

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION

Gene W Gard,
Appellant,

v.

Douglas County Board of Equalization,
Appellee.

Case No: 12R 890

Decision Reversing the Determination of the
Douglas County Board of Equalization

GENERAL BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. The Subject Property (herein referred to as the “Subject Property”) is a residential parcel located at 4812 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebraska, with a legal description of: SUNSET ADD LOT 22 BLOCK 2 50 X 139.¹
2. The Douglas County Assessor assessed the Subject Property at \$135,300 for tax year 2012.
3. The Taxpayer (herein referred to as the “Taxpayer”) protested this value to the Douglas County Board of Equalization (herein referred to as the “County Board”) and requested as assessed value of \$60,000 for tax year 2012.
4. The County Board determined that the assessed value of the Subject Property was \$135,300 for tax year 2012.
5. The Taxpayer appealed the determination of the County Board to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (herein referred to as the “Commission”).
6. A Single Commissioner hearing was held on April 3, 2014, at the Tax Equalization and Review Commission Hearing Room, Sixth Floor, Nebraska State Office Building, 301 Centennial Mall South, Lincoln, NE, before Commissioner Thomas D. Freimuth.
7. Gene W. Gard was present at the hearing.
8. Larry Thomsen, an assessor with the Douglas County Assessor’s Office, was present for the County Board.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

9. The Commission’s review of the determination of the County Board of Equalization is de novo.² “When an appeal is conducted as a ‘trial de novo,’ as opposed to a ‘trial de novo on the record,’ it means literally a new hearing and not merely new findings of fact based upon a previous record. A trial de novo is conducted as though the earlier trial had not

¹ See, Assessment Report, pg. 2.

² See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016(8) (2012 Cum. Supp.), *Brenner v. Banner Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 276 Neb. 275, 286, 753 N.W.2d 802, 813 (2008).

been held in the first place, and evidence is taken anew as such evidence is available at the time of the trial on appeal.”³

10. When considering an appeal a presumption exists that the “board of equalization has faithfully performed its official duties in making an assessment and has acted upon sufficient competent evidence to justify its action.”⁴ That presumption “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. From that point forward, 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.”⁵
11. 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.⁶
12. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action was unreasonable or arbitrary must be made by clear and convincing evidence.⁷
13. A Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the subject property in order to successfully claim that the subject property is overvalued.⁸

SUMMARY OF HEARING DOCUMENTS & STATEMENTS

14. The Taxpayer asserted that the Subject Property’s condition should be poor instead of average. The Taxpayer specifically asserted that the improvements on the Subject Property suffered from severe deferred maintenance including a 20- year old-roof with extensive deterioration.
15. The Taxpayer submitted a cancellation letter issued by his homeowner’s insurance carrier. The letter indicates that the reason for cancellation includes the condition of the Subject Property’s roof and detached garage.⁹
16. Taxpayer also asserted that he was unable to secure financing on the \$48,000 debt against the Subject Property due to condition problems.
17. The Taxpayer provided the Commission with screenshots from the Douglas County Assessor’s website of four alleged comparable properties (these properties are referred to herein as “Comp 1,” “Comp 2,” Comp 3,” and “Comp 4”).

³ *Koch v. Cedar Cty. Freeholder Bd.*, 276 Neb. 1009, 1019 (2009).

⁴ *Brenner v. Banner Cty. Bd. Of Equal.*, 276 Neb. 275, 283, 753 N.W.2d 802, 811 (2008) (Citations omitted).

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016(8) (2012 Cum. Supp.).

⁷ *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb. App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002).

⁸ Cf. *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Board of Equalization for Buffalo County*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (1965) (determination of actual value); *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. County Bd. Of Equalization of York County*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N.W.2d 515 (1981)(determination of equalized taxable value).

⁹ See, Insurance Letter dated March 28, 2014.

18. The Taxpayer asserted that Comp 1 and Comp 4 were similar to the Subject Property in terms of condition. The screenshots provided by the Taxpayer indicate that Comp 1 and Comp 4 received a condition rating of Fair.¹⁰
19. Comp 2 provided by the Taxpayer was assigned a condition rating of Poor.¹¹ The Taxpayer agreed that the condition of Comp 2 was worse than the Subject Property.
20. The Taxpayer asserted that Comp 3 was similar to the Subject Property. The screenshot indicates that Comp 3 was assigned a condition rating of Average like the Subject Property. According to the screenshot, the assessed value of Comp 3 for tax year 2012 was \$95,400.¹²
21. The Taxpayer asserted that Comp 4, located within 500 feet of the Subject Property, sold in a foreclosure sale in October 2013 for \$95,500. The screenshot provided by the Taxpayer indicated that Comp 4 was assigned a condition rating of Fair by the County Assessor.¹³
22. The County Assessor provided an Assessment Report.
23. Thomsen indicated that an exterior inspection of the Subject Property occurred in May 2011, resulting in the Subject Property's condition being changed from Fair to Average. The Assessment Report includes a Market Calculation Detail document indicating that the Subject Property's tax year 2012 assessment was based on a condition rating of Average.¹⁴ A Revised Market Calculation Detail for the Subject Property contained in the Assessment Report indicates that the Subject Property's condition should be rated Fair, and that the revised opinion of value based on this adjustment was \$123,700 rounded.¹⁵

GENERAL VALUATION LAW

24. A Taxpayer must introduce competent evidence of actual value of the subject property in order to successfully claim that the subject property is overvalued.¹⁶
25. "Actual value, market value, and fair market value mean exactly the same thing."¹⁷
26. Taxable value is the percentage of actual value subject to taxation as directed by Nebraska Statutes section 77-201 and has the same meaning as assessed value.¹⁸
27. All real property in Nebraska subject to taxation shall be assessed as of January 1.¹⁹

¹⁰ See, Screenshots Comp 1 and Comp 4.

¹¹ See, Screenshot Comp 2.

¹² See, Screenshot Comp 3.

¹³ See, Screenshot Comp 4.

¹⁴ See, Assessment Report, pg. 10.

¹⁵ See, Assessment Report, pg. 11.

¹⁶ Cf. *Josten-Wilbert Vault Co. v. Board of Equalization for Buffalo County*, 179 Neb. 415, 138 N.W.2d 641 (1965) (determination of actual value); *Lincoln Tel. and Tel. Co. v. County Bd. Of Equalization of York County*, 209 Neb. 465, 308 N.W.2d 515 (1981) (determination of equalized taxable value).

¹⁷ *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas County Board of Equalization, et al.*, 11 Neb.App. 171, 180, 645 N.W.2d 821, 829 (2002).

¹⁸ Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-131 (Reissue 2009).

¹⁹ See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1301(1) (Reissue 2009).

28. All taxable real property, with the exception of agricultural land and horticultural land, shall be valued at actual value for purposes of taxation.²⁰
29. Nebraska Statutes section 77-112 defines actual value as follows:

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 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.²¹

VALUATION ANALYSIS

30. Concerning the use of the foreclosure sale of Comp 4 to indicate the actual value of the Subject Property, the County noted that the Taxpayer's alleged transaction was a foreclosure or otherwise not an arm's-length transaction such as a "short sale," and that the County does not consider such distressed transactions valid under the sales comparison valuation approach or for purposes of constructing its mass appraisal cost approach model. The County's mass appraisal model used to value properties in the Subject Property's market area excludes foreclosure sales and other distressed sales that are deemed not arm's-length.
31. *The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal* defines an arm's-length transaction as follows: "A transaction between unrelated parties under no duress."²²
32. In connection with the sales comparison approach to valuation, *The Appraisal of Real Estate* states as follows: "[s]ales that are not arm's-length...should be identified and rarely if ever used."²³
33. As indicated above in the Standard of Review & General Valuation Law section, Nebraska Statutes section 77-112 references arm's-length transactions in defining actual (i.e., market) value, stating as follows:

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

²⁰ Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201(1) (Reissue 2009).

²¹ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-112 (Reissue 2009).

²² *The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal*, 4th Ed., Appraisal Institute, 2002, at p. 18.

²³ *The Appraisal of Real Estate*, 13th Edition, Appraisal Institute, 2008, at p. 304.

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.²⁴

34. In addition to the factors referenced above in Nebraska Statutes section 77-112, *Property Assessment Valuation* states that actual or market value is derived from transactions involving “reasonable time for exposure to the market.”²⁵
35. General guidance regarding consideration of the economic crisis by the County in the residential mass appraisal context is contained in *Property Assessment Valuation*, which is published by the International Association of Assessing Officers.²⁶ For example, *Property Assessment Valuation* states that assessment officials are required to review factors such as foreclosure rates and vacancy rates as a part of developing and maintaining market area databases.²⁷ Additionally, in addressing mass appraisal techniques such as the model used by the County to value the Subject Property, *Property Assessment Valuation* states as follows:

Although the structure of a mass appraisal model may be valid for many years, the model is usually recalibrated or updated every year. To update for short periods, trending factors may suffice. Over longer periods, as the relationships among the variables in market value change, complete market analyses are required. **The goal is for mass appraisal equations and schedules to reflect current market conditions.**²⁸

36. The New Jersey Tax Court stated as follows regarding consideration of “current market conditions” in a 2013 opinion that reduced the assessed value of the Borgata casino from \$2.26 billion to \$880 million in tax year 2009 and to \$870 million in tax year 2010 due to the adverse impact of the national economic crisis and increased gaming competition (the \$2.26 billion assessment stemmed from a reappraisal for tax year 2008, similar to the experience of the Taxpayer herein):

The national economy began to soften in late 2007, primarily due to the subprime housing crisis. By October 1, 2008, the economy suffered a significant downturn triggered by the collapse of the mortgage markets and the failure of Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers. The government-sanctioned bailout of Bear Stearns as a banking institution “too big to fail” set off alarms concerning the stability of the American banking system. The mid-September 2008 collapse of Lehman Brothers led to a sharp

²⁴ Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-112 (Reissue 2009).

²⁵ *Property Assessment Valuation*, 3rd Ed., International Association of Assessing Officers, 2010, at p. 15; *See also, The Appraisal of Real Estate*, 13 ed., Appraisal Institute, 2008, at pgs. 54-77

²⁶ *Property Assessment Valuation*, 3rd Ed., International Association of Assessing Officers, 2010, at pgs. 73 - 83.

²⁷ *Property Assessment Valuation*, 3rd Ed., International Association of Assessing Officers, 2010, at pgs. 77 - 83.

²⁸ *Property Assessment Valuation*, 3rd Ed., International Association of Assessing Officers, 2010, at p. 417-18 (emphasis added).

drop-off in the stock market and the beginning of the worst recession since the Great Depression.

In addition, the tourism industry faced a significant public stigma nicknamed the AIG effect. In 2008, American International Group, Inc., or AIG, a multinational insurance company, experienced a serious public relations backlash after it hosted a lavish corporate event during the height of the national economic crisis. The bad publicity caused other corporate entities to cancel events and to be more hesitant about hosting corporate functions at high-end resorts, such as the Borgata. These economic forces had a detrimental effect on the Borgata's revenues. The stagnant national economy affected consumer confidence, inhibiting spending on luxuries and entertainment.

By October 1, 2009, the national economic condition had further deteriorated. According to one expert who testified at trial "as of October 1, 2009, the macro economy had entered into what many commentators termed a 'New Normal,' meaning that the developed nations would enter into a prolonged period of low growth, high unemployment and a need for de-leveraging. This would add to the uncertainty surrounding the gaming industry in general and in Atlantic City specifically, as of the valuation date." Unemployment rates started to increase significantly in 2008 and were still rising as of September 2009. This fact is significant because low unemployment rates are indicative of increased consumer spending on such discretionary items as gaming and entertainment. The perception that the nation's economic trouble was not a transitory downturn, but a long-term recalibration of the economy, was hardening among the public and participants in the financial markets as of the second valuation date.²⁹

37. The Illinois Court of Appeal stated as follows regarding consideration of "current market conditions" in a 2012 opinion affirming a lower court's approval of a \$300,000 judicial foreclosure sale of commercial real estate secured by a note with a principal balance in the amount of \$824,540:

Our courts today face a similar situation as that faced by the court in [1937] *Levy* during the Great Depression, in that many properties were purchased during a time when real estate values greatly increased (referred to as "the real estate bubble") **and those same properties plummeted in value after 2006 [and] continuing to the present.** Consequently, many property owners owe much more to the lenders than what the property is worth. While this fact is unquestionably tragic, the value of a given piece

²⁹ *Marina District Development Co., LLC v. City of Atlantic City*, DOCKET NOS. 008116-2009, 008117-2009, 003188-2010, 003194-2010, at pgs. 1 – 2, 8 – 9 (New Jersey Tax Court 2013).

of property must be determined by considering all of the pertinent factors as they exist at the time of the sale, whether such sale is made in the open market or through a judicial sale as a result of a foreclosure action.³⁰

38. The Nebraska Supreme Court has also recently considered “current market conditions” in the aftermath of the economic crisis. In *County of Lancaster v. Union Bank & Trust Co. (In re Estate of Craven)*, the Court upheld a ruling issued by the Lancaster County Court that the \$113,000 purchase price of property sold at an estate auction in a weak real estate market after the decedent’s death in 2008 stemmed from an arm’s length transaction and was the best evidence of value for inheritance tax purposes.³¹
39. With respect to whether distressed sales generally can be considered reliable indicators of market value, several courts outside of Nebraska have issued opinions in the aftermath of the economic crisis.³²
40. In terms of the use of distressed sales in the property tax context, in 2012 the Oregon Tax Court considered whether “foreclosures and short sales characterize the market for the subject property” in *Greene v. Benton County Assessor*.³³ In summarizing the Taxpayer’s argument, the Court stated as follows:

The Taxpayer testified that, although he is not a licensed broker or appraiser, he owns 11 properties and is experienced in real estate. As support that the subject property sale is representative of its real market value, Greene provided an article by Alan Smith (Smith), Deputy Assessor, Ada County Assessor’s Office, Boise, Idaho, entitled “Distressed Sales: Anomaly or Market Value?” Smith states that “bank-owned resales, if they are marketed by a realtor, or through a multiple listing service for a time period considered to be an average exposure to the market, will likely be very close to fair market value in this type of market.”³⁴

³⁰ *Sewickley, LLC v. Chicago Title and Trust Company*, 974 N.E.2d 397, 406 (Court of Appeal of Illinois, First District, Second Division 2012) (emphasis added).

³¹ *County of Lancaster v. Union Bank & Trust Co. (In re Estate of Craven)*, 281 Neb. 122, 794 N.W.2d 406 (Neb. 2011).

³² *Sewickley, LLC v. Chicago Title and Trust Company*, 974 N.E.2d 397 (Illinois Court of Appeals 2012); *Greene v. Benton County Assessor*, TC-MD 110687N (Oregon Tax Court 2012); *Voronaeff v. Crook County Assessor*, TC-MD No 110361C (Oregon Tax Court 2012); *Brashnyk v. Lane County Assessor*, TC-MD No 110308 (Oregon Tax Court 2011); *Witkin v. Lane County Assessor*, TC-MD No 110460C (Oregon Tax Court 2012); *Umpqua Bank v. Lane County Assessor*, TC-MD No 110594N (Oregon Tax Court 2012); *Columbus City School Dist. Bd. of Education v. Franklin County*, 983 N.E.2d 1285, 134 Ohio St.3d 529 (Ohio Supreme Court 2012) (bank sale deemed arm's-length because bank acted like a typically motivated seller); *Cattell v. Lake Cty. Bd. of Revision*, 2010-Ohio-4426, 2009-L-161 (Ohio Court of Appeals, Eleventh District 2010) (bank sales deemed arm's-length where properties were listed with a realtor on the open market).

³³ *Greene v. Benton County Assessor*, TC-MD 110687N, at 8 (Oregon Tax Court 2012).

³⁴ *Greene v. Benton County Assessor*, TC-MD 110687N, at 3 (Oregon Tax Court 2012).

41. In holding that the Taxpayer failed to prove that foreclosures or short sales characterized the market under the sales comparison approach, the Oregon Tax Court in *Greene* indicated that proof that the “majority” of market area sales were distressed is required:

[P]roperty purchased through foreclosure may be “a voluntary *bona fide* arm’s-length transaction between a knowledgeable and willing buyer and a willing seller.” *Ward v. Dept. of Revenue*, 293 Or 506, 508, 650 P2d 923 (1982). “There are narrow exceptions determined on a case-by-case basis to the holding that bank-owned property sales are not typically representative of real market value.” *Brashnyk v. Lane County Assessor (Brashnyk)*, TC-MD No 110308 at 8, WL 6182028 *5 (Dec 12, 2011). “[W]here the majority of sales are distress, it would seem that that kind of sale would provide a more accurate reflection of the market.” *Morrow Co. Grain Growers v. Dept. of Rev. (Morrow)*, 10 OTR 146, 148 (1985)..... Plaintiffs have not presented any evidence that foreclosures and short sales characterize the market for the subject property. Plaintiffs provided a list of sales that occurred between 2003 and 2011 in the subject property neighborhood; unadjusted sale prices in 2008, 2009, and 2010, ranged from \$335,000 to \$452,000. It is not clear which, if any, of those sales were foreclosures or short sales. Plaintiffs’ purchase of the subject property for \$295,000 in May 2009 is the lowest sale price identified for any of the years, 2003 through 2011. “Usually, one sale does not make a market.” *Truitt Brothers, Inc. v. Dept. of Rev.*, 302 Or 603, 609, 732 P2d 497 (1987).³⁵

42. The Oregon Tax Court has also considered three Oregon Department of Revenue directives issued to county assessors in 2009 and 2010 regarding consideration of distressed transactions for purposes of the sales comparison approach and ratio studies.³⁶ For instance, in *Brashnyk v. Lane County Assessor*, the Oregon Tax Court addressed whether bank sales were valid indicators of market value and quoted the Oregon Department of Revenue’s memorandum entitled “Valid Market Sales for Oregon Assessment Purposes” issued to county assessors on January 21, 2009:

‘[s]o long as the nominal standards for an acceptable comparable sale are met – arm’s length, voluntary, knowledgeable parties, exposure to the market, cash equivalent, etc. – such [bank] sales are appropriate to

³⁵ *Greene v. Benton County Assessor*, TC-MD 110687N, at p. 8 (Oregon Tax Court 2012).

³⁶ *Brashnyk v. Lane County Assessor*, TC-MD No 110308, at p. 9 (Oregon Tax Court 2011); *Voronaeff v. Crook County Assessor*, TC-MD No 110361C, at p. 8-9 (Oregon Tax Court 2012).

consider. Under the market value definition standard, any sale that meets those criteria should be considered as a potential comparable.³⁷

43. In *Voronaeff v. Crook County Assessor*, the Oregon Tax Court addressed whether short sales were valid indicators of market value and quoted the Oregon Department of Revenue’s memorandum entitled “Valid Market Sales for Oregon Assessment Purposes” issued to county assessors on January 21, 2009:

‘[Short sales] should be carefully reviewed to determine if they meet the relevant criteria for a comparable. The mere fact that there is, presumably, some duress on the part of the seller (the upside down owner) that prompts the sale, does not itself disqualify the transaction from consideration, especially when there is some duress in the market. This situation is analogous to the owner losing his job and selling because he can’t make the mortgage payments. *We wouldn’t discount that sale simply because the owner was very motivated to sell* (some duress) so long as the sale was an arm’s-length with adequate exposure and contained no unusual financing terms or elements that couldn’t be adjusted out.’³⁸

44. In *Voronaeff v. Crook County Assessor*, the Oregon Tax Court also included the following excerpt from a letter from the Oregon Department of Revenue to the Crook County Assessor dated February 1, 2010:

‘We recommend you analyze all sales, foreclosure, short or otherwise, and determine if they represent market conditions. If elements of a particular sale raise reasonable doubt that the sale doesn’t represent the market, prevailing wisdom suggests eliminating that sale in the market value study. However, in a declining market, foreclosures and short sales are common and in many cases can and should be used in market value studies. *If, in your opinion, the current economics and market conditions, as of the valuation date, indicate some level of distress is a common market characteristic, it is appropriate to include such sales in a comparable sale’s value analysis or a ratio study.*’³⁹

45. The Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division’s Sales File Practice Manuals for tax year 2012 does not address circumstances where foreclosures or short sales could be reliable indicators of market value. The 2012 Sales File Practice

³⁷ *Brashnyk v. Lane County Assessor*, TC-MD No 110308, at p. 9 (Oregon Tax Court 2011).

³⁸ *Voronaeff v. Crook County Assessor*, TC-MD No 110361C, at p. 9 (Oregon Tax Court 2012). [Emphasis in original Memorandum.]

³⁹ *Voronaeff v. Crook County Assessor*, TC-MD No 110361C, at p. 8-9 (Oregon Tax Court 2012). [Emphasis in original Letter.]

Manual does, however, state as follows with respect to consideration of sales from banks for purposes of determining whether such a transaction is arm's-length:

Sales from banks should not be automatically considered a non-arm's-length transaction especially if you do not have an abundant supply of sales. Typically, values will be on the low end of the value range, but they may be considered arm's length transactions and included in the ratio study if all other criteria for being an open market arm's-length transaction are met.⁴⁰

46. Under the guidance above regarding consideration of distressed transactions as indicators of market value in the aftermath of the economic crisis, the Taxpayer's assertions and raise questions regarding the validity of the County's mass appraisal model for purposes of determining actual value for tax year 2012.
47. The Taxpayer did not, however, provide analysis regarding the ratio of distressed sales to sales considered valid by the County in the market area. Therefore, because it is unclear whether distressed transactions constitute either a significant portion or a majority of the total market area sales in the two-year period preceding the assessment date that is analyzed by the County for purposes of constructing its mass appraisal model, the Commission finds that the Taxpayer has not provided clear and convincing evidence that the distressed transaction presented should have been considered as reliable indicator of value for tax year 2012.
48. The Commission additionally notes that the Taxpayer did not provide the Property Record File for Comp 4 or any transfer statements indicating the actual sale price in October 2013.
49. The Commission also notes that section 8 of the Order for Single Commissioner Hearing issued to the parties in this matter at least 30 days prior to the hearing provides as follows:

NOTE: *Copies of the County's Property Record File for any parcel you will present as a comparable parcel should be provided so that your claim can be properly analyzed. The information provided on the County's web page is not a property record file. A Property Record File is only maintained in the office of the County Assessor and should be obtained from that office prior to the hearing.*

50. In part because Property Record File for Comp 4 was not submitted by the Taxpayer, the Commission finds that Comp 4 does not constitute clear and convincing evidence that the County Board's determination for tax year 2012 was arbitrary or unreasonable.

⁴⁰ 2012 Statewide Equalization Exhibit 107, p. 117.

51. The Taxpayer and County Assessor agree that the Subject Property had a condition rating of Fair for tax year 2012 rather than Average.
52. The Revised Market Calculation detail indicates that the Subject Property should have been assessed at significantly less than \$135,300.
53. The Commission finds that the Subject Property's Revised Market Calculation Detail document,⁴¹ together with a review of Comp 1, Comp 2, and the statements made at the hearing, constitute clear and convincing evidence that the condition of the Subject Property was Fair for tax year 2012.
54. The Commission finds that it was unreasonable or arbitrary for the County Board to adopt the County Assessor's opinion of value that rated the Subject Property as Average.
55. The Commission finds that the actual value of the Subject Property for tax year 2012 is \$123,700.

GENERAL EQUALIZATION LAW

56. "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."⁴² Equalization is the process of ensuring that all taxable property is placed on the assessment rolls at a uniform percentage of its actual value.⁴³ 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.⁴⁴
57. In order to determine a proportionate valuation, a comparison of the ratio of assessed value to market value for both the subject property and comparable property is required.⁴⁵
58. 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.⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷
59. The constitutional requirement of uniformity in taxation extends to both rate and valuation.⁴⁸ 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

⁴¹ Assessment Report, pg. 11.

⁴² *Neb. Const.*, Art. VIII, §1.

⁴³ *MAPCO Ammonia Pipeline v. State Bd. of Equal.*, 238 Neb. 565, 471 N.W.2d 734 (1991).

⁴⁴ *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).

⁴⁵ *Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597 N.W.2d 623 (1999).

⁴⁶ *Banner County v. State Board of Equalization*, 226 Neb. 236, 411 N.W.2d 35 (1987).

⁴⁷ *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).

⁴⁸ *First Nat. Bank & Trust Co. v. County of Lancaster*, 177 Neb. 390, 128 N.W.2d 820 (1964).

result of systematic will or failure of a plain legal duty, and not mere error of judgment [sic].”⁴⁹ “There must be something more, something which in effect amounts to an intentional violation of the essential principle of practical uniformity.”⁵⁰

60. “To set the valuation of similarly situated property, i.e. comparables, at materially different levels, i.e., value per square foot, is by definition, unreasonable and arbitrary, under the Nebraska Constitution.”⁵¹

EQUALIZATION ANALYSIS

61. For equalization analysis purposes, the Taxpayer submitted screenshots from the Douglas County Assessor’s website for four residential parcels.
62. As indicated previously, an order for equalization requires evidence that either: (1) similar properties were assessed at materially different values;⁵² or (2) a comparison of the ratio of assessed value to market value for the Subject Property and other real property **regardless of similarity** indicates that the Subject Property was not assessed at a uniform percentage of market value.⁵³
63. The Commission is unable to properly evaluate similarity because Property Record Files were not submitted for the four properties offered by the Taxpayer for consideration.
64. The Commission further finds that the Taxpayer did not produce sufficient evidence of the market value of the properties submitted for comparison, in order to determine whether the ratio of one or more assessed to market values was less than 100% for tax years 2012. Thus, the Commission is unable to determine whether the Subject Property was assessed at an excessive percentage of market value in comparison to the properties presented for consideration by the Taxpayer.

CONCLUSION

65. The Taxpayer has produced competent evidence that the County Board failed to faithfully perform its duties and to act on sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions.
66. The Taxpayer has adduced sufficient, clear and convincing evidence that the determination of the County Board is unreasonable or arbitrary and the decision of the County Board should be vacated.

⁴⁹ *Newman v. County of Dawson*, 167 Neb. 666, 670, 94 N.W.2d 47, 49-50 (1959) (Citations omitted).

⁵⁰ *Id.* at 673, 94 N.W.2d at 50.

⁵¹ *Scribante v. Douglas County Board of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 25, 39, 588 N.W.2d 190, 199 (1999).

⁵² See, *Scribante v. Douglas County Board of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 25, 39, 588 N.W.2d 190, 199 (1999).

⁵³ See, *Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597 N.W.2d 623, 635 (1999).

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. The Decision of the Douglas County Board of Equalization determining the value of the Subject Property for tax year 2012 is Vacated and Reversed.
2. The taxable value of the Subject Property for tax year 2012 is \$123,700.
3. This decision and order, if no further action is taken, shall be certified to the Douglas County Treasurer and the Douglas County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (2012 Cum. Supp.).
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 2012.
7. This order is effective on July 7, 2014.

Signed and Sealed: July 7, 2014

Thomas D. Freimuth, Commissioner