

CARSON CITY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
Minutes of the February 22, 2011 Meeting
Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Board of Equalization was scheduled for 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, February 22, 2011, in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT:	Chairperson Heidi McFadden	STAFF:	Dave Dawley, Assessor
	Vice Chairperson Jed Block		Randall Munn, Chief Deputy District Attorney
	Member Ron Allen		Steve Walker, Chief Property Appraiser
	Member Jill Rasner		Kimberly Adams, Senior Property Appraiser
	Member Gary Schulz		Tim Clark, Property Appraiser
			Don Coon, Property Appraiser
			Tamar Warren, Recording Secretary

- A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM (9:00:06)** – Chairperson McFadden called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present
- B. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES (9:00:31)** – There were no minutes to approve.
- C. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA (9:00:39)** – None.
- D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (9:01:05)** – None.
- E. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PETITIONS FOR REVIEW OF ASSESSED VALUATION**

E-1. CARSON GAMING HOTELS, LLC, 3870 SOUTH CARSON STREET; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-153-18 (9:01:16) – Mr. Walker introduced the property and stated that late Thursday evening, the Assessor’s Office had received an e-mail from the appellant, incorporated into the record, withdrawing their petition subject to the Summary of Corrected Values from the Assessor’s Office, also attached to the e-mail. Mr. Walker asked the Board to compare it to page 2 of 42 in the Assessor’s Evidence for confirmation and suggested a motion for acceptance. In response to Member Schulz’s question, Mr. Walker confirmed that the corrections were for the last three years. **Vice Chairperson Block moved to approve the Assessor’s recommendations for Carson Gaming Hotels, LLC, APN 009-153-18, at 3870 South Carson Street, as based on the exhibit of the Assessor’s recommendation on page 2 of 42, the Summary of corrected Values for APN 009-153-18. The motion was seconded by Member Schulz. Motion carried 5-0.**

E-2. STEVEN T. AND AMY R. CLEMENS, 832 JENNA COURT; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-822-25 (9:04:03) – Mr. Clark introduced the property, gave background, and read the recommendation from the Assessor’s office indicating that the value remain as is, all of which are incorporated into the record. Chairperson McFadden asked whether the appellants were present and was told they were not. Mr. Clark also asked the Board to turn to page 2 of 12 in the Assessor’s Evidence, and elaborated on the comparatives. **Member Allen moved to accept the values as presented by the Carson City Assessor’s Office on APN 009-822-25, 832 Jenna Court, Carson City, Nevada, Steven T. and Amy R. Clemens, owners, for the reason’s stated in the Assessor’s Office presentations – the calculations on the appellant’s part were incorrectly done and did not show a comparable method for determining the value.** Chairperson McFadden called for question and when none were forthcoming, a second. **The motion was seconded by Vice Chairperson Block. Motion carried 5-0.**

E-3. MODOCO, LLC, 3079 - 3109 AIRPORT ROAD; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APNs 008-191-32; 008-191-33; 008-191-34; 008-191-35 (9:11:17) – Mr. Coon introduced the properties and Mr. Dawley invited the

CARSON CITY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
Minutes of the February 22, 2011 Meeting
Page 2

appellant to speak. Henry Butler, Esq., representing Modoco, LLC, presented the Appellant Evidence, incorporated into the record. He cited the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS), stating that the Assessor's Office must consider the income method in valuing properties, by doing "a comprehensive income study of what the values of these rental properties are as a method of determining the value". Mr. Butler added that he had discussed this issue at length with the Assessor's staff, and that they were "agreeable to doing that, and tabling taking it off calendar, if we could do a comprehensive study of what the income of these properties is, or should be". He indicated that the Assessor had "decided that he did not want to do that". He also stated that the first notification he had received for additional information was "Friday before last". Mr. Butler called the previous week "disruptive because of the bad weather and the snow", and that he had attempted to contact the Assessor's Office last Friday but was unable to reach "the people I had to deal with". Mr. Butler then stated that he had "some income information for you this morning", explaining that the only income information he had was not a comprehensive study, but the actual income relating to the properties. Mr. Butler also reminded the Board that Collegetown Holding, LLC, a group of four-plexes representing 15 parcels (agenda item E5), and Modoco, LLC operated as a consolidated group, and that all these properties were managed together as one property. He presented a copy of the income data to the Board and stated they were from the years 2008, 2009 and 2010, and stated that the information had not yet been considered by the Assessor's Office in valuing the properties in question. Chairperson McFadden requested and received clarification that the properties mentioned included those in agenda items E4 and E5, as they were all operated as a "common unit" even though they had different APN numbers, per Mr. Butler. He stated that over the last three years, the income from the properties had been "on a constant slide". He explained his operating income calculation methodology to the Board and clarified that one of the properties was a duplex, due to the small lot size. Mr. Butler stated that he had looked at comparable sales of apartment complexes that had 90 units, and discovered that one complex on Hot Springs Road, built in 1995 or later, had sold at "a 9.5 % cap rate". He added that he had seen cap rates of properties, both in MLS and the Recorder's records, ranging from 7.5 -9.5%. He then summarized that he had provided the income data for the Assessor to review, and believed that the assessments of the Collegetown property should be reduced to the vicinity of \$220,000 per four-plex and \$115,000 - \$120,000 for the duplex unit. Mr. Butler also indicated that there was a minor mistake in the valuation of one of the parcels.

(9:22:28) – Chairperson McFadden advised the Board that they would hear from the Assessor's Office then ask questions. Mr. Coon re-introduced the properties as part of the Assessor's Evidence, incorporated into the record. He also stated that Mr. Butler had valued the property at \$900,000 for which the Assessor's Office had requested supporting documentation on January 24, 2011, but none had been received to date. He also believed that all the units should not be valued as a group of apartments, as each unit was located on a separate parcel, otherwise a lot line deletion application should be completed through the City. Mr. Coon continued to read the Assessor's office justification and recommendation, incorporated into the record, of keeping the value as is. He also referred to a letter, included in the Assessor's Evidence, dated January 24, 2011, which was sent to Mr. Butler via certified mail, requesting the income information up front, which had just been provided. Mr. Dawley disclosed that Mr. Butler had spoken to staff members in the Assessor's Office that morning and that they had agreed to do a market study for the rent, however, the values could not be changed for the upcoming assessment for all the properties, unless the Board decided to do so. Mr. Butler advised the Board, if they have the authority, to reduce the property tax subject to the property values based on the income approach, to help his company which was losing money. Member Allen asked for clarification and Mr. Butler explained that he was concerned with the present and wished to have the reduction now. He also praised the Assessor's Office for "coming close" based on the sales approach, however, he stated that there had been so few sales of multi-family projects. Member Allen questioned why the income information had not been given to the Assessor's Office sooner, so that the Board could look at it prior to the meeting. He also objected to the fact that Mr. Butler had provided a single copy since there were five Board members present, as this could be done by e-mail, despite weather conditions. Mr. Butler explained that "lack of staffing in my office" had led to notifications falling through the cracks. Chairperson McFadden received confirmation from Mr. Dawley that he had no issues working with the income statements provided, however, he stressed

CARSON CITY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
Minutes of the February 22, 2011 Meeting
Page 3

that this information had been requested on January 24th and had not been received until this morning. He added that they would be more than happy to work with Mr. Butler for next year's assessment, as long as it was provided by October, prior to assessment notices going out. Member Allen asked whether the values on all of Mr. Butler's properties had been approached in the same manner, and Mr. Dawley responded that they had been. Ms. Adams advised the Board of a correction in agenda item E5, stating that the second parcel number should correctly read 002-52-15 on the cover page of the supporting documents. Member Block asked whether Mr. Butler "could go back and appeal 2010-2011 at the same time" if there was a glaring discrepancy between the sales and income approaches. Mr. Dawley replied that today's decision by the Board would be the decision for the 2011-2011 year. In response to Member Schulz's question, Mr. Munn explained that Mr. Butler could present the income approach exhibit during the appeal to the State Board, since he had raised and preserved the issue, even though it could not be addressed because of timing. Mr. Butler pointed out that upon denial, he would appeal to the State Board of Equalization. In response to Member Allen's question, Mr. Munn confirmed that a group motion would suffice for all three agenda items, E3, E4, and E5, as long as the Assessor's Evidence page numbered were referenced into the record. **Vice Chairperson Block moved, based on the lack of time and ability to review the income information prior to the State-mandated deadlines, to approve the Assessor's recommendation to keep the values as is on agenda item numbers E3 (on Assessor's Evidence pages 1 of 40 and 2 of 40), E4 (on Assessor's Evidence page 1 of 39), and E5 (on Assessor's Evidence pages 1 of 124 and 2 of 124). Member Allen seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.** Mr. Dawley informed the Chair that the deadline to file for the State Board of Equalization was March 10, 2011.

E-4. MODOCO, LLC, 103 and 107 NORTH HARBIN AVENUE; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APNs 004-176-12; 004-176-13, 101 and 105 SOUTH HARBIN AVENUE; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APNs 004-176-14; 004-176-15 – Previously addressed in item E3.

E-5. COLLEGETOWN HOLDINGS, LLC, 3218 - 3254 NORTH ROOP STREET; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APNs 002-052-14; 002-052-15; 002-052-21; 002-052-22; 002-052-23; 002-052-24; 002-052-25; 002-052-26; 002-052-27; 002-052-28; 002-052-29; 002-052-30; 002-052-31; 002-052-32; 002-052-33 – Previously addressed in item E3.

(9:47:35) – Mr. Coon requested, on behalf of the Assessor's Office, that items E6, E7, and E8 be withdrawn, based on an agreement from the Appellant. He also stated that they did not have agent authorizations for them. Andrew Flahive, Esq., representing Roger Croteau and Associates, confirmed that the three properties referenced above had been sold, and that they were no longer represented by his firm. **Member Allen moved to remove items E6 (ARC Investments, Inc., APN 009-052-21, 2310 South Carson Street, Suite 6, Carson City, Nevada), E7 (Coffee Road Investment, LLC, APN 009-052-11, 2310 South Carson Street, Suite 1, Carson City, Nevada), and E8 (First Independent Bank of Nevada, APN 009-052-12, 2310 South Carson Street, Suite 4, Carson City, Nevada) from today's agenda. Member Schulz seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

(9:50:01) – Mr. Flahive also requested the withdrawal of items E15, E17, and E19, stating that as an agent of the appellant, he agreed with the recommendations of the Assessor's Office. Chairperson McFadden called for a motion. **Member Allen moved to remove items E15 (South Carson, LLC, APN 009-266-06, 4500 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada), E17 (South Carson LLC, APN 009-266-08, South Carson Street [Common Area], Carson City, Nevada), and E19 (South Carson Street, LLC, APN 009-266-10, 4630 (sic) South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada) from the agenda. The motion was seconded by Member Schulz. Motion carried 5-0.**

(9:51:41) – Mr. Walker requested hearing agenda items E9-E13 as one item. In response to Chairperson McFadden's question, Mr. Flahive said that he did not object, however, he reminded the board that the properties were

CARSON CITY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
Minutes of the February 22, 2011 Meeting
Page 4

different and had different vacancies. He also did “promise not to take long on any of these”. Mr. Walker agreed to hear each item individually.

E-6. ARC INVESTMENTS, INC., 2310 SOUTH CARSON STREET, SUITE 6; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-052-21 – Withdrawn

E-7. COFFEE ROAD INVESTMENT, LLC, 2310 SOUTH CARSON STREET, SUITE 1; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-052-11 - Withdrawn

E-8. FIRST INDEPENDENT BANK OF NEVADA, 2310 SOUTH CARSON STREET, SUITE 4; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-052-12 – Withdrawn

E-9. SOUTH CARSON STREET, LLC, 2300 SOUTH CARSON STREET; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-052-17 (9:52:53) – Chairperson McFadden introduced the item. Mr. Flahive thanked the Board and the Assessor’s Office for their time, and described their interaction with him as “very pleasant”. Mr. Flahive also stated that the same comparatives had been used for most of the items. He agreed with Mr. Butler who had previously stated that NRS stated that the income method would be when dealing with commercial properties, thus their appeal included income statements, which were supplemented later by rent rolls, showing vacancies. Mr. Flahive also argued that all his client’s properties were triple-net, which did not matter when you had 60-80% vacancy, as they could not pass the costs down to the tenants. He then presented the income and direct expenses for the property, and corrected the vacancy to be 41%, not 25% as represented by the Assessor’s Office. Mr. Walker gave property information, background, and Assessor’s Evidence, all incorporated into the record, and recommended that the taxable value remain the same. He also introduced recently-received rent rolls, which he circulated to the Board, and incorporated into the record. He pointed out that the average lease rate used by the appellant was \$2.22 per square foot, which was above the \$1.25 per square foot used by the Assessor’s Office. In response to Member Allen’s question, Mr. Walker was not certain why the sale occurred, as there were many LLCs involved, however he stated that they were “right at Carson City’s median”. He also stated that the smaller buildings had larger prices per square foot, per the rules of economies of scale, and that he had not used like-type comparatives. Mr. Flahive repeated the Nevada Revised Statute of using the income method when dealing with commercial properties, and stated that like-type comparables could not be used since the market was “goofy” and that the reasons were unknown. He stated that “what you normally see is what is being asked for and not the unpaid rent, or what the actuals are”. Mr. Flahive also contested that Mr. Walker cited properties that were 20-25% vacant, which was not the case with this property. In rebuttal, Mr. Walker stated that the high lease rates of \$2.22 per square foot contributed to the higher vacancy rates. Discussion ensued regarding individual versus group motions. Mr. Munn advised considering each item individually. **Member Allen moved that for item E9, South Carson Street, LLC, 2300 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada, APN 009-052-17, the taxable value remain the same, as proposed by the Assessor’s Office, based on the testimony presented by the appellant and the Assessor’s Office. The motion was seconded by member Rasner. Motion carried 5-0.**

E-10. SUNRISE, LLC, 2310 SOUTH CARSON STREET, SUITE 5; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-052-20 (10:20:02) – Mr. Walker introduced the property. Mr. Flahive presented the Appellant Evidence, incorporated into the record, stating that they had produced actual rent rolls and actual income statements. He disclosed that the vacancy rate on this 3,040 square foot property was 61%, and believed that the Assessor’s Office claim of \$2.22 per square foot for rent was an old rate, since some of the tenants were no longer paying rent. Mr. Walker read the Assessor’s Evidence and recommendation, incorporated into the record, and stated that there were “no values lower than the taxable value” in the income statement; therefore, the Assessor’s Office recommended that the taxable value stay as is. Mr. Flahive cited the NRS indicating it required them “to use actual income when it is available to the Assessor, which

CARSON CITY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
Minutes of the February 22, 2011 Meeting
Page 5

they have not done". He also referred to the arguments made in item E9, where it was stated that there was no information on the \$168,000 sale. Mr. Flahive responded to Member Allen's question by indicating that the building was 61% vacant. In response to Member Schulz's question, Mr. Flahive explained that if a property were vacant and generated no income, he would propose looking around for "what a fair square footage would be, around \$40 or \$45 per square foot". Mr. Dawley explained that NRS 361.227 item 5C "specifically states capitalization of a fair economic income expectancy, or fair economic grant, or an analysis of the discounted cash flow", therefore they could base it on the economic expectancy, stating that based on \$1 per foot, their values are under the current expected value. **Member Allen moved that for item E10, Sunrise, LLC, 2310 South Carson Street, Suite 5, Carson City, Nevada, APN 009-052-21, the valuation remain as submitted by the Assessor's Office, due to the lack of additional information that would change the opinion of the Board. The motion was seconded by member Schulz. Motion carried 5-0.** Mr. Flahive submitted the rent roll from item E9 to Mr. Munn as an exhibit.

E-11. TAMLIN INVESTMENTS, LLC, 2310 SOUTH CARSON STREET, SUITE 7; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-052-22 (10:31:52) – Mr. Walker introduced the property. Mr. Flahive presented the Appellant Evidence, incorporated into the record, and stated that the property was a 3,525 square foot commercial building with a 57% vacancy. He also submitted the rent roll to Chairperson McFadden. Mr. Walker stated that the information he would present, incorporated into the record, was the same as the previous item. He also introduced into the record a market study that explained the \$1.26 lease rate. Mr. Walker elaborated, based on a request from Member Allen, that they had asked realtors on what they had been paying on their leases, and adjusted it based on the triple-net calculations. Mr. Flahive stressed that the handout was based on information without accompanying testimony. **Member Rasner moved to agree with the recommendation of the Carson City Assessor's Office to keep the taxable value as is for Tamlin Investments, LLC, 2310 South Carson Street, Suite 7, Carson City, Nevada, APN 009-052-22. Member Allen seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

E-12. 2340 SOUTH CARSON STREET, LLC, 2340 SOUTH CARSON STREET; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-052-23 (10:38:54) – Mr. Walker introduced the property. Mr. Flahive presented the Appellant Evidence, incorporated into the record, and stated that the property was a 4,184 square foot building. He also submitted a copy of the rent roll, indicating that it showed 100% occupancy, however, no income was received since August. Mr. Walker suggested evicting the tenants, to which Mr. Flahive responded that a Chapter 11 eviction could take over two years. **Vice Chairperson Block moved to approve the recommendation of the Assessor's Office that the taxable value remain the same for 2340 South Carson Street, LLC, 2340 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada, APN 009-052-23. The motion was seconded by Member Schulz. Motion Carried 5-0.**

(10:44:08) – Chairperson McFadden called a five-minute recess.

E-13. SOUTH CARSON STREET, LLC, 2320 SOUTH CARSON STREET; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-052-27 (10:49:55) – Mr. Clark introduced the property. Mr. Flahive announced that he would withdraw this item. **Member Allen moved to withdraw item E13, APN 009-05-27, South Carson Street, LLC, 2320 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada, at the request of the appellant. The motion was seconded by Member Schulz. Motion carried 5-0.**

E-14. SOUTH CARSON, LLC, 4530 SOUTH CARSON STREET, SUITE 1; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-266-05 (10:51:02) – Mr. Clark introduced the item. Mr. Flahive presented the Appellant Evidence, incorporated into the record, and stated that the property was a 20,812 square foot property. He also submitted a copy of the rent roll, stating that the vacancy rate was at 80%. He hoped the other units could be rented because the property had a good anchor. Mr. Clark gave background and read the Assessor's Evidence and recommendation, incorporated into the

CARSON CITY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
Minutes of the February 22, 2011 Meeting
Page 6

record, proposing that the taxable value remain as is. He also stated that the comparables were identical to the ones presented earlier by Mr. Walker. Mr. Flahive suggested incorporating the same arguments presented in item E9, stressing that the comparatives were inaccurate at this time because there were so few sales, in order not to belabor the Board's time. He also reminded the Board that they had provided actual income in the form of rent rolls, and were not using market-based research. Mr. Walker added that the Assessor's Office "is running this as a commercial shell", elaborating that none of the improvements had been incorporated. He stated that the appellant would receive an assessment notice upon which they could appeal for the 2011-2012 year. **Member Allen moved to keep the recommendation of the Assessor's Office for South Carson, LLC, 4530 South Carson Street, Suite 1, Carson City, Nevada, APN 009-266-05, in light of the current improvement not being "picked up" and giving the appellant a tax break, over and above the methodology used in determining the values. Vice Chairperson Block seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

E-15. SOUTH CARSON, LLC, 4500 SOUTH CARSON STREET; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-266-06 – Withdrawn

E-16. SOUTH CARSON, LLC, 4560 SOUTH CARSON STREET, SUITE 1; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-266-07 (11:00:05) – Mr. Clark introduced the property. Mr. Flahive presented the Appellant Evidence, incorporated into the record, and stated that the property was a 5,634 square foot commercial building and was 100% vacant. He added that the building had generated no income, thus being "upside down". He suggested the Board consider \$40 per square foot, putting the building at \$225,360. Mr. Clark gave property information, background, and Assessor's Evidence, all incorporated into the record, and recommended that the taxable value remain as is. Member Allen received confirmation that this property was also being valued as a commercial shell. **Member Allen moved to keep the recommendation of the Assessor's Office for South Carson, LLC, 4500 South Carson Street, Suite 1, Carson City, Nevada, APN 009-266-07, "especially in view of the fact to keep it in equalization with other previous decisions that we've already made since this is a shell-only building". The motion was seconded by Member Rasner. Motion carried 5-0.**

E-17. SOUTH CARSON, LLC, SOUTH CARSON STREET (COMMON AREA); CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-266-08 – Withdrawn

E-18. SOUTH CARSON, LLC, 4620 SOUTH CARSON STREET, SUITE 1; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-266-09 (11:06:53) – Mr. Clark introduced the property. Mr. Flahive presented the Appellant Evidence, incorporated into the record, and stated that the property was a 5,634 square foot commercial building and was 82% vacant. He also presented a copy of the rent roll to the Board, which is incorporated into the record. Mr. Flahive argued that the Assessor's Office had based its decisions on comparatives of buildings that had full occupancy. Mr. Clark gave background and read the Assessor's Evidence and recommendation, incorporated into the record, proposing that the taxable value remain as is. He also stated that the building was being valued as a commercial shell. **Vice Chairperson Block moved to agree with the recommendation of the Assessor's Office that the value remain as is for South Carson, LLC, 4620 South Carson Street, Suite 1, Carson City, Nevada, APN 009-266-09. Member Rasner seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

E-19. SOUTH CARSON, LLC, 4640 SOUTH CARSON STREET; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-266-10 – Withdrawn

E-20. SOUTH CARSON, LLC, 211 WEST APPION WAY; CARSON CITY, NEVADA, APN 009-268-02 (11:12:33) – Mr. Clark introduced the property. Mr. Flahive referred to Page 1 of Exhibit A in the Assessor's binder, and

CARSON CITY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
Minutes of the February 22, 2011 Meeting
Page 7

stated that “while appraising this and to keep with fairness, they looked at another vacant land which was sold in October 2010 for \$409,000”. He added that the referenced property was valued at \$13.44 per square foot, therefore when valuing the appellant’s property, \$8.50 per square foot was acceptable. He then asked to turn to the final page of the appellant’s exhibit, and stated that the aforementioned property, valued by the Assessor’s office at \$409,000 was now valued at \$259,000, 65% less than the sale price. He then referred to pages 1-3, to a comparative of a vacant land that sold \$4.29 per square foot. Therefore, Mr. Flahive concluded that if the appellant’s property was valued at \$4.29 per square foot, it would be valued at \$76,619. Mr. Clark gave background and read the Assessor’s Evidence and recommendation, incorporated into the record, proposing that the taxable value remain as is. He also addressed the only land sale in this market area, which sold for \$13.44 per square foot, and a sale of an unusable structure, now torn down, therefore the demolition cost had not been included by the Assessor’s Office. Mr. Walker commented that the sales provided by the appellant were multi-family land sales and could not be directly compared with the commercial market land sale. Mr. Flahive reiterated his position of the Assessor’s Office lowering the above mentioned property value by 65%. Mr. Dawley commented that the sale in question had taken place in October of 2010, because they had to use sales up to July 1, 2010. Member Allen asked whether the sale was an arms-length transaction and Mr. Clark confirmed that it was, and that it was purchased for its land value, because the building was uninhabitable. Mr. Walker commented that the Assessor’s value was under market. **Member Block moved to approve the recommendation of the Assessor’s Office that the value remain as is for South Carson LLC, 211 West Appion Way, Carson City, Nevada, APN 009-268-02, based on the discussion. Member Rasner seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.** Chairperson McFadden reiterated that Mr. Flahive needed to file an appeal for the State Board of Equalization before March 10, 2011. Mr. Flahive thanked the Board for their time.

F. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING NEXT MEETING DATE (11:23:22) – It was discussed whether the minutes would need to be approved by the Board. The response was that the minutes would be respectfully submitted by the recording secretary.

(11:23:59) – Mr. Dawley thanked each member of the Board for dedicating their time. He also hoped that next year the process might change and Board members would be issued laptops to save time and trees.

G. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (11:24:39) – **Member Allen moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Member Rasner. The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.**

The Minutes of the February 22, 2011 Carson City Board of Equalization Meeting are respectfully submitted this 16th day of March, 2011.

ALAN GLOVER, Clerk - Recorder

By: _____
Tamar Warren, Deputy Clerk/Recording Secretary