 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.

25-093E PARCEL NO. 040-951-08 – LOWE'S HOME CENTERS LLC
HEARING NO. 25-0030

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2025-26 taxable valuation on property located at 5075 Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

- Exhibit A: Comparable properties and photographs, 25 pages.
- Exhibit B: Comparable leases summary and analysis, 43 pages.
- Exhibit C: Lease comps details, 4 pages.
- Exhibit D: Real estate report, 3 pages.

Exhibit E: Trepp Cap rates, 1 page.

Exhibit F: Letter for consideration of Petitioner's Information, 25 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet (HEP) including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 48 pages.

Chief Deputy County Clerk Cathy Smith distributed documents to the Board from the Petitioner and placed them on file as Petitioner's Exhibit F (PE-F).

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Chair McDonald advised that the Board would take a few minutes to review PE-F.

Appraiser Lewis spoke about the sales comparison approach outlined on page 2 of the HEP he provided. He read from the descriptions provided on pages 3 and 4 of his HEP. In addition to the details included in his HEP narrative, he mentioned that Improved Sale (IS) 2, as shown on page 2 of the HEP, was being operated as an Airstream Recreational Vehicle (RV) dealership.

Member Olsen recalled that during the previous hearing, it was noted that Sam's Club and Walmart had somewhat reduced values due to their location at the back of the shopping center. He disclosed that he had experienced challenges in accessing the subject parcel and wondered if those access issues were considered in the determination of valuation for the property. He theorized that the detriments might be similar to other properties in the area.

Assessor Lewis informed that detriments of the type Member Olsen observed were built into the Base Lot Value determination rather than separately applied as adjustments.

Chair McDonald stated that the Petitioner argued for a land value closer to \$9.90 per square foot, which Chair McDonald disclosed he found inappropriate for the shopping center the subject parcel was in. He asked Appraiser Lewis to speak about the shopping center and area.

Appraiser Lewis advised that the subject property was situated in an excellent retail location. He described the busy intersection and said the demographics of the area were very strong. He agreed with Member Olsen's observation about access challenges, but he reiterated that consideration was included when determining Base Lot Value. He said the Walmart and Sam's Club properties had visibility and access issues

because of their location in the rear of the shopping center. He conveyed that the location of the subject property was superior. He added that sales of vacant land on similar prime retail locations and main streets revealed higher values. He believed \$12.00 per square foot for the subject parcel and \$9.90 for Sam's Club and Walmart were justified due to the relative strength of their locations.

Appraiser Lewis reviewed the income approach outlined on page 5 of the HEP.

Chair McDonald stated that the Firecreek Crossing Shopping Center had a number of vacancies. Appraiser Lewis informed that the Firecreek Crossing Shopping Center was located across from the subject property, and was not quite in the same retail location.

Chair McDonald recalled that the Petitioner suggested a rate closer to \$7.80 per square foot. He thought that appeared to be predominantly based on a property on Stardust Street. He asked Appraiser Lewis to speak about that comparable.

Appraiser Lewis spoke about the rents used by the Petitioner. He said the property on Stardust Street was formerly a bowling alley, had been vacant for quite some time, and was being converted into a car wash. He did not consider that a comparable property to a big box retail store. He asserted that the rent example from the Stardust Street property should not hold any weight. He believed the rents used by the Petitioner were leases that were signed over six years ago, and he noted that the market had shifted since that time. He specified that rental rates had increased significantly and the examples used by the Petitioner were thus not appropriate to establish a rent value. He noted that the rent of Flooring Liquidators was included, which he acknowledged was also on the Assessor's Office (AO) rent chart. He stated that it was in an inferior retail location, had suffered from vacancy issues, and had been vacant for some time.

Appraiser Lewis stated that the two approaches to value indicated a range of \$105 per square foot to \$106 per square foot. He informed that the AO gave the most weight to the income approach at \$105 per square foot. He said the sales comparison approach was reconciled to \$18,560,000, and the income approach was reconciled to \$18,300,000. He said the two approaches to value supported the AO total taxable value of \$103 per square foot or \$17,970,989. He recommended upholding the total taxable value.

Appraiser Lewis asked if the Board wanted him to review any of the other materials presented, and Chair McDonald requested more information on the quality rating.

Appraiser Lewis explained that the quality rating was an issue pointed out by the Petitioner that the AO recognized. He informed the Board that there was more information regarding the issue on pages 37-46 of the HEP. He advised that he included some comparables and the Marshall & Swift guidelines about quality class. He said the Petitioner pointed out Sam's Club was currently classed as quality 1, which was a low-quality class. He described that the AO believed that quality classification was incorrect

for the Sam's Club according to the Marshall & Swift guidelines. He referenced pictures in the HEP that supported that conclusion. He stated that the AO believed the subject parcel would be correctly classed at 1.5 and adhered to the Marshall & Swift guidelines for that classification. He disclosed that the AO would correct what they considered an error on their side for the Sam's Club during the next fiscal year in the reappraisal cycle. Appraiser Lewis addressed evidence submitted by the Petitioner. He remarked that they provided some local sales data but did not provide any explanation to accompany the sales information. He surmised that evidence was intended to outline a sales comparison approach, but the Petitioner did not provide any explanation, so he could not be sure. He noted the Petitioner provided some rent comparables located throughout the Pacific Northwest. Appraiser Lewis said he was an appraiser in Washoe County, and could not speak to those markets and did not know anything about them. He added that the Petitioners relied on what seemed like national investor surveys, which encompassed the entire West Coast to inform the capitalization (cap) rate they suggested. Appraiser Lewis did not feel that it was appropriate to use the whole West Coast to value a single property without any support from local data. He said his HEP was entirely comprised of local data, all of his cap rates were supported, all of his rents were supported, and he believed his analysis should be given the most weight. He theorized that the income approach provided by the Petitioner was not based on current information.

Member Olsen determined that pertinent characteristics of the subject parcel appeared to be accounted for in the AO valuation and stated his agreement with their conclusions. Vice Chair Ainsworth echoed the agreement expressed by Member Olsen about the AO valuation and did not understand why the Petitioner chose to include out-of-area comparables in their appeal.

Member Olsen noted that the Petitioner marked two bases for appeal, Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 361.356 and 361.357 on their application. He asked if his motion should incorporate both.

Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Trenton Ross advised that Member Olsen should select one basis.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 040-951-08, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.356, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Olsen, seconded by Vice Chair Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner has failed to meet their burden to show that the land and improvements are valued higher than another property whose use is identical and whose location is comparable.

25-094E PARCEL NO. 150-012-08 – SEVITA – HEARING NO. 25-0034

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the

2025-26 taxable valuation on property located at 3980 Lake Placid Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Tenant's estoppel certificate, lease, and redacted photos, 46 pages.

Exhibit B: Value summary, maps, photographs, and supporting documentation, 39 pages.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet (HEP) including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 28 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

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

Appraiser Wiele described that the subject building was a highly-specialized neuro-rehabilitation hospital built to meet the specific needs of the tenant, NeuroRestorative. He informed that they provided custom care plans for patients with high-intensity needs, such as those with traumatic brain injuries or who needed assistance breathing. He stated that, at that time, NeuroRestorative contained 24 pediatric beds and 12 adult beds for a maximum occupancy of 36 potential concurrent patients. He advised that pages 13 and 14 of the HEP provided additional details about NeuroRestorative services. He said the property operated as an investment on an absolute net lease. He noted that the subject property sold in December 2019 for \$12,550,000, which was equivalent to \$625 per square foot prior to a 6,567 square foot addition completed in 2022. He offered that a sales comparison approach to value and an income approach to value were outlined on pages 2 through 4 of the HEP. He said both methods supported the Assessor's Office (AO) current total taxable value of \$8,017,576.

Chair McDonald asked Appraiser Weile to speak about his determination of the overall capitalization (cap) rate.

Appraiser Weile responded that a local survey of cap rates was conducted. He revealed that those rates ranged from a little over 2 percent to as high as 6 percent. He disclosed that, to be conservative, the AO proceeded with a rate of 6 percent for their analysis.

Appraiser Weile stated that the Appealant's agent provided documentation in support of the Appealant's opinion of a value of \$4,500,000. He noted that a sales comparison analysis of both improved and vacant land sales and a replacement cost

analysis were included. He imparted that the AO determined data provided by the Appellant was not an appropriate indicator of value for the subject property. He discerned that the Appellant's sales comparison approach relied on dissimilar and invalid sales. He said the cost approach was incomplete and did not account for all components of the subject property. Appraiser Weile stated that the current taxable value was well supported by the Assessor's income and sales comparison analysis, and he recommended that the Board uphold the 2025-26 total taxable value of \$8,017,576.

Chair McDonald disclosed that he was concerned by the 6 percent cap rate because it seemed like cap rates had increased significantly. Vice Chair Ainsworth thought 6 percent might be the highest cap rate the County used. Chair McDonald recalled that higher rates had been used, and commented that cap rates had risen noticeably on all commercial real estate. He observed that the subject property was a special-use property because it was set up as a hospital, which he theorized would be more expensive to operate and thereby inform a higher cap rate than the rate generally used.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 150-012-08, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Olsen, seconded by Vice Chair Ainsworth, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet their burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the property in the current assessment year.

**25-095E PARCEL NO. 200-610-04 – 6155 STONE VALLEY DRIVE
HOLDINGS LLC – HEARING NO. 25-0051**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2025-26 taxable valuation on property located at 6155 Stone Valley Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

Exhibit A: Appeal and deed upon sale, 8 pages.

Exhibit B: Appraisal Report from Newmark Valuation & Advisory including maps and comparables, 202 pages.

Assessor

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

Exhibit II: Taxable Value Change Stipulation, 1 page.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Assessor's Office.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 200-610-04 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Olsen, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed, that the taxable land value be upheld, and that the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$4,930,940, resulting in a total taxable value of \$6,100,000 for tax year 2025-26. 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.

25-096E ROLL NO. 2212576 – GRIFFITH, TYLER – HEARING NO. 25-0015P24

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2024-25 taxable valuation on personal property located at 1901 Silverada Blvd, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

Petitioner

None.

Assessor

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet (HEP) including appeal summary, photos, and email correspondence, 11 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Victor Garcia, Personal Property Auditor-Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property.

Appraiser Garcia read from the Remarks section located on page 1 of his HEP.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Account No. 2212576, which petition was brought pursuant to NRS 361.357, based on the evidence presented, on motion by Vice Chair Ainsworth, seconded by Member Olsen, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Assessor's taxable values be upheld and it was found that the Petitioner failed to meet their burden to show that the full cash value of the property is less than the taxable value computed for the

property in the 2024-25 assessment year.

25-097E BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board member comments.

25-098E PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no response to the call for public comment.

* * * * * * * * * *

10:10 a.m. There being no further hearings or business to come before the Board, with no objection the meeting was adjourned.

DAREN MCDONALD, Chair
Washoe County Board of Equalization

ATTEST:

JANIS GALASSINI, County Clerk
and Clerk of the Washoe County
Board of Equalization

*Minutes prepared by
Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk*