

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

MICHELE A. ROBERTS
APPELLANT,

CASE NO: 24R 0820

V.

DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD
OF EQUALIZATION,
APPELLEE.

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 0828247604.
2. The Douglas County Assessor (the County Assessor) assessed the Subject Property at \$436,600 for tax year 2024.
3. Michele A. Roberts (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 \$436,600 for tax year 2024.
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 November 6, 2025, at the Tax Equalization and Review Commission Hearing Room, Nebraska State Office Building, Lincoln, Nebraska, before Commissioner Jackie S. Russell.
7. James Turner (spouse) was present at the hearing for the Taxpayer.
8. Tim Tran (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 Subject Property is a one-story, single-family home built in 2019 with above grade area of 1,593 square feet (SF), basement area of 1,593 SF of which 873 SF is fully finished. There are two full and one-half baths, one fireplace, and an attached garage with 744 SF. The overall quality rating is good, and the condition rating is very good. The property is located in the Copperfields subdivision.
18. The Taxpayer alleged there is an equalization issue within the Subject Property neighborhood creating an arbitrary or unreasonable value for the Subject Property.
19. The Taxpayer provided information from the Douglas County website for five properties within the Copperfields subdivision. The printouts were accompanied by a document explaining an analysis by the Taxpayer with a requested valuation of \$290,000.
20. The Taxpayer provided an article from Wenatchee, WA, that properties with lakefront lots have higher intrinsic value and do not depreciate as quickly as inland properties. Because of this, the Taxpayer alleged that the Subject Property should be valued less than waterfront property since it is located inland.
21. The Taxpayer also provided an article from Home Matter Construction of Omaha's website that stated walkout basements have a rate of return of 20-30% more than homes without walkout basements leading to the opinion that since the Subject Property does not have a walkout basement, the value should be priced 20-30% less than properties in the neighborhood with walkout basements.
22. The Taxpayer did not provide the Property Record Files (PRF) for any of the properties presented for equalization purposes. Without the details contained in the PRF, the Commission is unable to determine from the website printouts whether the

properties discussed are comparable to the Subject Property and being treated uniformly within the cost analysis.¹⁶

23. The County Assessor is responsible for setting property valuations for all real property in the county at actual value as of January 1, 2024.
24. A determination of actual value may be made by using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods.¹⁷ The methods expressly stated in statute are the sales comparison approach, the income approach, and the cost approach.¹⁸
25. Comparable properties share similar use (residential, commercial/industrial, or agricultural), physical characteristics (style, size, finish, condition, etc.), and location.¹⁹
26. “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
27. The Taxpayer has not presented information to demonstrate that walkout basements or waterfront properties have a higher rate of return when sold in the Subject Property’s market area and would warrant a change of value for properties without those components.

¹⁶ For this reason, the Order for Single Commissioner Hearing and Notice issued to the Taxpayer on October 3, 2025, 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.

¹⁷ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-112 (Reissue 2018).

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ 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.*

28. After the Commission's review of the Taxpayer's website printouts, the components of contributory value (sections headed with "Buildings" and "Buildings Detail") used in setting a property's valuation, vary greatly amongst all properties presented and the analysis of the Taxpayer does not address those additional differences. Therefore, the Commission does not find it to be sufficient competent evidence.
29. The Appraiser stated there was a revaluation conducted to the Subject Property neighborhood for 2024. The increases (or decreases) to each property in the market study area were dependent upon the property data components and comparable sales within the study period.
30. The Appraiser provided a packet of information for the Subject Property including the PRF. The information details the Subject Property's components of contributory value, the subsequent cost approach to value, sales from the Subject Property neighborhood, and the impact of the market sales data on the property's valuation using professionally accepted mass appraisal practices.
31. The Taxpayer has not produced sufficient competent evidence that the County Board failed to faithfully perform its duties and to act on sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions.
32. 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 2024 is affirmed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2024 is:

Land	\$ 37,300
<u>Improvements</u>	<u>\$399,300</u>
Total	\$436,600

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 2024.
7. This Decision and Order is effective on January 26, 2026.

Signed and Sealed: January 26, 2026



Jackie S. Russell, Commissioner