

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

ORVILLE E. SCHMIDT, TRUSTEE,)	
SCHMIDT FAMILY TRUST,)	
)	Case No 06A-016
Appellant,)	
)	DECISION AND ORDER REVERSING
v.)	THE DECISION OF THE DAWSON
)	COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
DAWSON COUNTY BOARD OF)	
EQUALIZATION,)	
)	
Appellee.)	

The above-captioned case was called for a hearing on the merits of an appeal by Orville E. Schmidt, Trustee, Schmidt Family Trust ("the Taxpayer") to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission ("the Commission"). The hearing was held in the Holiday Inn Express, 2605 Plum Creek Parkway, Lexington, Nebraska, on April 3, 2007, pursuant to an Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued January 17, 2007. Commissioners Wickersham, Warnes, and Lore were present. Commissioner Wickersham presided at the hearing.

Orville E. Schmidt, Trustee of Schmidt Family Trust, was present at the hearing. No one appeared as legal counsel for the Taxpayer.

Kurt R. McBride, a Deputy County Attorney for Dawson County, Nebraska, appeared as legal counsel for the Dawson 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 taxable value of the subject property as of January 1, 2006, is less than taxable value as determined by the County Board. The issues on appeal related to that assertion are:

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

What was taxable 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. Taxable value of the subject property placed on the assessment roll as of January 1, 2006, ("the assessment date") by the Dawson County Assessor, value as proposed in a timely protest, and taxable value as determined by the County Board is shown in the following table:

Case No. 06A-016

Description: A 10.02 acre tract in the W½, Section 29, Township 11, Range 23, Dawson County, Nebraska.

	Assessor Notice Value	Taxpayer Protest Value	Board Determined Value
Agricultural Land	\$24,563.00	\$12,560.00	\$24,563.00
Total	\$24,563.00	\$12,560.00	\$24,563.00

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 January 17, 2007, set a hearing of the appeal for April 3, 2007, at 8:00 a.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. Taxable value of the subject property as of the assessment date for the tax year 2006 is:

Agricultural land	\$19,650.00
Total	<u>\$19,560.00.</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. Qualified agricultural land and horticultural land shall be valued for purposes of taxation at eighty percent of its actual value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2) (Reissue 2003).

9. Qualified agricultural land and horticultural land means land which is primarily used for the production of agricultural or horticultural products, including wasteland lying in or adjacent to and in common ownership or management with land used for the production of agricultural or horticultural products. Land retained or protected for future agricultural or horticultural uses under a conservation easement as provided in the Conservation and Preservation Easements Act shall be defined as agricultural land or horticultural land. Land enrolled in a federal or state program in which payments are received for removing such land from agricultural or horticultural production shall be defined as agricultural land or horticultural land. Land that is zoned predominantly for purposes other than agricultural or horticultural use shall not be assessed as agricultural land or horticultural land. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1359 (1) (Reissue 2003).
10. Agricultural or horticultural products include grain and feed crops; forages and sod crops; animal production, including breeding, feeding, or grazing of cattle, horses, swine, sheep, goats, bees, or poultry; and fruits, vegetables, flowers, seeds, grasses, trees, timber, and other horticultural crops. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1359 (2) (Reissue 2003).
11. No residential, commercial, industrial, or agricultural building or enclosed structure or the directly associated land or site of the building or enclosed structure shall be assessed as qualified agricultural or horticultural land. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1361 (2) (Reissue 2003).

12. 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).
13. 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).
14. 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)
15. 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).
16. "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).

17. 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).
18. 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).
19. "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 a 10.02 acre parcel without improvements. (E10).

The parcel was assessed for tax year 2006 as a home site. (E10:2). The Taxpayer testified that the parcel was used in 2005 and 2006 exclusively for the production of alfalfa. Use of the property qualifies it for assessment as agricultural land and horticultural land. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1359 (Reissue 2003). As agricultural land and horticultural land the subject property is to be assessed at 80% of its actual value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2) (Reissue 2003).

The County Board determined that actual value of the subject property was \$24,563.00. (E10:2). That determination was based on the parcel's potential use as a rural home site. (E10:2). The County Assessor testified that a residence could legally be constructed on the

subject property, that there were no physical barriers to construction of a residence on the subject property, that it would be financially feasible to construct a residence on the subject property and the construction of a residence on the subject property would maximize its value. The Commission concludes that the highest and best use of the subject property is as rural residential site. The subject property may have a lower value attributable to a use for agricultural and horticultural purposes but that is not before the Commission because special valuation was not elected for the parcel.

The evidence is that the subject property should be assessed at 80% of actual value as determined by the County Board . Taxable value of the subject parcel for tax year 2006 should be \$19,650.00 ($\$24,563.00 \times .80 = \$19,650.00$).

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 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 reversed.

**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 reversed.
2. Taxable value of the subject property for the tax year 2006 is:

Agricultural land	\$19,650.00
Total	<u>\$19,560.00.</u>
3. This decision, if no appeal is timely filed, shall be certified to the Dawson County Treasurer, and the Dawson 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 April 16, 2007.

Signed and Sealed. April 16, 2007.

Wm. R. Wickersham, Commissioner

Susan S. Lore, Commissioner

William C. Warnes, 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.