

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

PETRA R. LADD,)	
)	
Appellant,)	Case No. 07C-060
)	
v.)	DECISION AND ORDER AFFIRMING
)	THE DECISION OF THE DOUGLAS
DOUGLAS 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 Petra R. Ladd ("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 April 4, 2008, pursuant to an Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued January 8, 2008. Commissioners Wickersham, Warnes, and Salmon were present. Commissioner Hotz was excused from participation by the presiding hearing officer. The appeal was heard by a panel of three commissioners pursuant to 442 Neb. Admin. Code, ch. 4, §11 (10/07). Commissioner Wickersham was the presiding hearing officer.

Petra R. Ladd was present at the hearing with Todd C. Schicker as legal counsel.

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 (Cum. Supp. 2006). 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, 2007, 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, 2007.

**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 is described as Lot 30, Block O, E 70 S 125.6 ft, Himebaugh Place, Omaha, Douglas County, Nebraska, ("the subject property").
3. Actual value of the subject property placed on the assessment roll as of January 1, 2007, ("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:

Description: Lot 30, Block O, E 70 S 125.6 ft, Himebaugh Place, Omaha, Douglas County, Nebraska.

	Assessor Notice Value	Taxpayer Protest Value	Board Determined Value
Land	\$10,500.00	\$In Total	\$10,500.00
Improvement	\$152,300.00	\$In Total	\$152,300.00
Total	\$162,800.00	\$65,000.00	\$162,800.00

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. The Taxpayer was served with a Notice in Lieu of Summons and duly answered that Notice.
7. An Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued on January 8, 2008, as amended by an Order issued on January 8, 2008, set a hearing of the appeal for April 4, 2008, at 11:00 a.m. CDST.
8. 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.
9. Actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date for the tax year 2007 is:

Land value	\$ 10,500.00
Improvement value	<u>\$152,300.00</u>
Total value	<u>\$162,800.00.</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) (Supp. 2007).
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 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. *City of York v. York County Bd. Of Equalization*, 266 Neb. 297, 64 N.W.2d 445 (2003).
9. 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).
10. The presumption disappears if there is competent evidence to the contrary. Id.
11. The Commission can grant relief only if the action of the County Board was unreasonable or arbitrary. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016 (8) (Cum. Supp. 2006),
12. Proof that the action of the County Board 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).

13. "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).
14. 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).
15. 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).
16. "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).
17. 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).
18. A Taxpayer, who only produced evidence that was aimed at discrediting valuation methods utilized by 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).
19. 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 values); and *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 an improved residential parcel. The residence on the parcel was constructed in 1901. (E3:1). The residence has 3,777 square feet of above ground living space and a 1,438 square foot basement with 350 square feet of finish. (E3:1). At some time the single family residence was converted to apartments. There are 6 units or apartments in the residence.

The Taxpayer's property manager testified that actual value of the subject property was affected by crime in the neighborhood. The impact of that factor on actual value was not quantified. An appraiser for the Douglas County Assessor's office "County Appraiser" was called as a witness for the Taxpayer. The County Appraiser testified that the County maintained a data base of sales that were analyzed by neighborhood. The subject property for example is in neighborhood 19. (E2:4). The County Appraiser also testified the effect of location on actual value would be reflected in the neighborhood sales used to estimate actual value based on a multiple regression analysis of those sales. The Taxpayer's property manager also testified that actual value of the subject property was affected by requirements of the building codes for the City of Omaha. In particular, the Taxpayer's property manager testified that the City of Omaha was requiring changes in the heating system and that the cost while unknown was certain to be significant. It is easy to conclude that the requirements described by the Taxpayer's property

manager would affect actual value of the subject property and that those requirements existed January 1, 2007. It is not possible however to quantify the affect the city's requirements have on actual value because in part the cost of remediation is unknown.

An appraiser for the Taxpayer testified that she had developed an opinion of value for the subject property as of March 6, 2008. The date for which valuation is to be determined is January 1, 2007. There is no evidence that an opinion of value as of March 6, 2008 is appropriate for consideration as the value of the subject property as of January 1, 2007.

While the Taxpayer was successful in raising doubts about actual value as determined by the County Board it is necessary to do more than criticize the County Boards determination. *Beynon v. Board of Equalization of Lancaster County*, 213 Neb. 488, 329 N.W.2d 857 (1983). It is necessary for the Taxpayer to show what actual value was as of January 1, 2007. Cf, *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. V. Board of Equalization for Buffalo County*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (1965).

The Commission is unable to determine 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 ORDERED THAT:

1. The decision of the County Board determining actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date, January 1, 2007, is affirmed.

2. Actual value, for the tax year 2007, of the subject property is:

Land value \$ 10,500.00

Improvement value \$152,300.00

Total value \$162,800.00.

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 (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 2007.

7. This order is effective for purposes of appeal on March 24, 2008.

Signed and Sealed. March 24, 2008.

Wm. R. Wickersham, Commissioner

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 (CUM. SUPP. 2006), OTHER PROVISIONS OF NEBRASKA STATUTES, AND COURT RULES.