

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

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| ROBERT P. PETERSON, |) | |
| |) | |
| Appellant, |) | Case No. 08R 391 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | DECISION AND ORDER |
| |) | AFFIRMING THE DECISION OF |
| DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF |) | THE DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF |
| EQUALIZATION, |) | EQUALIZATION |
| |) | |
| Appellee. |) | |

The above-captioned case was called for a hearing on the merits of an appeal by Robert P. Peterson ("the Taxpayer") to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission ("the Commission"). The hearing was held in the Commission's Hearing Room on the sixth floor of the Nebraska State Office Building in the City of Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, on March 2, 2010, pursuant to an Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued December 31, 2009. Commissioner Warnes, Vice-Chairperson of the Commission, was the presiding hearing officer. Commissioner Wickersham, Chairperson of the Commission, was absent. Commissioner Warnes as Vice-Chairperson acting in the absence of the Chairperson designated Commissioners Warnes, Salmon, and Hotz as a panel of the Commission to hear the appeal. Commissioner Hotz was excused. Commissioner Salmon was present. The appeal was heard by a quorum of a panel of the Commission.

Robert P. Peterson was present at the hearing. No one appeared as legal counsel for the Taxpayer.

Thomas S. Barrett, a Deputy County Attorney for Douglas County, Nebraska, was present as legal counsel for the Douglas County Board of Equalization ("the County Board").

The Commission took statutory notice, received exhibits, and heard testimony.

The Commission is required to state its final decision and order concerning an appeal, with findings of fact and conclusions of law, on the record or in writing. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Reissue 2009). The final decision and order of the Commission in this case is as follows.

**I.
ISSUES**

The Taxpayer has asserted that actual value of the subject property as of January 1, 2008, is less than actual value as determined by the County Board. The issues on appeal related to that assertion are:

Whether the decision of the County Board, determining actual value of the subject property, is unreasonable or arbitrary; and

The actual value of the subject property on January 1, 2008.

The Taxpayer has asserted that taxable value of the subject property as of January 1, 2008, is not equalized with the taxable value of other real property. The issues on appeal related to that assertion are:

Whether the decision of the County Board, determining the equalized taxable value of the subject property, is unreasonable or arbitrary;

Whether the equalized taxable value of the subject property was determined by the County Board in a manner and an amount that is uniform and proportionate as required by Nebraska's Constitution in Article VIII §1; and

The equalized taxable value of the subject property on January 1, 2008.

**II.
FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Commission finds and determines that:

1. The Taxpayer has a sufficient interest in the outcome of the above captioned appeal to maintain the appeal.
2. The parcel of real property to which this appeal pertains ("the Subject Property") is described in the table below.
3. Actual value of the subject property placed on the assessment roll as of January 1, 2008, ("the assessment date") by the Douglas County Assessor, value as proposed in a timely protest, and actual value as determined by the County Board is shown in the following table:

Case No. 08R 391

Description: DEER CREEK LOTS 244-459 & OL BCDE LOT 369 BLOCK 0 IRREG, Douglas County, Nebraska.

| | Assessor Notice Value | Taxpayer Protest Value | Board Determined Value |
|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Land | \$60,000.00 | \$55,000.00 | \$60,000.00 |
| Improvement | \$200,700.00 | \$160,000.00 | \$200,700.00 |
| Total | \$260,700.00 | \$215,000.00 | \$260,700.00 |

4. An appeal of the County Board's decision was filed with the Commission.
5. The County Board was served with a Notice in Lieu of Summons and duly answered that Notice.
6. An Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued on December 31, 2009, set a hearing of the appeal for March 2, 2010, at 1:00 p.m. CST.

7. An Affidavit of Service, which appears in the records of the Commission, establishes that a copy of the Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing was served on all parties.
8. Actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date for the tax year 2008 is:

Case No. 08R 391

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Land value | \$60,000.00 |
| Improvement value | <u>\$200,700.00</u> |
| Total value | <u>\$260,700.00.</u> |

III. APPLICABLE LAW

1. Subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission in this appeal is over all questions necessary to determine taxable value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016(7) (Reissue 2009).
2. “Actual value is the most probable price expressed in terms of money that a property will bring if exposed for sale in the open market, or in an arm’s length transaction, between a willing buyer and a willing seller, both of whom are knowledgeable concerning all the uses to which the real property is adapted and for which the real property is capable of being used. In analyzing the uses and restrictions applicable to real property the analysis shall include a full description of the physical characteristics of the real property and an identification of the property rights valued.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2009).
3. Actual value may be determined using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods, including, but not limited to, the (1) sales comparison approach using the guidelines in section 77-1371, (2) income approach, and (3) cost approach. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2009).

4. “Actual value, market value, and fair market value mean exactly the same thing.”
Omaha Country Club v. Douglas County Board of Equalization, et al., 11 Neb.App. 171, 180, 645 N.W.2d 821, 829 (2002).
5. Taxable value is the percentage of actual value subject to taxation as directed by section 77-201 of Nebraska Statutes and has the same meaning as assessed value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-131 (Reissue 2009).
6. All taxable real property, with the exception of agricultural land and horticultural land, shall be valued at actual value for purposes of taxation. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201(1) (Reissue 2009).
7. “Taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all real property and franchises as defined by the Legislature except as otherwise provided in or permitted by this Constitution.” *Neb. Const.*, Art. VIII, §1.
8. Equalization is the process of ensuring that all taxable property is placed on the assessment rolls at a uniform percentage of its actual value. *MAPCO Ammonia Pipeline v. State Bd. of Equal.*, 238 Neb. 565, 471 N.W.2d 734 (1991).
9. The purpose of equalization of assessments is to bring the assessment of different parts of a taxing district to the same relative standard, so that no one of the parts may be compelled to pay a disproportionate part of the tax. *MAPCO Ammonia Pipeline v. State Bd. of Equal.*, 238 Neb. 565, 471 N.W.2d 734 (1991); *Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597 N.W.2d 623 (1999).

10. Equalization to obtain proportionate valuation requires a comparison of the ratio of assessed to actual value for the subject property and comparable property. See *Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597 N.W.2d 623 (1999).
11. Uniformity requires that whatever methods are used to determine actual or taxable value for various classifications of real property that the results be correlated to show uniformity. *Banner County v. State Board of Equalization*, 226 Neb. 236, 411 N.W.2d 35 (1987).
12. Taxpayers are entitled to have their property assessed uniformly and proportionately, even though the result may be that it is assessed at less than the actual value. *Equitable Life v. Lincoln County Bd. of Equal.*, 229 Neb. 60, 425 N.W.2d 320 (1988); *Fremont Plaza v. Dodge County Bd. of Equal.*, 225 Neb. 303, 405 N.W.2d 555 (1987).
13. The constitutional requirement of uniformity in taxation extends to both rate and valuation. *First Nat. Bank & Trust Co. v. County of Lancaster*, 177 Neb. 390, 128 N.W.2d 820 (1964).
14. In the evaluation of real property for tax purposes, where buildings and improvements are taxable as a part of the real estate, the critical issue is the actual value of the entire property, not the proportion of that value which is allocated to the land or to the buildings and improvements by the appraiser. *Bumgarner v. Valley County*, 208 Neb. 361, 303 N.W.2d 307 (1981).
15. If taxable values are to be equalized it is necessary for a Taxpayer to establish by clear and convincing evidence that valuation placed on his or her property when compared with valuations placed on similar property is grossly excessive and is the result of systematic

will or failure of a plain legal duty, and not mere error of judgement. There must be something more, something which in effect amounts to an intentional violation of the essential principle of practical uniformity. *Newman v. County of Dawson*, 167 Neb. 666, 94 N.W.2d 47 (1959).

16. A presumption exists that the County Board has faithfully performed its duties and has acted on competent evidence. *City of York v. York County Bd. Of Equalization*, 266 Neb. 297, 64 N.W.2d 445 (2003).
17. The presumption in favor of the county board may be classified as a principle of procedure involving the burden of proof, namely, a taxpayer has the burden to prove that action by a board of equalization fixing or determining valuation of real estate for tax purposes is unauthorized by or contrary to constitutional or statutory provisions governing taxation. *Gordman Properties Company v. Board of Equalization of Hall County*, 225 Neb. 169, 403 N.W.2d 366 (1987).
18. The presumption disappears if there is competent evidence to the contrary. *Id.*
19. 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. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016 (8) (Cum. Supp. 2006).
20. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action appealed from was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence. See, e.g., *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb.App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).

21. "Clear and convincing evidence means and is that amount of evidence which produces in the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction about the existence of a fact to be proved."
Castellano v. Bitkower, 216 Neb. 806, 812, 346 N.W.2d 249, 253 (1984).
22. A decision is "arbitrary" when it is made in disregard of the facts and circumstances and without some basis which could lead a reasonable person to the same conclusion. *Phelps Cty. Bd. of Equal. v. Graf*, 258 Neb 810, 606 N.W.2d 736 (2000).
23. A decision is unreasonable only if the evidence presented leaves no room for differences of opinion among reasonable minds. *Pittman v. Sarpy Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 258 Neb 390, 603 N.W.2d 447 (1999).
24. "An owner who is familiar with his property and knows its worth is permitted to testify as to its value." *U. S. Ecology v. Boyd County Bd. Of Equalization*, 256 Neb. 7, 16, 588 N.W.2d 575, 581 (1999).
25. The County Board need not put on any evidence to support its valuation of the property at issue unless the taxpayer establishes the Board's valuation was unreasonable or arbitrary. *Bottorf v. Clay County Bd. of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 162, 580 N.W.2d 561 (1998).
26. A Taxpayer, who only produced evidence that was aimed at discrediting valuation methods utilized by the county assessor, failed to meet burden of proving that value of property was not fairly and proportionately equalized or that valuation placed upon property for tax purposes was unreasonable or arbitrary. *Beynon v. Board of Equalization of Lancaster County*, 213 Neb. 488, 329 N.W.2d 857 (1983).
27. A Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the subject property in order to successfully claim that the subject property is overvalued. Cf. *Lincoln Tel. and*

Tel. Co. v. County Bd. Of Equalization of York County, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N.W.2d 515 (1981); *Arenson v. Cedar County*, 212 Neb. 62, 321 N.W.2d 427 (1982) (determination of equalized taxable value); *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Board of Equalization for Buffalo County*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (1965) (determination of actual value).

IV. ANALYSIS

The subject property is a residential parcel improved with a one story townhouse with 1,575 square feet of living area built in 2002. (E2:6). The townhouse is rated good for both quality and condition. (E2:6). The subject property is located in a subdivision known as Deer Creek. (E2:7).

The Taxpayer testified that the subject property was purchased on March 19, 2008 for \$215,000. His testimony confirmed that the property was purchased from a "bank". The Commission notes that the sale of the subject property to the Taxpayer from a bank is shown in the property record file. (E2:7). The testimony of the Taxpayer was that to the best of his knowledge an individual(s) had purchased the subject property prior to the bank's ownership and the subject property had been reclaimed by the lender and resold to him. The Taxpayer's protest form to the Douglas County Board of Equalization stated a requested 2008 taxable valuation of \$215,000; however, in response to questions asked of him, his opinion of actual value of the subject property on January 1, 2008 was \$230,000 to \$235,000. The Taxpayer's own testimony of his opinion of fair market value for the subject property on January 1, 2008 is evidence that the purchase price is not the sole indicia of actual value.

The appraiser for the County Assessor testified that the subject property was one of several in the Deer Creek subdivision that were purchased by an individual(s) who later was charged with a “bank fraud scam”. The subject property was reclaimed by the lender. A second example of why the purchase price is not the only criteria for determining actual value is shown by the Commission taking note of the purchase price shown in the property record file for the subject property’s sale on March 29, 2005 for \$360,000. (E2:7) This sale was to that purchaser that was part of the “bank fraud scam” as testified to by the appraiser for the County Assessor

“It is true that the purchase price of property may be taken into consideration in determining the actual value thereof for assessment purposes, together with all other relevant elements pertaining to such issue; however, standing alone, it is not conclusive of the actual value of property for assessment purposes. Other matters relevant to the actual value thereof must be considered in connection with the sale price to determine actual value. Sale price is not synonymous with actual value or fair market value.” *Forney v. Box Butte County Bd. of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 417, 424, 582 N.W.2D 631, 637 (1998).

The subject property is of the residential land classification. It is to be valued at “... its actual value.” Neb Rev Stat 77-201 (Reissue 2009). “Actual value of real property for purposes of taxation means the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade. Actual value may be determined using professionally accepted mass appraisal methods, including, but not limited to, the (1) sales comparison approach using the guidelines in section 77-1371, (2) income approach, and (3) cost approach. Actual value is the most probable price expressed in terms of money that a property will bring if exposed for sale in the open market, or in an arm’s length transaction, between a willing buyer and willing seller, both of whom are knowledgeable

concerning all the uses to which the real property is adapted and for which the real property is capable of being used. In analyzing the uses and restrictions applicable to real property, the analysis shall include a consideration of the full description of the physical characteristics of the real property and an identification of the property rights being valued.” Neb Rev Stat 77-112 (Reissue 2009).

Testimony by the Taxpayer disparaged the comparables used by the County as shown on Exhibit 2 page 6. The Commission notes that the three alleged comparable parcels shown by the County on this exhibit have not been adjusted for differences with the subject property and no taxable valuation is shown, in other words, these parcels were not used to directly value the subject property. The appraiser for the County Assessor testified that the County’s alleged comparables were not used to value the subject property directly, but have been shown as an illustration to examine and compare with the valuation determined by the cost approach, in other words the County’s alleged comparables are merely a “backdrop” to use for limited comparative purposes.

The appraiser testified that the subject property was one of several parcels sold as “invalid sales” in the Deer Creek subdivision. Nebraska statute 77-1371 (2009 Reissue) provides guidelines for what constitutes a “comparable sale”. “Comparable sales are recent sales of properties that are similar to the property being assessed in significant physical, functional, and location characteristics and in their contribution to value.” Nebraska statute 77-1371 (2009 Reissue) Item (4) of this statute gives as one of the guidelines whether a sale was made in connection with a foreclosure, bankruptcy, or condemnation, in lieu of foreclosure as to whether it is reflecting market value. The Commission finds that the sale of the subject parcel to the

Taxpayer was made by a bank which had taken the subject property back in a foreclosure following a “bank fraud scam”. This historical background does not provide the Commission with relevant evidence of the sale of the subject property to the Taxpayer from the bank. There is limited evidence regarding the actual sale of the subject property to the Taxpayer for the Commission to determine if the sale was a valid sale that followed exposure in the open market.

From the evidence adduced, the Commission finds that the sale of the subject property to Taxpayer for \$215,000 on March 19, 2008, was an arms length transaction; however, the Commission has limited evidence to make a determination that the sale to the Taxpayer by the bank followed exposure in an open market. In any case, the sales price of the property is but one indicia of its market value. *Potts v Board of Equalization of Hamilton County*, 213 Neb. 37, 48, 328 N.W.2d 175, 328 (1982). In the *Potts* case the court ruled "... standing alone (sale price), it is not conclusive of the actual value of property for assessment purposes, and many other matters relevant to the actual value of property appear in the record and must be considered in connection with the purchase price to determine the actual value", supra., at p. 7. The *Potts* case further states "The true test in all cases is to arrive at actual value, meaning value in the market in the ordinary course of trade", Supra, at p. 7. Thus, the Commission determines that it must look to other indicators of market value besides sale price to determine if the sale price is in fact a valid indicia of market value and if it is not, what is the market value for the subject property.

The Taxpayer provided limited evidence to support his opinion of actual value for the subject property. He did not provide any property files for alleged comparable parcels which had sold or for a comparison of assessed valuations.

There is a presumption that a board of equalization has faithfully performed its official duties in making an assessment and has acted upon sufficient competent evidence to justify its action. The presumption remains until there is competent evidence to the contrary presented, and the presumption disappears when there is competent evidence on appeal to the contrary. From that point on, 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. In an appeal to the county board of equalization or to the district court, and from the district court to this court, the burden of persuasion imposed on the complaining taxpayer is not met by showing a mere difference of opinion unless it is established by clear and convincing evidence that the valuation placed upon his property when compared to valuations placed on other similar property is grossly excessive and is the result of a systematic exercise of intentional will or failure of plain duty, and not mere errors of judgment. *US Ecology, Inc. v. Boyd County Bd of Equalization*, 256 Neb. 7, 15, 588 N.W.2d 575, 581 (1999).

Despite the Commission's finding that the Taxpayer did not provide sufficient competent evidence to rebut the presumption, the Commission has reviewed the evidence provided by the County. The County provided evidence of their valuation method which used the cost approach to value the improvements and the sales comparison approach to value the land. (E2:7 and E2:11).

That under professionally accepted mass appraisal methodologies, the Cost Approach includes six steps: "(1) Estimate the land (site) value as if vacant and available for development to its highest and best use; (2) Estimate the total cost new of the improvements as of the appraisal

date, including direct costs, indirect costs, and entrepreneurial profit from market analysis; (3) Estimate the total amount of accrued depreciation attributable to physical deterioration, functional obsolescence, and external (economic) obsolescence; (5) Subtract the total amount of accrued depreciation from the total cost new of the primary improvements to arrive at the depreciated cost of improvements; (5) Estimate the total cost new of any accessory improvements and site improvements, then estimate and deduct all accrued depreciation from the total cost new of these improvements; (6) Add site value to the depreciated cost of the primary improvements, accessory improvements, and site improvements, to arrive at a value indication by the cost approach.” *Property Assessment Valuation*, 2nd Ed., International Association of Assessing Officers, 1996, 128 - 129.

The Commission finds that the County’s cost valuation methods to value the improvements of the subject property were in accordance with professionally accepted appraisal practices. The Commission notes that the 2008 land valuations for each of the County’s comparables are the same, \$60,000, except for the third comparable which is \$59,000. (E2:13, E2:20 and E2:27). The Commission finds no evidence that the subject property was not fairly and proportionately equalized to comparable properties.

The Board, based upon the applicable law, need not put on any evidence to support its valuation of the property at issue unless the taxpayer establishes the Board's valuation was unreasonable or arbitrary. *Bottorf v. Clay County Bd. of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 162, 168, 580 N.W.2d 561, 566 (1998); Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016(7)(Cum. Supp. 2004).

A taxpayer who offers no evidence that the subject property is valued in excess of its actual value and who only produces evidence that is aimed at discrediting the valuation methods

utilized by county assessor fails to meet his or her burden of proving that the value of the property was not fairly and proportionately equalized or that valuation placed upon the property for tax purposes was unreasonable or arbitrary. *Beynon v. Board of Equalization of Lancaster County*, 213 Neb. 488, 329 N.W.2d 857 (1983).

Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of its property in order to successfully claim that a property is overvalued. *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. County Bd. Of Equalization of York County*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N. W. 2d 515 (1981).

The Commission finds that the Taxpayer has not provided competent evidence to rebut the presumption that the County Board faithfully performed its duties and had sufficient competent evidence to make its determination nor has he provided clear and convincing evidence that the County Board's decision was arbitrary or unreasonable. The appeal of the Taxpayer is denied.

V. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has subject matter jurisdiction in this appeal.
2. The Commission has jurisdiction over the parties to this appeal.
3. The Taxpayer has not produced competent evidence that the County Board failed to faithfully perform its official duties and to act on sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions.

4. The Taxpayer has not adduced sufficient, clear and convincing evidence that the decision of the County Board is unreasonable or arbitrary and the decision of the County Board should be affirmed.

**VI.
ORDER**

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The decision of the County Board determining actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date, January 1, 2008, is affirmed.
2. Actual value, for the tax year 2008, of the subject property is:

Case No. 08R 391

| | |
|-------------------|----------------------|
| Land value | \$ 60,000.00 |
| Improvement value | <u>\$200,700.00</u> |
| Total value | <u>\$260,700.00.</u> |

3. This decision, if no appeal is timely filed, shall be certified to the Douglas County Treasurer, and the Douglas County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Reissue 2009).
4. Any request for relief, by any party, which is not specifically provided for by this order is denied.
5. Each party is to bear its own costs in this proceeding.
6. This decision shall only be applicable to tax year 2008.

7. This order is effective for purposes of appeal on April 7, 2010.

Signed and Sealed. April 7, 2010.

Nancy J. Salmon, Commissioner

William C. Warnes, Commissioner

SEAL

APPEALS FROM DECISIONS OF THE COMMISSION MUST SATISFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF NEB. REV. STAT. §77-5019 (REISSUE 2009), OTHER PROVISIONS OF NEBRASKA STATUTES, AND COURT RULES.