

**BOARD OF EQUALIZATION  
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA**

MONDAY

9:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 23, 2026

PRESENT:

**Daren McDonald, Chair**  
**Eugenia Bonnenfant, Vice Chair**  
**Robert Lissner, Member**  
**Corinthia Yancey, Alternate Member**

**Janis Galassini, County Clerk**  
**Herb Kaplan, Deputy District Attorney**

ABSENT:

**Savita Shukla, Member**  
**Erin Albright, Member**

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

**26-050E      PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**26-051E      SWEARING IN**

County Clerk Jan Galassini indicated that there was no appraisal staff to be sworn in.

**26-052E      WITHDRAWN PETITIONS**

The following petitions scheduled on the agenda were withdrawn by the Petitioners prior to the hearing:

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>	<b>Hearing No.</b>
007-215-31	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041A
007-261-12	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041B
007-261-21	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041C
007-261-23	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041D
007-261-28	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041E
007-261-29	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041F
007-262-19	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041G

007-262-26	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041H
007-291-25	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041I
007-292-13	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041J
007-292-14	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041K
007-292-26	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041L
007-292-29	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041M
007-292-32	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041N
007-292-33	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041O
007-292-34	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041P
007-292-35	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041Q
007-292-36	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041R
007-293-19	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041S
007-294-36	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041T
007-294-38	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041U
007-523-01	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041V
007-551-01	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041W
011-370-71	CAESARS ENTERTAINMENT INC	26-0041X

County Clerk Jan Galassini distributed documents to the Board for the withdrawal of Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 007-215-31 through 011-370-71, hearing numbers 26-0041A through 26-0041X. She noted that the documents would represent Assessor's Exhibit II.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, seconded by Member Lissner, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the hearing be withdrawn.

**26-053E      PARCEL NO. 163-062-15 – DANIEL BYRON – HEARING NO. 26-0002**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 9845 Gateway Drive, 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 (AO).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 163-062-15 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Yancey, seconded by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld, and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$6,546,612, resulting in a total taxable value of \$8,600,000 for tax year 2026-27. 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.

**26-054E      PARCEL NO. 037-272-38 – RADIANT PROPERTIES SPARKS LLC**  
**– HEARING NO. 26-0003**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2121 East Prater Way, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Washoe County Assessor Property Data, 2 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 25 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 (AO).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 037-272-38 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Yancey, seconded by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld, and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$4,644,060, resulting in a total taxable value of \$5,624,160 for tax year 2026-27. 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.

**26-055E**      **PARCEL NO. 163-281-05 – FLOCCHINI-MAGNOLIA  
PROPERTIES LLC – HEARING NO. 26-0008**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 730 Sandhill Road, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A:      Property summaries, photos, and supporting documentation, 7 pages.

**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 (AO).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 163-281-05 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Yancey, seconded by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld, and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$5,665,232, resulting in a total taxable value of \$6,700,000 for tax year 2026-27. 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.

**26-056E**      **PARCEL NO. 032-341-02 – RAFF COHEN – HEARING NO. 26-0067**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1250 Victorian 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 (AO).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 032-341-02 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Yancey, seconded by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld, and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$7,700,000, resulting in a total taxable value of \$8,501,281 for tax year 2026-27. 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.

**26-057E      PARCEL NO. 032-011-08 – CEMEX INC – HEARING NO. 26-0071**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 350 Galletti Way, 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 (AO).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 032-011-08 based on the stipulation signed by the Assessor's Office and the Petitioner, on motion by Member Yancey, seconded by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the stipulation be adopted and confirmed and that the taxable land value be upheld, and the taxable improvement value be reduced to \$591,603, resulting in a total taxable value of \$2,457,330 for tax year 2026-27. 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.

**26-058E      PARCEL NO. 163-160-18 – FINDLAY AUTOMOTIVE GROUP – HEARING NO. 26-0012**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 9150 South Virginia Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Property summary, photos, maps, and supporting documents, 25 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 40 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Adam Smith, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He explained that his testimony pertained to hearing number 26-0012, regarding Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 163-160-13 and 163-160-14. He reported that the subject was the local Audi, Land Rover, and Jaguar dealerships, located on South Virginia Street, immediately south of the southbound on-ramp to Interstate 580 (I-580), which was detailed on Page 29 of Exhibit I. He explained that APNs 163-160-13 and 163-160-14 were in the process of being combined into one parcel, which would lead to a new land value being set in the 2026-27 reopen and the appealed subject parcels no longer existing. He stated that there was an active permit for remodel and addition, which would result in the parcel being assigned a new improvement value. He reported that the appellant would have an opportunity to appeal the results of the 2026-27 reopen during the following appeal season, which they had been notified of. He attributed those factors to the recommendation to uphold the current assessed valuation.

Member Lissner noted his belief that the value per square foot (sq ft) of the building on the property was listed as approximately \$180 in Exhibit I. He asked whether Mr. Smith was comfortable with that valuation. He noted that the value per sq ft of a different dealership property located near Plumb Lane, which the Board would deliberate on later in the meeting, was approximately \$70 per sq ft. He acknowledged that the buildings he had mentioned for those two properties had a 50-year age difference and reiterated his question by asking again whether Mr. Smith was comfortable with the \$180 per sq ft valuation for hearing number 26-0012. Mr. Smith confirmed that he was comfortable with that valuation, as the building on the subject parcel was significantly newer and had a higher ratio of automobile showroom to service garage than the other two dealership properties. He noted that the cost of the automobile showroom was much higher than that of service garages. He further attributed the higher value per sq ft to a higher quality class and the use of different construction materials.

Chair McDonald noted that Mr. Smith had identified in Exhibit I that the Assessor's Office (AO) had placed greater emphasis on the sales comparison approach compared to the income approach. He stated that the results of the income approach were reported as being slightly under the taxable value. He asked what information the AO had

received from the petitioner to justify the income approach. Mr. Smith responded that he had not received any data for the income approach from the petitioner.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant remarked that she had questions and matters to discuss regarding hearing number 26-0012, but opined that doing so felt unnecessary, given that there would be a change to the land value and improvement value during the 2026-27 reopen.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 163-160-18, 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 Vice Chair Bonnenfant, seconded by Member Lissner, 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 his/her 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.

**26-059E      PARCEL NO. 510-083-03 THROUGH 510-483-02 – CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC – HEARING NO. 26-0013A THROUGH 26-0013K**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 255 Disc Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

<b>Assessor's Parcel No.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>	<b>Hearing No.</b>
510-083-03	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013A
510-083-04	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013B
510-083-08	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013C
510-083-09	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013D
510-481-04	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013E
510-481-08	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013F
510-482-01	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013G
510-482-02	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013H
510-482-07	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013I

510-483-01	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013J
510-483-02	CIRE EQUITY/SPARKS GALLERIA REH LLC	26-0013K

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Photos, maps, and supporting documents, 32 pages.

Exhibit B: Emails, 4 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 108 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Harley Olson, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. She stated that the hearing numbers for which she was offering testimony were 26-0013A through 26-0013K, totaling 11 parcels as identified on Page 1 of Exhibit I. She noted that the subject property was the Sparks Galleria shopping center, located at 125 Disc Drive, on the corner of Disc Drive and Pyramid Way in the Spanish Springs area. She noted that the 11 parcels collectively comprised 29.67 acres and approximately 215,000 square feet (sq ft) in total leasable area. She reported that parcel maps were provided on Pages 81 and 82 of Exhibit I. She asked if there were any questions from the Board regarding the location of the subject property. Chair McDonald determined that there were no questions and invited Ms. Olson to proceed.

Ms. Olson reported that she had outlined the parcels included in the appeal on Page 1 of Exhibit I to provide the Board with information on the parcels that comprised the shopping center. She stated that the shopping center was located immediately following the exit from Pyramid Drive onto Disc Drive, near the Sprouts Farmers Market, Marshalls and Homegoods, Fitness Connection, and other small tenants. She noted that another tenant included in the appeal was located in the same parking lot shared with the Home Depot directly across the street. She explained that two vacant pad sites and a small inline retail area listed in the appeal were located behind the IHOP and Red Robin, adjacent to the Home Depot parking lot across Galleria Parkway. She explained that the properties had been appealed multiple times since 2021 by the same petitioner. She reported that in prior years, the petition had either been withdrawn or the value from the Assessor's Office (AO) had been upheld by the Board of Equalization (BOE).

Ms. Olson explained that, prior to discussing her sales comparisons approach, she intended to disclose that the AO had an adjustment on the subject property in place since 2023, in which the AO reviewed the property annually for obsolescence. She reported that each year prior to that review, the AO requested income and expense data, as

well as rent rolls from the property owner, which she noted had not been received since 2023. She explained that the dated rent roll from 2023 and current market data were used to determine the need for obsolescence for the current year's review, resulting in nearly \$7.5 million in value. She noted that the current year's adjustment resulted in an overall value of approximately \$35 million, or \$162 per sq ft, as shown on Page 1 of Exhibit I.

Ms. Olson referred to the sales comparison approach provided on Page 2 of Exhibit I. She noted that photographs and location maps of the subject and comparable sales properties were provided on Pages 83 through 91 of Exhibit I. She expressed her intent to begin her discussion of sales comparisons with the most recent sale of the subject property, which she reported as having occurred on October 9, 2019. She acknowledged that the number for the sales price listed within the top table titled *Subject* on Page 2 of Exhibit I would differ with the number she would proceed to report to the Board, as two different transactions had occurred on the same day by the property owner, noting that one included a majority of the parcel numbers associated with the shopping center, while the other was associated with the sale of most of the pad sites and several other parcels not listed in the current appeal. She elaborated that the two transactions on October 9, 2019, totaled \$40.65 million, or \$193 per sq ft.

Ms. Olson referred to the comparable sales examples for improved sales provided in Exhibit I, noting that all were neighborhood or regional shopping centers with similar occupancies, square footage, and age. She stated that the sales prices for those comparables ranged from \$207 to \$217 per sq ft. She noted that the most comparable sale was Improved Sale (IS) 1, shown on Page 85 of Exhibit I, which was the Sparks Crossing Shopping Center, located directly across from the subject property. She described the Sparks Crossing Shopping Center as being nearly intermingled with the subject property. She stated that the Sparks Crossing Shopping Center included tenants like Trader Joe's, Ross Dress for Less, Boot Barn, and the new Land Ocean Restaurant. She noted that the most significance was given to IS 1 as a comparable sale due to its location in the same shopping area as the subject parcel, its comparable tenant mix, and its similar land size and leasable area. She noted that the sale of the Sparks Crossing Shopping Center had occurred just three months prior, on December 23, 2025, for a sales price of \$70.1 million, or \$214 per sq ft. She emphasized that IS 1 was the best sale to compare to the subject and strongly supported the subject's total taxable value of \$162 per sq ft, or \$35 million in total. She concluded her discussion on improved sales and invited questions on the topic, and the Board indicated there were none.

Ms. Olson noted that she would briefly review details regarding land sales. She reported that she had included details regarding three vacant commercial land sales on the bottom of Page 2 of Exhibit I. She noted that each of those sales was located off Pyramid Way in the Spanish Springs area, with sale prices ranging from \$8.85 to \$17.50 per sq ft. She stated that the most closely comparable sale to the subject property was Land Sale (LS) 2, which totaled 47 acres of commercial property and included plans to build the newest shopping center in Spanish Springs. She reported that LS 2 sold for \$12.60 per sq ft on March 21, 2025, supporting the subject property's current land value of \$10.60 per sq ft.

Ms. Olson referred to the income approach detailed on Page 4 of Exhibit I, noting that, as she had previously stated, the rent rolls and income and expense data had been requested by the AO but were not provided by the property owner. She reiterated that the most recent instance of rent rolls being received was in 2023, so market-supported rents, vacancy expenses, and capitalization rates were accordingly used for the figures provided on Pages 5 through 8 of Exhibit I. She stated that the indicated value from the income approach was approximately \$38 million, or \$178 per sq ft, which supported the current taxable value of \$35 million, or \$162 per sq ft. She concluded that both the sales comparison approach and the income approach supported the current taxable value of \$34,839,765, or \$162 per sq ft, and that the assessed value did not exceed full cash value, thereby supporting the recommendation that the BOE uphold the current taxable value of the property.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant asked Ms. Olson whether she had engaged in any conversations with the petitioner regarding the basis of the petition. She acknowledged that the Board had received exhibits from the petitioner but expressed interest in hearing what Ms. Olson might know beyond the submitted documentation. Ms. Olson noted that she had received a few emails from the petitioner, including a list of parcels with the values they desired for each parcel. She noted that the desired values represented a decrease of approximately 40 percent from the current total taxable value for the parcels in question. She recalled having sent the petitioner a copy of Exhibit I in response, but had not yet received any additional feedback from the petitioner.

Chair McDonald noted that in the pro forma income analysis provided in Exhibit A, the petitioner indicated a rental income that was approximately \$1 million lower than listed in Exhibit I. He asked whether the petitioner had provided Ms. Olson with a reason for that difference or if that figure had been taken from the 2023 rent rolls. Ms. Olson affirmed that the petitioner provided comparable sales and rent rates in Exhibit A, though she believed the figures seemed to represent a marketwide comprehensive rental income. She noted that she had broken down the different occupancies associated with that rate in her income analysis. She explained that the \$0.88 per sq ft monthly rent rate listed in Exhibit A was likely for a much larger discount center, whereas she had calculated the rent rate provided in Exhibit I to account for both the larger square footage tenants at a lower rate, as well as the higher rates for smaller tenants. Chair McDonald asked Ms. Olson whether the \$0.88 monthly rent per sq ft rate she had used was from the 2023 rent rolls or from historical data, and she clarified that, while she had included that rate in her rental analysis, she had also included newer rents. She noted that the \$0.88 monthly rent per sq ft rate would fall below the current rate.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant recalled that there had been previous discussion of the income and comparable sales approaches in Exhibit I. She referred to the inclusion of properties located on Oddie Boulevard and Kings Row as sales comparables in Exhibit A, and opined that, from an economic demographic standpoint, those properties were not comparable in terms of their reach to the surrounding population, and therefore, they could not be considered comparable in that regard. She also mentioned that those properties were

twenty or more years older than the subject property. Chair McDonald agreed, noting that the comparables did not have the same draws as the subject property.

Chair McDonald asked whether the Board had any additional comments regarding the petitioner’s materials. He noted that it seemed as though the Board could mostly rely on the AO’s value. He stated that the proposed capitalization rates were relatively minimal, noting that he did not suspect any meaningful contention in that regard.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel Nos. 510-083-03 through 510-483-02, 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 Yancey, seconded by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, 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 his/her burden to show that the full cash value of the properties are less than the taxable value computed for the properties in the current assessment year.

**26-060E      PARCEL NO. 015-301-36 – LITHIA MOTORS/LITHIA REAL ESTATE – HEARING NO. 26-0019A**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2270 Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Property summaries, photos, maps, and supporting documents, 26 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 29 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

\* \* \* \* \*

Hearing Numbers 26-0019A and 26-0019B (Minute Number 26-061E) were heard together. The following discussion appears under both items.

\* \* \* \* \*

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Adam Smith, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He stated that his testimony was in regard to hearing numbers 26-0019A and 26-0019B, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 015-301-36 and 015-301-38. He noted that the subject property for hearing number 26-0019A was the Lithia Reno Subaru car dealership located at 2270 Kietzke Lane, between Plumb Lane and East Moana Lane. He explained that the property consisted of an automobile showroom and service garage, totaling 52,105 square feet (sq ft), built in 1991 and 2002, as outlined in Pages 20 and 21 of Exhibit I. He asked the Board if they had any questions about the location of the subject property, and Chair McDonald confirmed they did not.

Mr. Smith explained that the subject property spanned two parcels totaling 5.41 acres, consisting of 9,776 sq ft of an automobile showroom and 42,329 sq ft of a service-repair garage. He stated that the property was considered to be in a good location, with high traffic on Kietzke Lane, large surrounding retail centers, the Reno-Tahoe International Airport nearby, and other national dealerships in close proximity. He reported that the improved sales comparables provided in Exhibit I were all major automobile dealerships in the subject's immediate market area, ranging from \$282 to \$393 per sq ft, which he described as being well above the subject's \$182 price per sq ft. He noted that the land sales comparables ranged from \$22 to \$50 per sq ft, while the subject's land value was \$18.69 per sq ft.

Mr. Smith reported that he had attempted to contact the petitioner several times but was unable to obtain any of their financial data, so market data was used to determine the subject property's value using the income approach. He explained that using the income approach indicated a value of \$237 per sq ft. He referred to the data provided by the appellant in Exhibit A, noting that their cost approach did not include any of the subject property's extra features, involved overstated depreciation, and the listed characteristics did not add up. He indicated that the sales data provided by the petitioner was factually inaccurate and irrelevant to the subject property, describing an example presented in Exhibit A, with Land Sale (LS) 1 and LS 2 composing parts of an improved multi-parcel sale that had sold for \$5.3 million rather than the \$459,415 reported in Exhibit A. He said that the subject property's total taxable value did not exceed the full cash value, given the results of the Assessor's Office (AO) use of the income approach and the sales comparison approach. He noted that the AO's request was for the Board to uphold the total taxable value.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant acknowledged that there were new members of the Board of Equalization (BOE) and explained that when the Board received cost analyses from applicants, the BOE would receive the applicants' cost depreciation estimates, which typically did not match the determinations made by the AO. She asked whether Mr. Smith could explain how the AO arrived at the depreciation values they had determined and how those values differed from those obtained by other market approaches. Mr. Smith responded that the petitioner used an age-life method, while the AO was statutorily required to use a 1.5 percent per year depreciation rate.

Member Lissner opined that the petitioner's land comparable examples for APN 015-301-14 were inferior to the subject property, noting that the subject property for hearing number 26-0019A was located on Kietzke Lane, while other comparables were located elsewhere. He referred to Exhibit I for APN 105-301-38, which listed a \$75 per sq ft value for a metal building on the property, and he asked Mr. Smith to defend that valuation. Mr. Smith requested clarification on whether Member Lissner was referring to the service repair garage, which Member Lissner confirmed, noting that his question was prompted by that building's metal composition. He asked whether the metal construction material made the building less valuable than one made with masonry, for example. Mr. Smith noted that the two materials would be associated with different costings, but disclosed that he did not know the exact price per sq ft difference between them. Member Lissner asked if Mr. Smith was comfortable with the \$75 per sq ft valuation, which Mr. Smith confirmed. Chair McDonald asked Mr. Smith for confirmation on whether the primary reason he had mentioned the costing for a building made of metal rather than one constructed with masonry or concrete was associated with the Marshall & Swift cost approach model for a building's construction, rather than the market value. Mr. Smith confirmed that Chair McDonald was correct.

Chair McDonald inquired whether the Board had any discussion or questions regarding the AO's or petitioners' materials, and it was determined that they did not. Vice Chair Bonnenfant expressed agreement with the AO's cost approach to the depreciation estimate for the subject property, as she had mentioned previously. She noted her agreement with Member Lissner's earlier comments, opining that the comparables provided in Exhibit A were inferior to the subject property, as some examples had entirely different zoning classifications than the subject property. She stated that she was comfortable with the data provided by the AO.

Member Lissner moved, with regard to Parcel Nos. 015-301-38 and 015-303-14, to uphold the Assessor's appraisal of the subject properties, finding that the Petitioner failed to meet their burden to show that the full cash value of the properties are less than the taxable value computed for the properties in the current assessment year, and finding that the land and improvements were valued correctly and that the total taxable value did not exceed full cash value.

Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Herbert Kaplan stated that the third parcel, APN 015-303-14, had not yet been called. He explained that only the hearings of APN 015-301-36 and 015-301-38 were being deliberated at that time. Chair McDonald inquired if Member Lissner would accept an amendment to his earlier motion to instead include Parcel Nos. 015-301-36 and 015-301-38. Member Lissner expressed agreement with the suggested amendment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 015-301-36, 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 Lissner, seconded by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, 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 his/her 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.

**PARCEL NO. 015-301-38 – LITHIA MOTORS/LITHIA REAL ESTATE – HEARING NO. 26-0019B**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 657 East Grove Street, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Property summaries, photos, maps, and supporting documents, 26 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 29 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

\* \* \* \* \*

Hearing Numbers 26-0019A and 26-0019B (Minute Number 26-061E) were heard together. The following discussion appears under both items.

\* \* \* \* \*

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Adam Smith, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He stated that his testimony was in regard to hearing numbers 26-0019A and 26-0019B, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 015-301-36 and 015-301-38. He noted that the subject property for hearing number 26-0019A was the Lithia Reno Subaru car dealership located at 2270 Kietzke Lane, between Plumb Lane and East Moana Lane. He explained that the property consisted of an automobile showroom and service garage, totaling 52,105 square feet (sq ft), built in 1991 and 2002, as outlined in Pages 20 and 21 of Exhibit I. He asked the Board if they had any questions about the location of the subject property, and Chair McDonald confirmed they did not.

Mr. Smith explained that the subject property spanned two parcels totaling 5.41 acres, consisting of 9,776 sq ft of an automobile showroom and 42,329 sq ft of a

service-repair garage. He stated that the property was considered to be in a good location, with high traffic on Kietzke Lane, large surrounding retail centers, the Reno-Tahoe International Airport nearby, and other national dealerships in close proximity. He reported that the improved sales comparables provided in Exhibit I were all major automobile dealerships in the subject's immediate market area, ranging from \$282 to \$393 per sq ft, which he described as being well above the subject's \$182 price per sq ft. He noted that the land sales comparables ranged from \$22 to \$50 per sq ft, while the subject's land value was \$18.69 per sq ft.

Mr. Smith reported that he had attempted to contact the petitioner several times but was unable to obtain any of their financial data, so market data was used to determine the subject property's value using the income approach. He explained that using the income approach indicated a value of \$237 per sq ft. He referred to the data provided by the appellant in Exhibit A, noting that their cost approach did not include any of the subject property's extra features, involved overstated depreciation, and the listed characteristics did not add up. He indicated that the sales data provided by the petitioner was factually inaccurate and irrelevant to the subject property, describing an example presented in Exhibit A, with Land Sale (LS) 1 and LS 2 composing parts of an improved multi-parcel sale that had sold for \$5.3 million rather than the \$459,415 reported in Exhibit A. He said that the subject property's total taxable value did not exceed the full cash value, given the results of the Assessor's Office (AO) use of the income approach and the sales comparison approach. He noted that the AO's request was for the Board to uphold the total taxable value.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant acknowledged that there were new members of the Board of Equalization (BOE) and explained that when the Board received cost analyses from applicants, the BOE would receive the applicants' cost depreciation estimates, which typically did not match the determinations made by the AO. She asked whether Mr. Smith could explain how the AO arrived at the depreciation values they had determined and how those values differed from those obtained by other market approaches. Mr. Smith responded that the petitioner used an age-life method, while the AO was statutorily required to use a 1.5 percent per year depreciation rate.

Member Lissner opined that the petitioner's land comparable examples for APN 015-301-14 were inferior to the subject property, noting that the subject property for hearing number 26-0019A was located on Kietzke Lane, while other comparables were located elsewhere. He referred to Exhibit I for APN 105-301-38, which listed a \$75 per sq ft value for a metal building on the property, and he asked Mr. Smith to defend that valuation. Mr. Smith requested clarification on whether Member Lissner was referring to the service repair garage, which Member Lissner confirmed, noting that his question was prompted by that building's metal composition. He asked whether the metal construction material made the building less valuable than one made with masonry, for example. Mr. Smith noted that the two materials would be associated with different costings, but disclosed that he did not know the exact price per sq ft difference between them. Member Lissner asked if Mr. Smith was comfortable with the \$75 per sq ft valuation, which Mr. Smith confirmed.

Chair McDonald asked Mr. Smith for confirmation on whether the primary reason he had mentioned the costing for a building made of metal rather than one constructed with masonry or concrete was associated with the Marshall & Swift cost approach model for a building's construction, rather than the market value. Mr. Smith confirmed that Chair McDonald was correct.

Chair McDonald inquired whether the Board had any discussion or questions regarding the AO's or petitioners' materials, and it was determined that they did not. Vice Chair Bonnenfant expressed agreement with the AO's cost approach to the depreciation estimate for the subject property, as she had mentioned previously. She noted her agreement with Member Lissner's earlier comments, opining that the comparables provided in Exhibit A were inferior to the subject property, as some examples had entirely different zoning classifications than the subject property. She stated that she was comfortable with the data provided by the AO.

Member Lissner moved, with regard to Parcel Nos. 015-301-38 and 015-303-14, to uphold the Assessor's appraisal of the subject properties, finding that the Petitioner failed to meet their burden to show that the full cash value of the properties are less than the taxable value computed for the properties in the current assessment year, and finding that the land and improvements were valued correctly and that the total taxable value did not exceed full cash value.

Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Herbert Kaplan stated that the third parcel, APN 015-303-14, had not yet been called. He explained that only the hearings of APN 015-301-36 and 015-301-38 were being deliberated at that time. Chair McDonald inquired if Member Lissner would accept an amendment to his earlier motion to instead include Parcel Nos. 015-301-36 and 015-301-38. Member Lissner expressed agreement with the suggested amendment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 015-301-38, 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 Lissner, seconded by Vice Chair Bonnenfant, 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 his/her 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.

**26-061E      PARCEL NO. 015-303-14 – LITHIA MOTORS/LITHIA REAL ESTATE – HEARING NO. 26-0020**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 2620 Kietzke Lane, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Property summary, photos, maps, and supporting documents, 25 pages.

**Assessor**

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

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Adam Smith, Appraiser, offered testimony. Chair McDonald indicated that Mr. Smith would not be required to orient the Board to the location of the subject property and invited him to proceed with presenting his evidence. Mr. Smith stated that the subject property for hearing number 26-0020, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 015-303-14, was the Lithia Hyundai of Reno car dealership, located at 2620 Kietzke Lane between Plumb Lane and East Moana Lane. He explained that the subject parcel was 3.76 acres and housed two buildings, including an automobile showroom and service garage built in 1971 and 1973, totaling 26,908 square feet (sq ft), as outlined on Pages 16 and 17 of Exhibit I. He asked the Board if they had any questions about the location of the subject property, and Chair McDonald confirmed they did not.

Mr. Smith stated that the subject property consisted of 7,654 sq ft of automobile showroom and 19,254 sq ft of service-repair garage. He stated that the property was considered to be in a good location, surrounded by other national dealerships. He reported that the improved sales comparables provided in Exhibit I were all automobile dealerships similar to the subject, ranging from \$282 to \$393 per sq ft, which he described as being well above the subject's \$163 price per sq ft. He noted that the land sales comparables ranged from \$22 to \$50 per sq ft, while the subject's land value was \$19.80 per sq ft.

Mr. Smith reported that he had attempted to contact the petitioner several times but was unable to obtain any of their financial data, so market data was used to determine the subject property's value using the income approach. He explained that using the income approach indicated a value of \$237 per sq ft. He referred to the data provided by the petitioner in Exhibit A, noting that their figures did not utilize the statutory depreciation rate, did not include any of the subject property's extra features, and provided only a basic analysis. He indicated that the land sales comparables provided by the petitioner were irrelevant to the subject property, citing Exhibit A, where Land Sale (LS) 5 actually represented an improved 7-Eleven gas station that had sold for \$4.7 million rather than the \$619,000 reported in Exhibit A. He said that the subject property's total taxable value did not exceed the full cash value, as indicated by the results of the Assessor's Office (AO) use of the income approach and the sales comparison approach. He noted that the AO's request was for the Board to uphold the total taxable value.

Chair McDonald inquired whether the Board had any questions to ask Mr. Smith, and it was determined that they did not. Chair McDonald indicated he had a question and asked Mr. Smith whether he had any evidence of obsolescence that should be included for consideration, as the subject property included a relatively old structure. Mr. Smith noted that he did not have such evidence based on the results of the income approach. Chair McDonald asked the Board whether they had any comments to mention regarding the AO's or petitioners' materials. Member Lissner stated that the land sale comparables listed in Exhibit A were inferior to the subject property. Vice Chair Bonnenfant agreed and reiterated the comments she had made during the discussion of hearing numbers 26-0019A and 26-0019B, opining that the cost approach used by the petitioner was also inaccurate.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 015-303-14, 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 Vice Chair Bonnenfant, seconded by Member Yancey, 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 his/her 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.

**26-062E      PARCEL NO. 032-312-41 – EMPIRE SOUTHWEST – HEARING NO. 26-0021**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 620 Glendale Avenue, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Property summary, photos, maps, and supporting documents, 39 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 61 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Jeff Cronin, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He explained that hearing number 26-0021 concerned Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 032-312-41, which was the location of the Empire Cat industrial complex at 620 Glendale Avenue in the Sparks industrial area. He noted that the property consisted of seven industrial buildings totaling 157,345 square feet (sq ft) of gross building area, with uses including service,

repair, storage, light manufacturing, engineering, and shop space. He reported that a map showing the property's location could be found on Page 37 of Exhibit I.

Mr. Cronin stated that the subject property was appealed annually. He acknowledged that there were new members on the Board of Equalization (BOE) and expressed his intent to ensure that the Assessor's Office (AO) provided them with a good description of the property. He explained that the subject was a purpose-built, owner-occupied facility for Empire Cat, a business specializing in the sale, leasing, service, repair, and parts distribution of heavy equipment. He wanted the Board to better understand the property's utility, noting that the subject represented one of the few places that could both supply an individual with equipment and also have the specialized service bays, parts, inventory, and yard infrastructure necessary to maintain it. He explained that the subject was not a generic warehouse or a speculative investment property, but rather a functional industrial campus specifically designed for Empire Cat's heavy equipment operations. He stated that properties like the subject typically did not trade often due to their specialized owner-user nature, which he attributed to the scarcity of comparable sales. He noted that those comparable sales were similarly typically owner-occupied, so there would be limited income data available for review. He explained that in such a case, appraisal theory indicated that the best approach for properties of that type would be the cost approach. He noted that the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) required the AO to use a modified cost approach for all properties in Nevada. He reported that, using the modified cost approach for the subject, the total taxable value was \$13,166,502, or \$84 per sq ft. He explained that details regarding valuation could be found on the record card on Pages 9 through 35 of Exhibit I.

Mr. Cronin addressed the use of the sales comparison approach, as outlined on Pages 2 through 4 of Exhibit I, by including several comparables. He referred to his earlier comments and reiterated that the comparables did not represent an exact match to the subject property, though he stated that the provided sales examples reasonably supported the subject's location, similar occupancies, and comparable gross area. He explained that Improved Sale (IS) 2, IS 3, and IS 4 in Exhibit I were the most relevant properties on a price per sq ft basis, indicating a value range from \$140 to \$153 per sq ft, which was significantly higher than the subject's \$84 per sq ft. He reported that a property sold the previous year, whose use was highly comparable to that of the subject, which was detailed on Pages 43 and 44 of Exhibit I as IS 1. He explained that IS 1 was located in the Sparks industrial area, in a location he acknowledged was inferior to that of the subject property, as IS 1 was not on a main arterial road. He noted that the improvements for IS 1 consisted largely of 45,000 sq ft of service-repair garage space, which was approximately one-third the subject's size, with the lot itself about three times smaller than the subject property. He explained that IS 1 was purchased by McCandless Truck Center for leasing, sales, parts, and maintenance of large commercial vehicles, such as semi-trucks. He noted that the use of IS 1 was similar to that of the subject. He reported that, despite being smaller and considered inferior, IS 1 sold for \$15.8 million in December of 2025, which supported the subject's total taxable value of \$13.2 million on an overall value basis.

Mr. Cronin stated that the AO tested the subject's value using the income approach, as detailed on Pages 5 through 8. He reiterated his earlier comments that the subject was an owner-occupied special-use facility and noted that properties of that type were rarely leased in the open market, which limited the AO's income data. He explained that despite that challenge, the AO developed an income analysis using relevant market data, which resulted in an indicated value of approximately \$23.2 million, or \$147 per sq ft. He noted that such a valuation was substantially higher than the subject's taxable value of \$84 per sq ft, and supported that the total taxable value did not exceed market value. He stated that the AO tested its valuation result using the sales comparison and income approaches, ultimately finding that the subject's total taxable value was well supported and did not exceed market value. He explained that the AO therefore recommended that the Board uphold the taxable value. Chair McDonald asked if the Board had any questions for Mr. Cronin.

Member Lissner noted that his materials indicated that the subject land value was approximately \$84 per sq ft and acknowledged that he had listened to Mr. Cronin's presentation. He stated that his impression was that such a value seemed low. He explained that based on his personal calculations, he added a total of 160,000 sq ft of building space, which came to approximately \$40 per sq ft. He asked Mr. Cronin if those numbers were approximately correct.

Mr. Cronin reminded Member Lissner that, when reviewing the land sale comparables he had found for the property, one needed to consider that there were no large-acreage land sales on Glendale Avenue that could be found anymore. He emphasized that such examples did not exist for comparison. He explained that the AO had to research a broader area to identify recent industrial sales similar to the subject property. He noted that the land sales comparables provided in Exhibit I ranged from \$8.85 to \$10.55 per sq ft, whereas the subject's taxable land value was \$8.37 per sq ft, which he said was well within the range. He opined that if a vacant 16-acre parcel were to sell on Glendale Avenue currently, it would likely sell for significantly more than the value he had described. He asked Member Lissner for clarification on whether his question was regarding the overall square footage of the subject's building space, which Member Lissner confirmed.

Mr. Cronin explained that the AO's records indicated a total gross building area on the subject property of 157,345 sq ft. Member Lissner asked whether a value of approximately \$45 per sq ft would be multiplied by the total square footage to calculate the subject's total valuation. Mr. Cronin suspected that he might be misunderstanding Member Lissner's comments, and asked whether he was implying that he had personally calculated a different square footage than was listed in Exhibit I. Member Lissner recalled that Mr. Cronin had reported the total building area as approximately 157,000 sq ft, but after doing the calculations in his head he arrived at a total of 160,000 sq ft. He clarified that what had led to his miscalculation was that the AO's website indicated there were seven buildings on the subject property, with the first building being about 54,000 sq ft. He acknowledged that, after adding up the square footage of all the buildings, the total was approximately 157,000 sq ft, a figure Mr. Cronin confirmed. Member Lissner asked about the building's total valuation. Mr. Cronin stated that he had not broken down the figure for

the improved values per sq ft. He explained that the taxable value of the improvement was just slightly over \$7 million. Member Lissner asked for some time to review that information, noting that the \$7 million would mean the improvement values equaled approximately \$45 per sq ft. Mr. Cronin responded that the \$7 million figure included both the improvements and the land. Member Lissner noted that he was happy with the assessed valuation, opining that it could likely be much higher, which Mr. Cronin agreed with.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant acknowledged that the appellant had provided land sales comparables and asked whether Mr. Cronin could address those examples for the record to ensure all the details were addressed. Mr. Cronin noted that, as mentioned during prior hearings, many of the values reflected in the appellant's comparables were not accurately portrayed. He referred to the third sales comparable provided on Page 7 of Exhibit A, noting that it was reported as a sale of a 38,000 sq ft building. He explained that the incorrect parcel number was listed in that sales example, and that the sale details were actually for a 5,440 sq ft industrial condominium. He elaborated that the sale was for just one parcel within the building, which he described as very misleading. He clarified that the actual sales price for that comparable was \$2.67 per sq ft. He stated that those factors contributed to that example not representing a good comparable.

Mr. Cronin referred to the land sales comparables in Exhibit A, noting that some similar factors in those examples led to an incorrect portrayal of the listed values. He reported that two of the land sales comparables in Exhibit A were located in the North Valleys area, and while they might appear to have a lower price per square foot, those properties involved a large percentage of land that was not usable due to easements or included other challenges that were not presented in Exhibit A. He stated that he would be happy to answer any questions from the Board regarding any of the sales in Exhibit A. Vice Chair Bonnenfant indicated that his answer fully satisfied her inquiry.

Chair McDonald inquired whether the Board had any discussion or questions regarding the AO's or petitioners' materials, and it was determined that they did not. Vice Chair Bonnenfant expressed agreement with previous comments regarding the sales information provided to the Board. She further agreed with Member Lissner that the sales indicated that the property was undervalued, acknowledging that the Board was limited to considering the matter through the cost approach. Member Lissner echoed his previous remarks, adding that two of the comparables provided in Exhibit A were unfit examples. He referred to the first sales comparable on White Lake Parkway, as provided on Page 7 of Exhibit A, noting that the property was in Cold Springs rather than on Glendale Avenue, unlike the subject property. He explained that Glendale Avenue was a prime location for a building of that kind, while White Lake Parkway was not. He opined that the second sales comparable listed in Exhibit A, located on Coney Island Drive, was similarly a poor comparable due to its distance from Glendale Avenue and its location within the floodplain.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 032-312-41, 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 Yancey, seconded by Member Lissner, 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 his/her 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.

**26-063E      PARCEL NO. 140-213-51 – RC WILLEY – HEARING NO. 26-0022**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 1201 Steamboat Parkway, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A: Property summary, photos, maps, and supporting documentation, 27 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I: Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 41 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Kelson Powell, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He explained that hearing number 26-0022 concerned Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 140-213-51, which was located at 1201 Steamboat Parkway. He reported that the subject property was located in the Damonte Ranch Town Center and comprised a 183,268 square foot (sq ft) building with a mix of storage warehouse, warehouse showroom, and store occupancies. He noted that a map on Page 17 of Exhibit I was provided for the Board to identify the property. He asked the Board if they had any questions about the location of the subject property, and Chair McDonald confirmed they did not, inviting Mr. Powell to proceed with his evidence.

Mr. Powell reported that the petitioner was not present at the meeting. He directed the Board to Exhibit I, noting that he had prepared a full sales-comparison approach and an income approach. He explained that the land value was based on market value, with the subject property's taxable land value of \$6,209,914, or \$10.80 per sq ft, supported by the most recent land sales outlined on Page 2 of Exhibit I. He reported that the improvements' taxable value of \$16,512,086 reflected the replacement cost and lower depreciation of all the permanently affixed improvements to the property. He explained that an income approach was performed each year, which could be found on Page 3 of Exhibit I. He stated that the total value of the subject property was determined to be

\$22,722,000, or \$124 per sq ft. He noted that the sales approach, using improved sales, supported a valuation of \$130 per sq ft. He asserted that the taxable value determined by the Assessor's Office (AO) was supported and should be upheld.

Mr. Powell stated that the petitioner did not provide income information or improved sales for the sales comparison approach. He noted his intent to first discuss the land sales comparables provided on behalf of RC Willey. He explained that the land sales comparables in Exhibit A were significantly smaller than the subject property, with the largest being only slightly larger than half of the subject's size. He reported that Land Sale (LS) 1 on Page 15 of Exhibit A listed the incorrect APN, noting that it should instead be listed as APN 090-142-15. He stated that all of the land sales listed in Exhibit A were located in the North Valleys area, which was at least 18 miles away from the subject property. He explained that the land sales comparables he provided in Exhibit I were closer in size and location to the subject than the examples provided by the petitioner.

Mr. Powell asserted that the cost analysis submitted by the petitioner in Exhibit A was incomplete and incorrect, as it only accounted for the base storage warehouse and warehouse showroom store occupancies. He explained that the analysis excluded adjustments for quality, wall height, sprinklers, and additional features on the property, like asphalt paving, curb parking lot, lighting, and more. He stated that the depreciation applied in Exhibit A was similarly incorrect, as 1.5 percent depreciation was statutorily applied annually for up to 50 years. He concluded that the evidence submitted by the petitioner should not be given any weight. He stated that the \$13.6 million value, or the proposed \$74 per sq ft, did not accurately reflect the subject property's value. He reported that the property had been appealed each year over the previous five years. He noted that, given the available local data for both the income and sales comparison approaches, both methods supported the subject property's taxable value of \$22,722,000, or \$124 per sq ft. He explained that, because the 2026-27 taxable value did not exceed market value, it was recommended that the Board uphold the AO's value. Chair McDonald asked whether the Board had any questions for Mr. Powell, and the Board indicated that they had none.

Vice Chair Bonnenfant noted that, as seen in previous hearings, the petitioner's cost approach was incorrect. She acknowledged that the subject property was brought before the Board of Equalization (BOE) every year. She stated that, because the Board commented on the 1.5 percent depreciation for the subject property each year, it would have been preferable if the appellant had accepted and fixed that factor. She noted that using the 1.5 percent depreciation in valuations was not something the AO did for fun, but rather was statutorily necessary. She referred to Mr. Powell's comments regarding the land sale comparables in Exhibit A, agreeing that Steamboat Parkway and the North Valleys area were completely different. Chair McDonald agreed, opining that the North Valleys area was not Damonte Ranch.

Member Lissner echoed the opinion that the comparables provided by the petitioner were inferior to the subject property. He explained that the subject parcel was in a prime retail location with an excellent demographic. He stated his belief that the current

\$12 per sq ft land value was likely far below market value. He noted that, despite the subject property being in a far better location than Kietzke Lane, hearing numbers 26-0019A and 26-0019B with properties on that street were given a land valuation of nearly \$19 per sq ft as opposed to the subject property's \$12 per sq ft. He stated that he was fully supportive of the AO's suggested land values.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

With regard to Parcel No. 140-213-51, 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 Vice Chair Bonnenfant, seconded by Member Yancey, 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 his/her 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.

**26-064E      PARCEL NO. 150-012-08 – SEVITA – HEARING NO. 26-0023**

A Petition for Review of Assessed Valuation was received protesting the 2026-27 taxable valuation on land and improvements located at 3980 Lake Placid Drive, Washoe County, Nevada.

The following exhibits were submitted into evidence:

**Petitioner**

Exhibit A:      Photos, maps, and supporting documents, 19 pages.

**Assessor**

Exhibit I:      Assessor's Hearing Evidence Packet including comparable sales, maps, and subject's appraisal records, 37 pages.

No one offered testimony on behalf of the Petitioner.

On behalf of the Assessor and having been previously sworn, Steve Wood, Appraiser, oriented the Board as to the location of the subject of the property. He explained that hearing number 26-0023 concerned Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 150-012-08, and was associated with the total taxable value of the subject property established during the 2026-27 secured roll. He reported that the subject property was located at 3980 Lake Placid Drive in Reno, just north of the Mt. Rose Highway and Thomas Creek Road intersection. He explained that the subject property was a 26,650 square foot (sq ft) neurological rehabilitation hospital on just under three acres of land. He noted that maps and pictures of the subject property were located on Pages 11 through 13 of Exhibit I. He asked the Board if they had any questions about the location of the subject property, and Chair McDonald confirmed they did not, inviting Mr. Wood to proceed with his evidence.

Mr. Wood reported that he and two other appraisers conducted a site visit at the subject property the previous month, including interior and exterior inspections and a meeting with an on-site manager. He noted that the site visit was done to confirm the Assessor's Office's (AOs) record accuracy. He explained that the subject was purchased by the petitioner in 2019 for \$12.55 million, or \$625 per sq ft. He noted that the gross building area was 20,083 sq ft at the time of that purchase, but a 6,657 sq ft addition with 12 new beds was completed in 2022, which brought the bed count to the current total of 36. He reported that Exhibit I included a comprehensive analysis consisting of all three approaches to value. He noted that the cost approach was used to establish the total taxable value, while the sales comparison and income approaches were used to test that value. He stated that the analysis could be found on Pages 2 through 4 of Exhibit I.

Mr. Wood explained that additional comparable properties were selected for their physical similarities to the subject for the sales comparison approach, given the limited sales information available for specialized rehabilitation hospitals like the subject. He reported that the sales comparison approach in Exhibit I consisted of four improved sales and four land sales examples. He noted that the improved sales comparables ranged from \$282 to \$637 per sq ft. He explained that the most weight was given to Improved Sale (IS) 1 in Exhibit I, which had an indicated value of \$496 per sq ft. He reported that the comparable land sales ranged from \$22.13 to \$27.16 per sq ft. He noted that Land Sale (LS) 4 in Exhibit I had a value of \$22.13 per sq ft, which he described as being quite inferior to the subject and supported the AO's determined taxable land value of \$15 per sq ft for the subject.

Mr. Wood stated that the comparable properties listed in Exhibit I were considered similar to the subject overall, and more than supported the subject's current taxable value of \$306 per sq ft. He noted that the income approach indicated a value of \$508 per sq ft for the subject property, which also sufficiently supported the subject's total taxable value of \$306 per sq ft. He concluded that both the sales comparison approach at \$496 per sq ft and the income approach at \$508 per sq ft more than supported the subject's current taxable value of \$306 per sq ft, and based on that analysis in Exhibit I, the taxable value did not exceed the market value. He noted that it was recommended that the Board uphold the taxable value and asked if they had any questions.

Chair McDonald inquired whether the Board had any questions for Mr. Wood. Chair McDonald noted that he had a question and asked Mr. Wood about the rental approach the AO used. He acknowledged that Mr. Wood had performed a rental analysis by considering properties similar to the subject, but ultimately disregarded most of those comparisons on the basis that the subject property was newer. He asked Mr. Wood whether he could discuss that matter further. Mr. Wood explained that the rental rates for the medical office were calculated solely based on listing rentals, while the rental rates for the general office buildings were based on area market reports from companies such as CBRE and CoStar, which led the AO to arrive at a 15 percent vacancy rate for the subject, which he described as a conservative rate that fell between the median vacancy rates indicated in the reports.

Chair McDonald noted that the AO also conducted a capitalization rate study and asked whether Mr. Wood could discuss the motivation for the AO's decision to support a 6 percent capitalization rate, given that Exhibit I showed that some surveys indicated a substantially higher rate. Mr. Wood noted that Chair McDonald was correct, but he added that the best information the AO had received from the subject was the 2020 income statements provided by the petitioner, which indicated a capitalization rate of 5.77 percent. He explained that a 6 percent capitalization rate was deemed suitable after comparing that information with the study conducted by the AO.

Member Lissner stated that the subject property's sales history indicated it sold for \$12.5 million in 2022. He asked whether that sale was for the exact same property as the subject, or whether anything else was included. Mr. Wood explained that the subject property sold for \$12.55 million, even though it was 6,500 sq ft smaller and had 12 fewer beds at that time. He noted that the facility was now larger with 12 additional patient rooms and beds. He clarified that the subject property was not exactly the same as it was at the time of that historical sale, as although it had the same owners, the property had been expanded both in size and number of patient rooms. Member Lissner indicated that the sale did not appear to be a transaction that occurred at an entirely fair market value. He asked whether Mr. Wood believed the sales price for the subject was a good reflection of the market. Mr. Wood stated that, to the best of his knowledge, the property was purchased at the price he described previously. Member Lissner expressed uncertainty about why anyone would pay more than something was worth.

Chair McDonald inquired whether the Board had any discussion or questions regarding the AO's or petitioners' materials, and it was determined that they did not. Vice Chair Bonnenfant noted that she was happy with the evidence from the AO. Member Lissner opined that the location of the subject property was unique, as it was in an area that was very affluent, where there was very little commercial property of the same kind. He stated that the land value was likely priceless given the facility's location.

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 Yancey, seconded by Member Lissner, 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 his/her 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.

#### **25-065E      BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Chair McDonald thanked those in attendance and opined that the meeting could have been more exciting if the petitioners had been present. He thanked those who had attended the meeting for going through the process to build a strong appellate record in the event the petitioners decided to appeal to the State Board of Equalization (SBOE).

Vice Chair Bonnenfant expressed appreciation for the appellants having provided the evidence that they submitted, explaining that while the Board might not agree with the information contained within those submissions, it was helpful to know what the appellants were thinking and to understand the information they had given to the Board.

**25-066E      PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

**10:09 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  
Brooke Koerner, Deputy County Clerk*