

ITEM XIV -
August 26, 2026
MEETING MINUTES
Draft

October 14, 2026
SBE Meeting Materials

STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
Meeting Minutes

August 26, 2026
9:00 am

This meeting was held at the following Nevada Department of Taxation location:
9850 Double R Blvd., Suite 101
Reno, Nevada 89521
and via Zoom

STATE BOARD MEMBERS' PRESENT

Paul Bancroft, Chairman
Corinne Burke, Member
Curtis Cadwell, Member
Kevin Orrock, Member

I. Call the Meeting to Order and Roll Call

Chief Deputy Executive Director Adriane Roberts-Larson, with the Department of Taxation (Department) called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Denise Mosely, Program Officer II with the Department, took roll and a quorum was established.

II. Opening Remarks by the Chair; Introduction of State Board Members

State Board of Equalization (State Board) Chairman Bancroft introduced the State Board Members and Deputy Attorney General Dana Cook.

III. Public Comment

Mr. Randy Roesch of Mountainview Animal Hospital made public comment that he was on the docket and wanted to confirm his attendance was reflected on the Zoom meeting.

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson read the rules for hearings and administered the oath to those testifying. Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced agenda item IV.

IV. For Possible Action: CONSENT AGENDA – Direct Appeals to the State Board of Equalization from action of the County Assessor taken pursuant to NRS 361.260, Tax Years 2025-26, 2024-25, 2023-24, 2022-23 Unsecured Roll

Chairman Bancroft stated that each case would be called individually due to insufficient information in the record on appeal to determine the nature of the reductions.

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 160	Klaich Animal Hospital LTD	Personal	Washoe County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-160, personal property direct appeal.

Austin Scott and Tony Lopez were present on behalf of the Washoe County Assessor's office. The Stipulation submitted indicated that the initial assessment was based on a taxable value of \$358,794 and the agreed proposed reduction was \$303,419. Chairman Bancroft pointed out that neither of these values were tied to the personal property record card submitted and asked the Assessor's office to provide an explanation. Additionally, Chairman Bancroft expressed the State Board's concern was that there was nothing in the record to support either of the values presented. Mr. Scott stated that an audit was performed

earlier in the year by Tax Management Associates, a third-party vendor hired by the Assessor's office. In addition, Mr. Scott stated that the 15% reduction was as a result of assets included in the audit during tax years 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 that did not exist in their business and confirmation was provided by the auditor during a site visit for tax years 2024-2025 that the assets were no longer present.

Chairman Bancroft made a motion to approve the stipulation in State Board case no. 26-160. Member Burke seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 162	Dayan Plastic Surgery PLLC	Personal	Washoe County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-162, personal property direct appeal.

Austin Scott and Tony Lopez were present on behalf of the Washoe County Assessor's office. Chairman Bancroft stated that there was a considerable reduction in value for each of the four years audited with nothing to support the reductions in the record. Mr. Scott stated that the Tax Management Associates auditor that conducted the audit for this case mistyped an acquisition cost causing the taxable value for each year to be incorrect. Mr. Scott continued that the error was brought to the auditor's attention and the corrected values were reflected in the stipulation. Chairman Bancroft asked the assessor's office to explain the procedure to confirm that work performed by Tax Management Associates was being done accurately and correctly. Mr. Lopez responded that the auditors would send an audited list for many years that they had audited, and these contained thousands of assets. The assessor's office was performing quality checks for life categories to make sure that the taxpayer has received the correct appreciation per asset.

Chairman Bancroft made a motion to approve the stipulation in State Board case no. 26-162. Member Orrock seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 163	Hunt Propane Inc	Personal	Washoe County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-163, personal property direct appeal.

Austin Scott and Tony Lopez were present on behalf of the Washoe County Assessor's office. Chairman Bancroft noted the considerable reduction in each of the four tax years and questioned if the issue was the same for each tax year. Mr. Lopez confirmed that the issue was the same for each of the tax years and involved items that were incorrectly assigned and had incorrect depreciable life. The taxpayer provided additional information to the assessor's office which verified that the assets in question were considered registered vehicles and not taxable assets. Chairman Bancroft asked if the registered vehicles were picked up and Mr. Lopez replied that one registered vehicle had been picked up as they did not have the information for that item. Chairman Bancroft noted that the registered vehicle should not have been picked up initially. Mr. Lopez agreed, adding that at the time of the audit it was not known that it was a registered vehicle.

Chairman Bancroft made a motion to approve the stipulation in State Board case no. 26-163. Member Burke seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 164	M5B LLC dba Mountainview Animal Hospital	Personal	Washoe County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-164, personal property direct appeal.

Austin Scott and Tony Lopez were present on behalf of the Washoe County Assessor's office. Chairman Bancroft noted the audit for this case was for four tax years and questioned if the nature of the reduction

was similar for each of the tax years. Mr. Lopez answered affirmatively and noted that the issue was that the Taxpayer expressed concerns about assets that were picked up were believed to be real property fixtures. He stated that after another site visit was conducted it was confirmed that the assets were real property fixtures.

Chairman Bancroft made a motion to approve the stipulation in State Board case no. 26-164. Member Orrock seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 165	Team Perio Inc	Personal	Washoe County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-165, personal property direct appeal.

Austin Scott and Tony Lopez were present on behalf of the Washoe County Assessor's office. Chairman Bancroft noted the audit for this case included four tax years and questioned if the nature of the reduction was similar for each of the tax years. Mr. Lopez replied that the Taxpayer indicated that there were assets that had the incorrect depreciable life assigned. Mr. Lopez stated that the depreciable lives had been corrected. Chairman Bancroft asked the type of asset and Mr. Lopez replied that it was a medical grade CT scanner that had been initially assigned a fifteen year depreciable life. He stated that after further consideration it was corrected to a diagnostic equipment and given a five year depreciable life.

Chairman Bancroft made a motion to approve the stipulation in State Board case no. 26-165. Member Burke seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 166	The Blind Onion Pizza and Pub	Personal	Washoe County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-166, personal property direct appeal.

Hector Mendoza and Tony Lopez were present on behalf of the Washoe County Assessor's office. Chairman Bancroft noted this case concerned significant reductions for four tax years and questioned if the nature of the reduction was similar for each of the four tax years. Mr. Mendoza stated that the audit for this case was performed by Tax Management Associates. He stated that Tax Management Associates was unable to make contact with the business in order to perform a thorough audit, therefore estimated values were assigned for each year based on audits conducted with similar like businesses. Mr. Lopez added that the assessor's office was subsequently able to make contact with the business, obtain the documentation required for the audit, and rework the audit, which resulted in the reductions. Member Orrock asked how the comparable business was selected and used for the estimate and Mr. Lopez replied that it was per industry size, number of employees and asset; it was not calculated by revenue.

Chairman Bancroft made a motion to approve the stipulation in State Board case no. 26-166. Member Orrock seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 168	Tholl Fence	Personal	Washoe County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-168, personal property direct appeal.

Austin Scott and Tony Lopez were present on behalf of the Washoe County Assessor's office. Chairman Bancroft noted this case concerned reductions for four tax years and questioned if the nature of the reduction was similar for each of the four tax years. Mr. Scott answered affirmatively and noted that Tax Management

Associates performed the audit and there were items that were picked up which were believed to be real property improvements. The Washoe Assessor's office conducted a site visit and confirmed the real property improvements and corrected the adjustments as a result of the site visit.

Chairman Bancroft made a motion to approve the stipulation in State Board case no. 26-168. Member Cadwell seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 170	Galena Veterinary Hospital	Personal	Washoe County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-170, personal property direct appeal.

Hector Mendoza and Tony Lopez were present on behalf of the Washoe County Assessor's office. Chairman Bancroft noted this case concerned a reduction for one tax year and questioned what the nature of the issue was. Mr. Mendoza replied that the audit had been conducted by Tax Management Associates mid-year 2025 and the site visit had been completed October 21, 2025. Mr. Mendoza indicated that the Taxpayer raised concerns regarding an asset that had been included in the audit which had matured in terms of depreciation and whether the Taxpayer still had that asset. After the assessors discussed the reasoning for the inclusion, the asset was removed for the tax year 2025-26.

Chairman Bancroft made a motion to approve the stipulation in case 26-170. Member Cadwell seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 171	Somerset Golf & Country Club	Personal	Washoe County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-171, personal property direct appeal.

Austin Scott and Tony Lopez were present on behalf of the Washoe County Assessor's office. Chairman Bancroft noted this case concerned a reduction for one tax year and questioned what the nature of the issue was. Mr. Lopez identified that the issue was regarding the Taxpayer's fleet of golf carts that had been listed on the Taxpayer's financials but had not specified that the fleet of golf carts had been leased. Mr. Lopez stated that the Taxpayer provided a list of their leased assets and it was verified that the rental fleet was being reported by another business identified as the lessor which resulted in having the rental fleet removed from the financials and then proceeded with the new stipulated values.

Chairman Bancroft made a motion to approve the stipulation in case 26-171. Member Cadwell seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

Chairman Bancroft expressed concerns regarding the audits that had been conducted by Tax Management Associates and questioned if it was possible the same types of errors that had been made in the cases that had been presented could also have occurred in other audits conducted by TMA. Mr. Lopez replied that it could have been a possibility and that the assessor's office had been transparent with the taxpayer and would take action on any concerns that would be brought up by the Taxpayer. Chairman Bancroft stated that many Taxpayers don't always understand the process and have felt intimidated to get answers from the assessor's office. Chairman Bancroft expressed concerns that these types of issues may have arisen in other audits conducted by TMA but had not been addressed. Chairman Bancroft encouraged the assessor's office staff to work with the Taxpayer's to assure that those who are audited end up with a correct assessment and that these types of mistakes don't continue being made.

V. For Possible Action: Direct Appeal to the State Board of Equalization from action of the County Assessor taken pursuant to NRS 361.260, Tax Years 2025-2026 Unsecured Roll

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 161	Empire Southwest LLC	Personal	Washoe County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-161, personal property located at 600 Glendale Avenue, Spark NV, Washoe County.

Chairman Bancroft asked the parties to Case no. 26-161 to introduce themselves. Petitioner's Authorized Agent James Susa, Esq of DeConcini McDonald Yetwin & Lacy, P.C and Dale Huizingh from Empire Southwest LLC were present on behalf of the petitioner. Herbert Kaplan of the Washoe County District Attorney's office and Tony Lopez and Howard Stockton were present on behalf of the Washoe County Assessor's office.

Chairman Bancroft stated that the State Board had ruled on SBE case no. 25-152 last year, with the notice of decision being issued on December 9, 2025. The ruling became binding for the determination of the tax treatment of property for fiscal year 2025-2026 and that an overpayment would have resulted. Chairman Bancroft noted that overpayments were to be promptly refunded and that this issue was discussed in the briefs submitted but did not have a place for the case presented at that time. Both the petitioner and the respondent agreed that they had come to a resolution for tax years 2023-2024 and 2024-2025. Chairman Bancroft reiterated that refunds are not to be delayed and should be paid upon the finalization of the State Board's decision.

Mr. Susa and Mr. Kaplan each delivered a 15-minute presentation to the State Board. Mr. Susa provided a 5-minute rebuttal.

Mr. Susa questioned Mr. Huizingh during the presentation to the State Board. Mr. Huizingh described his role and duties at Empire Southwest LLC and stated that he had reviewed the Washoe County personal property declarations that were filed July 2025, which consisted of disputed Assessor inclusion of allied Caterpillar equipment as being exempt from tax. Mr. Huizingh stated that what was reported was furniture fixtures and equipment. He also stated that all equipment in the rental fleet was also reported on another nine accounts on property out for rent. Mr. Huizingh noted that after the State Board meeting in 2025, Empire LLC submitted supplemental declarations to the assessor's office but had not received a corrected supplemental bill. Mr. Huizingh also stated that all the equipment that should be on the -in-yard accounts had been declared to the Assessor's office. He stated that 741 pieces of caterpillar equipment had been sold, which included equipment that had been acquired, and/or being sold as used equipment or equipment that had been put into the rental fleet. Mr. Huizingh also stated that only 1 in 10 CAT equipment sold was in the rental fleet. The primary purpose of purchasing CAT equipment was to be sold in the regular course of business. Mr. Huizingh noted that at times CAT equipment was placed in the rental fleet to meet customer demand. He continued that some of these items had been in the rental fleet for six months or less prior to being sold. Mr. Huizingh stated that the CAT manufacturer had directed dealers to rent the smaller CAT equipment for the duration of the equipment's life.

Mr. Kaplan stated that there were two issues with the presented case. He referenced NRS 361.068 as what was considered under the exemption and NRS 361.359 in how it applied to the exempt property. Mr. Kaplan stated that Empire had acknowledged it had two fleets – one for sale and one for rental. Mr. Kaplan read NRS 361.068 in which he stated that the language specifically *'required that the property be held for sale by the merchant in order to qualify as an exemption'*. Mr. Kaplan pointed out that they had not questioned the for-sale fleet, but the fleet being held for rent. He also reiterated that Empire acknowledged that they held a rental fleet because of customer need. Chairman Bancroft questioned if the CAT equipment could be held for both lease and sale. Mr. Kaplan answered that the CAT equipment could be held for both lease and sale. He also noted that the distinction was that the CAT equipment was not being actively marketed for sale. He also noted that the primary purpose of the CAT equipment was for it to have gone into the rental fleet. Mr. Kaplan stated that Empire has identified two separate fleets.

Mr. Susa questioned Mr. Huizingh during the 5-minute rebuttal. Mr. Huizingh clarified that equipment held for sale was only for sale and would not be rented as was described by Mr. Kaplan. And that equipment that was in the rental fleet could be rented but was always available for sale. Mr. Huizingh stated that the rental equipment has been marketed for sale. Mr. Susa stated that Empire's large CAT equipment has always been held for sale by a merchant and that those were the requirements for exemption under Nevada law.

Member Burke inquired about the Exhibit which listed the large CAT equipment and stated that a third of the dates listed were from 2022 or older, to which Mr. Susa explained that those pieces of equipment were part of the Cashman fleet which were acquired in 2022. Mr. Huizingh stated that Empire was not in the business of holding long-term leases, but that when that occurred, it was implied in Empire's business practices that taxes were paid by Empire and the rental rates would reflect that taxes were being paid.

Mr. Kaplan expressed that he was unclear whether the rental fleet was available for sale, which was different from being marketed for sale and that if someone wanted to buy something from the rental fleet it was available for sale, which was different than being marketed.

Chairman Bancroft asked how the equipment was being actively marketed. Mr. Huizingh explained that Empire had 50 sales account managers that marketed the equipment for sale and whose compensation was based on the amount they sold. The list of equipment to be sold was provided by Empire and identified as large CAT equipment even though they were listed in the rental pool.

Member Cadwell stated that if he had called Empire to rent equipment that was listed for sale that it would be rented. Mr. Huizingh answered that special consideration could be given if they were a large client, but usually they would be directed to the rental fleet and would not pull equipment out of new inventory. Member Cadwell asked what equipment was readily available for customers on the lot from the 700 pieces of CAT equipment that had been sold. Mr. Huizingh answered that if a piece of equipment that the customer needed was on the lot they would sell them that, if not it was ordered from the factory.

Chairman Bancroft inquired if there were 11 accounts in Washoe County that had assessments subject to the appeal, to which Mr. Susa replied that the appeal covered all 11 accounts as they did not have all of the details for every account. And that there could be large CAT equipment only on some of the accounts, but they were seeking a ruling of exemption on all 11 accounts. Chairman Bancroft asked if that was accurate to which Mr. Lopez replied affirmatively. Chairman Bancroft asked if the answer being sought was if the large CAT equipment was exempt or not, to which Mr. Susa replied affirmatively. Mr. Kaplan referenced NRS 361.159 which he stated would not really impact Empire, but that based on the lease provisions they would require guidance as the statute language was pretty clear as to how it was applied.

Chairman Bancroft noted that this was a difficult case that had come up previously to the State Board which resulted in a split decision. He noted that because of this it had made it difficult to write a decision that included findings of fact and conclusions of law where all members would have a consensus on. He noted that a motion would not be requested, that the case would stand as submitted, and that a subsequent hearing where the State Board would consider specific findings of fact, drafted and posted for the parties to review, and which the State Board would consider and vote.

Chairman Bancroft asked the State Board members for their preliminary thoughts to where they were at with the resolution of the non-binding statement. Member Cadwell stated he had not changed his mind and that taxes needed to be paid when the CAT equipment was being rented out. Member Burke stated that her decision had not changed and if it was being rented tax should be paid. Member Orrock noted that he saw it as a business with an intent to sell. Chairman Bancroft referenced the exemption statute NRS 361.068 which was the Department's advisory opinion issued in 2023 which he would review again to see how it would have been applied to this case. Chairman Bancroft noted that the matter was under submission and would advise as to when it would be rescheduled.

For Possible Action: Appeals from Action of a County Board of Equalization Pursuant to NRS 361.360 & NRS 361.400, Tax Years 2026-2027 Secured Roll; Tax Years 2025-2026 Unsecured Roll

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 112	Empire Southwest LLC	Personal	Elko

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-112, vacant land located at 72 Vallejo Verde St. Henderson NV, Clark County.

Chairman Bancroft asked the parties to Case no. 26-112 to introduce themselves. Petitioner's Authorized Agent James Susa, Esq of DeConcini McDonald Yetwin & Lacy, P.C and Dale Huizingh from Empire Southwest LLC were present on behalf of the petitioner. Gillian Jones, from the District Attorney's office, and Janet Iribarne and Tammie Dickerson were present on behalf of the Elko County Assessor.

Chairman Bancroft stated that this case had been heard at a previous State Board meeting and had been continued due to not having a final value for account number 2495. Chairman Bancroft asked the parties if they had worked together to come to a taxable value. Both parties agreed they had come to an agreed taxable value of \$31,797,624 which was an increase. Chairman Bancroft noted that the matter was under submission and would advise as to when it would be rescheduled to review and vote on the findings of fact and conclusions of law.

VI. For Possible Action: Direct Agricultural Appeal to the State Board of Equalization from action of the Nevada Department of Taxation taken pursuant to NRS 361A.160 and NRS 361.355, Tax Years 2026-2027, Secured Roll

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 174	Jonathan R & Josephine M Young	Agricultural	Nevada Department of Taxation

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-174, Agricultural land located at 188 Liberty Lane, Minden NV, Douglas County.

Chairman Bancroft asked the parties to Case no. 26-174 to introduce themselves. Mr. Jonathan Young was present on behalf of the Petitioner and Ms. Lorna Quisenberry and Ms. Tristan Silva were present on behalf of the Department.

Jonathan Young described his property and stated that they were under the construction of building their new home while being in the process of building it out for agricultural use. He stated they acquired the property in 2025 which was a carved down property of seven parcels which consisted of 247 acres. Mr. Young continued that they had an agreement with Douglas County North water Treatment plant until 2052 to grow fields so that they could have cows. Mr. Young reiterated that they were under the construction phase to become an agricultural property. Mr. Young also stated that if he had not filed an appeal he could be held liable for three years of back or forward back taxes.

Ms. Quisenberry stated that the Department conducted a site inspection as they are required to do for properties under 20 acres. Mr. Quisenberry noted that the land was completely graded and barred dirt and that carrying capacity of the land could not have sustained livestock, which resulted in the petitioner's application being denied.

Mr. Young clarified that not all of his land was graded. He stated that modifications were needing to be done to change out how the watering was done on the land so the water could flow properly.

Ms. Quisenberry clarified that the exemption was denied for the 2026-2027 tax year. Ms. Quisenberry stated that the reason for the exemption was due to it not being employed as real property as a business conducted for profit. Mr. Young explained that the property has been under a construction phase to change the use of the property and an agreement exists with Heyborne Ranch Management to develop the land for cattle. He stated that the land has to be held for the purposes of agricultural use and they have had an agreement with Douglas County until 2052. Mr. Young questioned how one would handle being under construction since active cattle cannot be had when under construction.

Chairman Bancroft questioned how long Mr. Young would lose the exemption for to which Ms. Quisenberry replied up to 7 years and that Douglas County would be the party to bill for this.

Chairman Bancroft asked Douglas County Assessor Mr. Trent Tholen if Mr. Young lost the agricultural use status would he have been responsible for deferred taxes accumulated for the past 7 years. Mr. Tholen stated they did not have the calculations readily available but that the potential to go back 7 years would be for just the land that was converted to a higher use.

Chairman Bancroft noted that NAC 361a.130 focused on additional documentation that may be requested, and not mandatory for a carrying capacity calculation.

Member Cadwell made a motion to find in favor of the taxpayer. Member Cadwell seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion carried.

VII. For Possible Action: Appeals from Action of a County Board of Equalization Pursuant to NRS 361.360 & NRS 361.400, Tax Years 2026-2027 Secured Roll; Tax Years 2025-2026 Unsecured Roll

<u>CASE#</u>	<u>PETITIONER</u>	<u>PROPERTY TYPE</u>	<u>RESPONDENT</u>
26 119	The Esly Carmona Trust	Residential	Lyon County Assessor

Chief Deputy Roberts-Larson introduced State Board case no. 26-119, Residential property located at 60 Jeanette Drive, Moundhouse NV, Lyon County.

Chairman Bancroft asked the parties to Case no. 26-119 to introduce themselves. Ms. Martha Carmona was present on behalf of the Petitioner and Ms. Kelly Wilson and Ms. Erin Singley were present on behalf of the Lyon County Assessor.

Ms. Carmona presented what she requested as that her property's land value be reduced to a fair baseline of \$90,000 which matched other neighborhood comparables. She noted that her land value was raised from the initial assessment of \$31,000 taxed value to \$260,000. Ms. Carmona asserted that the assessor's office had not provided neighborhood sales data or market evidence that supported the increase. Ms. Carmona provided several neighborhood comparables that supported her request for the decrease in taxable value to \$90,000. Ms. Carmona presented additional 1-to-5-acre parcels that showed taxable values of \$60,000 compared to her \$260,000 assessment. Ms. Carmona objected to the comparable market sales utilized by Lyon County Appraiser Ms. Wilson and stated that the sales pulled from the Dayton area were out of Ms. Wilson's immediate area.

Chairman Bancroft turned the floor over to Lyon County. Ms. Wilson and Ms. Singley presented the county's land assessment methodology to support the property's taxable assessment of \$565,711. Ms. Wilson stated the taxpayer's property consisted of premium structural features that increased the taxable value. Ms. Wilson noted that while the taxpayer's property had a taxable value of \$565,711, the taxpayer was only being billed on a capped value of \$377,918. Additionally, Ms. Wilson confirmed that the taxpayer had received annual building depreciation, and a veteran's tax exemption. Ms. Wilson presented three sales comparable to support the Assessors valuation of the taxpayer's property.

Chairman Bancroft re-stated the petitioner's chief grievance was the assessment value determined at \$260,000 and requested the County Assessor to explain how they established that value with the absence of vacant land sales. Ms. Wilson explained that Lyon County relied on the allocation model to assess land

value as older homes depreciate over time. Member Burke corrected that the method Ms. Sullivan described was not allocation, but the abstraction method. Ms. Singly stated that the county uses abstraction on improved properties to comply with the state level assessments. Ms. Singly stated that there was not a marked difference as to what people paid for a one -acre parcel or a two-acre parcel, stating that there might not be any difference in the value.

Member Burke asked for clarification on what improved parcels were being valued. Ms. Wilson replied, 'using abstraction'. Member Burke questioned that vacant five-acre parcel for \$90,000 in the same neighborhood and clarified that abstraction is a tool to get to a land value. It was determined that the vacant land sales analysis were the best method for determining land value.

Chairman Bancroft, with agreement from the other members, identified a potential issue that could have affected properties in Lyon County. He suggested that the hearing be continued to a future meeting and that an action item regarding Lyon County land valuation methods be placed on the next agenda. Additionally, Chairman Bancroft requested that the Lyon County Assessor attend the next State Board meeting to explain the land values.

**VII. Briefing to and from the Board and the Secretary and Staff For Possible Action:
Proposed Hearing Schedules and Docket Management**

Chief Deputy Roberts Larson noted that the next State Board meeting would be held tentatively on October 13th and 14th, 2026 and would be held in Las Vegas, Department of Taxation's. Chairman Bancroft stated that two days would not be needed as there were five matters. The State Board agreed to hold the next meeting on October 14, 2026.

District Attorney General Dana Cook provided an update on the pending Petitions for Judicial Review from the 2025 State Board session.

VIII. For Possible Action: Review and Approval of June 4, 2026, State Board Meeting Minutes.

Member Orrock made a motion to approve the July 29, 2026 meeting minutes. Member Cadwell seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried.

VIII. State Board of Equalization Comments (see Note 3)

No comment.

IX. Public Comment (See Note 3)

No Public Comment.

X. Adjournment

Chairman Bancroft adjourned the meeting at 2:36PM.