

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION

Bel Fury Investment Group LLC,
Appellant,

v.

Douglas County Board of Equalization,
Appellee.

Case Nos: 18R 0345 & 20R 0563

Decision and Order Affirming the
Determinations of the Douglas
County Board of Equalization

Background

1. The Subject Property consists of a residential parcel improved with a 1,162 square foot raised ranch style residence with a legal description of Northwest Hills Lot 8 Block 0 Irreg., Omaha, Douglas County, Nebraska.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$83,900 for tax year 2018 and \$112,900 for tax year 2020.
3. Bel Fury Investment Group LLC (the Taxpayer) protested these values to the Douglas County Board of Equalization (the County Board) and requested assessed values of \$78,600 for tax year 2018 and \$82,500 for tax year 2020.
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$83,900 for tax year 2018 and \$112,900 for tax year 2020.
5. The Taxpayer appealed the determinations of the County Board to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (the Commission).
6. A Single Commissioner hearing was held on May 25, 2021, at the Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam, Room 227, Omaha, Nebraska, before Commissioner Steven Keetle.
7. Arielle Bloemer, legal counsel, and Scott W. Bloemer were present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Scott Barnes and Kurt Skradis with the Douglas County Assessor/Register of Deeds Office (the County Appraisers) were present for the County Board.

Applicable Law

9. All real property in Nebraska subject to taxation shall be assessed as of the effective date of January 1.¹
10. The Commission’s review of a determination of the County Board of Equalization is de novo.²

¹ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1301(1) (Reissue 2018).

² See Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(8) (Reissue 2018), *Brenner v. Banner Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 276 Neb. 275, 286, 753 N.W.2d 802, 813 (2008). “When an appeal is conducted as a ‘trial de novo,’ as opposed to a ‘trial de novo on the record,’ it means literally a new hearing and not merely new findings of fact based upon a previous record. A trial de novo is conducted as though the earlier trial had not been held in the first place, and evidence is taken anew as such evidence is available at the time of the trial on appeal.” *Koch v. Cedar Cty. Freeholder Bd.*, 276 Neb. 1009, 1019 (2009).

11. When considering an appeal a presumption exists that the “board of equalization has faithfully performed its official duties in making an assessment and has acted upon sufficient competent evidence to justify its action.”³ That presumption “remains until there is competent evidence to the contrary presented, and the presumption disappears when there is competent evidence adduced on appeal to the contrary. From that point forward, the reasonableness of the valuation fixed by the board of equalization becomes one of fact based upon all the evidence presented. The burden of showing such valuation to be unreasonable rests upon the taxpayer on appeal from the action of the board.”⁴
12. The order, decision, determination or action appealed from shall be affirmed unless evidence is adduced establishing that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary.⁵
13. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.⁶
14. A Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the Subject Property in order to successfully claim that the Subject Property is overvalued.⁷
15. The Commission’s Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.⁸

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

1. The Taxpayer alleges that the increase in the assessed value from each of the prior tax year’s assessment is excessive, unreasonable, and arbitrary.
2. The assessed value for real property may be different from year to year, dependent upon the circumstances.⁹ For this reason, a prior year’s assessment is not relevant to the subsequent year’s valuation.¹⁰
3. For tax year 2018 the Taxpayer did not challenge the assessment of the improvement component of the Subject Property and argued only that the assessed value of the land component was not equalized with other comparable properties.
4. The Taxpayer presented the 2018 Property Record File (PRF) for four properties located near the Subject Property.
5. The Taxpayer presented a chart that showed the land values for these four properties and the Subject Property for tax year 2018.

³ *Brenner v. Banner Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 276 Neb. 275, 283, 753 N.W.2d 802, 811 (2008).

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(9) (Reissue 2018).

⁶ *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb. App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).

⁷ Cf. *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Bd. of Equal. for Buffalo Cty.*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (1965) (determination of actual value); *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. County Bd. of Equal. of York Cty.*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N.W.2d 515 (1981) (determination of equalized taxable value).

⁸ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018(1) (Reissue 2018).

⁹ See *Affiliated Foods Coop. v. Madison Co. Bd. of Equal.*, 229 Neb. 605, 613, 428 N.W.2d 201, 206 (1988).

¹⁰ See *DeVore v. Bd. Of Equal.*, 144 Neb. 351, 13 N.W.2d 451 (1944), *Affiliated Foods*, 229 Neb. at 613, 428 N.W.2d at 206 (1988).

6. The County Board presented the PRF for the Subject Property and information regarding recent valid sales in the area for tax year 2018.
7. The County Appraisers stated that the Subject Property and the four properties offered by the Taxpayer are in different market areas and would not be comparable due to different market factors in each market area for tax year 2018. The County Appraisers stated that the market areas were changed for tax year 2020 based on changes in the residential real estate market that occurred between tax years 2018 and 2020.
8. The Taxpayer alleges that the market areas determined by the County Assessor are arbitrary or unreasonable.
9. The Taxpayer asserts that the changes in the market areas between tax years 2018 and 2020 support the Taxpayer's allegation that the market areas are arbitrary or unreasonable.
10. The Taxpayer did not present information to demonstrate that the market areas utilized by the County Assessor are arbitrary or unreasonable.
11. The Commission finds that the properties presented by the Taxpayer are not comparable to the Subject Property.
12. For tax year 2020 the Taxpayer alleged that the value of the Subject Property was negatively impacted by the condition of the property.
13. The Taxpayer presented a Property Evaluation Report (PER) prepared by Connie Watson, a contractor and construction estimator employed by the Taxpayer, indicating that \$30,400 of repairs were needed on the Subject Property, \$25,200 in external repairs and \$5,200 for interior repairs.
14. The PER was dated June 23, 2020, but the Taxpayer stated that the condition of the Subject Property as described in the PER was the same as of all assessment dates at issue in these appeals.
15. The Taxpayer presented a 2017 insurance estimate for the repair of hail damage to the Subject Property.
16. The County Board presented the 2020 PRF for the Subject Property and information regarding recent valid sales for tax year 2020.
17. The PRF shows that the market area in which the Subject Property is located was reappraised for tax year 2020.
18. The PRF for the Subject Property shows that in tax year 2020 it had a condition rating of fair.
19. The County Appraisers stated that after reviewing the information presented to the Commission, including the photographs in the PER, the condition rating of fair took into account the needed repairs indicated in the PER for the Subject Property.
20. The Taxpayer has not presented information to demonstrate that the condition rating of fair for the Subject Property as shown on the PRF was arbitrary or unreasonable.

21. The Taxpayer has not produced competent evidence that the County Board failed to faithfully perform its duties and to act on sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions.
22. The Taxpayer has not adduced clear and convincing evidence that the determinations of the County Board are arbitrary or unreasonable and the decisions of the County Board should be affirmed.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The Decisions of the County Board of Equalization determining the taxable value of the Subject Property for tax years 2018 and 2020 are affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2018 is:

Land	\$ 15,300
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$ 68,600</u>
Total	\$ 83,900

3. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2020 is:

Land	\$ 20,300
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$ 92,600</u>
Total	\$112,900

4. This Decision and Order, if no further action is taken, shall be certified to the Douglas County Treasurer and the Douglas County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018 (Reissue 2018).
5. Any request for relief, by any party, which is not specifically provided for by this Decision and Order is denied.
6. Each party is to bear its own costs in this proceeding.
7. This Decision and Order shall only be applicable to tax years 2018 and 2020.
8. This Decision and Order is effective on February 18, 2022.

Signed and Sealed: February 18, 2022

Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner