

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

KYLE R. BUMGARDNER,)	
)	
Appellant,)	Case No 06R-415
)	
v.)	DECISION AND ORDER AFFIRMING
)	THE DECISION OF THE ADAMS
ADAMS COUNTY BOARD OF)	COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
EQUALIZATION,)	
)	
Appellee.)	

The above-captioned case was called for a hearing on the merits of an appeal by Kyle R. Bumgardner ("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 February 26, 2007, pursuant to an Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued December 21, 2006. Commissioners Wickersham, Lore, and Hans were present. Commissioner Wickersham presided at the hearing.

Kyle R. Bumgardner, was present at the hearing. No one appeared as legal counsel for the Taxpayer.

Charles A. Hamilton, a Deputy County Attorney for Adams County, Nebraska, appeared as legal counsel for the Adams County Board of Equalization ("the County Board").

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

The Commission is required by Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Cum. Supp. 2006) to state its final decision and order concerning an appeal, with findings of fact and conclusions of law, on the record or in writing. 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, 2006, is less than actual value as determined by the County Board. The issues on appeal related to that assertion are:

Was the decision of the County Board determining actual value of the subject property unreasonable or arbitrary?

What was actual value of the subject property on January 1, 2006?

**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 described below is the ("subject property").
3. Actual value of the subject property placed on the assessment roll as of January 1, 2006, ("the assessment date") by the Adams 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. 06R-415

Description: A tract of land in the SE Section 12, Township 8, Range 10, Northridge Subdivision No 2, Adams County, Nebraska.

	Assessor Notice Value	Taxpayer Protest Value	Board Determined Value
Land	\$ 12,600.00	\$ 9,000.00	\$ 12,600.00
Improvement	\$217,875.00	\$144,000.00	\$204,490.00
Total	\$230,475.00	\$153,000.00	\$217,090.00

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 21, 2006, set a hearing of the appeal for February 26, 2007, at 3:00 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 2006 is:

Land value	\$ 12,600.00
Improvement value	<u>\$204,490.00</u>
Total value	<u>\$217,090.00.</u>

III. APPLICABLE LAW

1. Subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission in this appeal is over issues raised during the county board of equalization proceedings. *Arcadian Fertilizer, L.P. v. Sarpy County Bd. of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 655, 584 N.W.2d 353, (1998).
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 2003).
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 2003).
4. Use of all of the statutory factors for determination of actual value is not required. All that is required is use of the applicable factors. *First National Bank & Trust of Syracuse v. Otoe Cty.*, 233 Neb. 412, 445 N.W.2d 880 (1989).

5. “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).
6. 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 2003).
7. All taxable real property, with the exception of qualified agricultural land and horticultural land, shall be valued at actual value for purposes of taxation. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201(1) (Cum. Supp. 2006).
8. A presumption exists that the County Board has faithfully performed its duties and has acted on competent evidence. *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas County Bd. of Equalization*, 11 Neb.App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).
9. The presumption that a county board of equalization has faithfully performed its official duties in making an assessment and has acted upon sufficient competent evidence to justify its action 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. *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas County Bd. of Equalization*, 11 Neb.App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).
10. 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) (citations omitted)

11. The Commission can grant relief only if there is clear and convincing evidence that the action of the County Board was unreasonable or arbitrary. See. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016 (7) (Supp. 2005).
12. "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).
13. 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).
14. 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).
15. "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).

IV. ANALYSIS

The subject property is an improved residential parcel near Hastings, Nebraska. The residence is a 2,104 square foot, one story, single family structure with an attached garage of

1,500 square feet and a 2,288 square foot basement that is partially finished. (E:6).

Construction of the residence was completed in 2005. (E:6).

The Taxpayer testified that actual value of the subject property as of January 1, 2006. The Taxpayer's opinion was based on conversations with realtors and friends and the sale of a nearby residence. The sales comparison approach is a method for determining actual value explicitly approved by Nebraska law. Neb. Rev. Stat.. §77-112 (Reissue 2003). Use of that approach requires that the compared properties be comparable. *DeBruce Grain, Inc. v. Otoe County Bd. of Equalization* 7 Neb. App. 688, 584 N.W.2d 837, (Neb. App. 1998).

“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, p. 98. The property offered as a comparable was built in 1995. (E:14). The residence is 1,461 square feet in size and has a full basement that is unfinished. (E2:14). The attached garage on the comparable is 552 square feet. (E2:14). When the age of the subject property, its size, and general building characteristics are compared to the offered comparable substantial differences are obvious.

There are other differences between the subject property and some similarities. (5:6 and E2:14). 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, p.103. Differences can be accounted for with adjustments to the sale price of the comparable. *The Appraisal of Real Estate*, 12th Ed, Appraisal Institute, 2001, p. 337. No adjustments were suggested to the Commission.

The Taxpayer's conversations with others, who did not appear as witnesses, and the unadjusted sale of a parcel that is not truly comparable to the subject property is not clear and convincing evidence that the decision of the County Board was unreasonable or arbitrary.

**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 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 THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

1. The decision of the County Board determining taxable value of the subject property as of the assessment date, January 1, 2006, is affirmed.
2. Actual value of the subject property for the tax year 2006 is:

Land value	\$ 12,600.00
Improvement value	<u>\$204,490.00</u>
Total value	<u>\$217,090.00.</u>

3. This decision, if no appeal is timely filed, shall be certified to the Adams County Treasurer, and the Adams County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Cum. Supp. 2006).
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 2006.
7. This order is effective for purposes of appeal February 27, 2007.

Signed and Sealed. February 27, 2007.

Wm. R. Wickersham, Commissioner

Susan S. Lore, Commissioner

Robert L. Hans, Commissioner

SEAL

ANY PARTY SEEKING REVIEW OF THIS ORDER MAY DO SO BY FILING A PETITION WITH THE APPROPRIATE DOCKET FEES IN THE NEBRASKA COURT OF APPEALS. THE PETITION MUST BE FILED WITHIN THIRTY DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF THIS ORDER AND MUST SATISFY THE REQUIREMENTS OF STATE LAW CONTAINED IN NEB. REV. STAT. §77-5019 (CUM. SUPP. 2006). IF A PETITION IS NOT TIMELY FILED, THIS ORDER BECOMES FINAL AND CANNOT BE CHANGED.