

minutes101596S
BOARD MINUTES FOR 10/15/96

OCTOBER 15, 1996

THE PROPERTY APPRAISAL VALUE ADJUSTMENT BOARD FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY MET ON THE ABOVE DATE AT 9:00 A.M. AT THE WASHINGTON COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, 711 THIRD STREET, CHIPLEY, FLORIDA WITH COUNTY COMMISSION BOARD MEMBERS ALBERT DAVIS, LENZY CORBIN, CHARLES BROCK AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS THELMA WOOD AND PHILLIP ROUNTREE PRESENT AND SITTING AS THE VALUE ADJUSTMENT BOARD. ATTORNEY GERALD HOLLEY, PROPERTY APPRAISER RONALD WRIGHT, DEPUTY APPRAISER GIL CARTER, CLERK EARNESTINE MILLER AND DEPUTY CLERK DIANNE CARTER WERE ALSO IN ATTENDANCE.

ALBERT DAVIS, CHAIRMAN OF THE VALUE ADJUSTMENT BOARD, CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER WITH BOARD MEMBER ROUNTREE OFFERING PRAYER.

THE VALUE ADJUSTMENT BOARD ADDRESSED PETITION #6 FILED BY WILLIAM VICKERS REQUESTING AN AGRICULTURE CLASSIFICATION ON HIS PROPERTY. THE PROPERTY APPRAISER ADVISED THE BOARD VICKERS FILED A LATE CLASSIFICATION PETITION AND THEN REFERENCED THE REMARKS IN VICKERS PETITION PLEADING IGNORANCE TO THE MARCH 1, 1996 DEADLINE. ATTORNEY HOLLEY AND THE PROPERTY APPRAISER ADDRESSED THIS BEING THE FIRST YEAR THE BOARD HAS HAD AUTHORITY TO GRANT LATE FILING OF A PETITION FOR AN AG CLASSIFICATION; HOWEVER, THE LATE FILING HAS TO BE DUE TO A JUST CAUSE.

VICKERS ADDRESSED HIS PETITION ADVISING THE BOARD THIS WAS THE FIRST TIME HE HAD BEEN INVOLVED WITH THE GREENBELT PROCEDURES AND WAS NOT AWARE OF THE MARCH 1, 1996 DEADLINE. VICKERS ALSO ADDRESSED THE PROPERTY WAS BEING PREPARED FOR PLANTING, TREES WERE ORDERED AND SOMEONE WAS LINED UP TO START PLANTING; HOWEVER, HE HAD BEEN TOLD THE BEST TIME FOR PLANTING WAS LATE DECEMBER OR EARLY JANUARY. VICKERS SAID A RECOMMENDATION HE HAD GOTTEN FROM PERSONS IN TIMBER BUSINESS WAS AFTER HARVESTING TIMBER, LEAVE IT A YEAR TO ALLOW THE STUMPS TO ROT AND THEN REPLANT IT; THIS IS WHY THE PROPERTY HAS NOT BEEN PLANTED AT THIS POINT.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY READ THE STATUTES WHICH REQUIRES EVERY DECISION THE BOARD MAKES MUST CONTAIN SPECIFIC AND DETAILED FINDINGS OF FACT WHICH SHALL INCLUDE BOTH ULTIMATE FINDINGS OF FACT AND BASIC AND UNDERLINING FINDINGS OF FACT. HOLLEY ADVISED THE BOARD TO STATE IN THE RECORD WHEN THEY MAKE A DECISION ON A PETITION THE FACTS ON WHICH THEY ARE BASING THE DECISION OR LACK OF FACTS; THE BURDEN OF PROOF IS ON THE PETITIONER AND IF HE PRESENTS NO EVIDENCE THEN IT WOULD BE LACK OF PROOF ON HIS PART.

BOARD MEMBER ROUNTREE QUESTIONED IF THE REQUEST MEETS THE CRITERIA AS SPECIFIED IN THE LAW TO BE ELIGIBLE TO BE CLASSIFIED AS GREENBELT PROPERTY. PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT EXPLAINED THE REQUIREMENTS FOR AGRICULTURE CLASSIFICATION IS FOR THE PROPERTY TO BE PUT TO A BONAFIDE COMMERCIAL AGRICULTURE USE; 70 ACRES OF PLANTED PINES WOULD QUALIFY IF THAT WERE THE PREDOMINANT USE OF THE PROPERTY BUT FIRST THAT WOULD NEED TO BE ESTABLISHED AS THE USE. WRIGHT ADVISED THE BOARD VICKERS WAS RIGHT WHEN HE STATED MOST OF THE SURROUNDING PROPERTY WAS CLASSIFIED AS AGRICULTURE PROPERTY; SOME OF THOSE PARCELS ARE BEING SOLD AND DEVELOPED AND MR. VICKERS BOUGHT SOME OF THIS PROPERTY.

BOARD MEMBER MORRIS OFFERED A MOTION TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN AG CLASSIFICATION BASED ON THE FACT HE CAN'T PLANT HIS TREES UNTIL NOVEMBER OR DECEMBER WITH THE PROPERTY APPRAISER LOOKING AT THIS IN THE COMING YEAR; IF IT IS NOT PLANTED IN PINES AT THAT TIME, CLASSIFY IT DIFFERENTLY. THE MOTION DIED FOR A LACK OF A SECOND.

BOARD MEMBER WOOD REFERENCED VICKERS WAS CORRECT WHEN HE STATED DECEMBER WAS A BETTER TIME TO PLANT PINES AND QUESTIONED IF DOCUMENTATION COULD BE PROVIDED FROM THE PERSON WHO IS SUPPOSE TO BE VICKER'S CONTRACTOR STATING VICKERS IS IN THE PROCESS OF PLANTING PINES. ATTORNEY HOLLEY STATED THE PETITIONER HAS TESTIFIED HE WAS IN THE PROCESS OF PLANTING PINES AND THE BOARD CAN ONLY USE EVIDENCE THAT IS PRESENTED AT THE HEARING.

WRIGHT STATED THE PURPOSE OF THE CHANGE IN THE LAW WAS TO GRANT THE PETITIONER SOME OPPORTUNITY TO PROVE HE WAS LATE FILING DUE TO SOME EXTINUATING CIRCUMSTANCE, NOT NECESSARILY THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE PROPERTY. WRIGHT ADVISED THE BOARD THEY WOULD REVIEW WHY A TIMELY APPLICATION WAS NOT FILED MUCH MORE THAN THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE PROPERTY. ATTORNEY HOLLEY AGREED THAT IS WHAT THE LAW STATES AND THE BOARD CAN ONLY GRANT IT IF THERE WAS AN EXTINUATING CIRCUMSTANCE OR HARDSHIP AS TO WHY HE DID NOT FILE IN A TIMELY MANNER.

BOARD MEMBER ROUNTREE QUESTIONED IF IT WAS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE BOARD TO DETERMINE THE USE OF THE PROPERTY. ATTORNEY HOLLEY ADVISED THE BOARD IT WAS THE PROPERTY APPRAISER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO DETERMINE THE USE OF THE PROPERTY.

BOARD MEMBER ROUNTREE OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER WOOD AND CARRIED TO GRANT THE PETITIONER, WILLIAM VICKERS, AN AGRICULTURE CLASSIFICATION.

THE BOARD ADDRESSED PETITION #14 FILED BY SUSAN WARREN REQUESTING AN AGRICULTURE CLASSIFICATION. PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT INFORMED THE BOARD WARREN HAD CONTACTED HIM STATING SINCE THIS PROPERTY JOINED SOME AGRICULTURE LAND SHE HAD SOUTHEAST OF WAUSAU, SHE THOUGHT IT WAS AUTOMATICALLY INCLUDED IN THE AGRICULTURE LAND SHE ALREADY OWNED. THEREFORE, SHE FAILED TO FILE A TIMELY APPLICATION FOR AGRICULTURE USE. WRIGHT SAID THE PROPERTY WAS CURRENTLY CUT OVER TIMBER LAND; THE PROPERTY SHE HAS JOINING IT IS PASTURE AND TIME WILL TELL; HOWEVER, IT APPEARS THE PROPERTY WILL BE USED AS AGRICULTURE. ATTORNEY HOLLEY ADVISED THE BOARD IF THE PETITIONER DOES NOT APPEAR BEFORE THE BOARD IN THE TIME ALLOTTED, YOU HAVE NO AUTHORITY TO GRANT THE PETITION. BOARD MEMBER MORRIS OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER ROUNTREE AND CARRIED TO DENY WARREN'S REQUEST FOR AN AG CLASSIFICATION BASED ON HER FAILURE TO APPEAR BEFORE THE BOARD TO PRESENT EVIDENCE AS TO WHY SHE FAILED TO APPLY FOR AN AGRICULTURE CLASSIFICATION IN A TIMELY MANNER.

THE BOARD ADDRESSED PETITION #17 AND #18 FILED BY JAMES HAMMOND REQUESTING HE BE GRANTED AN AGRICULTURE CLASSIFICATION. PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT ADVISED THE BOARD HAMMOND FAILED TO APPLY FOR AN AGRICULTURAL CLASSIFICATION IN A TIMELY MANNER AND REFERENCED HAMMOND HAD WRITTEN ON HIS PETITION IT WAS DUE TO NEGLECT.

HAMMOND ADDRESSED THE BOARD ON HIS PETITION ADVISING THEM HE HAD A HEART ATTACK IN OCTOBER OF LAST YEAR AND HAD A TRIPPLE BYPASS AND WOULDN'T QUITE UP TO PAR; HE REALIZED THIS WAS NO EXCUSE AND DIDN'T KNOW IF THE BOARD COULD CLASSIFY THIS AS AN EXTINUATING CIRCUMSTANCE OR NOT.

WRIGHT EXPLAINED THERE WAS 30 ACRES OF TIMBER THAT IS BEING MANAGED OUT OF THE 70 ACRES OF PLANTED TIMBER AND THE USE WAS THERE. HOWEVER, THE EXTINUATING CIRCUMSTANCES IS WHAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED. BOARD MEMBER BROCK OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER MORRIS AND CARRIED TO APPROVE OF JAMES HAMMOND REQUEST FOR AN AGRICULTURAL CLASSIFICATION DUE TO HEART SURGERY.

THE BOARD ADDRESSED PETITION # 31 FILED BY MR. & MRS. JERRY BRUNSON REQUESTING AN AG CLASSIFICATION. PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT ADVISED THE BOARD THE PROPERTY IN QUESTION WAS A 21.2 ACRE PARCEL AND REFERENCED THE PETITION HAD BRUNSON'S REASONING ON IT.

MS. BRUNSON ADDRESSED THE BOARD ADVISING THEM SHE WAS SENT THE AGRICULTURAL CLASSIFICATION FORM, SHE FILLED IT OUT AND MAILED IT BACK IN; HOWEVER, THE PROPERTY APPRAISER'S OFFICE WAS UNABLE TO LOCATE IT AND IT WAS TOO LATE TO FILE AGAIN. BRUNSON ALSO ADVISED THIS PROPERTY WAS UNDER THE GREENBELT WHEN HE PURCHASED THE PROPERTY.

PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT AGREED THE PROPERTY WAS UNDER GREENBELT PRIOR TO BRUNSON'S PURCHASE BUT HIS OFFICE DID NOT RECEIVE A COPY OF THE APPLICATION OR HAVE A COPY OF IT AND MR. BRUNSON DIDN'T KEEP A COPY.

BOARD MEMBER MORRIS OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER ROUNTREE AND CARRIED TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN AGRICULTURAL CLASSIFICATION.

THE BOARD ADDRESSED PETITION #35 FILED BY LORI ARMENTI REQUESTING AN AGRICULTURAL CLASSIFICATION. ATTORNEY HOLLEY AND PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT REFERENCED HER PETITION DID NOT REFERENCE ANY EXTINUATING CIRCUMSTANCES AS TO WHY SHE DIDN'T FILE THE APPLICATION FOR AN AGRICULTURAL CLASSIFICATION IN A TIMELY MANNER. THE BOARD QUESTIONED WRIGHT IF THE PROPERTY WAS CLASSIFIED AG PROPERTY PRIOR TO ARMENTI PURCHASING IT; WRIGHT ADVISED THE BOARD IT WAS. THE BOARD TABLED THIS PETITION FOR THE PRESENT TIME.

THE BOARD ADDRESSED PETITION #37 FILED BY DAWN MARKUS WHO WAS REQUESTING A REDUCTION IN THE ASSESSMENT OF HER PROPERTY AS SHE FELT HER PROPERTY WAS ASSESSED MORE THAN THE JUST VALUE. MARKUS ADDRESSED THE BOARD STATING THERE WAS AN INEQUITY IN THE ASSESSMENT WITH THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND SEVERAL OTHER POINTS.

PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT REFERENCED A LETTER WHICH WAS ATTACHED TO HER PETITION ALLEGING IT IS RAW, UNDEVELOPED ACREAGE; HOWEVER, THE LAND IS ACTUALLY A SUBDIVISION.

MARKUS SHOWED THE BOARD PICTURES OF THE PROPERTY WHEN SHE PURCHASED IT WHICH APPEARED TO BE LAKEFRONT PROPERTY; HOWEVER, THE LAKE DRIED UP WITHIN TWELVE WEEKS. MARKUS ADVISED THE BOARD SHE PAID \$24,000.00 FOR THE PROPERTY BECAUSE SHE THOUGHT IT WAS LAKEFRONT PROPERTY BUT NOW FEELS IT WAS REAL ESTATE FRAUD.

minutes101596s

PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT ADVISED THE BOARD HE HAD REDUCED THE ASSESSED VALUE TO \$15,000.00; THEREFORE, THE VALUE ON THE PETITION OF \$20,400.00 WAS INCORRECT.

MARKUS REFERENCED THE EXISTING PROPERTY SURROUNDING THAT AREA ARE VALUED ABOUT ONE THIRD OF WHAT HER PROPERTY IS VALUED AT AND THEY HAVE A HOME, POND, BARN, ETC.

PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT ADDRESSED MARKUS PURCHASED THE PROPERTY AS A SUBDIVISION. MARKUS REFERENCED GARY THURMAN, THE PREVIOUS YEAR, HAD PAID \$5.00 PER LOT FOR PROPERTY AND QUESTIONED WHY THE PROPERTY WAS VALUED SO MUCH MORE NOW. WRIGHT EXPLAINED THURMAN HAD SIX ACRES ACROSS THE ROAD WHICH HAD JUST SOLD FOR \$1,700.00 PER ACRE WHICH WAS A RECORDED SUBDIVISION AWAY FROM ANY WATER. MARKUS QUESTIONED WHY HER PROPERTY WAS ASSESSED AT A HIGHER RATE WITH WRIGHT EXPLAINING SHE WAS ON THE WATER. MARKUS EXPLAINED SHE HAD NO WATER; THAT WAS THE PROBLEM.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY READ THE STATUTES WHICH LAYS THE BURDEN OF PROOF ON THE PETITIONING TAXPAYER TO PROVE THE PROPERTY APPRAISER'S ASSESSMENT IS NOT CORRECT. BOARD MEMBER MORRIS OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER ROUNTREE TO DENY MARKUS'S REQUEST FOR AN ASSESSMENT REDUCTION DUE TO HER PUR- CHASING THE PROPERTY AS A PLATTED SUBDIVISION. DISCUSSION WAS HELD WITH MARKUS BEING ADVISED SHE WOULD HAVE A RECOURSE NEXT YEAR IF SHE WOULD GO AHEAD AND COME BEFORE THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND REQUEST THEY VACATE THE SUBDIVISION PLAT ON HER PROPERTY. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE BOARD RE-ADDRESSED PETITION #35 FILED BY LORI ARMENTI. BOARD MEMBER MORRIS OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER BROCK AND CARRIED TO DENY ARMENTI'S REQUEST FOR AN AG CLASSIFICATION DUE TO HER FAILING TO APPEAR.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS CALLED FOR A FIVE MINUTE RECESS.

PURSUANT TO A RECESS, TOM PARNELL WAS PRESENT TO REPRESENT A. C. MOORE WITH PETITIONS #43 THRU 46. PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT ADDRESSED THESE PETITIONS ADVISING THE BOARD THE PROPERTY OWNER OF RECORD AND THE PERSON IN THE CORPORATION WHO IS ASSESSED IS COKOMO INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION. THE PETITIONS WERE FILED BY A. C. MOORE, AGENT FOR COKOMO INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION. WRIGHT REQUESTED MOORE'S REPRESENTATIVE TO SHOW THE BOARD AUTHORIZATION FROM COKOMO FOR MR. MOORE TO FILE THE PETITIONS AND AUTHORIZATION FROM MR. MOORE FOR PARNELL TO REPRESENT HIM TODAY. WRIGHT ADVISED THE BOARD THE REGISTERED AGENT FOR COKOMO INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION WAS M. J. COKER. CHAIRMAN DAVIS QUESTIONED PARNELL IF HE HAD A LETTER AUTHORIZING HIM TO REPRESENT MR. MOORE WHO IS ACTING AS AGENT FOR COKOMO AND IF HE HAD ANYTHING SHOWING MR. MOORE HAD AUTHORIZATION TO FILE THE PETITIONS ON BEHALF OF COKOMO INTERNATIONAL, INC. MR. PARNELL ADVISED THE BOARD HE DIDN'T HAVE EITHER OF THESE DOCUMENTS.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY REFERENCED THERE BEING SOME PRECEDENCE IN THE STATE WHERE BOARDS HAVE REFUSED TO HEAR PETITIONS WITHOUT THE PROPER AUTHORIZATION AND ASKED THE PROPERTY APPRAISER TO ADDRESS THIS. WRIGHT ADDRESSED THE VALUE ADJUSTMENT BOARD IN GLADES COUNTY REFUSED TO HEAR PETITIONS DUE TO THE PETITIONER FAILING TO PRODUCE AUTHORIZATION FOR FILING THE PETITIONS ON BEHALF OF A CLIENT FOR A CORPORATION THEY WERE REPRESENTING. WRIGHT REQUESTED THE BOARD, IN THE ABSENCE OF ANY AUTHORIZATION, REFUSE TO HEAR THESE PETITIONS.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS QUESTIONED ATTORNEY HOLLEY, BASED ON THE REQUEST OF THE PROPERTY APPRAISER AND THE BOARD HAVING A PETITIONER PRESENT WHO CAME AS A REPRESENTATIVE FOR A. C. MOORE, WHAT OBLIGATION DOES THE BOARD HAVE TO HEAR THE PETITIONS. ATTORNEY HOLLEY ADVISED THE BOARD THEY DON'T HAVE ANY LEGAL OBLIGATION TO HEAR THE PETITIONS WITHOUT THE AUTHORIZATIONS THE PROPERTY APPRAISER HAS REQUESTED; HOWEVER, IT WAS THE BOARD'S DECISION.

PARNELL EXPLAINED MR. COKER, WHO IS COKOMO INTERNATIONAL, LIVES IN GULF SHORES AND WAS UNABLE TO ATTEND AND MR. A. C. MOORE HAD A VERY SERIOUS ILLNESS THAT HAS TAKEN HIM OUT OF TOWN. WRIGHT ADVISED THE BOARD THE ADDRESS LISTED FOR COKOMO INTERNATIONAL WAS 2802 PARADISE LAKE ROAD, VERNON, FLORIDA. PARNELL STATED THIS WAS THE OFFICE ADDRESS. BOARD MEMBER MORRIS OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY MEMBER WOOD AND CARRIED TO DENY COKOMO INTERNATIONAL THEIR REQUEST FOR AN ASSESSMENT REDUCTION DUE TO LACK OF AUTHORIZATION FOR MR. A. C. MOORE TO FILE THE PETITIONS ON BEHALF OF THE CORPORATION AND LACK OF AUTHORIZATION FOR MR. PARNELL TO ACT AS AN AGENT FOR MR. MOORE.

THE BOARD ADDRESSED PETITION #49 FOR PARADISE OAKS PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION.

PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT ADVISED THE BOARD HE HAD AN OWNER OF RECORD FOR MOST OF PARADISE OAKS SUBDIVISION IN THE NAME OF NEW JERUSALEM U.S.A., INC. AND THE REGISTERED AGENT FOR NEW JERUSALEM IS A. C. MOORE; THE REGISTERED AGENT FOR PARADISE OAKS PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION IS ALLAN H. MOORE. WRIGHT QUESTIONED IF THERE WAS

minutes101596S

ANY AUTHORIZATION FROM ALLAN MOORE TO ALLOW A. C. MOORE TO REPRESENT THIS CORPORATION OR ANY BOARD RESOLUTION. PARNELL ADDRESSED ALLAN H. MOORE WAS A. C. MOORE'S SON.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY QUESTIONED IF WRIGHT WAS SAYING THE OWNER WHO FILED THE PETITION WAS NOT THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY. WRIGHT ADVISED THAT THE ASSESSMENT OF RECORD IS TO NEW JERUSALEM U.S.A., INC. HOLLEY STATED ANYONE WHO DOES NOT OWN THE PROPERTY CAN'T PETITION ABOUT THE TAXES. BOARD MEMBER MORRIS OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER ROUNTREE AND CARRIED TO DENY PETITION #49 DUE TO IT BEING FILED IMPROPERLY.

THE BOARD ADDRESSED PETITION # 50 THRU 53 FOR NEW JERUSALEM U.S.A. INC. PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT REQUESTED A LETTER OF AUTHORIZATION FROM MR. A. C. MOORE TO MR. PARNELL TO ALLOW HIM TO REPRESENT MOORE ON THESE PETITIONS. PARNELL HAD NO AUTHORIZATION FROM MR. MOORE.

ATTORNEY HOLLEY RECOMMENDED SINCE MR. MOORE WAS THE REGISTERED AGENT IF PARNELL WANTS TO TESTIFY AS A WITNESS FOR A. C. MOORE AS TO THE VALUE OF THE PROPERTY. ATTORNEY HOLLEY RE-ADDRESSED THE PRESUMPTION OF CORRECTNESS LYING WITH THE PROPERTY APPRAISER'S VALUATION AND IF PARNELL HAS SOME COMPETENT EVIDENCE HE COULD PRESENT TO SHOW THAT IS NOT THE VALUE OF THE PROPERTY, THE BOARD SHOULD ALLOW HIM TO DO SO. MR. PARNELL ADVISED THE BOARD HE DID NOT HAVE ANY EVIDENCE TO PRESENT TO THEM AS TO THE VALUE OF THE PROPERTY. BOARD MEMBER MORRIS OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER ROUNTREE AND CARRIED BASED ON THE ABSENCE OF SUFFICIENT DOCUMENTATION TO CHANGE THE ASSESSMENT OF THIS PROPERTY, TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR A REDUCTION IN ASSESSMENT.

THE BOARD ADDRESSED PETITIONS #54 THRU 63 FOR R. J. HIGBEE, INC. PROPERTY APPRAISER WRIGHT ADDRESSED R. J. HIGBEE, INC. WAS THE OWNER OF RECORD OF THE PROPERTY BEING PRESENTED IN PETITIONS 54 THRU 63. ATTORNEY HOLLEY QUESTIONED IF THERE WAS A LETTER OF AUTHORIZATION FROM THE OWNER SHOWING MOORE HAD THE AUTHORITY TO FILE THE PETITION. WRIGHT ADVISED THE BOARD THE PETITIONS WERE FILED BY A. C. MOORE, AGENT FOR; THE REGISTERED AGENT IS ANTHONY W. MOORE, R. J. HIGBEE, INC. BOARD MEMBER MORRIS OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER WOOD AND CARRIED TO DENY PETITIONS #54 THRU 63 FOR R. J. HIGBEE, INC. DUE TO INCORRECT FILING AND LACK OF PROPER DOCUMENTATION TO SHOW AUTHORIZATION FOR MR. A. C. MOORE TO FILE THE PETITIONS AND LACK OF AUTHORIZATION TO SHOW MR. PARNELL IS ACTING AGENT FOR MOORE. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIRMAN DAVIS QUESTIONED IF A LETTER COULD BE ADDRESSED TO EACH OF THESE CORPORATIONS ADVISING THEM THE PROPER PROCEDURE TO FOLLOW. ATTORNEY HOLLEY ADVISED THE BOARD A WRITTEN DECISION OF THE BOARD WOULD BE PROVIDED TO THEM.

BOARD MEMBER ROUNTREE OFFERED A MOTION, SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER WOOD AND CARRIED TO ADJOURN THIS MEETING. ATTEST: _____

CLERK

CHAIRMAN

DEPUTY CLERK

END OF MINUTES FOR 10/15/96