

**BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW
COMMISSION**

BEL FURY INVESTMENTS
GROUP LLC
APPELLANT,

V.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD
OF EQUALIZATION,
APPELLEE.

CASE NO: 19R 0521

DECISION AND ORDER
AFFIRMING THE DECISION
OF THE DOUGLAS COUNTY
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Subject Property is an improved residential parcel in Douglas County, parcel number 1249870000.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$80,700 for tax year 2019.
3. Bel Fury Investments Group LLC (the Taxpayer) protested this value to the Douglas County Board of Equalization (the County Board).
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$80,700 for tax year 2019.
5. The Taxpayer appealed the determination of the County Board to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (the Commission).
6. A Single Commissioner hearing was held on September 28, 2021, at the Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam Street, Room 227, Omaha, Nebraska, before Commissioner Steven Keetle.
7. Arielle Bloemer, legal counsel, and Scott Bloemer were present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.

8. Scott Barnes and Kurt Skradis with the County Assessor's Office (County Appraisers) were present for the County Board.

II. 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
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

¹ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1301(1) (Cum. Supp. 2020).

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, 759 N.W.2d 464, 473 (2009).

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

⁴ *Id.* at 283-84.

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

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

III. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

16. The Subject Property is a raised ranch residence constructed in 1948.
17. The Taxpayer alleges that the increase in the assessed value from the prior tax year's assessment is excessive, unreasonable, and arbitrary.
18. 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
19. The Taxpayer alleged that the value of the Subject Property was negatively impacted by the condition of the property.
20. The Taxpayer presented a 2017 insurance estimate for the repair of hail damage to the Subject Property, as well as an invoice for roof repairs that were completed in June of 2019 after the assessment date.

⁶ *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb. App. 171, 174-75, 645 N.W.2d 821, 826 (2002).

⁷ *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Bd. of Equal. for Buffalo Cty.*, 179 Neb. 415, 418, 138 N.W.2d 641, 643 (1965) (determination of actual value); *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. Cty. Bd. of Equal. of York Cty.*, 209 Neb. 465, 468, 308 N.W.2d 515, 518 (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).

21. The County Board presented the PRF for the Subject Property. The PRF contains information about the characteristics of the Subject Property and information regarding the qualified sales that occurred in the economic area of the Subject Property for the tax year at issue. This information was used to determine the value attributed to each of the characteristics of residential properties in the area, including the Subject Property.
22. The PRF shows that the market area in which the Subject Property is located was reappraised for tax year 2019.
23. The PRF for the Subject Property shows that it had a condition rating of fair for tax year 2019.
24. The County Appraisers stated that after reviewing the information presented to the Commission, including the invoice for roof repair, the condition rating of fair took into account the condition of the roof on the Subject Property prior to its replacement.
25. The Taxpayer has not presented information to demonstrate that the condition rating of fair for the Subject Property was arbitrary or unreasonable.
26. The Taxpayer alleged that the per square foot assessed value of the Subject Property was not equalized with a comparable property.
27. The Taxpayer notes that the Nebraska Court of Appeals held in *Scribante* that “To set the valuation of similarly situated property, i.e. comparables, at materially different levels, i.e., value per square foot, is by definition, unreasonable and arbitrary, under the Nebraska Constitution.”¹¹
28. Comparable properties share similar use (residential, commercial/industrial, or agricultural), physical characteristics (size, shape, and topography), and location.¹²
29. The Taxpayer presented the PRF for one property located within one block of the Subject Property.

¹¹ *Scribante v. Douglas County Board of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 25, 39, 588 N.W.2d 190, 199 (1999)

¹² See generally, International Association of Assessing Officers, *Property Assessment Valuation*, at 169-79 (3rd ed. 2010)

30. The Taxpayer presented a chart that made adjustments to the value of this property for tax year 2019 to adjust for differences in the characteristics of the properties. The Taxpayer stated that these adjustments were made based on his experience in the real estate market and the information contained in the PRFs. Although the Taxpayer may have knowledge of the Omaha real estate market, he is not a trained appraiser and none of the adjustments can be quantified by supporting evidence.
31. The County Appraisers stated that the Subject Property and the property offered by the Taxpayer were in different market areas separated by 60th street a major north-south road and therefore would not be comparable to the Subject Property due to different market factors in each market area.
32. The County Appraisers stated that the differences in values between the Subject Property and the other property presented were based on different market factors in each market area.
33. A review of the PRFs shows that the valuation factors for all of the properties are very similar, the main difference in per square foot assessed values appear to be due to differences in location/market area.
34. The Taxpayer alleges that the market areas determined by the County Assessor are arbitrary or unreasonable.
35. The County Appraisers discussed the qualified sales that occurred in the economic area of the Subject Property for each of the tax years at issue in the Subject Property's market area and presented the assessment statistics to support the market area adjustments made to the valuation of the Subject Property.
36. The Taxpayer did not present sales information to support the allegation that the difference in market area adjustments between the Subject Property and the other properties presented are arbitrary or unreasonable.
37. The Taxpayer did not present information to demonstrate that the market areas utilized by the County Assessor are arbitrary or unreasonable.

38. The Taxpayer has not demonstrated that the valuation of similarly situated properties were set at materially different levels entitling the Subject Property to a reduction assessed value under the court's determination in *Scribante*.
39. 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.
40. The Taxpayer has not adduced clear and convincing evidence that the determination of the County Board is arbitrary or unreasonable and the decision of the County Board should be affirmed.

IV. ORDER

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The decision of the County Board of Equalization determining the taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2019 is affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2019 is:

Land	\$10,000
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$70,700</u>
Total	\$80,700
3. 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).
4. Any request for relief, by any party, which is not specifically provided for by this Decision and Order is denied.
5. Each party is to bear its own costs in this proceeding.
6. This Decision and Order shall only be applicable to tax year 2019.

7. This Decision and Order is effective on March 29, 2023

Signed and Sealed: March 29, 2023



Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner