GUNNISON COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
MEETING MINUTES
July 22, 2013

The July 22, 2013 Board of Equalization meeting was held in the Board of County Commissioners Meeting Room at the 200 East Virginia, Gunnison Colorado. Present were:

Paula Swenson, Chairperson
Phil Chamberland, Commissioner
Jonathan Houck, Commissioner
Bobbie Lucero, Clerk to the Board

County Assessor Kristy McFarland, Deputy Assessor and Senior Appraiser/Analyst George Lickiss and others were present and participated as indicated in the text.

NOTICE: The Petitioner's and Assessor's exhibits for each case are located in their individual Board of Equalization files.

The valuation time period is July 1, 2010 –June 30, 2012

CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Swenson called the July 22, 2013 meeting of the County Board of Equalization to order at 8:30 am. Chairperson Swenson explained the roles, rights and responsibilities of the Board and the Petitioner during each hearing where a Petitioner and/or a Petitioner's representative was present, either in person or via telephone. Appeal notices were also provided to each Petitioner.

CBOE #01; Faye L. Mott

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Property owner, Jayleen, was present for the hearing via conference call. Jayleen discussed the letter that had been provided on 7/19/2013. She explained that the property was not used for grazing for one year due to the draught, but the property is still agricultural land. She informed to the board that she made a mistake while filling out the form and expressed that she accidentally marked on the form that they do not use the land for grazing, because they didn't last year due to the draught.

Chairperson Swenson explained to the petitioner that the Assessor's Office cannot use the valuations of the adjoining properties, if they haven't sold. Jayleen explained that they do other things for a source of income, they do own cattle and they do farm on this property. The petitioner explained that they live roughly 5-10 miles from the property. Jayleen explained that she was given the property from Faye Mott, because Faye moved to Paraguay.

The Assessor's Office confirmed that they already made adjustments to the value, due to lack of access and location. Chairperson Swenson explained to the petitioner that the property was not being used as agricultural land when the form was filled out. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland, seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #01. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #02; The Carolyn J. Summers Family Trust

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. The board reviewed the petitioner's packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: The petitioner was not present for the discussion. The board discussed that property is either on the river or off the river, and there is nothing in between. There was discussion that these property owners disputed a few years ago to change that their property is off the river. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland, seconded by Commissioner Houck, to deny CBOE #02 because it was discussed to be classified off the river a few years back, and it is indeed off the river. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #06; John Cosentino

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. He explained that no integral agricultural use is the main issue with this appeal. The

values of the residential and agricultural land is the issue. He referenced House Bill 11-46 (HB-1146) if a residential structure is not integral to the agriculture operation the Assessor's Office must subtract up to 2 acres and place full market value, not agriculture value. Lickiss provided the state statute for the board to review. Lickiss informed the board that the home is vacant and cannot be deemed as integral to the operation. Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. The board and the Assessor's Office discussed the comparables provided in the petitioner's packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioners, John Cosentino, was present for the hearing. He provided additional information at the hearing. He provided an affidavit that the structure is an integral part of the operation and it is vacant. He explained that he lives 15 minutes from this property and argued that the statues is ambiguous.

Lickiss explained that he spoke with County Deputy Attorney Art Trezise about this property, and Trezise advised him that the statute wording says "shall be..." which means the property must be occupied. Lickiss explained that since the house is not occupied the land is not integral. The petitioner disagreed that the statute is ambiguous, and it does not say he has to reside in the property.

The board discussed that the intent of the law is because so many land were being sold and the home was not being lived in while the agricultural land was being worked, the idea was that unless it was the home or ranch hands living in the property that the property was no longer considered integral. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #06 based off of the facts provided for this appeal. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #07; Glenn Saunders

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. Lickiss informed the board that during the reassessment, the value went down significantly due to the condition. The board and the Assessor's Office discussed the comparables provided in the petitioner's packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, Glenn Saunders, was present for the hearing via conference call. He informed that he reviewed all of the sales during the valuation period, and opined that there haven't been enough sales to support increasing his valuation. The board explained the new HB-1146. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #07 based off of the facts provided for this appeal. Motion carried unanimously.

BREAK: The meeting recessed from 9:16 am until 9: 22 am.

CBOE #08; Robert Newman

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. He explained that the property is steep and they have already made an adjustment to bring the value down. The board and the Assessor's Office discussed the comparables provided in the petitioner's packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, Robert Newman, was present for the hearing via conference call. He explained to the board that in 2009 he went through the same process on this property, and it was agreed up on the value was $29,000. He opined the terrain it is not very steep, and there isn't a five acre flat spot. He reported to the board that there isn't an opportunity to get electricity to the property in a reasonable cost, because it is not on a road or prepared road, it is across an easement across from other property. He informed that he can't get a building permit because the cost to improve the road would be $100,000+. He opined that the value in 2009 is the same value of the property today, and he can't see how the value has increased when the access and terrain are not the same as the comparables.

Swenson explained the adjustment that the Assessor's Office already made to his property due to the steep terrain. Lickiss explained that the valuation was based off of the last appeal, regarding the five acres of flat terrain. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to adjust the value for CBOE #08 to $40,140 based on the flat area is one acre vs. five acres. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #03; Renee Wiseman

Assessor's Case: McFarland described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. The board and the Assessor's Office discussed the comparables provided in the petitioner's packet materials. She explained that the properties are affected based on the steep slope and availability to utilities. She informed that there is already an adjustment of 5% due to the steep slope. She mentioned that the property has an avalanche zone on the property and this does not qualify as being in an avalanche zone. It is in a snow slide area, not an avalanche zone, based on the Town of Crested Butte standards.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, Todd Wiseman, was present for the hearing via conference call. Todd referenced the additional materials that he provided in the packet materials regarding the Sales Comparison Method. The board explained that they cannot use the sales price because it was outside of the valuation period. The petitioner informed the board that the property was listed for sale for $90,000 for four years, and no one bought it.

The board referenced the Time Trend Analysis and that there was no significant decline in the sales. The Assessor's Office explained that this sale would not qualify because it is considered a distress sale, because the seller confirmed that this property was sold in a distressed mode and sold it for less than what he wanted to sell it for. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #03 based on the information provided. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #04; Renee Wiseman

Assessor's Case: McFarland described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. She informed the board the property has been adjusted based on it being affected by wetland at the bottom of the property. The board and the Assessor's Office discussed the comparables provided in the petitioner's packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, Todd Wiseman, was present for the hearing via conference call. The board reviewed sales during the valuation period in the property's area. The petitioner explained that the comparable provided in the packet materials do not compare because they do not have wetlands on the properties. He mentioned a property that has wet lands on a property that sold for $80,000 during the valuation period. Swenson explained that the Assessor's Office uses all of the properties that sold in Economic Area 6 to value his property, not just the examples provided in the packet materials. McFarland informed that she was on the property last week and does not have a large area of wet land. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #04 based on the information provided. Motion carried unanimously.

BREAK: The meeting recessed from 10:10 am until 10:17 am.

CBOE #05; John Ferrell

Assessor's Case: McFarland described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. The board and the Assessor's Office discussed the comparables provided in the petitioner's packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, John, was present for the hearing via conference call. He explained that he looked at all the one bedroom units that sold in the time period. He explained that he as an unobstructed view of the mountain. He referenced other units that sold up at the mountain.

The Assessor's Office explained that views are not a criteria for valuation in Mountaineer Square. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #05 based on the information provided. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #09; Joan Atkinson

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. The board and the Assessor's Office discussed the comparables provided in

the petitioner's packet materials. Lickiss proposed changing the value to $300 a square foot and valuing the property at $1,276,800.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner's Agent, Attorney David Leinsdorf, was present for the hearing. He expressed to the board the timing the Assessor's Office provides their valuation information is un-timely and it is a violation of law because they do not provide the specific information they use to value the property. Leinsdorf reviewed examples that he had mentioned in his additional materials, previously provided in the packet materials. He opined that both were built by the same contractor and within the same size, and the subject property should be valued above lot 28.

Lickiss informed that an Appraiser went out to all of these properties in May of 2013 and verified that the construction of all of these properties are very good. Leinsdorf defended that he cannot see why the value is 43% higher than the other comparables. He opined that the Assessor's Office is not complying by statute, because they are not notifying the tax payers of the change in condition or how the property is valued. There was discussion that there are many factors that cannot be shown in the photos regarding the quality of construction. **Moved** by Chairperson Swenson and seconded by Commissioner Chamberland to adjust the value of CBOE #09 to $1,128,000 based on the average of the comparables shown today. Motion carried unanimously.

McFarland informed that Gunnison County Deputy Attorney Art Trezise has confirmed with the Department of Property Taxation that they have complied by the statute, and the example provided at the hearing is a courtesy, not a requirement, because they use all sales during the valuation period.

CBOE #10 and #11; Gerald and Carolyn Revocable Living Trust

Assessor's Case: McFarland described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. She explained that the time adjusted sales price ranges in value from $176.14 to $230.77 a square foot. There was discussion that the values from floor to floor differ.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner's Agent, Attorney David Leinsdorf, was present for the hearing. He provided additional information to the board at the hearing. He informed that he reviewed the averages for square footage from year to year, and compared to the 4th floor and 5th floor. He opined units should be, at the least, the value of the floor below them, because they are on the 5th floor.

There was discussion regarding the Time Adjustment. McFarland explained the Mass Appraisal Process and how the units are valued. She informed that the Assessor's Office is audited on the Time Trend Analysis and it is very stringent. Lickiss confirmed that there were 33 sales within the Grand Lodge during the valuation timeframe. Leinsdorf provided the statute that informs that they should not go back farther than 6 months at a time to gather enough sales for the valuation, and the Assessor's Office went back four years, which increased the value significantly. McFarland explained that to comply with the audit they had to go back four years. Leinsdorf commented that going back into a market where values were higher is not justifiable. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #10 and CBOE #11 based on the information provided. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #12 - 22; Verzuh Ranch, Inc.

Assessor's Case: McFarland described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner's Agent, Attorney David Leinsdorf, was present for the hearing. He explained that there are two adjacent lots that sold during the valuation period. The board reviewed these lots. He explained that the interior lot prices have dropped 32% during the timeframe. He opined that the lots have been time adjusted enough, and it doesn't make sense to raise exterior lots. He recommends that there are 3 different sizes of lots.

McFarland explained that you cannot pick and choose subdivisions to apply the time adjustment, because it would be against the law. She informed that no sales is not an indication that the value is not there, and the Assessor's Office would need a sale in the subdivision to

show the value the subject property could sell for. Lickiss explained that Leinsdorf is making his case based on 2 sales, and 2 sales does not make a trend.

Leinsdorf expressed to the board that they are not bound by the same laws as the Assessor's Office and they can make a determination if they think that the Assessor's Office did a valuation that is incorrect, even if they followed the laws.

CBOE discussed that there is no indication that once the lots start selling that they need to be lowered to the amount requested by Leinsdorf. McFarland confirmed to Leinsdorf the 54% increase is based on all of the sales in CB. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland, seconded by Commissioner Houck, to deny CBOE #12 - #22 based on the information provided. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #23; David Weekley

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. He explained that the subject property is in excellent condition. He referenced the packet materials that show the above quality conditions in this subject property.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner's Agent, Attorney David Leinsdorf, was present for the hearing. He agrees that it is in excellent property, but it is not in the top of the line condition. He referenced top of the line qualities to properties that this property does not have. He requests that it should be considered above average quality, and not excellent quality. He informed lot values in Prospect have plummeted.

The board researched other comparable that are in very good condition. There was discussion if there are any guidelines to score for condition. The Assessor's Office explained that the list they review to rate a property for condition is exhaustive. McFarland explained that this property has unobstructed views, where the other properties have obstructed views. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #23 based on the information provided. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #24; Sherman Street Holdings, LLC.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner's Agent, Attorney David Leinsdorf, was present for the hearing. He recommended denial of CBOE #24 because there are supporting sales that he found justify the Assessor's Office valuation. **Moved** by Commissioner Houck and seconded by Commissioner Chamberland to deny CBOE #24 based on the petitioner's agent requesting denial. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #25; Sherman Street Holdings, LLC.

Assessor's Case: Lickiss proposed adjusting this subject property to $400,000.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner's Agent, Attorney David Leinsdorf, was present for the hearing.

Moved by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to adjust the subject property value to $400,000, based on the Assessor's Office recommendation. Motion carried unanimously.

The board discussed making a neighborhood adjustment based on the information provided. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to adjust the value of R003151 to $400,000; R003156 to $200,000 and R003183 to $300,030 based on the information that rose from the appeal with CBOE #25. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #26; David Leinsdorf

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, Attorney David Leinsdorf, was present for the hearing. There was discussion on the other commercial properties that sold in the valuation period that compare to the subject property. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner

Houck to adjust the value to $200/square foot for a total value of $160,600 based on the condition and the 3rd floor location in the building. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #27; David Leinsdorf

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, Attorney David Leinsdorf, was present for the hearing. He opined that comparable #2 should not qualify because it sold for noncommercial purposes. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland, seconded by Commissioner Houck to adjust the value of CBOE #27 to $704,500 based on the information provided at the hearing and that one of the comparable was sold to a non-governmental entity. Motion carried unanimously.

BREAK: The meeting recessed from 12:11 pm until 2:15 pm.

CBOE #28 and 29; Renbarger Family LLC

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. Lickiss informed the board that he inspected the property on 7/11/2013, and upon inspection, he did not find any cattle on the property at the time, nor did he find any sign of current or past evidence of cattle use. The Assessor's Officers also inspected the watering hole and salt lick on the property and did not find any evidence of cattle. Lickiss informed the board that Brand Inspector, Irby, informed Lickiss he does not have any recollection of inspecting cattle on this property.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioners, Randy Renbarger and Don Renbarger, and Petitioner's Agent, Fourth Scoufos, was present for the hearing via conference call. There was a discussion regarding the salt lick. Lickiss explained that there were no signs of cattle manure around the salt lick. The agent mentioned that there were cattle panels on the property. Lickiss did not inspect the pin for cattle or horses, he opined he thought they were to be used for hunters to hold their horses. The agent commented that the pins could also be used for cattle wranglers to hold their horses. There was discussion that the current owner has owned this property since 1998. Scoufos informed the board the summer of 2011 and 2012 there were cattle on this property, and all of the cattle were all wrangled up by fall.

Scoufos explained to the board that the Renbarger Family transports cattle to the property from Oklahoma. He explained that the Renbarger Family bought the property to use for cattle grazing for a few months, to get them through pasturing season in Oklahoma, and there isn't a schedule or regular routine. McFarland commented that there was no physical evidence of cattle on the property when it was inspected. Scoufos confirmed that the Renbarger Family has no intention to irrigate or hay on the property. There was discussion that transportation of cattle in and out of the state of Colorado, the cattle owners must stop at a port of entry and obtain a brand inspection. The Renbarger Family informed the board that they did not stop at the port of entry and get a brand inspection while transporting the cattle. Mr. Renbarger expressed that he did not know stopping at the port of entry was a requirement, and they transported the cattle in gooseneck trailers. Lickiss informed that it is required by the State of Colorado to stop at the port of entry when transporting livestock.

The board discussed that this is definitely a ranching family, there isn't a brand inspection provided for transporting the cattle across the state line, there is an affidavit from someone stating they have seen cattle on this property yet there is no evidence of cattle on the property near the watering hole or salt lick. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to re-classify the property as Agricultural Land. Chairperson Swenson opined that she will not support this motion, because there is no evidence that there have been cattle on this property, and if cattle was transported, they were transported illegally because there was not a brand inspection at the state line. Motion carried 2 to 1.

CBOE #30-33; Dena Hildreth

CBOE #30: Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. The board and the Assessor's Office discussed the comparables provided in the petitioner's packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner's Agent, John Johnson, and Petitioner, Dena Hildreth, were present for the hearing. There was discussion that the Assessor's Office had to use properties that sold in 2008 and 2009, but the owners purchased the property for $2 million, and the seller had owned it for 38 years before. The petitioner expressed that there is $45,000 in taxes, which is 15% of gross revenue for a business that is trying to make it in Gunnison County. The petitioner and agent commented that they purchased the property a few months ago for $2.4 million dollars and it's already valued at $2.9 million. They informed the board that the previous owner didn't sell it in duress. The board reviewed other properties that sold during the valuation period. The Assessor's Office explained the valuation process and valuation time period. **Moved** by Commissioner Houck and seconded by Commissioner Chamberland, to deny CBOE #30. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #31: Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials.

The Assessor's Office confirmed that the little pond on the property would not be enough wet land area to qualify for the adjustment. The board reviewed other properties that sold during the valuation period that are affected by being adjacent to commercial property. **Moved** by Chairperson Swenson and seconded by Commissioner Chamberland to adjust CBOE #31 to $80,000 based on 12 Red Lady Way, which is a property that was affected by its location to a commercial property. Adjust the property to the value as affected property that sold lower than 5%. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #32 & #33: Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials.

The CBOE discussed the location of this property and that it is a low density multifamily lot. There was discussion that the Assessor's Office used comparables from Gunnison. The Assessor's Office informed the board that they could have used comparables from Aspen or Vail, but chose Gunnison because you have to use comparables in a ski area. **Moved** by Commissioner Houck and seconded by Commissioner Chamberland to deny CBOE #32 based on the information provided. Motion carried unanimously. **Moved** by Commissioner Houck and seconded by Commissioner Chamberland to deny CBOE #33 based on the petitioner's agent requesting denial. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #40; Alan Lauer Trust

Assessor's Case: McFarland described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. The board and the Assessor's Office discussed the comparables provided in the petitioner's packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner was not present for the discussion.

Moved by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #40 based on the information reviewed. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #35; LSC Southwest Colorado LLC

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, Layne, was present for the hearing via conference call. There was discussion on the market approach. Lickiss explained that the comparables are based on a multiple regression analysis. He mentioned that the bank appraised his property. The bank said the valuation must be wrong or the appraisal must be wrong, because the value dropped to $80,000 in 2013. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #35 based on the information reviewed. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #36; John A&M Isabel Gibson Revocable Real Estate Trust Agreement

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, John Gibson, was present for the hearing. He mentioned that unit 11 is the same square footage as the subject property, and unit 5 has a better view and is bigger house than the subject property. He provided a comparable at the hearing for the Assessor's Office and the board to review. The comparable provided by the petitioner has the exact square footage, view, condition, and is in the same complex as the subject property. He mentioned that the comparable he provided actually has better view because it looks at the mountain, whereas his unit looks at an office building. This comparable provided by the petitioner is within the valuation period. McFarland explained the Mass Appraisal process. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #36 based on the information reviewed. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #37; Worldwide Properties LLC

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. He explained based on the discussion of only one acre being integral to adjust the property to. The board explained that the law changed, and now the land under the residence is included in the valuation. Lickiss recommended the following value of this subject property:

1 acre of land = $27,180
Cabin = $5,210
Ag Land = $1,050
Total Valuation of $33,440

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, Denver Price, was present for the hearing. There was discussion that there is an error on the Assessor's Office Notice of Determination sheet. The board discussed that you begin at a baseline of $25,000 then add additional values. Petitioner commented that he was concerned that the value for his 300 square foot shack was $29,130. Lease agreement needs to be renewed every two years if it expires. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to adjust the value of CBOE #37 to $33,440. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #38; David Esposito

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. The board and the Assessor's Office discussed the comparables provided in the petitioner's packet materials.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner was not present for the hearing. Chairperson Swenson left a message, informing the petitioner that we are reviewing his appeal. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland, seconded by Commissioner Houck, to adjust value to $2,238,090 because the condition changed from excellent to good. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #39; Jennifer Lynn French Revocable Trust

Assessor's Case: Lickiss described the subject property and the examples provided in the packet materials. He explained that the subject property is located in the area commonly known as Gunnison Highlands North.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner, Ken French, was present for the discussion via conference call. Ken reviewed the comparable provided and disagreed with them because some of the comparable have utilities, live creeks, year round access, etc. The board discussed that the quality and condition of properties affects the value. There was discussion that one of the comparables sold within the valuation period that is in his area. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to deny CBOE #36 based on the information reviewed. Motion carried unanimously.

CBOE #41; 1st Net Real Estate Services, Inc.

Assessor's Case: Lickiss informed the board that the petitioner and the Assessor's Office have agreed upon a stipulated amount of $1,005,000.

Petitioner's Case: Petitioner was not present for the hearing. **Moved** by Commissioner Chamberland and seconded by Commissioner Houck to adjust the value of CBOE #41 to $1,005,000 based on the stipulated amount agreed upon. Motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURN: **Moved** by Commissioner Swenson, seconded by Commissioner Houck, to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously. The July 22, 2013 meeting of the Board of Equalization adjourned at 5:00 pm.

****

_____
Paula Swenson, Chairperson

_____
Phil Chamberland, Commissioner

_____
Jonathan Houck, Commissioner

Minutes Prepared By:

_____
Bobbie Lucero, Deputy County Clerk

Attest:

_____
Stella Dominguez, County Clerk