

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

DARRELL L. GRANTSKI,)	
)	
Appellant,)	Case No. 07R-365
)	
v.)	DECISION AND ORDER
)	AFFIRMING THE DECISION OF
DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF)	THE DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF
EQUALIZATION,)	EQUALIZATION
)	
Appellee.)	

The above-captioned case was called for a hearing on the merits of an appeal by Darrell L. Grantski ("the Taxpayer") to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission ("the Commission"). The hearing was held in Lincoln, Lancaster County, Nebraska, on October 21, 2008. Commissioners Wickersham and Salmon were present. Commissioner Wickersham was the presiding hearing officer. Commissioner Warnes was excused from participation by the presiding hearing officer. A panel of three commissioners was created pursuant to 442 Neb. Admin. Code, ch. 4, §011 (10/07). Commissioner Hotz was absent. The Appeal was heard by a quorum of a three Commissioner panel.

Darrell L. Grantski was present at the hearing without legal counsel.

Thomas S. Barrett, a Deputy County Attorney for Douglas County, Nebraska, was present as legal counsel for the Douglas County Board of Equalization ("the County Board").

The Commission took statutory notice, received exhibits, and heard testimony.

The Commission is required to state its final decision and order concerning an appeal, with findings of fact and conclusions of law, on the record or in writing. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Cum. Supp. 2006). The final decision and order of the Commission in this case is as follows.

**I.
ISSUES**

The Taxpayer has asserted that actual value of the subject property as of January 1, 2007, is less than actual value as determined by the County Board. The issues on appeal related to that assertion are:

Whether the decision of the County Board determining actual value of the subject property is unreasonable or arbitrary; and

The actual value of the subject property on January 1, 2007.

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 County Assessor for Douglas County, 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-365

Description: Lot 168 Block 0 Hillsborough, Omaha, Douglas County, Nebraska.

	County Assessor Value	Taxpayer Protest Value	Board Determined Value
Land	\$30,000.00	\$In Total	\$30,000.00
Improvement	\$205,200.00	\$In Total	\$205,200.00
Total	\$235,200.00	\$200,400.00	\$235,200.00

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 August 4, 2008, set a hearing of the appeal for October 21, 2008, at 3:00 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-365

Land value	\$ 30,000.00
Improvement value	<u>\$205,200.00</u>
Total value	<u><u>\$235,200.00</u></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 the 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. A 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 2 story residence on the parcel was constructed in 1996. (E3:1). The County Assessor's records show that the residence contains 2462 square feet of above ground space, an 1,130 square foot basement with 1,061 square feet of finish and a built in garage with 451 square feet. (E3:1).

The taxpayer asserts that the residence contains 2,382 square feet above ground based on his building plans. The front elevations for the residence on the subject property with plans for

the first floor and basement were received as Exhibit 6. Plans for the second story were not submitted. A drawing showing the dimensions of the first and second floor as determined by an appraiser employed by the County Assessor (“County Appraiser”) are shown on Exhibit 3 at page 4. Dimensions shown in the County Assessor’s records to the extent a comparison can be made with the portion of the plans submitted show variances by inches in various dimensions. The differences in inches when multiplied by many feet may account for some of the discrepancy asserted by the Taxpayer. Without plans for the second story, the Commission cannot consider the Taxpayer’s assertion of incorrect footage further.

The Taxpayer testified that in his opinion actual value of the subject property as of the assessment date was \$207, 221. The Taxpayer testified that his opinion was based on the average sale price per square foot of eleven parcels shown in Exhibit 7. Actual value may be determined using the sales comparison approach, the cost approach, the income approach or other professionally accepted appraisal methods. The Taxpayer produced evidence of the sales and characteristics of eleven parcels. In the sales comparison approach an opinion of value is developed by analyzing similar properties and comparing those properties with the subject property. *The Appraisal of Real Estate*, 12th Edition, Appraisal Institute, 2001, pg. 418. An opinion of value based on use of the sales comparison approach requires use of a systematic procedure:

“1. Research the competitive market for information on sales transactions, listings, and offers to purchase or sell involving properties that are similar to the subject property in terms of characteristics such as property type, date of sale, size, physical condition, location, and land use restraints. ...

2. Verify the information by confirming that the data obtained is factually accurate and that the transactions reflect arm's-length market considerations. ...

3. Select relevant units of comparison (e.g., price per acre, price per square foot, price per front foot) and develop a comparative analysis for each unit. ...

4. Look for differences between the comparable sale properties and the subject property using the elements of comparison. Then adjust the price of each sale to reflect how it differs from the subject property or eliminate that property as a comparable. This step typically involves using the most comparable sale properties and then adjusting for any remaining differences. ...

5. Reconcile the various value indications produced from the analysis of comparables into a single value indication or a range of values.” *The Appraisal of Real Estate* 12th Edition, The Appraisal Institute, 2001, p. 422.

Adjustments for differences in characteristics to arrive at an estimate of value based on the sales comparison approach were not suggested by the Taxpayer. The Commission has examined the characteristics of the eleven parcels submitted by the parties as comparables to determine if the unadjusted sales support the Taxpayer's opinion of value. “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. Three parcels were selected for review as the most comparable parcels. The three parcels were selected on the basis of size, style, condition and time of sale. The residence on the parcel at 13535 Sahler is 220 square feet smaller than the residence on subject property, the residence on the parcel at 13703 Sahler is 254 square feet smaller, than the residence on the subject property, the residence on the parcel at parcel at 13325

Sahler is 43 square feet smaller than the residence on the subject property, the residence on the parcel at 4425 N St is 8 square feet larger than the residence on the subject property, the residence on the parcel at 4335 N. 142 Ave. is 203 square feet smaller than the residence on the subject property. The residences on all other parcels had greater differences between the sizes of the residences on those parcels and the size of the residence on the subject property and were not considered further. The residences on the parcels at 13325 Sahler and 4335 N 142 Ave were in good condition. Residences on the three other parcels noted above were in average condition. Sales of the parcels at 13535 Sahler, 13703 Sahler, and 4335 N 142 Ave were closest to the assessment date. The sale price of one parcel was unknown (E17:1). The following table summarizing information concerning the subject property and the selected comparables.

Descriptor	Subject	Comp 1	Comp 2	Comp 3
Exhibit	E3:1	E4:6 & 7	E4:11 &12	E14:1 & 5
Location	13601 Sahlers	13535 Sahlers	13703 Sahler	4335 N 142 Ave.
Condition	Average	Average	Average	Good
Quality	Good	Good	Good	Good
Yr Built	1996	1997	1997	1994
Const	Frame Siding	Frame Siding	Frame Siding	Frame Siding
Total SF	2,462	2,242	2,208	2,259
Built As	2 Story	2 Story	2 Story	2 Story
Roof	Comp Shingle	Comp Shingle	Comp Shingle	Comp Shingle
HVAC	Central Air	Central Air	Central Air	Central Air
Basement	1,130	1,120	850	1,115
Finished	1,061	1,000	675	575
Walkout	1	1	1	
Bedrooms	4	4	4	4
Bathrooms	3.5	3.5	2.5	2.5
Garage Type	Built In	Attached	Built In	Built In
Garage Area	451	725	506	550
Misc Imp	Fireplace, deck	Fireplace, deck	Fireplace, deck	Fireplace
Sale Date		9/15/2006	6/30/2006	6/26/2006
Sale Price		\$216,500	\$199,900	\$204,000

All of the comparables have residences smaller than the residence on the subject property and all sold for more than actual value of the subject property as proposed by the Taxpayer. The sales of comparable properties do not support the Taxpayer's opinion of actual value.

The Taxpayer developed his opinion of actual value based on an averaging of sales prices. An average of sales prices may be influenced by the sales selected. Use of the sales comparison approach with an examination of the characteristics of the sold properties and a full disclosure of adjustments made to produce comparability with a subject property and an indication of value, lessens the influence of sales selection. The averaging of sales prices technique developed by the Taxpayer is not supported in any appraisal literature reviewed by the Commission.

The Taxpayer considered the parcel at 13703 Sahler to be the most comparable parcel to the subject property. The contribution to actual value of the 8,190 square foot land component on that parcel as determined by the County Assessor was 24,000. (E4:11). The contribution to actual value of the 7,930 square foot land component of the parcel at 13529 Sahler was also determined to be 24,000 by the County Assessor. (E4:2). The contribution to value of the land component of all other parcels submitted as comparables was 30,000. (E4:7, E10:2, E11:2, E12:2, E13:2, E14:2, E17:2, and E18:2) Size of the lots ranged from 17,000 square feet to 10,624 square feet. (E4:7, E10:2, E11:2, E12:2 E13:2, E14:2, E17:2, and E18:2). The Taxpayer testified that the back of the subject property abuts a commercial development and that the commercial development has a negative impact on actual value of the subject property. The Taxpayer attributed the lower contributions to value for the land component as shown in Exhibit 4 at page 2 and Exhibit 4 at page 12 versus the contribution to actual value of the land component of the subject property to a recognition of that impact. The County Assessor's office apparently agrees that some negative influence is present because a 2% adjustment was made for that reason. (E4:2 and E4:12). Three of the parcels proposed as comparables abut the

commercial development. (E8:1). One of those parcels at 13703 Sahler has a 17,000 square foot lot. (E10:2). The subject property has an 11,388 square foot lot. (E3:2). Lots on the other two parcels are similar in size to the subject property lot. (E12:2 and E13:2). A cohesive explanation of the amount determined as the contribution to actual value of the land component of the various parcels is not possible, however, for purposes of determining actual value, the Commission has determined that sales of parcels most comparable to the subject property do not support the opinion of actual value stated by the Taxpayer. An analysis of the contribution to actual value of the land component does not alter that finding. For purposes of equalization the land components cannot be considered separately, it is the total value of a property that must be equalized with other parcels. *Bumgarner v. Valley County*, 208 Neb. 361, 366 - 367, 303 N.W.2d 307,311 (1981).

The Taxpayer also asserted that taxable value of the subject property was not equalized with the taxable value of two parcels in the neighborhood of the subject property with ranch style residences. 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). The Commission has evidence of the actual value and the taxable value of the subject property. The Commission has no evidence of actual value of the two parcels with ranch style residences. The Commission is unable to determine whether the ratio of taxable value to actual value of the two parcels with ranch style residences is different than the ratio of taxable value to actual value for the subject property.

There is no evidence that the decision of the County Board was arbitrary or unreasonable.

**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-365

Land value \$ 30,000.00

Improvement value \$205,200.00

Total value \$235,200.00.

3. This decision, if no appeal is timely filed, shall be certified to the Douglas County Treasurer, and the Douglas County Assessor, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5018 (Cum. Supp. 2006).
 4. Any request for relief, by any party, which is not specifically provided for by this order is denied.
 5. Each party is to bear its own costs in this proceeding.
 6. This decision shall only be applicable to tax year 2007.
 7. This order is effective for purposes of appeal on November 3, 2008.
- Signed and Sealed. November 3, 2008.

Nancy J. Salmon, 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 analysis 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