

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

DAVID M. SHERRY,)	
)	
Appellant,)	Case No. 07R-265
)	
v.)	DECISION AND ORDER AFFIRMING
)	THE DECISION OF THE DAKOTA
DAKOTA 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 David M. Sherry ("the Taxpayer") to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission ("the Commission"). The hearing was held in the Holiday Inn Express, 920 S 20th St., Norfolk, Nebraska, on August 4, 2008, pursuant to an Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued May 27, 2008. Commissioners Wickersham, Salmon, and Hotz were present. Commissioner Wickersham was the presiding hearing officer. Commissioner Warnes 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).

David M. Sherry was present at the hearing without legal counsel.

Kim Watson, County Attorney for Dakota County, Nebraska, was present as legal counsel for the Dakota 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.

The Taxpayer has asserted that taxable value of the subject property as of January 1, 2007, 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, 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 ("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, 2007, ("the assessment date") by the Dakota 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. 07R-265

Description: Lot 12 Jackson Bluff Addition, Jackson, Dakota County, Nebraska.

	Assessor Notice Value	Taxpayer Protest Value	Board Determined Value
Land	\$25,000.00	\$In Total	\$25,000.00
Improvement	\$137,485.00	\$In Total	\$137,485.00
Total	\$162,485.00	\$155,485.00	\$162,485.00

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 May 27, 2008, set a hearing of the appeal for August 4, 2008, at 1:00 p.m. CDST.
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 2007 is:

Case No. 07R-265

Land value	\$ 25,000.00
Improvement value	<u>\$137,485.00</u>
Total value	<u>\$162,485.00.</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. “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 2003).
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) (Cum. Supp. 2006).
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 to obtain proportionate valuation requires a comparison of the ratio of assessed to actual value for the subject property and comparable property. *Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597 N.W.2d 623 (1999).
9. 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).
10. 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).

11. 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).
12. 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).
13. 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).
14. 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).
15. 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).
16. The presumption disappears if there is competent evidence to the contrary. *Id.*
 17. 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) (Cum. Supp. 2006).
 18. Proof that the order, decision, determination, or action 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).
 19. "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).
 20. 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).
 21. 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).
 22. "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).

23. 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).
24. 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).
25. 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 2004. (E2:6). The one story ranch style residence contains 1,434 square feet on the main floor, a 1,434 square foot basement and an attached 572 square foot garage. (E2:6).

The Taxpayer contends that actual value as determined by the County Board for the tax year 2006 should not have been changed because no changes were made to the subject property with the exception of planting trees and shrubs. A determination of actual value made in a prior

year is not relevant to a determination of actual value in a subsequent year. *DeVore v. Bd. Of Equal.*, 144 Neb. 351, 13 N.W.2d 451 (1944). *Affiliated Foods Coop v. Madison Co. Bd. Of Equal.*, 229 Neb. 605, 613, 428 N.W.2d 201, 206 (1988). No other evidence of actual value for the subject property as of the assessment date was presented by the Taxpayer.

The Taxpayer also contends that actual value of the subject property is not equalized with other parcels. Information concerning 3 other parcels was presented in Exhibit 2. The following table contains information extracted from Exhibit 2 for the subject property and the 3 other parcels.

Descriptor	Subject	Parcel 1	Parcel 2	Parcel 3
Exhibit	E2:6 & 7	E2:12 &13	E2:14 & 15	E2:16 &17
Location	303 N Court. St, Jackson	104 Gill Ave., Jackson	303 St. Patrick Ct., Jackson	745 Dakota Flats Dr., Dakota City
Condition	Good	Good	Good	Good
Quality	Ave+	Ave	Ave	Ave+
Yr Built	2004	2002	2006	1996
Ext Wall 1	95% Vinyl 5% Masonry Veneer	100% Vinyl	95% Siding 5% Masonry Veneer	100% Siding
Base Area	1,434	1,502	1,668	2,152
Total Area	1,434	1,502	1,668	2,152
Style	One Story	One Story	One Story	One Story
Roof	Comp Shingle	Comp Shingle	Comp Shingle	Comp Shingle
HVAC	100%	100%	100%	100%
Basement	1,434	1,502	1,668	2,152
Part Finish				1,290
Bedrooms	3	3	3	3

Descriptor	Subject	Parcel 1	Parcel 2	Parcel 3
Bathrooms	2	2	1.75	2.5
Garage Type	Attached	Attached	Attached	Attached
Garage Area	572	620	528	650
Misc Imp	porches, wood deck	porch, yard shed, slab	fireplace, slabs	porches, wood deck
Sale Date	05/01/2005	02/05/2004	05/25/2007	06/29/2005
Sale Price	\$177,500.00	\$152,000.00	\$185,000.00	\$260,000.00
Assessed Value 1/1/07	\$162,485.00	\$137,050.00	\$80,195.00	\$238,940.00

Equalization to obtain proportionate valuation requires a comparison of the ratio of assessed to actual value for the subject property and comparable property. *Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597 N.W.2d 623 (1999). 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. When using “comparables” to determine value, similarities and differences between the subject property and the comparables must be recognized and adjustments made to compensate for the differences. *Property Assessment Valuation*, 2nd Ed., 1996, p.103.

Parcel 3 is eight years older and larger than the subject property and located in a different community. Parcel 3 also has a basement with partition finish and a larger garage. Parcel 3 cannot be considered comparable to the subject property without adjustments. The amounts and character, whether positive or negative, of the necessary adjustments are unknown.

Parcel 2 is newer and larger than the subject property. Parcel 2 has a smaller garage and a fireplace. It appears from the record that a substantial change in the value of improvements occurred between tax years 2006 and 2007 and a building permit issued on August 18, 2006 as shown on page 14 of Exhibit 2, that the residence was under construction as of January 1, 2007. The completed percentage of the residence as of January 1, 2007 is unknown. Given the information available it is not possible to consider Parcel 2 as comparable to the subject property as of January 1, 2007.

Parcel 1 as described in Exhibit 2 has elements of comparability. The Taxpayer testified that Parcel 2 is constructed of concrete with foam insulation. The subject property is “stick built.” Parcel 2 cannot be considered comparable to the subject property without adjustment for the difference in construction. The amounts and character, whether positive or negative, of the necessary adjustments are unknown.

The sales of Parcels 1, 2, and 3, without adjustment, may not be used to estimate actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date for the reasons noted.

The remaining question is whether the assessed value of the parcels or their sales may be used to determine the equalized taxable value of the subject property.

Equalization requires that taxable values be determined uniformly and proportionately. See, *Neb. Const.*, Art. VIII, §1. To determine whether value has been determined proportionately requires a comparison of the ratios of taxable value to actual value for the subject property and comparable parcels. *Cabela's Inc. v. Cheyenne County Bd. of Equalization*, 8 Neb.App. 582, 597 N.W.2d 623 (1999). As noted above, there is no evidence that actual value of the subject property is different than actual value as determined by the County Board. The ratio of assessed

value to actual value for the subject property is $1(\$162,485.00 \div \$162,485.00)$. To determine the ratio of assessed value to actual value for parcel 2 it is necessary to determine its actual value. The taxable values of Parcel 1, 2, and 3 are known. A Taxpayer wishing to use taxable “assessed” values to prove actual or fair market value must show that the approach used is a professionally approved mass or fee appraisal approach and demonstrate application of the approach.

A determination of actual value may be made for mass appraisal and assessment purposes by using approaches identified in Nebraska Statutes. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003). The approaches identified are the sales comparison approach, the income approach, the cost approach and other professionally accepted mass appraisal methods. *Id.* Comparison of assessed values is not identified in the Nebraska Statutes as an accepted approach for a determination of actual value for purposes of mass appraisal. *Id.* Because the method is not identified in statute, proof of its professional acceptance as an accepted appraisal approach would have to be produced. *Id.* No evidence has been presented to the Commission that comparison of assessed values is a professionally accepted mass or fee appraisal approach.

The Taxpayer in this case asks the Commission to presume that the taxable “assessed” value of each offered comparable is equal to its actual value. A presumption can arise that an assessor properly determined taxable “assessed” value. *Woods v. Lincoln Gas and Electric Co.*, 74 Neb. 526, 527 (1905), *Brown v. Douglas County*, 98 Neb. 299, 303 (1915), *Gamboni v. County of Otoe*, 159 Neb. 417, 431, 67 N.W.2d 489, 499 (1954), *Ahern v. Board of Equalization*, 160 Neb. 709, 711, 71 N.W.2d 307, 309 (1955). A presumption can also arise that a County Board’s determination of taxable “assessed” value is correct. *Constructor's Inc. v. Cass*

Cty. Bd. of Equal., 258 Neb. 866, 606 N.W.2d 786 (2000). A presumption is not, however, evidence of correctness in and of itself but may be classified as a principle of procedure involving the burden of proof. See, *Gordman Properties Company v. Board of Equalization of Hall County*, 225 Neb. 169, 403 N.W.2d 366 (1987).

The weight of authority is that assessed value is not in and of itself direct evidence of actual value. See, *Lienemann v. City of Omaha*, 191 Neb. 442, 215 N.W.2d 893 (1974). If however the “taxable ‘assessed’ value comparison approach” was shown to be a professionally accepted approach for determination of actual value, and that the taxable “assessed value of the proposed comparables was equal to actual value, further analysis would be required. Techniques for use of the approach would have to be developed. Techniques used in the sales comparison approach are instructive. In the sales comparison approach, a sale price is an indication of actual value for a sold property but must be adjusted to account for differences between properties to become an indicator of actual value for another property. *The Appraisal of Real Estate*, Twelfth Edition, Appraisal Institute, Chs 17, 18, 19, (2001). An analysis of differences and adjustments to the taxable “assessed” value of comparison properties would be necessary to obtain an indication of actual value for a subject property. See, *DeBruce Grain v. Otoe County Board of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 688, 584 N.W.2d 837, (1998). No adjustments or analysis of adjustments necessary to compensate for differences between the subject property and the taxable “assessed” values of other parcels was presented. The ratio of assessed value to actual value for the proposed comparable is unknown because no evidence of its actual value was presented. In the alternative if assessed value is deemed to be actual value for Parcel 2 its assessed value to actual value would be 1 and equal to the ratio determined for the subject property.

Parcels 1, 2, and 3 have been sold. It is true that the purchase price of property may be taken into consideration in determining the actual value thereof for assessment purposes, together with all other relevant elements pertaining to such issue; however, standing alone, it is not conclusive of the actual value of property for assessment purposes. Other matters relevant to the actual value thereof must be considered in connection with the sale price to determine actual value. Sale price is not synonymous with actual value or fair market value. *Forney v. Box Butte County Bd. of Equalization*, 7 Neb.App. 417, 424, 582 N.W.2d 631, 637 (1998). The only evidence is simply that sales of parcels 1, 2, and 3 occurred. There is no evidence of the circumstances surrounding the sales. There is no basis for determining that the sale prices of parcels 1, 2, and 3 are equal to their actual value as of January 1, 2007.

The evidence shows that the subject property's actual value was determined with an economic depreciation factor of -10%. (E2:6).

Economic depreciation, economic obsolescence, and external obsolescence, are terms having a common definition. External obsolescence may be described as "a temporary or permanent impairment of the utility or salability of an improvement or property due to negative influences outside the property. (External obsolescence may result from adverse market conditions. Because of its fixed location, real estate is subject to external influences that cannot be controlled by the property owner, landlord or tenant.)" *The Appraisal of Real Estate* 12th Edition, The Appraisal Institute, 2001, p. 363. The use of a negative amount for economic depreciation in the calculation shown on page 6 of Exhibit 2 causes an item of depreciation to be a factor increasing value. The expectation is that an item of depreciation would decrease value.

The decrease in value due to economic obsolescence may be applied to land or improvements. Economic obsolescence loss in value attributable to land should not be applied against improvements. *Property Appraisal and Assessment Administration*, International Association of Assessing Officers, 1990, pg. 228. If the factor is having a special distinguishable positive influence on actual value, then it may be a better practice to reflect that influence in the value of the land rather than as a form of negative depreciation. The resulting estimate of actual value may be the same, but the division of the factors contributing to value and the factors detracting to value when the cost approach is used may be clearer. There is no evidence in this case that the use of a negative number for economic depreciation, despite any confusion it may have engendered, did not result in an appropriate estimate of actual value.

There is no evidence that a negative economic depreciation factor was not uniformly applied to other parcels with the same location factors as were present for the subject property as of January 1, 2007. The evidence does not therefore support relief on the uniformity aspect of the Taxpayer's equalization claim.

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

Case No. 07R-265

Land value \$ 25,000.00

Improvement value \$137,485.00

Total value \$162,485.00.

3. This decision, if no appeal is timely filed, shall be certified to the Dakota County Treasurer, and the Dakota 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 August 15, 2008.

Signed and Sealed. August 15, 2008.

Nancy J. Salmon, Commissioner

Robert W. Hotz, 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.

I concur in the result.

The Commission is an administrative agency of state government. See, *Creighton St. Joseph Regional Hospital v. Nebraska Tax Equalization and Review Commission*, 260 Neb. 905, 620 N.W.2d 90 (2000). As an administrative agency of state government the Commission has only the powers and authority granted to it by statute. *Id.* The Commission is authorized by statute to review appeals from decisions of a county board of equalization, the Tax Commissioner, and the Department of Motor Vehicles. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5007 (Supp. 2007). In general the Commission may only grant relief on appeal if it is shown that the order, decision, determination, or action appealed from was unreasonable or arbitrary. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016(8) (Supp. 2007).

Nebraska courts have held that the provisions of section 77-5016(8) of the Nebraska Statutes create a presumption that the County Board has faithfully performed its official duties and has acted upon sufficient competent evidence to justify its actions. *City of York v. York County Board of Equalization*, 266 Neb. 297, 664 N.W.2d 445 (2003). The presumption cited in *York* has roots in the early jurisprudence of Nebraska. See, *State v. Savage*, 65 Neb. 714, 91

N.W. 716 (1902) (citing *Dixon Co. v. Halstead*, 23 Neb. 697, 37 N.W. 621 (1888) and *State v. County Board of Dodge Co.* 20 Neb. 595, 31 N.W. 117 (1887)). As early as 1903 Nebraska Statutes provided for review of County Board assessment decisions by the district courts. Laws 1903, c. 73 §124. The statute providing for review did not state a standard for that review. *Id.*

In 1959 the legislature provided a statutory standard for review by the district courts of county board of equalization, assessment decisions. 1959 Neb Laws, LB 55, §3. The statutory standard of review required the district Court to affirm the decision of the county board of equalization unless the decision was arbitrary or unreasonable or the value as established was too low. *Id.* The statutory standard of review was codified in section 77-1511 of the Nebraska Statutes. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1511 (Cum. Supp. 1959). Review of district court decisions made pursuant to section 77-1511 was de novo. *Future Motels, Inc. v. Custer County Board of Equalization*, 252 Neb. 565, 563 N.W.2d 785 (1997). The presumption functioned as a standard of review. See, e.g. *Gamboni v. County of Otoe*, 159 Neb. 417, 67 N.W.2d 492 (1954).

The Tax Equalization and Review Commission was created in 1995. 1995 Neb. Laws, LB 490 §153. Section 77-1511 of the Nebraska Statutes was made applicable to review of county board of equalization assessment decisions by the Commission. *Id.* In 2001 section 77-1511 of Nebraska Statutes was repealed. 2001 Neb. Laws, LB 465, §12. After repeal of section 77-1511 the standard for review to be applied by the Commission in most appeals was stated in section 77-5016 of the Nebraska Statutes. Section 77-5016 requires a finding that the decision being reviewed was unreasonable or arbitrary. The basis for that determination is the evidence presented to the Commission in a new record. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016 (Cum. Supp. 2006). Commission decisions are reviewed for error on the record. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-

5019(5) (Cum. Supp. 2006). The statutory basis for Commission review and the review of its decisions is analogous to district courts review of decisions made by administrative agencies. The basis for district court review of decisions made by administrative agencies is de novo on the record. *Tyson Fresh Meats v. State*, 270 Neb. 535, 704 N.W.2d 788 (2005). The decisions of the district court examining the administrative decision are reviewed for error on the record. *Thorson v. Nebraska Dept. of Health & Human Servs.*, 274 Neb. 322, 740 N.W.2d 27 (2007). The similarities are enough to suggest that the framework for review applied to district court decisions could be made applicable to decisions of the Commission.

Many appeals of decisions made pursuant to section 77-1511 were decided without reference to the statutory standard of review applicable to the district courts. See, e.g. *Grainger Brothers Company v. County Board of Equalization of the County of Lancaster*, 180 Neb. 571, 144 N.W.2d 161 (1966). As noted however review was de novo and the reviewing court was not bound by the standard of review imposed on district court. *Loskill v. Board of Equalization of Adams County*, 186 Neb. 707, 185 N.W.2d 852 (1971). In *Hastings Building Co., v. Board of Equalization of Adams County*, 190 Neb. 63, 206 N.W.2d 338 (1973), the Nebraska Supreme Court acknowledged that two standards of review existed for the district courts; one statutory, and the other judicial stated as a presumption that the county board of equalization faithfully performed its official duties and acted upon sufficient competent evidence. No attempt was made by the *Hastings* Court to reconcile the two standards of review that were applicable to the district courts.

The possible results from application of the presumption and the statutory standard of review by the Commission are: (1) the presumption is not overcome and the statutory standard is

not overcome; (2) the presumption is overcome and the statutory standard is not overcome; (3) the presumption is not overcome and the statutory standard is overcome; (4) and finally the presumption is overcome and the statutory standard is overcome. The first possibility does not allow a grant of relief, neither standard of review has been met. If the presumption is overcome the statutory standard remains. See, *City of York v. York County Bd of Equal.*, 266 Neb. 297, 664 N.W.2d 445 (2003). The second possibility does not therefore allow a grant of relief even though the presumption is overcome. The third possibility requires analysis. The presumption and the statutory standard of review are different legal standards, one remaining after the other has been met. See. *City of York v. York County Bd of Equal.*, 266 Neb. 297, 664 N.W.2d 445 (2003). The burden of proof to overcome the presumption is competent evidence. *City of York*, Supra. Clear and convincing evidence is required to show that a county board of equalization's decision was unreasonable or arbitrary. See, e.g. *Omaha Country Club v. Douglas Cty. Bd. of Equal.*, 11 Neb.App. 171, 645 N.W.2d 821 (2002). Competent evidence that the county board of equalization failed to perform its duties or act upon sufficient competent evidence is not always evidence that the county board of equalization acted unreasonably or arbitrarily because the statutory standard of review remains even if the presumption is overcome. *City of York*, Supra. Clear and convincing evidence that a county board of equalization's determination, action, order, or decision was unreasonable or arbitrary, as those terms have been defined, may however overcome the presumption that the county board of equalization faithfully discharged its duties and acted on sufficient competent evidence. In any event the statutory standard has been met and relief may be granted. Both standards of review are met in the fourth possibility and relief may

be granted. Each analyses of the standards of review allowing a grant of relief requires a finding that the statutory standard has been met.

Use of the presumption as a standard of review has been criticized. See, G. Michael Fenner, *About Presumptions in Civil Cases*, 17 *Creighton L. Rev.* 307 (1984). In the view of that author the presumption should be returned to its roots as a burden of proof. *Id.* Nebraska's Supreme Court acknowledged the difficulty of using two standards of review and classified the presumption in favor of the county board of equalization 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. See, *Gordman Properties Company v. Board of Equalization of Hall County*, 225 Neb. 169, 403 N.W.2d 366 (1987). Use of the *Gordman* analysis allows consideration of both the presumption and the statutory standard of review without the possible conflict or difficulties inherent in the application of two standards of review. The *Gordman* analysis requires the Commission to consider all of the evidence produced in order to determine whether there is clear and convincing evidence that the decision, action, order, or determination being reviewed was unreasonable or arbitrary. It is within that framework that I have analyzed the evidence.

Wm R. Wickersham, Commissioner