

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

1230 P, LLC
APPELLANT,

V.

LANCASTER COUNTY
BOARD OF EQUALIZATION,
APPELLEE.

CASE NOS: 23C 1145, 24C
0324

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

I. BACKGROUND

1. The Subject Property consists of an improved commercial parcel in Lancaster County, parcel number 10-23-425-007-000.
2. The Lancaster County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$1,164,300 for tax year 2023 and \$1,172,600 for tax year 2024.
3. 1230 P, LLC (the Taxpayer) protested these values to the Lancaster County Board of Equalization (the County Board).
4. The County Board determined that the taxable value of the Subject Property was \$1,164,300 for tax year 2023 and \$1,172,600 for tax year 2024.
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 January 16, 2025, at the Tax Equalization and Review Commission Hearing Room, Nebraska State Office Building, Lincoln, Nebraska, before Commissioner James D. Kuhn.
7. Brian P. Morrissey was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Matt Cartwright (the Appraiser) was 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 the Commission considers an appeal of a decision of a county board of equalization, there are two burdens of proof.³
12. The first involves a presumption 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.⁴ 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.⁵
13. The second burden of proof requires that 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.⁶ The burden of showing such valuation to be unreasonable rests upon the taxpayer on appeal from the action of the board.⁷

¹ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1301(1) (Cum. Supp. 2022).

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 *Pinnacle Enters., Inc. v. Sarpy Cty. Bd. of Equalization*, 320 Neb. 303, 309, 27 N.W.3d 1, 6 (2025). See also *Brenner*, 276 Neb. at 283, 753 N.W.2d at 811 (quoting *Ideal Basic Indus. v. Nuckolls Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 231 Neb. 653, 654-55, 437 N.W.2d 501, 502 (1989)).

⁴ *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, 27 N.W.3d at 6 (quoting *Cain v. Custer Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 315 Neb. 809, 818, 1 N.W.3d 512, 521 (2024)). See also *Brenner*, 276 Neb. at 283, 753 N.W.2d at 811 (quoting *Ideal Basic Indus.*, 231 Neb. at 654-55, 437 N.W.2d at 502).

⁵ *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, 27 N.W.3d at 6.

⁶ *Id.* See also *Brenner*, 276 Neb. at 283-84, 753 N.W.2d at 811.

⁷ *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, 27 N.W.3d at 6. See also *Brenner*, 276 Neb. at 283-84, 753 N.W.2d at 811.

14. 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.⁸ Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.⁹
15. The Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the Subject Property in order to successfully claim that the Subject Property is overvalued.¹⁰ The County Board need not put on any evidence to support its valuation of the property at issue unless the Taxpayer establishes that the County Board's valuation was unreasonable or arbitrary.¹¹
16. In an appeal, the Commission may determine any question raised in the proceeding upon which an order, decision, determination, or action appealed from is based.¹² The Commission may consider all questions necessary to determine taxable value of property as it hears an appeal or cross appeal.¹³ The Commission may take notice of judicially cognizable facts, may take notice of general, technical, or scientific facts within its specialized knowledge, and may utilize its experience, technical competence, and specialized knowledge in the evaluation of the evidence presented to it.¹⁴ The Commission's Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.¹⁵

⁸ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(9) (Reissue 2018).

⁹ *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, 27 N.W.3d at 6; *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas County Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb. App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).

¹⁰ Cf. *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Bd. of Equal. for Buffalo County*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (1965) (determination of actual value) abrogated on other grounds by *Potts v. Bd. of Equalization*, 213 Neb. 37, 328 N.W.2d 175 (1982)); *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. County Bd. of Equal. of York County*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N.W.2d 515 (1981) (determination of equalized taxable value).

¹¹ *Wheatland Indus., LLC v. Perkins Cty. Bd. of Equalization*, 304 Neb. 638, 935 N.W.2d 764 (2019) (quoting *Bottorf v. Clay Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 7 Neb. App. 162, 168, 580 N.W.2d 561, 566 (1998)).

¹² Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(8) (Reissue 2018).

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5016(6) (Reissue 2018).

¹⁵ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018(1) (Reissue 2018).

III. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

17. The Taxpayer stated the main issue with the appeal is the way the Lancaster County Assessor's office is utilizing their income approach by not loading the capitalization rate for this commercial property.
18. The Taxpayer stated the Assessor is not following appraisal practice or mass appraisal practices. The Taxpayer asserts that small retail properties should have a loaded cap rate whereas large retailers such as Walgreens should not have a loaded cap.
19. The Taxpayer provided a spreadsheet for the Subject Property with the information the Assessor is using to value the property and what the Taxpayer asserts is the proper information to be used in the income approach. The Taxpayers' information shows differing vacancy rates, lower net operating income (NOI) and a loaded cap rate.
20. The Appraiser stated commercial property in the city with triple net leases (NNN) do not have a loaded cap rate with their income approach. The Appraiser stated the taxes are taken care of by the tenant with a triple net lease so the NOI is stabilized by the tenant, so the cap rate remains unloaded.
21. The Appraiser provided information from the Cook County Assessor's office about determining a capitalization rate for the assessment of income producing properties and an article by C. Kevin Bokoske, MAI which in part supports not loading the cap rate for the Subject Property.
22. "The burden of showing a valuation to be unreasonable rests upon the taxpayer on appeal from the action of the board of equalization."¹⁶ "The burden of persuasion imposed on a complaining taxpayer is not met by showing a mere difference of opinion unless it is established by clear and convincing evidence

¹⁶ *Wheatland Indus.*, 304 Neb. at 644-45, 935 N.W.2d at 769-70 (citing *Betty L. Green Living Trust v. Morrill Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 299 Neb. 933, 941-42, 911 N.W.2d 551, 558 (2018)).

that the valuation placed upon the property when compared with valuations placed on other similar property is grossly excessive and is a result of a systematic exercise of intentional will or failure of plain duty, and not mere errors of judgment.”¹⁷

23. The Taxpayer did not provide any property record files (PRFs) for the Commission to analyze to see if the Subject Property is being valued differently or unfairly as compared to similar properties.¹⁸
24. 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.
25. 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.

IV. 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 2023 and 2024 are affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax years 2023 and 2024 is:

<u>2023 Total</u>	<u>\$1,164,300</u>
<u>2024 Total</u>	<u>\$1,172,600</u>

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ For this reason, the Order for Single Commissioner Hearing and Notice issued to the Taxpayer on December 12, 2024, includes the following:

NOTE: *Copies of the County’s Property Record File for any property you will present as a comparable parcel should be provided so that your claim can be properly analyzed. The information provided on the County’s web page is not a property record file. A Property Record File is only maintained in the office of the County Assessor and should be obtained from that office prior to the hearing.*

3. This Decision and Order, if no further action is taken, shall be certified to the Lancaster County Treasurer and the Lancaster County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5018.
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 years 2023 and 2024.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on February 18, 2026.

Signed and Sealed: February 18, 2026.



James D. Kuhn, Commissioner