

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

RONALD E. AUPPERLE,)	
)	
Appellant,)	Case No. 09R 698
)	
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 Ronald E. Aupperle ("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 24, 2011, pursuant to an Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued September 13, 2010 as amended by an Order dated January 14, 2011. 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.

Ronald E. Aupperle 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, 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 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. 09R 698

Description: MOCKINGBIRD HILLS WEST LOT 348 BLOCK 0 IRREG, Douglas County, Nebraska.

	Assessor Notice Value	Taxpayer Protest Value	Board Determined Value
Land	\$22,000.00	\$22,000.00	\$22,000.00
Improvement	\$139,600.00	\$118,000.00	\$139,600.00
Total	\$161,600.00	\$140,000.00	\$161,600.00

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 September 13, 2010, as amended by an Order issued on January 14, 2011, set a hearing of the appeal for March 24, 2011, at 3:00 p.m. CST.

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. 09R 698

Land value	\$22,000.00
Improvement value	<u>\$139,600.00</u>
Total value	<u>\$161,600.00.</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. "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 tri-level style house of 2,170 square feet living area built in 1971 and remodeled in 1987. (E2:5). The house is rated average for both quality and condition. (E2:5).

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

The Taxpayer does not prevail on his appeal since the Commission finds that the evidence does not support relief for valuation nor has the Taxpayer proved that the subject property was not equalized with other comparable real property.

First, the Taxpayer testified that the subject property was located in a subdivision that had three principal builders. Each builder built houses of differing quality. He alleged that the subject property was built by a builder who built inferior quality houses. Examples of this inferior quality are demonstrated by the nailing of siding directly to wall studs over wall insulation. He alleged that the appraiser for the County Assessor did not take into account the differences in quality of the houses in the subdivision based on the quality associated with the

different builders. The Taxpayer provided a written statement of his testimony in his Exhibit 9 page 3.

The Taxpayer testified that he did not allow for an interior inspection when asked. The Commission notes that a Taxpayer is not required to allow an inspection of their property, but it does put the appraiser for the County Assessor at a disadvantage in their ability to determine quality of a home if it becomes an item of dispute.

The second allegation that the Taxpayer made was that he had averaged the sale price of 31 parcels that had sold and made a comparison of their selling price to the assessed value for 2009. He stated that his analysis of this comparison showed that the sales price was below the assessed value on at least some of the parcels. Upon questioning, the Taxpayer testified that he used sales from 2009 and 2010 which makes the relevancy of these sales of little probative value for the 2009 appeal. In addition, the Taxpayer did not provide the property record files for any of the sales referred to. Without such, the Commission does not have before it the assessed value for any of the parcels in question nor can it make a comparison of these alleged comparable parcels to the subject. The Taxpayer testified that he obtained the sales of parcels from the Douglas County Assessors website. The Commission's Order for Hearing, paragraph 13, requires that the property record files be provided for any parcels that are being used for comparison purposes. The Commission's Order expressly cautions a Taxpayer not to use screen shots from the Douglas County Assessors website because they are not complete and reliable. The Taxpayer's analysis and evidence is not given great weight by the Commission because the property record files have not been provided and the method stated is not a professionally accepted appraisal method for determining actual value of the subject property.

The Taxpayer provided three alleged comparable parcels in support of his opinion of actual value. Each of the comparables were chosen because they were sales from the neighborhood and had similar square footage of living area. He testified that the parcel in Exhibit 5 was most comparable to the subject property. The Commission finds from the review of the three comparables that these three comparables are not comparable to the subject property without adjustments for differences in physical characteristics, rating for quality/condition, age and other differences. Examples of the differences and the significance of these differences are shown by examining the property record files for the subject property and the parcel shown in Exhibit 5. (E2:4 and E5:5). The Commission notes that the size of the basement area of the subject property is 1,670 square feet as compared to the 520 square feet of the parcel shown in Exhibit 5. The unit value for each square foot of basement area is \$12 for the comparable which when adjusted by the difference of 1,150 square feet is \$13,800 (1,150 square feet x \$12/square foot = \$13,800). (E5:5). The unit value for each square foot of living area is \$35 per square foot and when the difference of the 2,170 square feet living area of the subject property is compared to the parcel shown in Exhibit 5 which is 2,012 square feet the needed adjustment is \$5,530 (\$35/square foot x 155 square feet (2,170 square feet - 2,012 square feet = 155 square feet = \$5,530). (E5:5). Both of these adjustments are additions to the comparable since they are inferior characteristics of the comparable to the subject. Another adjustment that must be made is for the added improvements which shows that the parcel shown in Exhibit 5 has one additional bath and a screened in porch. (E5:5). This adjustment is a reduction to the compared value of the parcel in Exhibit 5 in the amount of approximately \$6,284 (\$5,000/bath + \$1,284 (\$3,780 - \$2,496 = \$1,284) for a screened in porch over the wood deck of the subject property. The net

total of these adjustments is approximately \$13,046 ($\$13,800 + \$5530 = \$19,330 - \$6,284 = \$13,046$). The parcel shown in Exhibit 5 is assessed for 2009 at \$147,440 and when the adjustment is made to it for comparison to the subject property its value is \$160,486 ($\$147,440 + \$13,046 = \$160,486$) as compared to \$161,600 for the subject property. (E5:6). The Commission finds that this difference is not grossly excessive nor is there clear and convincing evidence that the valuation placed upon the subject 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's review of the Taxpayer's other two alleged comparable parcels does not support either a valuation or equalization issue.

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 the 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 ..., 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.” *Garvey Elevators, Inc. v. Adams County Bd. of Equal.*, 261 Neb. 130 (2001).

A 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.

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. 09R 698

Land value	\$22,000.00
Improvement value	<u>\$139,600.00</u>
Total value	<u>\$161,600.00.</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 2009.
7. This order is effective for purposes of appeal on April 15, 2011.

Signed and Sealed. April 15, 2011.

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.