



STATE OF NEVADA  
STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

BRIAN SANDOVAL  
Governor

1550 College Parkway, Suite 115  
Carson City, Nevada 89706-7921  
Telephone (775) 684-2160  
Fax (775) 684-2020

CHRISTOPHER G.  
NIELSEN  
Secretary

In the Matter of

ABS NV-O, LLC  
APN: 124-29-414-006  
Clark County, Nevada  
PETITIONER

Michele Shafe  
Clark County Assessor  
RESPONDENT

Appeal of the Decision of the  
CLARK COUNTY  
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

Case No. 14-199

**NOTICE OF DECISION**

***Appearances***

Bretta Ferrie appeared on behalf of ABS NV-O, LLC (Taxpayer).

Michelle Hanrahan appeared on behalf of the Clark County Assessor's Office (Assessor).

***Summary***

The matter of the Taxpayer's petition for review of property valuations for the 2014-15 Secured Roll within Clark County, Nevada, originally came before the State Board of Equalization (State Board) for hearing in Las Vegas, Nevada, on June 24, 2014 after due notice to the Taxpayer and the Assessor.

The State Board incorporated by reference the record of case 14-190 through 14-197 into the current case.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Tr., 6-24-14, p. 54, l. 2 through p. 55, l. 12: 2 So what I would like to do, Mr. Chairman, with 3 your blessing, is Cases 14-190 through -- all the 4 Albertsons -- through 14-203 -- and I guess it does also 5 include, then, 14-235, 14-265, and 14-241 -- I would 6 like to incorporate by reference the comments that were 7 made in all of these cases, so there's outstanding 8 incorporation by reference to any of those cases listed 9 to the other cases and discussions we've had herein, so 10 we don't have to keep doing it, and that way someone can 11 go back and pick up one case and say, Keith wasn't -- 12 didn't consider X, Y, or Z, or Ben was sounding like an 13 idiot again. 14 CHAIRMAN MESERVY: Well, my only concern there 15 is you're talking about cases we haven't even heard yet. 16 Don't try to incorporate it when we haven't taken a 17 stance on those. 18 MS. WILSON: I would actually like to also point 19 out that 235, 241, and 265, I don't believe are subject 20 to the service transaction, so neither of those comments 21 would be relevant. 22 CHAIRMAN MESERVY: I think we should make it 23 more all the cases that we've heard prior to the case in 24 numerical sequence. 25 MR. JOHNSON: Or we can do it again in 203, Page 55 1 because she is correct that the last three didn't 2 include that service transaction. And that's just based 3 on -- I'm reading the case files that were all 4 similar -- very similar issues and similar presentation 5 and data. 6

The State Board, having considered all evidence, documents and testimony pertaining to the valuation of the property in accordance with NRS 361.227, hereby makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1) The State Board is an administrative body created pursuant to NRS 361.375.
- 2) The State Board is mandated to hear all appeals of property tax assessments pursuant to NRS 361.360 and NRS 361.400.
- 3) The Taxpayer and the Assessor were given adequate, proper and legal notice of the time and place of the hearing before the State Board, and the matter was properly noticed pursuant to the Open Meeting Law at NRS 241.020.<sup>2</sup>
- 4) The subject property consists of an Albertson's supermarket containing a 56,251 square feet, t constructed in 2005, situated on a 5.31 acre parcel located at 3010 W. Ann Road at Simmons Street in Clark County, Nevada.<sup>3</sup>
- 5) The Clark County Board of Equalization (County Board) ordered the total taxable value for the subject property, APN 124-29-414-006 of \$ \$4,361,511 be upheld on the 2014-2015 secured roll.<sup>4</sup>
- 6) The State Board found the Taxpayer presented sufficient evidence to support values different from that established by the County Board. The State Board found the Assessor used a 7.5% capitalization rate (cap rate) in the income approach. However, the State Board found the cap rate did not sufficiently reflect the amount of risk associated with possible vacancy and lack of alternative uses for a "big box" retail store. The State Board tested the taxable value using the income approach by applying a capitalization rate of 9 per cent to the net operating income (NOI) of \$377,264.12, developed by using \$0.67-1/2 rent per square foot and using the same vacancy loss and expense ratios estimated by the Assessor, which resulted in an indicated value of \$4,191,825. The State Board found the use of \$0.65 rent per square foot was still within market parameters and reflected the age of the property. The State Board found the 9% capitalization rate better reflected the investment risk in this type of property.<sup>5</sup>
- 7) The State Board adjusted the decision of the County Board by reducing the value from \$4,361,511 to \$4,191,825.<sup>6</sup>

---

CHAIRMAN MESERVY: Well, we have reviewed those 7 cases, so I guess I have no problem with that. 8 Do you have any objection, either party? 9 MS. FERRIE: No. 10 CHAIRMAN MESERVY: The Assessors have now -- 11 MR. JOHNSON: And that would apply at 14-190 12 through 14-203

<sup>2</sup> See Record, SBE page 128, Receipt of Certified Mail.

<sup>3</sup> See Record, SBE pages 99-100, Maps; and 105, Capitalization Summary; Tr., 6-24-14, p. 81, ll. 11-14: 11 MS. HANRAHAN: The subject is located at 12 3010 West Ann Road and Simmons Street, situated on 13 5.31 acres, consisting of 56,251 square foot -- square 14 feet constructed in 2005. And it is also an Albertsons.

<sup>4</sup> See Record, SBE page 11, CBE Decision Letter; and SBE page 126, CBE Minutes.

<sup>5</sup> See Tr., 6-24-14, p. 83, l. 16 through p. 84, l. 6: 16 MR. JOHNSON: The only thing I didn't think of, 17 and I don't know if you did, Keith, is the 67 1/2 a 18 square foot, which -- I mean, I'm following the lines as 19 you, Keith, had the same conclusions, which is 20 \$4,191,824.52. I don't know. I can go either way here. 21 It is subjective. I do think this is a higher rent than 22 the ones we've dealt with previously today. Is 70 -- 65 23 to 70 -- I don't know. 24 I could be persuaded, but I think I'm going to 25 make a motion that in case 14-199 that we reduce the Page 84 1 taxable value to \$4,191,825. That's based on market 2 rent of 67 1/2 cents per square foot, 65-70 cents per 3 square foot, and we're using the midpoint, and then 4 using 8 percent vacancy and credit loss, 10 in 5 non-reimbursable expenses, and a 9 percent 6 capitalization rate.

<sup>6</sup> See Tr., 6-24-14, p. 83, l. 24 through p. 84, l. 22: 24 I could be persuaded, but I think I'm going to 25 make a motion that in case 14-199 that we reduce the Page 84 1 taxable value to \$4,191,825. That's based on market 2 rent of 67 1/2 cents per square foot, 65-70 cents per



- 8) Any finding of fact above construed to constitute a conclusion of law is adopted as such to the same extent as if originally so denominated.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1) The Taxpayer timely filed a notice of appeal, and the State Board accepted jurisdiction to determine this matter.
- 2) The Taxpayer and the Assessor are subject to the jurisdiction of the State Board.
- 3) The State Board has the authority to determine the taxable values in the State.
- 4) The subject property is appraised at the property taxable value as adjusted, in accordance with NRS 361.227.
- 5) Any conclusion of law above construed to constitute a finding of fact is adopted as such to the same extent as if originally so denominated.

### DECISION

The Petition of the Taxpayer is granted based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. The Clark County Comptroller is instructed to correct the assessment roll by adjusting the assessed valuation of the subject property as follows:

#### 2014-2015 Secured Roll

Parcel Number 124-29-414-006	Taxable Value		Assessed Value	
	Established by County Board of Equalization	Revised By State Board	Established by County Board of Equalization	Revised by State Board
Land	\$1,179,651	\$1,179,651	\$412,878	\$412,878
Improvements	\$3,181,860	\$3,012,174	\$1,113,651	\$1,054,261
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$4,361,511</b>	<b>\$4,191,825</b>	<b>\$1,526,529</b>	<b>\$1,467,139</b>

The Clark County Comptroller is instructed to certify the assessment roll of the county consistent with this decision.

BY THE STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION THIS 30<sup>th</sup> DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2014.



Christopher G. Nielsen, Secretary  
CGN/ter

3 square foot, and we're using the midpoint, and then 4 using 8 percent vacancy and credit loss, 10 in 5 non-reimbursable expenses, and a 9 percent 6 capitalization rate. 7 CHAIRMAN MESERVY: So the difference is he had 8 kept it as 70, and you're doing 67 1/2? 9 MR. JOHNSON: Correct. 10 CHAIRMAN MESERVY: And then -- okay. And we 11 still think the cap rate is still at 9 over there too? 12 MR. JOHNSON: It will vary to 9. 13 CHAIRMAN MESERVY: Any second? 14 MR. HARPER: Second. 15 CHAIRMAN MESERVY: Any more comments? 16 (No response.) 17 CHAIRMAN MESERVY: All in favor? 18 MR. JOHNSON: Aye. 19 MR. HARPER: Aye. 20 CHAIRMAN MESERVY: Any opposed? 21 (No response.) 22 CHAIRMAN MESERVY: It passes unanimously.