

**STATE OF NEVADA**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

OF THE

**State Board of Assessors**

WITH THE

**STATE REVENUE BOARD**

---

**Carson City, January 9 and 10, 1905**



CARSON CITY, NEVADA

STATE PRINTING OFFICE, : : : : : ANDREW MAUTE, SUPERINTENDENT

1905

**SUMMARY OF VALUATIONS AS FIXED BY THE BOARD OF ASSESSORS,  
JANUARY, 1905.**

- Work Horses. Left to the Assessors.
- Saddle Horses. Left to the Assessors.
- Stock Horses. Left to the Assessors.
- Work Mules. Left to the Assessors.
- Unbroken Mules. Left to the Assessors.
- Beef Cattle. Valuation placed at \$25 per head.
- Milch Cows. Valuation placed at \$25 per head.
- Stock Cattle. Valuation placed at \$15 per head, except in Nye, Esmeralda, Lincoln and White Pine; in these counties \$18.
- Thoroughbred Cattle. Left to the Assessors.
- Sheep. Valuation placed at \$2.50, except in White Pine and Nye; in these counties \$2.
- Buck Sheep. Value placed at \$5 per head.
- Hogs. Left to the Assessors.
- Goats. Valuation placed at \$5 per head.
- Telephone Lines. Left to the Assessors.
- Telegraph Lines. Left to the Assessors.
- Electric Light and Power Lines. Left to the Assessors.
- Contract Lands. Left to the Assessors.
- Central Pacific Railroad. Valuation placed at \$16,000 per mile on the main line and \$5,400 on the side track.
- Virginia and Truckee Railroad. Valuation placed at \$8,700 on the main line and \$2,500 on the side track.
- San Pedro, Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad. Valuation placed at \$7,000 per mile on the main line and \$2,500 on the side track.
- Nevada, California and Oregon Railroad. Valuation placed at \$2,800 on the main line and \$1,000 on the side track.
- Carson and Colorado Railroad. Valuation placed at \$3,500 on the main line and \$1,250 on the side track.
- Eureka and Palisade Railroad. Valuation placed at \$1,850 on the main line and \$1,000 on the side track.
- Nevada Central Railroad. Left to the Assessor.
- Tonopah Railroad. Valuation placed at \$2,250 per mile on the main line and \$1,100 on the side track.
- Quartette Railroad. Left to the Assessor of Lincoln County.
- Ploche and Pacific Transportation Road. Left to the Assessor of Lincoln County.
- Glasgow and Western Exploration Road. Left to the Assessor of Humboldt County.

# MINUTES OF ASSESSORS' MEETING, 1905.

## FIRST DAY.

CARSON CITY, NEVADA, January 9, 1905.

Meeting called to order by the Chairman, Governor Sparks, at 1:15 p. m.

There being a quorum present, the Secretary, W. R. Davis, was ordered to call the roll, and the following answered to their names:

J. C. Lofthouse.....	Churchill County
William McCormick.....	Douglas County
J. Eggers.....	Elko County
H. C. McTerney.....	Eureka County
J. W. Guthrie.....	Humboldt County
William Easton.....	Lander County
J. F. Roeder.....	Lincoln County
D. P. Randall.....	Lyon County
Thomas W. Logan.....	Nye County
William Kinney.....	Ormsby County
James Quirk.....	Storey County
W. S. Beard.....	Washoe County
A. C. House.....	White Pine County

J. F. Bradley of Esmeralda County came in a few moments after roll call.

Of the State officers acting with the Assessors' Board under the law, there were present Governor John Sparks, Controller S. P. Davis and Attorney-General J. G. Sweeney.

The Chairman requested the Attorney-General to read the law relating to the meeting of the Board.

The Attorney-General read the law as follows:

The Attorney-General—The law under which you are convened to-day was enacted by the last Legislature, and, as it has not been abrogated in any way, is in full force and effect:

SECTION 1. The County Assessors of the several counties of this State shall meet for a period not exceeding ten days in the office of the Governor, at Carson City, Nevada, on the second Monday in January of each year, and shall at such meetings establish a valuation throughout the State of all railroads and rolling stock of such railroads, of all telegraph and telephone lines, of all electric light and power lines, of

all cattle and sheep, and upon all other kinds of property which, in the judgment of said Assessors, can be valued and assessed more uniformly by said Assessors, acting collectively, than by the several County Assessors acting separately; *provided*, that, in fixing such valuations, the location and situation of such property shall be considered; *and, provided further*, that nothing herein shall be so construed as to impair the right of the Board of Equalization of any county to equalize taxes on all property, the valuation of which has not been fixed at the annual meeting of the County Assessors as provided in this section; but the said County Board of Equalization shall not have the power to equalize any property upon which a valuation has been fixed by the said Board of County Assessors; *provided*, any taxpayer, under the provisions of this Act, shall not be deprived of any remedy or redress in a court of law relating to the payment of taxes.

SECTION 2. At such meetings the Governor shall be the Chairman and the Governor's Secretary shall be the Clerk. The Governor shall have the casting vote in case of a tie. The State Controller shall supply all information and data concerning the finances of the State, either on his own motion, or upon request of the Board. Eight Assessors shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and a majority of the entire Board shall decide any question before the meeting; *provided*, that in case of a tie on any question before the Board, the Chairman shall cast the deciding vote; and it is hereby made the duty of every Assessor present at the meeting of said Board to vote aye or no, upon every question put by the Chairman of said meeting, and every Assessor failing so to do shall forfeit his office and shall be proceeded against by the District Attorney of said Assessor's county, at the request of the Attorney-General to enforce said forfeiture; *provided*, that, if at any meeting the Assessor of any county shall, by reason of sickness or other unavoidable cause, be unable to attend any such meeting, then, in that event, the Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of such counties shall attend such meeting, and shall act and vote in the place of such absent Assessor, with the same force and effect as such Assessor might do if present, and the Governor or Acting Chairman of said meeting shall be and hereby is authorized to issue a subpoena for the attendance of any Assessor who shall fail to attend, unless excused by the provisions of this Act. And he is hereby further empowered to depute anyone who is qualified by law to serve a summons to serve the same; *and, provided further*, that if at any meeting the Governor or his Secretary shall, for any reason, be unable to act as Chairman or Clerk, then, in that event, the State Controller shall act as Chairman, and in case the State Controller shall also be absent, then the Attorney-General shall act as Chairman, and as such Chairman shall have all of the powers herein granted to the Governor acting as such Chairman. Any Assessor who shall fail to attend the meetings provided for in section one, unless he is prevented by sickness or other unavoidable cause, shall be subject to a penalty of \$500, to be collected in a suit instituted against said delinquent Assessor or his bondsmen by the District Attorney of the county of said Assessor, on the request of the Attorney-General; and shall be further subject to removal from office, should a majority of the State Board of Revenue hereinafter created order proceedings to that effect to be instituted.

SECTION 4. The valuation fixed at such annual meetings shall be

the actual cash value of all such property as may be designated, as now provided by law, taking into consideration the locality of such property, and the Assessors of the several counties shall assess and enter upon the assessment rolls of their respective counties all such property at the valuation designated by such meeting of County Assessors, and shall fix the value and assess all property not so valued at said meetings in the manner now provided by law.

SECTION 5. The valuation fixed at such annual meetings shall be uniform on all such property as may be designated, except in cases where the value is affected by its locality or other consideration affecting its cash value; and the Assessors of the several counties of the State shall fix values on all property not so valued at said annual meeting, in the manner now provided by law.

SECTION 11. It shall be the duty of each County Assessor to fix the valuation of all property which may be assessed by him at the valuation placed upon the same kind of property at the regular annual meeting of Assessors for the State.

SECTION 13. Should any Assessor in this State neglect to assess property in accordance with the provisions of this Act, or laws now in force or effect, or place a greater or less valuation on any property that has been fixed at said meeting of Assessors, the State Board of Revenue, which is hereby created, consisting of the Governor, State Controller, and Attorney-General, shall instruct the District Attorney of said Assessor's county to bring suit against such Assessor and his bondsmen for the sum of five hundred dollars as a penalty therefor, which said sum, when collected, shall be paid into the General Fund of the State Treasury, and such Board may instruct the Attorney-General to request the District Attorney of said Assessor's county to institute suit against such Assessor for his removal from office for such neglect or refusal. The suit shall be tried in the District Court having jurisdiction in the county where property is situated.

SECTION 7. All Acts and parts of Acts in conflict with the provisions of this Act as herein amended are hereby repealed.

After the reading of the law, Mr. Kinney moved that a committee be appointed to formulate an order of business.

Motion carried.

The Chairman appointed the following Committee on the Order of Business: Mr. McTerney of Eureka County, Mr. Randall of Lyon County, Mr. Eggers of Elko County, Mr. Beard of Washoe County, and Mr. Roeder of Lincoln County, with instructions to select their own Chairman.

Mr. Beard moved to adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. Kinney moved as an amendment that the adjournment be until 11 o'clock.

Amendment carried by a vote of 11 to 3.

Adjourned.

## SECOND DAY.

CARSON CITY, NEVADA, January 10, 1905.

Meeting called to order at 11 o'clock by the Chairman, Governor Sparks.

At roll call all the members answered to their names.

The Committee on Order of Business submitted the following order which was unanimously accepted:

1. Work Horses.
2. Saddle Horses.
3. Stock Horses.
4. Work Mules.
5. Stock Mules.
6. Beef Cattle.
7. Milch Cows.
8. Stock Cattle.
9. Thoroughbred Cattle.
10. Sheep.
11. Buck Sheep.
12. Hogs.
13. Telephone Lines.
14. Telegraph Lines.
15. Electric Light and Power Lines.
16. Contract Lands.
17. Railroads, classified as follows:
  1. Central Pacific Railroad.
  2. Virginia and Truckee Railroad.
  3. San Pedro, Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad.
  4. Nevada, California and Oregon Railroad.
  5. Carson and Colorado Railroad.
  6. Eureka and Palisade Railroad.
  7. Nevada Central Railroad.

(Signed:)

H. C. McTERNEY, Chairman,  
J. F. ROEDER, Secretary,  
J. EGGERS,  
W. S. BEARD,  
D. P. RANDALL.

Mr. Eggers stated that the Tonopah road had been left from the list, and suggested that it be added.

Mr. Roeder made the necessary correction to the report, and it was adopted.

The Chairman asked the Board if they would like to hear Mr. Bartine's report, and upon their signifying in the affirmative, Mr. Bartine read the following report:

MINUTES OF ASSESSORS' MEETING, 1906.

---

---

**TAX EXAMINER'S REPORT.**

---

---

## REPORT OF STATE TAX EXAMINER.

CARSON CITY, NEVADA, January 5, 1905.

HON. JOHN SPARKS, HON. S. P. DAVIS, *and* HON. JAMES G. SWEENEY,  
*State Board of Revenue.*

GENTLEMEN: Since my last report was made the law approved March 13, 1903, entitled "An Act relating to county government and the reduction of the rate of county taxation," has been in full force and effect for the period of one year, namely, the year 1904, and we are now in a position to consider its results in the light of this brief experience. While there have been some complaints that the law has not worked, and cannot work, with perfect equality between the different counties, it can hardly be denied that the measure is a step in the right direction, and that its results have been generally beneficial. However desirable and just it may be, absolute equality of taxation, whether between communities or individuals, may fairly be classed among the unattainable things in government. It will never be possible as long as there is selfishness in human nature, for almost every individual taxpayer seems to regard it as a solemn duty on his part to keep his own taxes down and his neighbor's up. Individual characteristics necessarily control the action of communities, and accordingly we find the gravest fears expressed in every county lest the citizens thereof may be compelled to bear more than their just proportion of the burden of State taxation.

### THE STATE TAX.

In this connection it should be borne in mind that it is only with reference to the State tax that any question of inequality between counties can arise under this law. So far as the county expenditures are concerned, it can make no difference whether property is assessed at a high valuation and a low rate, or a low valuation and a high rate, as there is just so much money to be raised. But it is obvious that a county which assesses its property at a higher valuation than the general average throughout the State is at a disadvantage in the matter of State taxation. As I stated in my former report, the trouble is that in each county the impression prevails that property therein is assessed higher, relatively, than in other counties. There is no conclusive or satisfactory way of proving either the correctness or the error of this impression with reference to particular cases. It is, though, morally

certain that very little property in the State is assessed at its real value, and there can be no denial of the palpable fact that the system of undervaluation for taxation is general. It is safe to say that comparatively few taxpayers would be willing to sell their property at the valuation placed upon it by the Assessor, with 50 per cent added thereto.

**THERE HAS ALWAYS BEEN INEQUALITY.**

It may be true, doubtless is true, that the law under consideration will not operate with perfect equality between the various counties, but it is just as true that the old system was open to the same objection on this head; because as long as a county can raise the county rate at will, it can lower the valuations proportionately, and thus pay less than its share of the State tax. The belief is widespread that this custom has been more or less general and there has been quite as much complaint on account of it as there now is of the present or prospective inequality of the law of 1903.

**RESULTS THUS FAR ATTAINED.**

In my former report I adverted to some of the evils of high tax rates, and it is not necessary for me to repeat what I then said. This law is intended to remedy the evils complained of, at the same time bringing the various counties to a cash basis and incidentally promoting economy in county expenditures. Surely no one will seriously contend that low tax rates, cash payments and economical county administration are not desirable things. With the close of the first year of the law's full operation, two results have been attained which ought to be gratifying to all. First, there has been a reduction in the regular tax rate in every county of the State to which the law applies. Second, there has been an increase of taxable property as shown by the assessment rolls aggregating \$3,562,671—more than 10 per cent. This is considerably more than enough to offset the reduction of the tax rate, as will be seen by a glance at my former report in which I showed that to meet the reduction in the rate there must be an average advance of a little more than 5 per cent in values.

**INCREASED VALUATION GENERAL.**

It is gratifying to know that the advance in values has been general, and not confined to a few localities. Every county shows an increase. Elko leads all the counties in the amount of her increase, which is \$826,980. Washoe comes next, with \$806,470. The largest relative increase was in Lincoln County, which rose from \$657,293 to \$921,753—a clear gain of about 40 per cent. Esmeralda and Churchill also show a very healthy growth, the former increasing about 37½ per cent and the latter about 26 per cent.

A large portion of the increased valuation is clearly owing to new

developments rather than to an arbitrary raising of values to meet the reduction of the rate. This makes the showing even more gratifying, because, while it is desirable to have all property assessed at its actual value, the creation of new property is still more desirable.

#### THE POORER COUNTIES.

Still, it is undeniable that an arbitrary reduction of the tax rate can be more easily met in a county which is progressing, where new property is all the time being created, than in one which is at a standstill, or possibly retrograding a little. Fortunately the counties in the latter class are few, and we are justified in indulging the hope that those in which business conditions are least favorable will soon feel the impulse which has set the State as a whole upon the up grade. Reports from the Comstock are encouraging. There has been much talk of resuming work at the great mines of Eureka. It is hardly to be supposed that the mines of Austin will forever remain inactive. There is good reason to believe that the time is not far distant when White Pine will be brought into railroad communication with the rest of the State, and then mining in that county will receive an impetus such as it has not had since the subsidence of the great excitement of 1869 and 1870. The mineral wealth of the counties named is so great and so certain that it needs but a slight revival of interest to place them once more upon the high road of prosperity and progress.

#### LAW SHOULD BE FAIRLY TRIED.

In view of the conditions now existing I do not feel justified in suggesting any modification of the law at the hands of the next Legislature. It seems to me that, for the next two years at least, every county in the State can adjust itself to the law, and, in justice to the Legislature which enacted it, there should be a fair trial of the law before it is changed in any important particulars. The year's experience has failed to justify the adverse criticisms which have been passed upon it. No individual taxpayer has been oppressed, no county has been subjected to any hardship. The claim that the law was designed or calculated to favor the railroad interests, at the expense of other taxpayers, has been utterly exploded, as is conclusively proved by the substantial increase in the railroad assessments. As I remarked a year ago, it is impossible for the railroads to be unduly favored except through a failure of the Assessors to do their duty. The law reducing tax rates applies to all property alike.

#### POLICY OF REVENUE BOARD.

It has been the policy of the Board of Revenue, while seeking to hold the counties to a fair compliance with the law, to so construe and enforce it as to make the change from the old system to the new

as easy as possible. To this end the main provision, that relating to a reduction of the tax rates, was held not to be operative until the year 1904, as the law was not approved until after the rates for 1903 had been fixed. So it was considered that the provisions relating to the floating debts, emergency loans and taxes and annual reports were intended to operate only with the inception of the new system of taxation—that is to say, in 1904—thus giving the counties the greater part of 1903 to prepare for the change.

During the year 1904, the Board approved a number of emergency loans, it appearing that the interests of the counties concerned might otherwise suffer. This power in the Board is an important feature of the law, as it furnishes a method by which emergencies can be provided for, and meets one of the strongest objections to the law. At the same time it is a power which should be exercised with care and discretion, in order that the law may not be evaded under emergency pleas. The law is now well understood, and the counties have had nearly two years to put themselves in line with it. Henceforth it should be enforced in accordance with its fair intendment.

#### ANNUAL REPORTS.

This law provides for annual reports by county officials, in addition to the quarterly reports heretofore made to the State Controller. Forms for these reports have been prepared and will be furnished the county officials required to make them. It is believed that these reports, which were formulated in the Controller's Office, will be found sufficiently comprehensive to show fairly the working of the revenue law in the different counties. Should it appear that they are lacking in any essential particulars, they can easily be reformed.

#### APPORTIONMENT OF REVENUE.

The Controller's office complains greatly of the difficulty of effecting settlements with the various counties under the present system of apportioning the revenue between them and the State. This question does not arise under the tax reduction law, but has been a troublesome one for many years. It does not, in strictness, come within the purview of my duties to consider it, or make any recommendations concerning it. But the Controller is a member of the Board of Revenue, and all revenue matters being more or less cognate, I cannot be indifferent to any of their complications. The Controller is personally much in favor of adopting what is known as the "Oregon system"—that of assessing each county a lump sum for State purposes, thus avoiding long and confused accounts and conflicting interpretations of different laws.

#### THE OREGON PLAN.

Undoubtedly the Oregon plan, which the Controller explains in detail,

would be much simpler than the cumbersome method of dividing the funds. It would also probably be more equitable, if a just method can be adopted whereby the amount to be paid by each county can be fixed. The Controller's idea is that the Board of Assessors should do this annually, acting each year on the basis of an average of the five preceding years, with power to fix the rate arbitrarily in emergency cases where there has been a great and sudden change of values, and with the power of revision in the Board of Revenue.

I incline strongly to the opinion that the Board of Assessors should have nothing to do with this matter. Naturally enough each Assessor would be anxious to make the best arrangement possible for his own county. The subject of taxation is one upon which every community is sensitive, and, granting the high character of Assessors in general, it is hardly to be supposed that they would be free from local influences. It seems to me that the power should be lodged wholly in a State Board, the members of which are chosen by the electors of the entire State, and who are answerable to the people of the whole Commonwealth—not to those of a particular county. In the event of such a plan being adopted, the power to apportion the State tax among the different counties might be lodged in the State Board of Revenue. Of course, a special Board could be established for the purpose, but that seems unnecessary. The present duties of the Board of Revenue are such as to familiarize its members with revenue matters in general, thus peculiarly fitting them for the work of apportioning taxes in the manner suggested. Not being confronted by the difficulties which perplex the Controller's office, I am not prepared to say from my own knowledge how serious they are. It seems to me, though, that it is a matter in which the views of the Controller should carry great weight.

It is proper for me to again suggest in this connection that the recommendation of the Controller in regard to this method of apportionment does not in any manner touch the tax reduction law. If the recommendation should be adopted by the Legislature, it would not in the slightest degree modify the law mentioned.

As I am not in possession of the detailed report from the several counties, I cannot go more fully into revenue matters at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

H. F. BARTINE,  
*Tax Examiner.*

After the reading of the report, the first order of business was called:

\*

1. *Work Horses.*

Mr. Guthrie moved that the valuation of work horses be left to the various Assessors.

Motion carried.

2. *Saddle Horses.*

Mr. Logan moved that they take the same course.

Motion carried.

3. *Stock Horses.*

Mr. Beard moved that they be left to the Assessors.

Motion carried.

4. *Work Mules.*

Mr. Logan moved the valuation be left to the Assessors of the various counties.

Motion carried.

5. *Stock Mules.*

After considerable discussion it was decided that the words "Stock Mules" were somewhat misleading, and the words "Unbroken Mules" would more clearly define the meaning intended.

Therefore the fifth order of business was changed to read "Unbroken Mules," by vote of the Board.

Mr. Logan moved that the valuation be left to the Assessors.

Motion carried.

6. *Beef Cattle.*

Mr. Beard moved that the valuation be placed at \$25 per head.

Motion carried.

7. *Milch Cows.*

Moved by Mr. Beard that the valuation be placed at \$25 per head.

Motion carried.

8. *Stock Cattle.*

Mr. Randall moved that the valuation be placed at \$15 per head in the northern counties.

Mr. Logan—I notice that in the assessment of last year the stock cattle in the northern counties were assessed at \$17 per head, and \$15 in the four lower counties. I don't know much about the value of cattle in the northern counties, but I do know that the cattle that were assessed for \$15 in Nye County last year were sold for \$10 and \$14. Large bands of cattle were sold for \$14.50 per head and some as low as \$10. I do not believe that the difference allowed between the counties last year is enough, and I have had something like twenty years' experience in the cattle business. I notice the cattle in the northern counties are higher class. When your cattle get fat they are right handy to the cars, while our cattle never do get real fat; when they get rounded out a little we have to drive them 150 or 200 miles to market. I think the

cattle in some of these counties ought to be at least \$3 less per head than the other counties.

Mr. Randall—I move that we place the valuation of cattle in Nye, Esmeralda, Lincoln and White Pine at \$13 per head, and \$15 in the other counties.

Motion carried.

9. *Thoroughbred Cattle.*

Mr. Beard moved that the valuation be left to the Assessors.

Motion carried.

10. *Sheep.*

Mr. Kinney moved that the valuation be placed at \$2.25 per head.

Mr. Logan moved that the value of sheep in Nye County be placed at \$2, owing to the fact that it was so expensive to get the wool to market.

Mr. Easton suggested that sheep be assessed at \$2.50 throughout the State.

Mr. House moved that sheep in White Pine be assessed at \$2 per head, as he knew of several bands that had sold for that.

Mr. Logan stated that, as it was so expensive to get wool to the market, there should be a difference in the price of sheep, the same as cattle, admitting that Nye was a good sheep county.

The Chairman—I believe in assessing sheep at a high valuation. They are nothing but migratory insects anyhow. The sheep from other States and other counties come into Nye County to feed on the good winter ranges out there, and you ought to catch them for the highest possible valuation.

After similar discussions Mr. Randall moved an amendment to the effect that sheep be assessed at \$2.50 per head, except in White Pine and Nye, and in these counties at \$2.

Motion carried.

11. *Buck Sheep.*

Mr. Beard moved that they be valued at \$5 per head.

Motion carried.

12. *Hogs.*

Mr. Guthrie moved that the valuation be left to the Assessors.

Motion carried.

13. *Telephone Lines.*

Mr. Logan moved that these be left to the Assessors.

Motion carried.

14. *Telegraph Lines.*

Mr. Logan moved that these take the same course.

Motion carried.

15. *Electric Light and Power Lines.*

Mr. Beard moved that these be left to the Assessors.

Motion carried.

16. *Contract Lands.*

Mr. Eggers moved that these be left to the Assessors.

Motion carried.

The Chairman stated that it was his opinion that contract lands should be uniform in value, as the land must be worth \$1.25 per acre, the price paid to the State for it.

Mr. Eggers—I think there is a vast difference in the value of contract land. Some is worth more and some is worth less, so you have to average it. People who contract to pay the State \$1.25 per acre for the land have to pay 6 per cent interest per annum, and I think the State is getting pretty good value for its land. There is a difference in our county. Some I assess at \$2.50 per acre, and some a great deal less.

The Chairman—The Government fixes the price of land at \$1.25 per acre, and I think the value should be uniform.

Mr. Logan—I differ with Mr. Eggers in regard to the matter. He thinks because the lands have not been fully paid for they are not worth so much. If I sell Mr. Eggers a horse for \$40 and he pays \$20 down, the horse belongs to him and is worth \$40. In my county I assess no lands for less than \$1 per acre.

After a little further discussion the matter was left with the Assessors.

17. *Central Pacific Railroad.*

Mr. Kinney suggested that it was nearly 12 o'clock, and, as the railroad order might be long, it would be wise to adjourn until 1 o'clock.

Motion to that effect carried.

Adjourned until 1 o'clock.

### Afternoon Session.

Meeting called to order by the Chairman, Governor Sparks, at 1:20 p. m.

Roll called. All present.

17-1. *Central Pacific Railroad.*

Mr. Logan—Before we proceed with this order of business, I would like to suggest that goats be added to the list.

Mr. Guthrie moved that goats be added to the list.

Carried.

Mr. Easton moved that the valuation be placed at \$5 per head, the same as last year.

Motion carried.

Mr. Quirk suggested that, before proceeding with the assessment of

railroads, the Board ask Mr. Ryan of the Central Pacific to address the Board.

Mr. Ryan spoke as follows:

*Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen:* It always gives me great pleasure on the second Monday of every January to meet you here. I can assure you that it is more like a love feast than a business visit, from the fact that I am acquainted with all of you gentlemen. I have the same feeling for each gentleman that I meet here each succeeding year. As for the business that brings me here, I make this statement: Since the so-called Newlands Act, wherein the rate is reduced in some counties 10 cents on the hundred dollars and in the others 5 cents on the hundred dollars, you all know that I have never failed to meet that cut by the increased valuations in the assessment. The increase in the valuation and the decrease in the rate would seem to bring it to just about the same amount of taxes. We have paid in 1904, under this Act, \$31,509.34 more than we paid in 1903, and this can be verified by each gentleman here, through whose county our road runs, who knows the actual amount of taxes we have paid for each year. Under the circumstances, gentlemen, knowing it is your intention to do that which you believe to be your duty, I have nothing to say in the matter which is to come up before you. You all know the property we have, and we cannot leave out so many head of railroad, so, under the circumstances, I think we are doing our duty by the State. As long as I occupy the position I do, we will follow the same line of duty that we have followed heretofore. I thank you for the honor of asking me to make these few remarks to you and will add: "Peace be with you."

17-1. *Central Pacific Railroad.*

Mr. Beard moved that the valuation of the main track be placed at \$16,000 per mile, and the side tracks at \$5,400 per mile.

Motion carried.

17-2. *Virginia and Truckee Railroad.*

Mr. Kinney moved that the valuation be placed at \$8,700 per mile for the main track.

Mr. Beard moved that the valuation be placed at \$8,500 per mile on the main track.

No second.

Original motion carried by a vote of 11 to 3.

Mr. Beard moved that the valuation of the side track be placed at \$2,500 per mile.

Motion carried.

17-3. *San Pedro, Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad.*

Mr. Roeder moved that the valuation of the main track be placed at \$7,000 per mile, and side tracks at \$2,500 per mile.

\*

Motion carried.

17-4. *Nevada, California and Oregon Railroad.*

Mr. Beard moved that the valuation of the main track be placed at \$2,800 per mile, and the side tracks at \$1,000 per mile.

Motion carried.

17-5. *Carson and Colorado Railroad.*

Mr. Randall moved that the valuation of the main line be placed at \$3,500 per mile, and the side track at \$1,500 per mile.

Mr. Bradley—In rising to second the motion of the gentleman from Lyon, I would say that the Carson and Colorado Railroad passes through the county which he represents. The business of the Carson and Colorado for the last three years has increased a good deal. Now they have as much as they can attend to over the narrow-gauge road. Two years ago the valuation of the main line was placed at \$2,600, and one year ago at \$2,800. Now, there are things that I believe this honorable Board should be apprised of in regard to the Carson and Colorado road. At the present time they are broad-gauging their road and are going to considerable expense. It is true that the business of the road warrants them in doing it. A broad-gauge road in a county makes it rather more promising than a narrow-gauge road. It is beneficial to the State. In seconding the motion of the gentleman from Lyon County, I would say that I believe that an increase of \$700 per mile on the main line is a little bit excessive.

Motion called.

Mr. Beard moved to amend by placing the valuation on the main line at \$3,000 per mile.

No second to the amendment.

Original motion carried by a vote of 11 to 3.

Upon motion the value of the side tracks was placed at \$1,250, the same as last year.

17-5. *Eureka and Palisade Railroad.*

Mr. McTerney presented the following communication from the manager of the Eureka and Palisade Railroad:

January 6, 1905.

*To the Honorable Board of County Assessors, Carson City, Nevada.*

GENTLEMEN: The Eureka and Palisade Railway Company hereby makes request for reduction in the valuation placed on its main line, for purposes of assessment, from \$1,900 to \$1,500 per mile and on side tracks from \$1,000 to \$800 per mile.

In connection with such request we will say: The road has been paying taxes on the valuation of \$1,900 per mile since 1897, when it was reduced from \$2,000 per mile. Since 1897 the road has earned actually less each year (with the single exception of the year 1900), while its net profits have decreased 50.74 per cent, comparing the net earnings of 1897 with the same of 1904. Assuming that the net profits

for the next six months will average as much as for the same time last year, and we regret to say from present indications they will not, the net earnings of the road for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, will show a falling off of 35 per cent as compared with the net earnings for the year ending June 30, 1904.

It is agreed by all, we think, that, for purposes of assessment as well as for valuation, a railway is only worth what it can earn. We have shown above that its net profit has decreased over 50 per cent since 1897, when last reduction in valuation was made, and that it is growing smaller each year. In view of these facts, we ask your honorable body to grant the reduction asked. The Eureka and Palisade Railway Company, in making this request, desires it understood that in case business should increase on the road, it will be glad to return to its old assessment.

(Signed:)

M. L. REQUA,

G. D. ABBOTT, Secretary.

President.

Mr. McTerney moved that the valuation be placed at \$1,850 per mile on the main track.

Mr. Kinney moved as an amendment that the value be left at \$1,900, as the other roads had been made higher.

After slight discussion the original motion was put and carried, and the valuation of the side tracks was placed at \$1,000 per mile.

17-6. *Nevada Central Railroad.*

Mr. Easton—In regard to this road it is in the same condition as the Eureka and Palisade, only worse. It does not earn as much as the Eureka and Palisade does. I believe that the best thing for you to do with that road is to leave it to the Assessor of that county. There are two or three propositions which might materialize between now and the time for assessment so they would not want any reduction of the rate, and it would be kept where it is now.

Mr. Randall moved that the valuation be left to the Assessor.

Motion carried.

17-7. *Tonopah Road.*

Mr. Bradley—The Tonopah road is a narrow-gauge road about 60 miles long. Their rolling stock is quite limited, and they have got all the business they can attend to now. It is the same with them as the Carson and Colorado. They are broad-gauging it. They placed the valuation last year at \$2,000 per mile. I move that we place the valuation this year at \$2,250 per mile on the main track.

Mr. Kinney suggested that the superintendent of that road (Mr. Tripp) was in town, and might like to make some remarks to the Board before the assessment was settled.

It was stated that Mr. Tripp had left town, and the original motion was put and carried.

Valuation of the side tracks placed at \$1,100 per mile.

Upon motion the valuations of the Quartette Railroad and the Pioche

and Pacific Transportation Company road were left to the Assessor of Lincoln County.

The Glasgow and Western Exploration Company Railroad was left to the Assessor of Humboldt County.

Mr. Kinney moved to adjourn.

The Controller stated that if the members would sign their vouchers they could be cashed at the bank.

Adjourned *sine die* at 2 p. m., January 10, 1905.

JOHN SPARKS,

Chairman of State Board of Assessors.

=