

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

KATHY M. TSCHETTER,)	
)	
Appellant,)	Case No 07SV-004
)	
v.)	DECISION AND ORDER AFFIRMING
)	THE DECISION OF THE LANCASTER
LANCASTER 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 Kathy M. Tschetter ("the Taxpayer") to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission ("the Commission"). The hearing was held in the Commission's Hearing Room on the sixth floor of the Nebraska State Office Building in the City of Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, on February 12, 2008, pursuant to an Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued December 12, 2007. Commissioners Wickersham, Warnes, Salmon, and Hotz were present. Commissioner Wickersham was the presiding hearing officer.

Jay Tschetter, a co-owner and spouse of Kathy M. Tschetter, was present at the hearing without legal counsel.

Michael E. Thew, a Deputy County Attorney for Lancaster County, Nebraska, was present as legal counsel for the Lancaster 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

Was the County Board's decision upholding the County Assessor's disqualification of the land described in this appeal for special valuation unreasonable or arbitrary?

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 6, Section 19, Township 9, Range 5, 6th PM, Lancaster County, Nebraska, ("the subject property").
3. Prior to March 19, 2007, the County Assessor made a determination that the subject property should be disqualified for use of special valuation.
4. The Taxpayer protested that determination.
5. The County Board affirmed the determination of the County Assessor.
6. An appeal of the County Board's decision was filed with the Commission.
7. The County Board and the Taxpayer were served with a Notice in Lieu of Summons and duly answered that Notice.
8. An Order for Hearing and Notice of Hearing issued on December 12, 2007, as amended by an Order issued on February 8, 2008, set a hearing of the appeal for February 12, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. CST.

9. 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.

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. The Legislature may provide that agricultural land and horticultural land, as defined by the Legislature, shall constitute a separate and distinct class of property for purposes of taxation and may provide for a different method of taxing agricultural land and horticultural land which results in values that are not uniform and proportionate with all other real property and franchises but which results in values that are uniform and proportionate upon all property within the class of agricultural land and horticultural land. Neb. Const. art. VIII, §1 (4).
3. For purposes of sections 77-1359 to 77-1363:
 - (1) Agricultural land and horticultural land means a parcel of land which is primarily used for agricultural or horticultural purposes, including wasteland lying in or adjacent to and in common ownership or management with other agricultural land and horticultural land. Agricultural land and horticultural land does not include any land directly associated with any building or enclosed structure;
 - (2) Agricultural or horticultural purposes means used for the commercial production of any plant or animal product in a raw or unprocessed state that is derived from the science

and art of agriculture, aquaculture, or horticulture. Agricultural or horticultural purposes includes the following uses of land:

(a) Land retained or protected for future agricultural or horticultural purposes under a conservation easement as provided in the Conservation and Preservation Easements Act except when the parcel or a portion thereof is being used for purposes other than agricultural or horticultural purposes; and

(b) Land enrolled in a federal or state program in which payments are received for removing such land from agricultural or horticultural production;

(3) Farm home site means not more than one acre of land contiguous to a farm site which includes an inhabitable residence and improvements used for residential purposes, and such improvements include utility connections, water and sewer systems, and improved access to a public road; and

(4) Farm site means the portion of land contiguous to land actively devoted to agriculture which includes improvements that are agricultural or horticultural in nature, including any uninhabitable or unimproved farm home site. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359 (Cum. Supp. 2006).

4. The Legislature may enact laws to provide that the value of land actively devoted to agricultural or horticultural use shall for property tax purposes be that value which such land has for agricultural or horticultural use without regard to any value which such land might have for other purposes or uses. Neb. Const. art. VIII, §1 (5).
5. Agricultural or horticultural land which has an actual value as defined in section 77-112 reflecting purposes or uses other than agricultural or horticultural purposes or uses shall

be assessed as provided in subsection (3) of section 77-201 if the land meets the qualifications of this subsection and an application for such special valuation is filed and approved pursuant to section 77-1345. In order for the land to qualify for special valuation all of the following criteria shall be met: (a) The land is located outside the corporate boundaries of any sanitary and improvement district, city, or village except as provided in subsection (2) of this section; and (b) the land is agricultural or horticultural land. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1344 (1) (Supp. 2007).

6. The eligibility of land for the special valuation provisions is to be determined each year as of January 1, but if the land so qualified becomes disqualified on or before December 31 of that year, it shall be valued at its recapture value. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1344 (3).
7. Parcel means a contiguous tract of land determined by its boundaries, under the same ownership, and in the same tax district and section. Parcel also means an improvement on leased land. If all or several lots in the same block are owned by the same person and are contained in the same tax district, they may be included in one parcel. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-132 (Cum. Supp. 2006).
8. At any time, the county assessor may determine that land no longer qualifies for special valuation pursuant to sections 77-1344 and 77-1347. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1347.01 (Supp. 2007).
9. If land is deemed disqualified, the county assessor shall send a written notice of the determination to the applicant or owner within fifteen days after his or her determination, including the reason for the disqualification. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1347.01 (Supp. 2007).

10. A protest of the county assessor's determination may be filed with the county board of equalization within thirty days after the mailing of the notice. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1347.01 (Supp. 2007).
11. The county board of equalization shall decide the protest within thirty days after the filing of the protest. The county clerk shall, within seven days after the county board of equalization's final decision, mail to the protester written notification of the board's decision. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1347.01 (Supp. 2007).
12. The decision of the county board of equalization may be appealed to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission in accordance with section 77-5013 within thirty days after the date of the decision. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1347.01 (Supp. 2007).
13. 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)..
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).
15. The presumption disappears if there is competent evidence to the contrary. *Id.*
16. Competent evidence means evidence which tends to establish the fact in issue. *In re Application of Jantzen*, 245 Neb. 81, 511 N.W.2d 504 (1994).

17. The Taxpayer has the burden to adduce evidence that the decision, action, order, or determination appealed from was unreasonable or arbitrary as prescribed by statute. *City of York v. York County Bd. of Equalization*, 266 Neb. 297, 664 N.W.2d 445 (2003)
18. The Commission may not grant relief unless it is shown that the action of the County Board was unreasonable or arbitrary. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5016 (8) (Cum. Supp. 2006),
19. 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).
20. "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).
21. 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).
22. 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).

IV. ANALYSIS

The subject property is an improved parcel in rural Lancaster County. Improvements on the parcel include a residence and a farm utility building. (E2). The subject property consists of 23.74 acres and was acquired by the Taxpayer in 1999. (E2).

The Taxpayer's spouse testified that prairie hay had been harvested on the subject property for several years and that the proceeds were nominal. The Taxpayer's spouse testified that burning, haying and some use of chemicals were all part of an effort to restore a native prairie on the subject property. After restoration of the prairie the Taxpayer's spouse testified that the intention was to harvest seeds from plants growing on the prairie for sale and use in other prairie restoration efforts.

Only agricultural land and horticultural land as defined by the legislature is eligible for special valuation. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1344 (1) (Supp. 2007). The statutory definition of agricultural land and horticultural land contains various terms which are critical to an understanding of the statute. The term "parcel" has been defined by Nebraska's Legislature. "Parcel means a contiguous tract of land determined by its boundaries, under the same ownership, and in the same tax district and section. Parcel also means an improvement on leased land. If all or several lots in the same block are owned by the same person and are contained in the same tax district, they may be included in one parcel." Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-132 (Cum. Supp. 2006).

Other significant terms within the statutory definition of agricultural land and horticultural land have not been defined by the Legislature. The term "commercial production" has not been defined but only land used for the "commercial production" of any plant or animal product in a raw or unprocessed state that is derived from the science and art of agriculture, aquaculture, or horticulture, with exceptions noted above, may be agricultural land and horticultural land. The Commission has not found in statute or in Nebraska case law a definition of the term "commercial production." Commercial can mean "of, in or relating to commerce."

Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, Inc., (2002). p. 456. An alternate definition is “from the point of view of profit: having profit as the primary aim.” *Id.* Prior to adoption of amendments to the statute defining agricultural land and horticultural land in 2006 the definition of agricultural and horticultural land contained a requirement that the land be used for the “production” of agricultural products. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1359 (Reissue 2003). The new term “commercial production” did not appear in the definition. *Id.* A statute should be construed to give effect to purposeful change in its provisions. A construction of “commercial production” to mean production from the point of view of making a profit gives effect to the change in terminology as adopted by the legislature and is adopted by the Commission.

It is appropriate to consider a number of factors to determine whether or not an activity is undertaken with a view to making a profit. See, *Wood*, 548 T.M., *Hobby Losses*. Among the factors to be considered are: whether the activity is conducted in a business like manner with adequate records and adaption of operating methods to changing circumstances; expertise of the Taxpayer, if any, necessary for conduct of the operation; consultation with experts, if necessary, and reliance on appraisals or other data for decision making as necessary; time and effort expended by the Taxpayer in furtherance of the operation; any expectation of appreciation in the assets employed in the operation; success the Taxpayer has had in carrying on similar or dissimilar operations; the Taxpayer’s history of profits or losses with respect to the operation discounting startup losses and losses or gains due to unusual circumstances; any profits earned and the possibility of profits if none have been earned to date; the Taxpayer’s financial status, i.e. the ability to sustain losses or incur costs without regard to returns; and elements of personal pleasure or recreation, or other motives other than profit or gain. The same factors are relevant to

a determination of whether commercial production of a plant or animal product in a raw or unprocessed state that is derived from the science and art of agriculture, aquaculture, or horticulture (“commercial production”) has occurred on the parcel. In addition the Commission will consider other factors as presented for consideration on a case by case basis.

The Taxpayer’s spouse testified that income was derived from the sale of prairie hay. The income and expenses associated with its production were not, however, reported for income tax purposes. The Taxpayers’s spouse testified further that a longer range plan was to harvest and market seeds from plants growing on the restored prairie. The only records in evidence on the production of hay are some receipts for income and one expense invoice. (E9). The Taxpayer has developed some expertise in the restoration of prairies, but has not developed an expertise in the production and marketing of seeds from a restored prairie, the ultimate commercial objective. The Taxpayer’s spouse testified that he spent at least one month each year in an effort to restore the prairie. The Taxpayer’s spouse testified that he was a self employed sculptor and mason. There is no evidence that the production and harvesting of prairie seeds on the subject property is a primary source of income for either the Taxpayer or her spouse.

The Taxpayer promotes the restoration of other prairies but there is no evidence that those efforts are compensated. The Taxpayer testified that significant environmental and ecological benefits would accrue from restoration of the prairie on the subject property as it is part of a prairie corridor. The Taxpayer’s spouse testified that the restoration objective was important to him and the Taxpayer. The evidence indicates that record keeping for the production of hay is minimal, that neither the Taxpayer or her spouse and co-owner have developed any particular expertise in the production and marketing of prairie seeds, and that restoration of the prairie on

the subject property has a large element of personal satisfaction associated with it. There is no evidence that the production of prairie hay on the subject property is profitable. The Commission concludes after consideration of the evidence and the described factors that there has not been commercial production of any plant or animal product in a raw or unprocessed state that is derived from the science and art of agriculture, aquaculture, or horticulture had occurred on the subject property as of January 1, 2007, the date on which eligibility must be determined for purposes of this appeal.

It is therefore unnecessary to consider whether the parcel was primarily used for agricultural or horticultural purposes as of January 1, 2007.

**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 competent evidence to overcome the presumption that the County Board faithfully performed its duties and acted on competent evidence.
4. The Taxpayer has not adduced 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 that the subject property was not eligible for special valuation is affirmed.
2. This decision, if no appeal is timely filed, shall be certified to the Lancaster County Treasurer, and the Lancaster County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Cum. Supp. 2006).
3. Any request for relief, by any party, which is not specifically provided for by this order is denied.
4. Each party is to bear its own costs in this proceeding.
5. This decision shall only be applicable to tax year 2007.
6. This order is effective for purposes of appeal on February 21, 2008.

Signed and Sealed. February 21, 2008.

Wm. R. Wickersham, Commissioner

Nancy J. Salmon, Commissioner

Robert W. Hotz, 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.