

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

PURE INVESTMENTS II, LLC,)	
)	
Appellant,)	Case No. 09C 021
)	
v.)	DECISION AND ORDER
)	AFFIRMING THE DECISION OF
CASS COUNTY BOARD OF)	THE CASS COUNTY BOARD OF
EQUALIZATION,)	EQUALIZATION
)	
Appellee.)	

The above-captioned case was called for a hearing on the merits of an appeal by Pure Investments II, LLC ("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 July 27, 2010, pursuant to an Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued May 25, 2010. 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.

Rich L. Dreesman, Member of Pure Investments II, LLC, was present at the hearing. No one appeared as legal counsel for the Taxpayer.

Nathan B. Cox, County Attorney for Cass County, Nebraska, was present as legal counsel for the Cass 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, 2009, 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, 2009.

The Taxpayer has asserted that taxable value of the subject property as of January 1, 2009, 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, 2009.

**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, 2009, ("the assessment date") by the Cass 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. 09C 021

Description: PLATT'S -- SWEDE'S INDUSTRIAL SITE LOT 5 (1.82), Cass County, Nebraska.

	Assessor Notice Value	Taxpayer Protest Value	Board Determined Value
Land	\$85,896.00	\$57,340.00	\$85,896.00
Improvement	\$101,940.00	\$107,660.00	\$101,940.00
Total	\$187,836.00	\$165,000.00	\$187,836.00

4. An appeal of the County Board's decision was filed with the Commission.
5. An Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued on May 25, 2010, set a hearing of the appeal for July 27, 2010, at 1:00 p.m. CDST.
6. 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.

7. Actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date for the tax year 2009 is:

Case No. 09C 021

Land value	\$ 85,896.00
Improvement value	<u>\$101,940.00</u>
Total value	<u>\$187,836.00.</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) (Reissue 2009).
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. A corporate officer or other representative of an entity, must be shown to be familiar with the property in question and have a knowledge of values generally in the vicinity to be qualified to offer an opinion of value. *Kohl's Dept. Stores v. Douglas County Bd. of Equal.*, 10 Neb.App. 809, 638 N.W.2d 881 (2002).
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 commercial parcel of 1.82 acres improved with a 10,000 square foot warehouse storage commercial building with the warehouse built in 1977. (E2:1 and E2:2).

The Taxpayer has asserted that actual value of the subject property as of January 1, 2009, is less than actual value as determined by the County Board and in addition, the Taxpayer has asserted that taxable value of the subject property as of January 1, 2009, is not equalized with the taxable value of other real property.

VALUATION

The Taxpayer testified that he purchased the subject property on April 23, 2007 for \$175,000. The subject property had been listed with a relator prior to purchase by the Taxpayer at a price of \$250,000. The Taxpayer testified that the subject property had been listed for sale for 5 months prior to sale and that he purchased it "under duress" in that he needed commercial space for the production of orders for his product. The Commission finds that the purchase price for a property is but one indicator of actual value. *Forney v. Box Butte County Bd. of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 417, 424, 582 N.W.2D 631, 637, (1998).

The Taxpayer testified that the subject property was in need of repairs when he purchased it and the actual value of the property was diminished by this fact. Photos were provided as evidence of the deteriorated condition. (E4:5). The Taxpayer also testified that the real estate market had deteriorated and this along with the needed repairs reduced the actual value of the subject property to \$150,000. Other than the testimony of the Taxpayer, there was not evidence quantifying the cost to repair the subject property nor was there evidence provided of the deteriorated real estate market.

VALUATION AND EQUALIZATION

The Taxpayer provided three alleged comparable parcels to the subject property. (E4:7, E4:12 and E4:17). The Taxpayer testified to a comparison he had made of the subject property to these three alleged comparable parcels which he concluded showed that the subject property had been assessed too high for 2009 and not equalized with other comparable parcels. He testified that his comparison was based on the sales comparison valuation approach, but he had not made any adjustments for differences. The Commission notes that the County's valuation approach as shown on the property record files for the subject property and the property record files for each of the Taxpayer's alleged comparables was both the cost and income approach. In addition, the county provided three alleged comparable parcels as shown in Exhibit 3, but these alleged comparable parcels were not shown as resulting in a determination of actual value. There were no adjustments made by the County for differences between the alleged comparable parcels and the subject property.

The Commission finds from its review of the evidence that the Taxpayer's alleged comparables are not comparable to the subject property without adjustments for differences.

“Comparable properties” share similar quality, architectural attractiveness (style), age, size, amenities, functional utility, and physical condition. *Property Assessment Valuation*, 2nd Ed., International Association of Assessing Officers, 1996, 98.

When using “comparables” to determine value, similarities and differences between the subject property and the comparables must be recognized. *Property Assessment Valuation*, 2nd Ed., 1996, 103. Most adjustments are for physical characteristics. *Property Assessment Valuation*, 2nd Ed., 1996, 105. “Financing terms, market conditions, location, and physical characteristics are items that must be considered when making adjustments . . .” *Property Assessment Valuation*, 2nd Ed., 1996, 98.

The Taxpayer testified to his belief as to what differences there were between his alleged comparable parcels and from his testimony the Commission removed from comparison that parcel at Exhibit 4 pages 7-11 because it has too many amenities and is in the Taxpayer’s own words “a finished property” where the subject property lacks such amenities. The parcel shown as Exhibit 4 pages 17 to 20 is also removed from comparison because the Taxpayer testified that he had purchased this parcel and the purchase price included significant inventory which had not been identified on the Form 521, Sales Transfer Statement. This leaves the Taxpayer’s one remaining alleged comparable parcel shown at Exhibit 4 pages 12 to 16, 2317 Warren Drive, for the Commission to compare to the subject property.. In addition, the County’s comparables include a property shown at Exhibit 3 page 5, 2327 Warren which the Commission has examined. Both parcels, 2317 Warren and 2327 Warren, are the most comparable to the subject property, but each have differences to the subject property. The property record files for each

parcel show that the County used both the income and cost approach to determine actual value for the subject property and the alleged comparables. The County chose to use the valuation determined from the income approach. (E4:14 and E3:6). The same approach to valuation, the income approach, was used by the County Assessor to value the subject property and to make its recommendation to the County Board of Equalization for its determination. (E2:2).

The Commission’s review of the above two parcels shows that they are both 9,600 square feet as compared to the subject property being 10,000 square feet in size and identified as “warehouse, storage” as is the subject property. (E4:14, E3:6 and E2:2). The County’s determination of taxable value for each of the parcels using the income approach was as follows:

	Land	Improvements	Total
Subject Property	\$85,896	101,940	187,836
2317 Warren (E4:12-16)	36,133	148,698	184,131
2327 Warren (E3:5)	46,797	133,530	180,327

There was a conspicuous absence of evidence about the income, expenses or capitalization rate used by the County in its income approach to valuation of the subject property. The Commission notes that the same percentage was used for each of the above parcels for the vacancy and collection loss, 5 %, the expenses, 13%, and the capitalization rate, 11%.

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).

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. *Id.* 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 did have sufficient competent evidence to make its determination. The Taxpayer has not 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.

The Commission finds that the Taxpayer has not 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, 2009, is affirmed.
2. Actual value, for the tax year 2009, of the subject property is:

Case No. 09C 021

Land value	\$85,896.00
Improvement value	<u>\$101,940.00</u>
Total value	<u>\$187,836.00.</u>

3. This decision, if no appeal is timely filed, shall be certified to the Cass County Treasurer, and the Cass 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 2009.
7. This order is effective for purposes of appeal on August 18, 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.