

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

AUSTIN M. CLAPPER,
APPELLANT,

V.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD
OF EQUALIZATION,
APPELLEE.

CASE NO: 23R 1557

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 1441780000.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$251,200 for tax year 2023.
3. Austin M. Clapper (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 \$251,200 for tax year 2023.
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 March 20, 2024, at the Omaha State Office Building, 1313 Farnam, Room 227, Omaha, Nebraska, before Commissioner Steven Keetle.
7. Austin M. Clapper was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Cindy Stovie with the County Assessor's Office (the County 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, ____ N.W.3d ____ (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, ____ N.W.3d at ____ (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, ____ N.W.3d at ____.

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

⁷ *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, ____ N.W.3d at _____. 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

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

⁹ *Pinnacle Enters.*, 320 Neb. at 309, ____ N.W.3d at ____; *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).

Decision and Order shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law.¹⁵

III. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

17. The Subject Property is a residential parcel improved with a 1,460 square-foot ranch style residence constructed in 1952. The Subject Property has quality and condition ratings of average.
18. The Taxpayer alleged that the increase in the assessed value of the Subject Property from the prior assessment year, particularly when compared to other properties, was unreasonable or arbitrary.
19. The assessed value for real property may be different from year to year according to the circumstances.¹⁶ For this reason, a prior year's assessment is not relevant to the subsequent year's valuation.¹⁷ Similarly, prior assessments of other properties are not relevant to the subsequent assessment.¹⁸
20. The Taxpayer alleged that the assessed value of the Subject Property should be reduced due to its condition.
21. The Taxpayer discussed the driveway and plumbing in the Subject Property and presented photographs of the driveway and plumbing in the basement as well as estimates for the removal and replacement of the driveway and concrete patio.
22. The County Board presented the Property Record File (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. This information was used to determine

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

¹⁶ *Affiliated Foods Coop. v. Madison Co. Bd. of Equal.*, 229 Neb. 605, 614, 428 N.W.2d 201, 206 (1988); see Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1502 (Reissue 2018).

¹⁷ *Affiliated Foods Coop.*, 229 Neb. at 613, 428 N.W.2d at 206; *DeVore v. Board of Equal.*, 144 Neb. 351, 354-55, 13 N.W.2d 451, 452-53 (1944).

¹⁸ *Kohl's Dep't Stores v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 10 Neb. App. 809, 814-15, 638 N.W.2d 877, 881 (2002).

the value attributed to each of the residential properties in the area, including the Subject Property.

23. The County Board also presented the sales listing for the 2020 sale of the Subject Property which contained multiple photographs of the Subject Property.
24. The PRF shows that the County Assessor has given the Subject Property a condition rating of average.
25. The Taxpayer has not demonstrated that the condition rating of average as determined by the County Assessor is unreasonable or arbitrary.
26. The Taxpayer alleged that the assessed value of the Subject Property is not equalized with other comparable properties.
27. The Taxpayer presented the PRF for six properties he alleged were comparable to the Subject Property.
28. Comparable properties share similar use (residential, commercial/industrial, or agricultural), physical characteristics (size, shape, and topography), and location.¹⁹
29. “A sales comparison adjustment is made to account (in dollars or a percentage) for a specific difference between the subject property and a comparable property.”²⁰ “As the comparable is made more like the subject, its price is brought closer to the subject’s unknown value.”²¹
30. The PRF for the Subject Property and the six properties provided by the Taxpayer show that the differences in overall value per square foot between the properties are due to differences in the characteristics of the property such as location (one is located in a different subdivision), type of construction (ranch, raised ranch, one and one-half story), age, condition, amount and type of basement finish, garage type and size, patios, and other amenities.

¹⁹ See generally, International Association of Assessing Officers, *Property Assessment Valuation* 169-79 (3rd ed. 2010).

²⁰ Appraisal Institute, *Appraising Residential Properties* 334 (4th ed. 2007).

²¹ *Id.*

31. The property across the street for example has the same quality and condition rating as the Subject Property but it is not a ranch style design but rather a one-and-one-half story, is nineteen years older than the Subject Property, has a smaller basement with no basement finish, no fireplace, and a larger detached garage.
32. The Taxpayer has not shown that the assessed value of the Subject Property was not equalized with the assessed value of other comparable properties.
33. 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.
34. 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 2023 is affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2023 is:

Land	\$ 32,800
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$218,400</u>
Total	\$251,200

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.
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 2023.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on January 26, 2026.

Signed and Sealed: January 26, 2026



Steven A. Keetle, Commissioner