

Cleveland County Board of Equalization Meeting

May 23, 2013

The scheduled meeting of the Cleveland County Equalization Board was called to order this 23rd day of May 2013, in the conference room of the Cleveland County Office Building by Chairman Waldo Blanton. Tammy Belinson, County Clerk/Secretary, called roll and those present were:

Waldo Blanton, Chairman
Charles Thompson, Vice-Chairman
Pat Ross, Member
Tammy Belinson, Secretary

Others present: Carol Dillingham, Assistant District Attorney, Colleen Morton, David Tinsley, Billijo Ragland, Mike Weddle, Jannis Allen, Diana F. Petross, Doug Savage, Mary Jane Kelly, Victor T. Atkansel, Larry Ogee and Linda Atkins.

After the reading of the minutes of the special meeting of January 28, 2013 and May 9, 2013 and there being no additions or corrections, Charles Thompson moved that the minutes be approved. The motion was seconded by Waldo Blanton.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

Due to the representative being late for Item "a", Norman Hospitality, In., represented by Savage, Savage & Brown, Agents Address: P.O. box 22845 Oklahoma city, OK 73123; Protested Property Address: 1000 N. Interstate Drive, #R005417; Legal Description: Replat Spring Brook Sec 8 Lot 1 Blk 1, SD NC29, Chairman Waldo Blanton said that they will hear the next protester.

Diana F. Petross appeared before the Board to protest regarding the following: 4101 Silverton Circle, Norman, OK 73072, Protested Property Address; 401 E Boyd #402 Norman, OK 73069, #R0163714; Legal Description: Classen Miller Lts 13 thru 17 BLK 232 & PRT Vacated Macy St Loft 401 Condominium Unit 402 & 3.9033 UND IN in Common elements, NC29.

Ms. Petross asked the Board if they knew anyone else besides this woman dumb enough to buy a house by the railroad tracks in Norman, OK. She bought the condo across from The Mont, a restaurant located on Boyd Street. She thought it would be a good investment and that it could be rented out. She had a bit of a slush fund to invest; however, it has turned out to be a nightmare. She was not too sure how the process went but prepared briefing charts for the Board to follow along with her.

Waldo Blanton advised her that anything she had to present is fine and instructed her to go through her presentation and then the Board will hear from the Assessor's office.

Diana Petross said that the property is located at 401 Silverton and submitted pictures. She is not that familiar with the ones priced at The Mont. She pointed out an over view and submitted the architect's big vision of what it was supposed to look like when it started out. She said that the same guy is trying to buy the condos across from The Mont and one can see on the first page of

that briefing that some of the issues are actual property value as compared to what they paid for it. According to the real estate agents that she has talked to there is a difference. There are thirty-five condos in that location and only fifteen have sold in the last three years, because they are overpriced. They charged \$165.00 per square foot to build. She and others are in litigation with the builder. The Homeowners Association is through the ceiling with their rates. She compared the cost in living with Carmel, CA, which is in a high dollar neighborhood. She said it was a whole lot less than what they pay in Oklahoma, which she finds absolutely absurd. She and the other homeowners thought that they may be lowered once it got built, but it hasn't happened yet. She said that there is a breach of duty in which the builder cannot account for the money that they paid him for the home as well as for the Association. She said it has been a nightmare. The parking spaces aren't marked and the Codes aren't up to date. There is just a litany of problems that they have had with him. Then proceeding to the next chart, she said it talks about the average cost in Norman, information source was gathered from Trulia. She tried to find five Real Estate Companies in Norman to give her an estimate on what the property is worth. Ms. Petross did speak with Mike McCoy, who told her that she paid too much. She explained that the problem involved in getting appraisals from Real Estate Agents stem from them not wanting to give free estimates. She said they want one to be under contract in some form by either buying or selling a property. She found that the average listing price, \$224,426.00; Median sales price \$160,000; average price per square foot is \$100.00. She looked at a number of websites for the average cost and the comps are anywhere from \$89.00 to \$115.00.

The most expensive as one examines the next chart is the properties for sale at 2808 Castlewood Drive which is \$775,000.00. She said that is high-end. The one on Castlewood has a wine cellar and custom cabinets, the high end counter tops, cherry wood or oak. Her cabinets in the condos have particle board; it is not high end appliances. It was all done cheap and when they bought into this they were told it is going to be like the one on Castlewood. She said one gets so tired of dealing with the architect/developer until finally one just says, "Fine, just fix it and we'll buy it". She said that it took them a year and half to get it ready and they finally closed on it last year. She said at 202 Jason, which is close to OU sold for \$64,500/1200 square feet at \$53.75 sq. ft. She said that the one that she owns is 1650 sq. ft. On 12th Street, one mile east of OU, sits one \$28,000/756 sq. ft. at \$37.00 sq. ft. She said condos do not sell well because you have Homeowners Associations or there is some type of noisy neighbor in a condo. Her reasons for protesting the value is based on the next chart, stating that it is not custom built; cheap building materials; and particle board cabinets. She was told by Mark McCoy that it should average \$100 a sq. ft. He said that is a good average for Norman, especially, for condos because they don't sell well. She has tried to rent the place for the last year and a half and has received zero phone calls. It cost a lot to advertise in the Oklahoma Daily, the University Paper, Craig's list, and the Norman Transcript. The reason for no takers is because the rent has to cover the cost spent to build in order to get your money back. The cost of the house was \$269,187.00 and was built by a railroad track. She described the condo as 1650 square feet, two story structure and added that nothing in Norman sells for \$165 per square foot.

She thinks that this property has depreciated and added that Mark McCoy told her that he would appraise it for approximately \$200,000.00 since it was located close to the University.

Charles Thompson said there are exceptions and this is one of them.

Diana Petross said, in her opinion, they paid too much for the house. It has depreciated in value. None of the others have sold because he is asking \$165.00 square foot in Norman.

Diana Petross said that the thought was they were getting a custom built home and were so disappointed.

Charles Thompson said that he could understand completely.

Diana Petross said that they ended up with laminated floors, not even real wood floors. It is not a custom made property and it is not worth \$269,000.00.

Waldo Blanton asked for the Assessor's office response.

Charles Thompson asked Ms. Petross if she was requesting that it be lowered to \$208,000.00 as listed on her formal appeal.

Diana answered affirmatively.

David Tinsley said that everything that Miss Petross is saying is true. He knew there would be a problem and added that they have seen situations like this time and time again. Then what compounds it, in March 2013, a sale in the amount of \$186,000.00 took place. That is why they advised the home owners in there to come before the Board, because their hands are tied.

After a brief discussion, Charles Thompson moved that it be lowered to \$200,000.00. The motion was seconded by Waldo Blanton.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

David Tinsley said that Item "c" is basically the same thing.

Item "c" – Amy Reilly Sallusti and Matthew Paul Sallusti, 7009 Cliffbrook Drive, Dallas, TX 75254, Protested Property Address: 401 East Boyd Street, Unit 300, Norman, OK #R0163695; Legal Description: Classen Miller Lts 13 thru 17 Blk 23 & Prt Vacated Macy St. Lot 401 Condominiums Units 300 & 2.7655% Undivided Interest in Common Elements, NC29.

Diana Petross said that Matt and Amy are in Dallas. It is hard for them to get up here. They were going to try and come up two weeks ago, but the meeting was cancelled.

David Tinsley said that they assumed when one protest was heard that it would apply to all of them. So whatever that is per square foot it works for him. He said that they are figuring square footage and it comes out to about \$120.00 per square foot, which would make "c" \$141,741.00.

Waldo Blanton moved, seconded by Pat Ross, that the assessed value of this property be adjusted to \$141,741.00.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

David Tinsley said that there are just the two units being protested today, but they will apply it to all units in that complex.

Mary Jane Kelly appearing for Item "d" – James E. & Mary Jane Kelly, 3305 N. Olde Bridge Road, Moore, OK 73160, #96917, Legal Description: Olde Stonebridge Sec 2 Lot 11 & 12 Blk 4, MC2, said that she has provided the Board information regarding Old Stone Bridge, what used to be Old Stone Bridge until Monday. (Old Stone Bridge received tornado damage) She explained that they are a gated community; so therefore, they have no street repair and they pay for their own lighting. Their neighborhood backs up to Cleveland Heights, which in comparison to railroad tracks is pretty close to about the same thing. She stated that comps have been given to the Board. While admitting to having the largest house in the community, she asked for some consideration by taking her neighbors' square footage percentage and apply it to her 7,172

square foot house. By doing so, it still wouldn't even come close to what she is currently paying. Ms. Kelly stated that she is the Director in the community of the Home Owners Association and has been in 90% of the houses. She is friends with those people, whose homes were built under strict house covenants and the quality in their homes are absolute. She has one neighbor that has 5,093 square feet and they are paying close to \$8,300.00 a year. She said that they are paying \$14,000.00 a year. Some of the other compares consist of one with 3,800 square feet in which they are paying \$5,400.00, a year. She said that being from the old school; one was taught not to question, one just did what they had to do. Later on, she found out that there is an outlet for addressing their taxes to receive some consideration. This is exactly what she has tried to do. After meeting with David Tinsley and his crew, the taxes were lowered in 2011 and 2012, which she was more than grateful. She said that not wishing to sound greedy, but by taking the comparisons of the square footage of some of her neighbors, she is still hoping for more relief. She said that, from 2003 to 2010, they were paying as much in taxes as the Warren Theater. Billijo Ragland said that Mrs. Kelly is right; it is the largest house in the neighborhood. They currently have her value at \$1,550,371.00 which is about \$145.85 sq. ft. and added that her appraisal did come in at \$165.00 sq. ft. Ms. Ragland said that her property is over built for the neighborhood as stated in the appraisal as well. She said that they have some comps, but wanted to add that this area was hit by the tornado on Monday, May 20, 2013. The County Assessor is unable to get out there and assess the damage at the present time. She said that Ms. Kelly has said that they did receive some damage and they are looking at adjusting those values for this year. She said that they will not know the full extent of the damage until they are able to get in the area. She said that the value before the tornado was more than fair. She said the value being lowered last year was due to the millage rate decreasing a little bit in Moore. Ms. Ragland said that the millage rate will always be a factor. She said that in about two or three weeks they should be able to view the property and make some adjustments, because they had already planned to adjust for 2013.

Charles Thompson moved that the assessed value be lowered to \$950,000.00. He said that the amount may be a split in the difference for storm damage too.

The motion was seconded by Pat Ross.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

Victor Atkansel appeared for protest for Item "e" – 2633 S Berry Road, Norman, OK 73072, #37576, Legal Description: Lakewood Park Addition Lot 7 Block 1, NC29. He said that the house on 2421 S Berry is two blocks north of his house, was sold recently at \$59.50 square foot. This house has a bigger lot and has 3,279 sq. ft. living space. The value of the price was \$187,701.00, but the sale price was \$195,000.00, so it was not a fire sale. At this price, in his opinion, his house should be \$114,896.00. As a result of the tax increase on his property, his taxes were increased by \$144.90.

Waldo Blanton said that his property has been frozen at \$140,000.00.

Mr. Atkansel said, "But the value is the value."

Chairman Blanton asked the Assessor to respond.

Billijo Ragland said that Mr. Atkansel's property is located in a very nice neighborhood in the south part of Norman. They currently have his house as being built in 1995. The newer houses in that neighborhood are on at \$169,471.00, but Mr. Atkansel's is capped and frozen at \$140,515.00. There is a house two doors down from him that was built in 1957 that sold for \$168,000.00. It is 1,919 sq. ft. and has been remodeled and now they are asking \$279,900.00 which is \$145.86 sq. ft. The one that Mr. Atkansel was referring to is a large home with a flat roof, they did buy it low, but they have gone in and gutted that house completely and it doesn't look like the same house anymore. Vacant lots, about three blocks behind him, are selling anywhere from \$75,000.00 to \$79,000.00. There are some in a very small addition to the north of him that are about \$125,000.00 per lot. She said that Mr. Atkansel's house value is very much in line, and added they already have a 15% adjustment down on his house because of the creek behind him. She said that no one else has that adjustment but him and added that his value is more than fair.

Charles Thompson moved that there be no change in the assessed value. The motion was seconded by Waldo Blanton.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

Larry Ogee, 6601 E. Cedar Lane, Norman, OK, #104061, Legal description: Blue Ridge Acres Lot 1 and W102.69' of Lt Blk 2, NC40, appeared for protest.

Mr. Ogee said that this is the first time to appear before the Board and stated that he is not really protesting the value of the property. He said that from what he has been told the value was understated because at some point the square footage was in error and so the Assessor's office corrected the square footage. He said that they are the experts as far as real estate and does not have a problem with the value. The thing that concerned him was the tax increase of about 150% to 200% all in one year. He said there is a section in the Constitution of Oklahoma addressing this and because he has Home Stead Exemption it is limited to 3%.

Waldo Blanton said, "I think you are talking about two different things. Let's ask the assessor to talk and see what he has to say."

Billijo Ragland said that she agrees with Mr. Ogee that the protest is not regarding the value. She explained that in 1985 they were out there; it had been a 25'x36' two-story dwelling. She went back into the micro film and it said that it was under construction, but they were living in the house. This house sits back off the road quite a ways and is not visible. She drove out there yesterday and was unable to get on the property. They do have aerial photographs and on a lot of properties that they haven't been able to get in to take a look, they rely on pictography. Pictography helps when for whatever reason they can't get into a property, such as, locked gates, bad dogs, etc. Pictography allowed them to see what was on there, and found it so unbelievable; they thought they must have the wrong property. The house is so much larger now. One of the appraisers went out there and left a door hanger for Mr. Ogee to call them and they estimated it off of pictography. So the measurements that they have, which are on this next page, are just estimates. She called Mr. Ogee to see if they could come out there and measure it, because they

didn't know if their measurements were right, but Mr. Ogee has preferred they not come out there.

Mr. Ogee said, "That is a liability. It is a liability, I have dogs and horses. If someone was to get hurt it would be blamed on us."

Ms. Ragland said that they have never had this happen to them before and they added all that on for this year. She said that they didn't have it on before and it has never been taxed.

Charles Thompson told Mr. Ogee that it would be one big mess if everyone said they didn't want the County Assessor to appraise their property and refuse to give them access.

Mr. Ogee said, "I have livestock and everything else".

Chairman Blanton said, "For a meeting like that, I would think that you could be there. They have to adjust their time schedule to be there."

Mr. Ogee said, "In all the time that I have lived there, which is over twelve (12) years, I have never had any contact with any Assessors, they've never called, they never come by up until now."

Mr. Waldo Blanton said, "Well, they have now".

Charles Thompson said, "You were lucky for a long time. They come see me all the time".

Mr. Ogee said that he would like to add that according to the Constitution, Section 10, Paragraph 3, he should not be held liable for all that in one year.

Waldo Blanton said, "You will have to take that to District Court and talk to a Judge about it if that is what you want to do. My motion is to keep it the way it is listed."

The motion was seconded by Charles Thompson.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

Waldo Blanton said, "That is our decision".

Mr. Blanton, "Who is the USA Compression Partners?"

Tammy Belinson said, "David Tinsley just handed me something stating that they are withdrawing. So you can just strike that from the agenda".

Waldo Blanton moved, seconded by Charles Thompson, that the protest of USA Compression Partners, LLC, K.E. Andrews & Company, 1900 Dalrock Road, Rowlett, TX 75088, #P0154088, Protested Property is Various PP/Industrial Property located in School Districts: MC2, be stricken from the agenda as per their request to withdraw.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

Doug Savage representing Norman Hospitality, Inc., protested Property Address: 1000 N. Interstate Drive, #R005417; Legal Description: Replat Spring Brook Sec 8 Lot 1 Blk 1, SD NC29 appeared before the Board as an agent of Savage, Savage & Brown, P.O. Box 22845, Oklahoma city, OK 73123.

He apologized for being late and explained that he was tied up in traffic due to the tornado damage in Moore, OK that occurred on May 20th.

He said, “This is the Holiday Inn in Norman, off I35, 1000 N. Interstate Drive, is the actual address. We had an informal hearing on this property; we protested it within the window. They came down and I spoke with Mike and I told him that I had requested some income information because I knew that the hotel was struggling with their competitive set, but they have not finalized their 2012 income yet. I told him to give me a couple more days and he was more than willing to work with us and we got down to the time that he had to make a decision. I said send us a ‘no change’ and, hopefully, I can get this information by the time we go to the Board. That is what happened and I appreciate Mike for working with us, but he did basically everything that he could do. Now, we do have the income finalized. What I have here for you today, and I have numbered the pages down to the bottom right hand corner, it is real technical, but it is easy to walk you through this. The first few pages, pages 3, 4 and 5 are actually the printouts from the county’s website. I have highlighted on page 3, the current value of the property as \$5,960,877.00. I am going to fast forward to page 6. Any hotel/ motel operator or any hotel/motel investor is going to look at any property, if they are looking at purchasing it as an investment property at this report, right here. This is a Smith Travel Research report; what this report does, it actually shows you how you are doing against your competitors, how you are doing in the market and how the hotel is performing. Page 7 is a glance at exactly what is happening on this property. I have highlighted the top three sections starting at the left, I have highlighted, as you can see, this is the occupancy that the property experiences. The left side of that column under occupancy, it says, ‘my property’ and if you go down to the bottom of that it has the twelve-month running for 2012. Right now, this property is running about 60% occupied or 40% vacant. The next column, you will see, that is the competitive set. What they do, they take all the competitors in that market and average them out to find what their average occupancy is. The competitive set runs about 63% occupied and in the last column, in that grouping of threes in that index, shows that this property is about 94% of the competitive set. If that makes sense. If we move over to the right; the average daily rate on this property, the subject property is running about \$75 for an average daily rate. The next column, the competitive set is about \$84, which shows that this property is running about 80 or 90% of the competitive set. We move on over to the right; this is the big one, this is the rev part which is revenue per available per room. This is what any investor, or any hotel operator, when they look at their property to see ‘how am I doing’ you want to look at how much revenue you are creating for available rooms. This property is running about \$44 per available room or \$45 if you want to round it up. The competitive set runs about \$53 per available room, which this property is running about 83% in the competitive set, which is not very good. The average daily rate, if you go to the bottom of section, just from 2011 to 2012 is down almost \$6 or \$5.50. This is a pretty drastic change. I am going to flip pages here and I believe that one of the reasons that we see this and, it is on page 8 on the bottom right hand corner and I have highlighted for you, is this shows the pipeline or the current market and, under construction, in this market in the Oklahoma City and outlined area market, they are showing seven properties right now are under construction and adding another 899 rooms. Planning, there are 21 properties, planning for an additional 1,951 rooms. It will flood the market here soon. This is not good if you are a hotel/ motel operator. When we go to the next page, at the top, you will see a graph and this is exactly what I have just spoken to you about. These are all the indexes and, as you can see, at the top, the black dotted line is actually

the competitive set. Most of this property falls below that competitive set by quite a bit on all levels. The bottom right hand corner, if you will look all the way to the far right hand column, what that does on each section, this rates your property with its competitive set. I will have you fast forward one page and we are going to go to page 10. The competitive set is a group of hotels in your market that they compare you with. That is what is highlighted down here at the bottom and you will see in the market the competitive set. You've got the Holiday Inn in Norman, which is the subject, the Fairfield; the Embassy Suites; LaQuinta Inn and Suites; the Hilton Garden Inn in Norman; then the Comfort Inn and Suites, in Norman and the Courtyard, in Norman; is what it is compared with. If we look over to the far right hand side, it lists the number of rooms that are in these hotels. One thing that I have noticed is, in the very far right hand column, right next to room, it says the 'open date'. The subject property was opened in 1984. Every property in this competitive set, as you can see, the Fairfield was built in '95; the LaQuinta in '97; and the following three hotels were in 2007; 2008; and 2009. This is, definitely, the oldest hotel of the competitive set. There were 498 rooms added to this competitive set after this hotel was built. We are going to come back forward to page 9. As I was saying, over on the right hand side, on the twelve month running, this property is ranked 6 of 6, in both RevPAR and ADR adjustments, which means it is the worst hotel. You want to be 1 of 6, and we are 6 of 6. As you can see, in 2011, if you want to look it over, 30% is changed on the ADR to 3 of 6, before that they were 1 of 6. They have rapidly declined from 2010 and 2012, from first to last, and that I believe, is the reflection of those new hotels being added in this set. We go to the remaining pages of this Smith Travel and Research, page 12, you can see it is more graphs, it is on a daily index, daily income and they all fall way below the competitive set. What we have done is put together an income approach on this property, because when we are dealing with income producing properties, the best indicator is obviously income approach. If you are going to come in and purchase this hotel, you are going to want to know how much money it is going to make me. It is an income investment. In doing that, we have to look at our cap rates study and that is what I have included here for you on page 13. They don't have a specific cap rate study for Oklahoma, so we kind of averaged it out between Dallas and Denver. If we look at the select service hotels, the cap rate runs anywhere from 8% cap to 9.5% cap. Page 14 is the actual income and expense report ending the 12 months, ending in December 31, 2012. It is broken out by the revenue for the room, the food, the beverage, and telephone. We've also got the operating expenses and the unallocated expenses. If we look at the bottom line of this property, the net operating loss is negative \$544,558. That is what they lost last year on this property. Now, we can't just take the net operating income of the \$544,558 and throw it into an income approach and come up with a value or come up with a negative value. That doesn't work. I know that the property is worth something, you have to make adjustments in the expenses. You don't include the depreciation in amortization, you don't include property tax. You roll that back in capital and make some adjustments. Page 16, is our Income Proforma that we put together using that income information. The actual income on a property for 149 rooms was \$2,740,088. The vacancy rate is applicable, we are using the actual income, and the actual income that is going to be received is the vacancies that are included in that. You are not going to receive income on vacant rooms, so you wouldn't apply vacancy rate. The expenses are carried forward; all we included is the operating expenses from the previous pages of \$1,285,430, in unallocated expenses of \$1,023,340 and a management fee of \$108,681. The total

expenses with adjustments, was \$322,637, which is our revised net operating income. We are using a base cap from the cap rate study of 8.5, this is a medium. Then once you set the value, then you go back into the tax rate which is 1.4 on this property. The total cap rate comes in at 9.92%, which gives us an income indicated value on this property. If you look at the right, what you are going to do is divide the net operating income into the cap rate and it gives you an income indicator, which is \$3,252,389. However, we are dealing with a hotel/ motel property and you have to make adjustments for personal property, the 2013 value \$379,913 total adjustments, and \$379,193. Because when you go in and rent a hotel room, you are renting more than just a room. You are renting the TV, you are renting the facilities, and if it has a workout room. So it is typical of the method of valued property to back out the personal property value. The attached page, I believe it is page 17, is the actual print out from the county's website, of the 2012 personal value, that was \$379,193.00 and we backed that out of the income indicator which gives us an income indicated value which is highlighted at the bottom of the income approach of \$2,873,196.00. As I stated earlier, the county value currently on this property is \$5,960,877.00. We would love for this property to be worth \$5.9, but it is not producing that kind of income right now. It may be in the future, with the market flooded with new hotels, newer by 10 or 15 years, 20 years in some cases, I don't see it rapidly increasing. We feel that the more accurate market indicator on this property for 2013 would be the \$2,873,196.00. I will answer any questions that you have."

Charles Thompson said that written on the original form is a value of \$4.5 million.

Doug Savage said that amount was an estimate because they didn't have the income information at the time and are revising since they now have the actual income figure.

David Tinsley said that this is the first time they have seen this information and his office will need some time to review it.

Waldo Blanton asked, "So you need some time to look at that? Why don't we just pick a date and go over this with the Assessor and work that out."

Mr. Savage said, "I have no problem with that, I can set a meeting to come in and sit down with the Assessor. That is not a problem, in fact I apologize, and they didn't finish their financial statements".

Waldo Blanton moved, seconded by Pat Ross, to table this item until a later date for further review.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

Discussion was had by the Board to call another meeting for May 30, 2013.

Waldo Blanton called for discussion, consideration, and/or action regarding the Homestead Exemption Applications.

David Tinsley said “Here is a sample of them, if you want to bless them.”

Charles Thompson said, “You have been through them all and recommend that we approve?”

David Tinsley answered affirmatively.

Charles Thompson moved, seconded by Waldo Blanton, to approve the Homestead Exemption Applications.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

Discussion, consideration, and/or action to review approve and/or disapprove applications for Five-Year Ad Valorem Tax Exemption.

David Tinsley said these are all of them.

Charles Thompson asked if they were in order.

David Tinsley answered affirmatively.

Charles Thompson moved, seconded by Pat Ross, that they be approved.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

There was no new business to come before the Board.

There was no Public Comments.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Waldo Blanton moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Pat Ross.

The vote was: Waldo Blanton, yes; Charles Thompson, yes; Pat Ross, yes.

Motion carried.

(Clerk’s Note: Agenda was posted on May 20, 2013 at 1:55 pm.)