## Preface

The requirements for the assessment of real property for the purposes of property taxation are found in Nebraska law. The Constitution of Nebraska requires that "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, sec. 1 (1) (1998). The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as "the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade." Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (R.R.S., 2003). The assessment level for all real property, except agricultural land and horticultural land, is one hundred percent of actual value. The assessment level for agricultural land and horticultural land, hereinafter referred to as agricultural land, is seventy-five percent of actual value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (1) and (2)(R.S. Supp., 2006). More importantly, for purposes of equalization, similar properties must be assessed at the same proportion of actual value when compared to each other. Achieving the constitutional requirement of proportionality ultimately ensures the balance equity in the imposition of the property tax by local units of government on each parcel of real property.

The assessment process, implemented under the authority of the county assessor, seeks to value similarly classed properties at the same proportion to actual value. This is not a precise mathematical process, but instead depends on the judgment of the county assessor, based on his or her analysis of relevant factors that affect the actual value of real property. Nebraska law provides ranges of acceptable levels of value that must be met to achieve the uniform and proportionate valuation of classes and subclasses of real property in each county. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023 (R.S. Supp., 2006) requires that all classes of real property, except agricultural land, be assessed within the range of ninety-two and one hundred percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land be assessed within the range of sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation be assessed within the range sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of its special value; and, when the land is disqualified for special value the recapture value be assessed at actual value.

To ensure that the classes of real property are assessed at these required levels of actual value, the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation, hereinafter referred to as the Department, under the direction of the Property Tax Administrator, is annually responsible for analyzing and measuring the assessment performance of each county. This responsibility includes requiring the Property Tax Administrator to prepare statistical and narrative reports for the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, and the county assessors. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R.S. Supp., 2005):
(2) ... the Property Tax Administrator shall prepare and deliver to the commission and to each county assessor his or her annual reports and opinions.
(3) The annual reports and opinions of the Property Tax Administrator shall contain statistical and narrative reports informing the commission of the level of value and the quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property within the county and a certification of the opinion of the Property Tax

Administrator regarding the level of value and quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property in the county.
(4) In addition to an opinion of level of value and quality of assessment in the county, the Property Tax Administrator may make nonbinding recommendations for consideration by the commission.

The narrative and statistical reports contained in the Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator, hereinafter referred to as the R\&O, provide a thorough, concise analysis of the assessment process implemented by each county assessor to reach the levels of value and quality of assessment required by Nebraska law. The Property Tax Administrator's opinion of level of value and quality of assessment achieved by each county assessor is a conclusion based upon all the data provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Department regarding the assessment activities during the preceding year. This is done in recognition of the fact that the measurement of assessment compliance, in terms of the concepts of actual value and uniformity and proportionality mandated by Nebraska law, requires both statistical and narrative analysis.

The Department is required by Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2005) to develop and maintain a state-wide sales file of all arm's length transactions. From this sales file the Department prepares an assessment sales ratio study in compliance with acceptable mass appraisal standards. The assessment sales ratio study is the primary mass appraisal performance evaluation tool. From the sales file, the Department prepares statistical analysis from a nonrandomly selected set of observations, known as sales, from which inferences about the population, known as a class or subclass of real property, may be drawn. The statistical reports contained in the R\&O are developed in compliance with standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers, hereinafter referred to as the IAAO.

However, just as the valuation of property is sometimes more art than science, a narrative analysis of assessment practices in each county is necessary to give proper context to the statistical inferences from the assessment sales ratio study. There may be instances when the analysis of assessment practices outweighs or limits the reliability of the statistical inferences of central tendency or quality measures. This may require an opinion of the level of value that is not identical to the result of the statistical calculation. The Property Tax Administrator's goal is to provide statistical and narrative analysis of the assessment level and practices to the Commission, providing the Commission with the most complete picture possible of the true level of value and quality of assessment in each county.

The Property Tax Administrator's opinions of level of value and quality of assessment are stated as a single numeric representation for level of value and a simple judgment regarding the quality of assessment practices. Based on the information collected in developing this report the Property Tax Administrator may feel further recommendations must be stated for a county to assist the Commission in determining the level of value and quality of assessment within a county. These opinions are made only after considering all narrative and statistical analysis provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Department. An evaluation of these opinions must only be made after considering all other information provided in the R\&O.

Finally, after reviewing all of the information available to the Property Tax Administrator regarding the level and quality of assessment for classes and subclasses of real property in each county, the Property Tax Administrator, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027(4) (R.S. Supp., 2005), may make recommendations for adjustments to value for classes and subclasses of property. All of the factors relating to the Property Tax Administrator's determination of level of value and quality of assessment shall be taken into account in the making of such recommendations. Such recommendations are not binding on the Commission.
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## 2007 Commission Summary

| Residential Real Property - Current |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales |  | 260 | COD | 23.14 |
| Total Sales Price | \$ | 13305113 | PRD | 109.70 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$ | 13354613 | COV | 35.37 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$ | 12930715 | STD | 37.57 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$ | 51363.90 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 23.21 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | \$ | 49733.52 | Min | 34.01 |
| Median |  | 100.28 | Max | 340.83 |
| Wgt. Mean |  | 96.83 | 95\% Median C.I. | 96.59 to 104.23 |
| Mean |  | 106.22 | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. | 94.04 to 99.62 |
|  |  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. | 101.65 to 110.79 |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County |  |  |  | 18.3 |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  | 5.99 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  | 6.48 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  |  | 46,038 |


| Residential Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 9 . 7 0}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 263 | 96.25 | 19.09 | 105.43 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 222 | 98.07 | 19.64 | 105.66 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 212 | 93.79 | 21.06 | 104.67 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 244 | 93 | 21.3 | 102.53 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 285 | 94 | 19.67 | 102.92 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 339 | 97 | 21.98 | 106.34 |

## 2007 Commission Summary

45 Holt

Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales |  | $\mathbf{5 7}$ | COD | $\mathbf{2 2 . 7 2}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$$ | 7792260 | PRD | $\mathbf{9 5 . 0 5}$ |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 7704760 | COV | 29.35 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$$ | 8160525 | STD | 29.55 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 135171.23 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 22.62 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$$ | 143167.11 | Min | 35.16 |
| Median |  | $\mathbf{9 9 . 5 7}$ | Max | 168.88 |
| Wgt. Mean | 105.92 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 91.53 to 108.67 |  |
| Mean |  | 100.67 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 86.48 to 125.35 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 5.07 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 7.61 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 14.75 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 73,891 |


| Commercial Real Property - History <br> Year <br> Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 9 . 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 . 0 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 49 | 95.54 | 25.52 | 108.33 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 48 | 95.55 | 24.20 | 107.49 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 45 | 95.11 | 39.05 | 120.81 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 55 | 98 | 27.12 | 75.98 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 61 | 95 | 28.71 | 73.04 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 75 | 93 | 44.28 | 118.11 |

## 2007 Commission Summary

45 Holt

Agricultural Land - Current

| Number of Sales |  | $\mathbf{1 8 6}$ | COD | $\mathbf{2 3 . 7 3}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$$ | 48472599 | PRD | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 2 3}$ |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 45465838 | COV | 36.09 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$$ | 33162675 | STD | 27.17 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 244439.99 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 16.97 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$$ | 178293.95 | Min | 7.61 |
| Median |  | $\mathbf{7 1 . 5 2}$ | Max | 284.43 |
| Wgt. Mean | 72.94 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 68.49 to 73.86 |  |
| Mean |  | 75.30 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 69.09 to 76.79 |

\% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 78.83
\% of Records Sold in the Study Period 2.69
\% of Value Sold in the Study Period
Average Assessed Value of the Base 124,525

Agricultural Land - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 2 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 194 | 77.38 | 23.09 | 100.38 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 161 | 77.88 | 25.87 | 103.00 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 140 | 76.66 | 22.81 | 100.41 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 104 | 75 | 25.35 | 100.26 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 120 | 77 | 25.35 | 101.83 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 149 | 76 | 20.12 | 103.55 |

## 2007 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Holt County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me about the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While I rely primarily on the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property, my opinion of level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained in the RO. Although my primary resource regarding quality of assessment are the performance standards issued by the IAAO, my opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

## Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Holt County is $100 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Holt County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. In order to move the level of value of Assessor Location of O'Neill with-in the acceptable range, I have recommended an adjustment of $-8 \%$.

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Holt County is $100 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Holt County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land in Holt County is $72 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Holt County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.


Property Tax Administrator

# 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County 

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the residential sales utilization grid indicates that Holt County has utilized an acceptable percentage of the available sales. The measures of central tendency show the median and weighted mean are within the acceptable range; while the mean is above. The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is consistent suggesting that sold and unsold parcels were appraised similarly. Although the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential lowered after the preliminary statistics, these two quality statistics are still outside the acceptable range.

As noted in the Assessment Actions of the 2007 Assessment Survey for Holt County the Assessor updated to the June 2002 Marshall-Swift costing of all residential improvements within the Terra Scan computer system. In updating this costing, the sales in assessor location O'Neill have risen to a median of 102.64 , which is above the acceptable range. In reviewing the history charts for Holt County, they indicate that O'Neill has approximately forty-six percent of the residential value in the county. The current qualified residential sales file contains a total assessed value of close to 13 million dollars; over fifty percent of this value is in the assessor location of O'Neill. Based on the above information, my analysis of the subclass and discussions with the Assessor, I am making a non-binding recommendation to adjust the improvements only in assessor location O'Neill to the mid-point of the acceptable range.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2005) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Department periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (1999), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 404 | 260 | $\mathbf{6 4 . 3 6}$ |
| 2006 | 419 | 263 | $\mathbf{6 2 . 7 7}$ |
| 2005 | 424 | 222 | 52.36 |
| 2004 | 421 | 212 | 50.36 |
| 2003 | 396 | 244 | $\mathbf{6 1 . 6 2}$ |
| 2002 | 390 | 285 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 0 8}$ |
| 2001 | 451 | 339 | $\mathbf{7 5 . 1 7}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The percentage of qualified residential sales indicates little change when compared to the previous year. The sales verification process in this county has been in place for a number of years and Holt County appears to be using an acceptable number of qualified sales.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

## III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.
[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063=0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio Continued

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 94.11 | $\mathbf{8 . 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 2 8}$ |
| 2006 | 96.35 | 0.22 | 96.56 | 96.25 |
| 2005 | 97.95 | 0.64 | 98.58 | 98.07 |
| 2004 | 95.43 | 5.17 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 3 6}$ | 93.79 |
| 2003 | 92 | 0.83 | 92.76 | 93 |
| 2002 | 94.14 | 0.08 | 94.22 | 94 |
| 2001 | 93 | 10.76 | 103.01 | 97 |

RESIDENTIAL: Table III indicates a difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R\&O Median of $2.27 \%$. The difference may be attributed to the updating of the MarshallSwift costing to all residential improvements.

## IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2007 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2007 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2006 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sale file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, (International Association of Assessing Officers, 1999), p. 311.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11.44 | 2007 | $\mathbf{8 . 9 6}$ |
| 1.24 | 2006 | 0.22 |
| 0.81 | 2005 | 0.64 |
| -0.48 | 2004 | 5.17 |
| 2 | 2003 | 1 |
| -0.08 | 2002 | 0.08 |
| 6.86 | 2001 | 10.76 |

RESIDENTIAL: Comparison of the percent change in the sales file to the percent change to the residential base reveals a difference of $2.48 \%$. The difference may be attributed to the updating of the Marshall-Swift costing to all residential improvements. The difference implies that the assessment actions had more of an affect on the sales file base when compared to the assessed base.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Department: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Because each measure of central tendency has its own strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for "direct" equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Because the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for "indirect" equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6 . 2 2}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The measures of central tendency shown here reflect that the median and weighted mean for the qualified residential sales file are within the acceptable level of value. The mean is significantly higher; however the removal of some extreme outliers also brings this measure into the acceptable range. The median is a reliable measure of the level of assessment in this class of property.
VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237 indicates that a COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.
The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240 indicates that a PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 23.14 | 109.70 |
| Difference | $\mathbf{8 . 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 7}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. These quality statistics do not support assessment uniformity. However, these statistics are affected by outliers as well as low dollar sales in the sales file.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

## VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R\&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 261 | $\mathbf{2 6 0}$ | -1 |
| Median | 94.11 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 1 7}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | $\mathbf{8 6 . 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 8 3}$ | 9.97 |
| Mean | 98.64 | 106.22 | 7.58 |
| COD | 25.91 | 23.14 | -2.77 |
| PRD | 113.56 | 109.70 | $-\mathbf{3 . 8 6}$ |
| Min Sales Ratio | 18.64 | 34.01 | 15.37 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 315.67 | 340.83 | 25.16 |

RESIDENTIAL: Table 7 indicates that one sale was removed between the preliminary sales file and the final R\&O Statistics. This sale was removed subsequent to review by the county and the property now being substantially changed from the time of the sale. The table is consistent with the Assessment Actions section of the 2007 Assessment Survey for Holt County.

# 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County 

## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: A review of the commercial sales utilization grid indicates that Holt County has utilized an acceptable percentage of the available sales. The measures of central tendency reflect that the median for the qualified sales file is within the acceptable range, while the weighted mean and mean measures are above the range. The mean can be attributed to outliers in the sales file. The coefficient of dispersion is above the acceptable range while the price related differential is below the range indicating a question of assessment uniformity and progressivity. The assessment actions for 2007 support the change in statistics from the preliminary to the final statistics.

As noted in the Assessment Actions of the 2007 Assessment Survey for Holt County the Assessor updated to the June 2002 Marshall-Swift costing of all commercial improvements within the Terra Scan computer system. In updating this costing, the sales in assessor location O'Neill have risen to a median of 112 , which is above the acceptable range. Historically the assessor location of O'Neill has been within the acceptable range. In order for this location to improve to the mid-point of the acceptable range a decrease of $19 \%$ to the improvements would be needed. If this adjustment were made to the subclass, the price related differential would move further below the acceptable range, several occupancy codes would be lowered; however none of them would come into compliance. This class of property has some issues with uniformity and while the assessor should be commended for putting on updated pricing, perhaps the depreciation or economic factors need to be redone to increase the uniformity in the class of property. Based on the above information, my analysis on the subclass and discussions with the assessor I am recommending no adjustment to this subclass. The overall median best represents the level of value for the class of property for direct equalization purposes.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2005) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Department periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (1999), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 112 | 57 | 50.89 |
| 2006 | 92 | 49 | 53.26 |
| 2005 | 92 | 48 | 52.17 |
| 2004 | 92 | 45 | 48.91 |
| 2003 | 104 | 55 | 52.88 |
| 2002 | 100 | 61 | 61 |
| 2001 | 113 | 75 | 66.37 |

COMMERCIAL: The table represents the 2007 assessment year is consistent with the previous years, and would indicate that Holt County has an adequate portion of the sales file utilized in the determination of the level of value. The removal of the substantially changed sales from the qualified sales file as directed by the Department affects the percent used.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

## III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.
[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063=0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio Continued

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 95.54 | $\mathbf{7 . 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 0 7}$ | 99.57 |
| 2006 | 95.56 | -0.14 | 95.43 | 95.54 |
| 2005 | 93.21 | 0.04 | 93.24 | 95.55 |
| 2004 | 93.69 | -2.62 | 91.23 | 95.11 |
| 2003 | 97 | -2.31 | 94.76 | 98 |
| 2002 | 81.87 | 29.28 | 105.84 | 95 |
| 2001 | 93 | 2.46 | 95.29 | 93 |

COMMERCIAL: Table three indicates a difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R\&O Median of $3.5 \%$. The difference may be attributed to the updating of the Marshall-Swift costing to all commercial improvements.

## IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2007 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2007 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2006 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sale file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, (International Association of Assessing Officers, 1999), p. 311.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21.46 | 2007 | $\mathbf{7 . 8 8}$ |
| 0.93 | 2006 | $-\mathbf{0 . 1 4}$ |
| -3.07 | 2005 | 0.04 |
| -1.96 | 2004 | -2.62 |
| 4 | 2003 | -2 |
| 37.17 | 2002 | 29.28 |
| -0.21 | 2001 | 2.46 |

COMMERCIAL: Comparison of the percent change in the sales file to the percent change to the commercial base (excluding growth) appears to be very dissimilar and not supportive of each other. Further research revealed that nine sales used in calculating the percentage change in the sales file were sales located in assessor location Atkinson. The assessment actions applied to these nine parcels are significantly increasing the weighted mean calculation which is possibly overstating the percent change in the sales file. These nine sales make up $39 \%$ of value of the sales file that was used in determining this calculation. It is assumed that the county has valued the sold parcels similar to the unsold parcels in the commercial class of property for 2007.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Department: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Because each measure of central tendency has its own strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for "direct" equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Because the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for "indirect" equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 99.57 | $\mathbf{1 0 5 . 9 2}$ | 100.67 |

COMMERCIAL: The measures of central tendency shown here reflect that the median is within the acceptable range. The weighted mean and mean are above the range; however with the removal of one outlier sale the mean measure falls into the acceptable range. The weighted mean is still above the range.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

## VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237 indicates that a COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.
The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240 indicates that a PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 22.72 | 95.05 |
| Difference | 2.72 | -2.95 |

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both outside the acceptable range; indicating a question of assessment uniformity and progressivity.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

## VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R\&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 59 | 57 | -2 |
| Median | 95.54 | 99.57 | 4.03 |
| Wgt. Mean | 88.82 | 105.92 | 17.1 |
| Mean | 92.36 | 100.67 | 8.31 |
| COD | 24.52 | 22.72 | -1.8 |
| PRD | 103.98 | 95.05 | -8.93 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 35.14 | 35.16 | 0.02 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 164.00 | 168.88 | 4.88 |

COMMERCIAL: Table 7 indicates that two sales were removed between the preliminary sales file and the final R\&O Statistics. The sales were removed subsequent to review by the county and the properties now being substantially changed from the time of the sale. The table is consistent with the Assessment Actions section of the 2007 Assessment Survey for Holt County.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the 2007 Agricultural Unimproved statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the property in Holt County has been achieved. The measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range as well as the Trended Preliminary Ratio indicates support for the median. The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is consistent suggesting that sold and unsold parcels were appraised similarly. The price related differential rounds to within the acceptable range, while the coefficient of dispersion is slightly above the range. With removal of outliers this measure falls into the acceptable range indicating uniform and proportionate assessments in the agricultural unimproved class of property for assessment year 2007. The reported assessment actions for 2007 support the statistics from the preliminary to the final analysis. For purposes of direct equalization, the median will be used to describe the overall level of value for the agricultural class of property.
II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2005) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Department periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (1999), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 335 | 186 | 55.52 |
| 2006 | 350 | 194 | 55.43 |
| 2005 | 358 | 161 | 44.97 |
| 2004 | 324 | 140 | 43.21 |
| 2003 | 207 | 104 | 50.24 |
| 2002 | 191 | 120 | 62.83 |
| 2001 | 241 | 149 | 61.83 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the utilization table indicates that the percent of sales used has increased from the previous year. The percentage used at 55.52 percent is primarily because of the removal of the substantially changed sales from the qualified sales file as directed by the Department. It should be considered that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

## III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.
[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063=0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio Continued

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 5 2}$ |
| 2006 | $\mathbf{6 8 . 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 3 8}$ |
| 2005 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 8 8}$ |
| 2004 | $\mathbf{6 8 . 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 6 6}$ |
| 2003 | 70 | 6.54 | $\mathbf{7 4 . 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 5}$ |
| 2002 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 7}$ |
| 2001 | 76 | 4.34 | $\mathbf{7 9 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 6}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: After review of the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the Reports and Opinion Median, it is apparent that the two statistics are similar and support a level of value within the acceptable range.

## IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2007 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2007 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2006 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sale file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, (International Association of Assessing Officers, 1999), p. 311.
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2007 | $\mathbf{1 . 0 6}$ |
| 15.93 | 2006 | 13.56 |
| 19.07 | 2005 | 7.36 |
| 17.35 | 2004 | 12.49 |
| 6 | 2003 | 7 |
| 12.03 | 2002 | 7.29 |
| 0 | 2001 | 4.34 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The Trended Preliminary Ratio is relatively close to the R\&O Median suggesting the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and the population in a similar manner.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Department: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Because each measure of central tendency has its own strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for "direct" equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Because the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for "indirect" equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{7 1 . 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 3 0}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The measures of central tendency shown here reflect that all three measures for the qualified agricultural unimproved sales file are within the acceptable level of value. The measures being sufficiently in support of each other indicate that the median is a reliable measure of the level of assessment in this class of property.
VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237 indicates that a COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.
The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240 indicates that a PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 23.73 | 103.23 |
| Difference | $\mathbf{3 . 7 3}$ | 0.23 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The price related differential rounds to within the acceptable range, while the coefficient of dispersion is slightly above the range. With removal of outliers this measure falls into the acceptable range indicating uniform and proportionate assessments in the agricultural unimproved class of property for assessment year 2007.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Holt County

## VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R\&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 191 | $\mathbf{1 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{- 5}$ |
| Median | 70.24 | 71.52 | $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | 71.58 | $\mathbf{7 2 . 9 4}$ | 1.36 |
| Mean | 73.43 | 75.30 | 1.87 |
| COD | 22.12 | 23.73 | 1.61 |
| PRD | 102.59 | 103.23 | 0.64 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 7.61 | 7.61 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 171.96 | 284.43 | 112.47 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference in sales between the preliminary and final statistics is attributable to the removal of five substantially changed sales from the qualified sales file as directed by the Department. The table is consistent with the Assessment Actions section of the 2007 Assessment Survey for Holt County.




Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
260
$13,305,113$
$13,354,613$
$12,436,446$
51,363
47,832

95\% Median C.I.: 93.89 to 99.32
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:

| ASSESSED VALUE * |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE |  | COUNT |
| Low |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 20 |
| 5000 TOTotal \$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 36 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 71 |
| 30000 то | 59999 | 68 |
| 60000 то | 99999 | 52 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 28 |
| 150000 тO | 249999 | 4 |
| 250000 то | 499999 | 1 |
| ALL |  |  |

MEDIAN

94.11
98.42

95.78
102.56
98.96
93.82
93.84
94.44
81.38
MEAN WGT MRD

| EAN : | 9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| EAN : | 103 |
| COD : | 23.09 |

$$
\text { 95\% Mean C.I.: } 98.40 \text { to } 107.21
$$

$$
\text { 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: } 90.48 \text { to } 95.77
$$

|  | 260 | 96.27 | 102.80 | 93.12 | 23.09 | 110.39 | 34.01 | 318.60 | 93.89 to 99.32 | 51,363 | 47,832 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 26 | 94.11 | 91.19 | 72.12 | 18.28 | 126.44 | 37.27 | 157.50 | 84.30 to 97.40 | 9,057 | 6,532 |
| 10 | 14 | 98.22 | 93.71 | 98.61 | 13.92 | 95.03 | 62.55 | 121.29 | 68.80 to 111.45 | 34,387 | 33,910 |
| 15 | 8 | 145.57 | 151.65 | 142.25 | 26.97 | 106.61 | 91.04 | 228.14 | 91.04 to 228.14 | 8,875 | 12,625 |
| 20 | 59 | 92.32 | 98.50 | 85.69 | 27.01 | 114.95 | 34.01 | 318.60 | 85.13 to 97.00 | 41,210 | 35,314 |
| 25 | 29 | 97.94 | 99.60 | 92.24 | 20.68 | 107.99 | 48.04 | 199.88 | 85.11 to 110.46 | 42,073 | 38,806 |
| 30 | 106 | 99.71 | 107.54 | 96.13 | 22.55 | 111.87 | 49.19 | 279.49 | 95.31 to 104.48 | 62,119 | 59,715 |
| 35 | 13 | 97.73 | 99.50 | 97.43 | 10.08 | 102.12 | 81.51 | 133.45 | 87.54 to 108.14 | 107,302 | 104,547 |
| 40 | 4 | 90.45 | 89.61 | 86.56 | 7.88 | 103.53 | 77.57 | 99.99 | N/A | 152,625 | 132,111 |
| 45 | 1 | 81.38 | 81.38 | 81.38 |  |  | 81.38 | 81.38 | N/A | 325,000 | 264,500 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 260 | 96.27 | 102.80 | 93.12 | 23.09 | 110.39 | 34.01 | 318.60 | 93.89 to 99.32 | 51,363 | 47,832 |
| STYLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 26 | 94.11 | 91.19 | 72.12 | 18.28 | 126.44 | 37.27 | 157.50 | 84.30 to 97.40 | 9,057 | 6,532 |
| 100 | 5 | 92.81 | 93.63 | 88.15 | 12.64 | 106.22 | 73.19 | 114.43 | N/A | 22,800 | 20,098 |
| 101 | 176 | 98.06 | 104.97 | 94.11 | 22.68 | 111.54 | 48.04 | 318.60 | 94.72 to 100.76 | 59,393 | 55,895 |
| 102 | 8 | 100.61 | 101.36 | 101.55 | 9.00 | 99.81 | 74.78 | 118.66 | 74.78 to 118.66 | 42,606 | 43,268 |
| 104 | 37 | 93.86 | 104.62 | 89.12 | 34.13 | 117.40 | 34.01 | 279.49 | 86.96 to 110.86 | 41,554 | 37,031 |
| 106 | 1 | 92.58 | 92.58 | 92.58 |  |  | 92.58 | 92.58 | N/A | 6,000 | 5,555 |
| 111 | 7 | 91.96 | 91.58 | 90.89 | 6.49 | 100.76 | 80.00 | 105.80 | 80.00 to 105.80 | 95,342 | 86,658 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 260 | 96.27 | 102.80 | 93.12 | 23.09 | 110.39 | 34.01 | 318.60 | 93.89 to 99.32 | 51,363 | 47,832 |



SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE
Query: 5741
What If ID: 4882
Desc: New Whatif for Query ID: 5741

| Strata Hdg. | Strata | Chg.Value | Chg.Type | Pct.Chg. | Group | Priority |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessor Location | O'neill | Imprvmnt | Decrease | 8.000 | A | 1 |

Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007



|  |  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 01/2003 to 06/30/2 | 6 Posted | ore: 01/ | 2007 |  | (!: AVTot=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | f Sale |  | 57 | MEDIAN: | 95 |  | COV: | 28.27 | 95\% | edian C.I.: 89.10 | to 104.50 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | s Pric |  | , 260 | WGT. MEAN: | 101 |  | STD: | 26.76 | 95\% W | Mean C.I.: 78. | to 123.49 |  |
|  | L Adj. S | s Pric |  | , 760 | MEAN : | 95 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 20.40 |  | Mean C.I.: 87. | to 101.62 |  |
|  | AL Asse | d Valu |  | , 845 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | s Pric |  | , 171 | COD : | 21.47 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 156.48 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | , 769 | PRD : | 93.56 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 35.16 |  |  | Printed: 04/02 | 21:15:40 |
| YEAR BUILT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 0 OR Blank |  | 6 | 105.59 | 103.74 | 90.86 | 17.04 |  | 114.18 | 67.08 | 142.20 | 67.08 to 142.20 | 10,250 | 9,313 |
| Prior TO 1860 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1860 TO 1899 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1900 TO 1919 |  | 6 | 82.41 | 87.13 | 73.08 | 19.87 |  | 119.22 | 60.91 | 112.80 | 60.91 to 112.80 | 92,336 | 67,478 |
| 1920 TO 1939 |  | 9 | 98.29 | 103.55 | 101.31 | 18.39 |  | 102.21 | 58.59 | 155.49 | 84.52 to 122.54 | 73,277 | 74,235 |
| 1940 TO 1949 |  | 1 | 94.42 | 94.42 | 94.42 |  |  |  | 94.42 | 94.42 | N/A | 36,500 | 34,465 |
| 1950 TO 1959 |  | 13 | 104.50 | 100.09 | 97.57 | 19.87 |  | 102.59 | 52.42 | 149.65 | 71.86 to 128.15 | 48,184 | 47,012 |
| 1960 TO 1969 |  | 7 | 76.55 | 75.08 | 74.19 | 20.14 |  | 101.21 | 40.04 | 105.68 | 40.04 to 105.68 | 81,428 | 60,408 |
| 1970 TO 1979 |  | 6 | 93.18 | 90.86 | 83.40 | 17.12 |  | 108.94 | 51.22 | 121.63 | 51.22 to 121.63 | 93,583 | 78,047 |
| 1980 TO 1989 |  | 4 | 80.67 | 88.25 | 48.52 | 43.75 |  | 181.89 | 35.16 | 156.48 | N/A | 131,625 | 63,858 |
| 1990 TO 1994 |  | 1 | 91.53 | 91.53 | 91.53 |  |  |  | 91.53 | 91.53 | N/A | 126,840 | 116,100 |
| 1995 TO 1999 |  | 3 | 105.96 | 102.70 | 120.46 | 16.92 |  | 85.26 | 74.18 | 127.96 | N/A | 1,265,000 | 1,523,825 |
| 2000 TO Pres | nt | 1 | 100.10 | 100.10 | 100.10 |  |  |  | 100.10 | 100.10 | N/A | 187,000 | 187,190 |
| _ALL_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 57 | 95.03 | 94.67 | 101.18 | 21.47 |  | 93.56 | 35.16 | 156.48 | 89.10 to 104.50 | 135,171 | 136,769 |
| SALE PRICE <br> RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 1 | 142.20 | 142.20 | 142.20 |  |  |  | 142.20 | 142.20 | N/A | 2,500 | 3,555 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 5 | 104.50 | 100.96 | 100.98 | 8.75 |  | 99.98 | 88.20 | 112.00 | N/A | 6,500 | 6,564 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 6 | 107.75 | 107.83 | 103.93 | 12.90 |  | 103.76 | 88.20 | 142.20 | 88.20 to 142.20 | 5,833 | 6,062 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 15 | 103.76 | 102.29 | 99.72 | 23.04 |  | 102.57 | 52.42 | 156.48 | 70.74 to 112.80 | 18,001 | 17,951 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 12 | 100.98 | 99.66 | 98.75 | 20.44 |  | 100.92 | 64.64 | 133.29 | 71.86 to 122.54 | 42,991 | 42,454 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 5 | 90.60 | 76.96 | 76.96 | 19.60 |  | 99.99 | 40.04 | 96.07 | N/A | 65,300 | 50,257 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 7 | 94.56 | 92.12 | 91.69 | 12.41 |  | 100.47 | 51.22 | 115.13 | 51.22 to 115.13 | 119,548 | 109,615 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 7 | 76.63 | 78.25 | 78.25 | 8.73 |  | 100.01 | 60.91 | 100.10 | 60.91 to 100.10 | 166,500 | 130,280 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 4 | 86.24 | 78.40 | 77.91 | 27.51 |  | 100.63 | 35.16 | 105.96 | N/A | 388,750 | 302,865 |
| $500000+$ |  | 1 | 127.96 | 127.96 | 127.96 |  |  |  | 127.96 | 127.96 | N/A | 3,000,000 | 3,838,720 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 57 | 95.03 | 94.67 | 101.18 | 21.47 |  | 93.56 | 35.16 | 156.48 | 89.10 to 104.50 | 135,171 | 136,769 |




SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE
Query: 5742
What If ID: 4889
Desc: New Whatif for Query ID: 5742

| Strata Hdg. | Strata | Chg.Value | Chg.Type | Pct.Chg. | Group | Priority |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessor Location | O'neill | Imprvmnt | Decrease | 19.000 | A | 1 |

## 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2006 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

|  | 2006 CTL <br> County Total | 2007 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2007 Form 45-2006 CTL) | Percent <br> Change | 2007 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 179,327,665 | 199,667,970 | 20,340,305 | 11.34 | 4,266,223 | 8.96 |
| 2. Recreational | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 41,329,855 | 52,180,855 | 10,851,000 | 26.25 | *--- | 26.25 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 220,657,520 | 251,848,825 | 31,191,305 | 14.14 | 4,266,223 | 12.2 |
| 5. Commercial | 44,955,725 | 49,211,695 | 4,255,970 | 9.47 | 972,215 | 7.3 |
| 6. Industrial | 5,444,450 | 6,132,595 | 688,145 | 12.64 | 0 | 12.64 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 36,681,020 | 40,169,675 | 3,488,655 | 9.51 | 1,337,855 | 5.86 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 87,081,195 | 95,513,965 | 8,432,770 | 9.68 | 972,215 | 8.57 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 307,738,715 | 347,362,790 | 39,624,075 | 12.88 | 6,576,293 | 10.74 |
| 11. Irrigated | 304,282,260 | 313,932,375 | 9,650,115 | 3.17 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 37,025,555 | 36,543,585 | -481,970 | -1.3 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 437,209,255 | 436,312,105 | -897,150 | -0.21 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 1986055 | 1,987,395 | 1,340 | 0.07 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 811,030 | 810,030 | -1,000 | -0.12 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 781,314,155 | 789,585,490 | 8,271,335 | 1.06 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 1,089,052,870 | 1,136,948,280 | 47,895,410 | 4.4 | 6,576,293 | 3.79 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 outbuildings is shown in line 7.

45 - HOLT COUNTY

## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics

## Type: Qualified



## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics




## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics



## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified


## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics

# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 

State Stat Run

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:

95\% Median C.I.: 91.53 to 108.67


## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics <br> Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007



## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics

## Type: Qualified



# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 



## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics <br> Type: Qualified



## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics <br> Type: Qualified



Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


45 - HOLT COUNTY

## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics

## Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


## PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics

# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 

State Stat Run


NonValid School
_ALL__

|  |  | 186 | 71.52 | 75.30 | 72.94 | 23.73 | 103.23 | 7.61 | 284.43 | 68.49 to 73.86 | 244,439 | 178,293 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACRES IN SALERANGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
|  |  | Count | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 0.01 TO | 10.00 | 1 | 60.64 | 60.64 | 60.64 |  |  | 60.64 | 60.64 | N/A | 7,000 | 4,245 |
| 10.01 то | 30.00 | 1 | 171.96 | 171.96 | 171.96 |  |  | 171.96 | 171.96 | N/A | 12,000 | 20,635 |
| 30.01 то | 50.00 | 6 | 60.16 | 60.43 | 45.55 | 39.78 | 132.67 | 7.61 | 95.17 | 7.61 to 95.17 | 36,433 | 16,594 |
| 50.01 то | 100.00 | 14 | 75.88 | 92.26 | 79.63 | 38.81 | 115.85 | 44.39 | 284.43 | 58.79 to 94.61 | 78,405 | 62,436 |
| 100.01 TO | 180.00 | 99 | 68.59 | 71.46 | 69.89 | 19.63 | 102.25 | 20.00 | 129.74 | 65.40 to 72.63 | 184,050 | 128,637 |
| 180.01 TO | 330.00 | 32 | 71.25 | 72.02 | 69.33 | 18.24 | 103.88 | 46.21 | 124.30 | 60.61 to 78.65 | 341,668 | 236,884 |
| 330.01 TO | 650.00 | 23 | 72.80 | 76.33 | 68.71 | 22.55 | 111.09 | 31.26 | 126.46 | 65.70 to 82.55 | 321,420 | 220,839 |
| ALL |  | 10 | 90.66 | 98.32 | 89.26 | 28.24 | 110.14 | 59.70 | 145.87 | 61.32 to 137.91 | 758,348 | 676,939 |
|  |  | 186 | 71.52 | 75.30 | 72.94 | 23.73 | 103.23 | 7.61 | 284.43 | 68.49 to 73.86 | 244,439 | 178,293 |

45 - HOLT COUNTY


## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

State Stat Run


NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:

95\% Median C.I.: 89.47 to 96.65
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:
261
$13,335,113$
$13,384,613$
$11,625,760$
51,282
44,543

MEDIAN:
COV
.
. 46
GT. MEAN
AVG.ABS.DEV: $\quad 24.38$
95\% Wat. Mean C.I.: 83.66 to 90.06
95\% Mean C.I.: 93.92 to 103.36

## RANGE

NGE $\quad$ Qrtrs____

$\qquad$ ALL
ASSESSOR LOCATION
RANGE
RANGE
AMELIA
ATKINSON
CHAMBERS
EMMET
EWING
INMAN
O'NEILL
PAGE
RURAL
STUART
$\quad$


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 

State Stat Run

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
261
$13,335,113$
$13,384,613$
$11,625,760$
51,282

## MEDIAN:

GT. MEAN: MEAN :

COV: STD
AVG.ABS.DEV:
COD :
PRD :
25.91 MAX Sales Ratio: 315.67

95\% Median C.I.: 89.47 to 96.65
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 83.66 to 90.06
95\% Mean C.I.: 93.92 to 103.36

| YEAR BUILT * |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| O OR Blank | 26 |
| Prior TO 1860 | 6 |
| 1860 TO 1899 | 40 |
| 1900 | TO 1919 |
| 1920 TO 1939 | 49 |
| 1940 | TO 1949 |
| 1950 TO 1959 | 25 |
| 1960 | TO 1969 |


|  | ALL_ |
| :--- | ---: |
| SALE PRICE * | 261 |
| RANGE | COUNT |


| Low $\$$ |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 TO | 4999 |  |
| 5000 TO | 9999 |  |
| Total | $\$$ |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 |  |
| $10000 ~ T O$ | 29999 |  |
| 30000 TO | 59999 |  |
| 60000 TO | 99999 |  |
| 100000 TO | 149999 |  |
| 150000 TO | 249999 |  |
| 250000 TO | 499999 |  |


| 17 | 90.60 | 108.27 | 100.51 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 24 | 129.97 | 135.43 | 133.91 |
| 41 | 100.00 | 124.17 | 126.31 |
| 56 | 108.57 | 116.50 | 113.81 |
| 76 | 88.74 | 89.34 | 88.71 |
| 53 | 90.54 | 84.99 | 85.19 |
| 26 | 82.80 | 82.79 | 82.67 |
| 8 | 82.33 | 77.84 | 77.17 |
| 1 | 60.03 | 60.03 | 60.03 |
| 261 | 94.11 | 98.64 | 86.86 |


| 33.97 | 107.73 |
| :--- | ---: |
| 36.41 | 101.13 |
|  |  |
| 43.16 | 98.31 |
| 23.01 | 102.36 |
| 23.18 | 100.71 |
| 16.09 | 99.77 |
| 11.04 | 100.15 |
| 16.66 | 100.87 |
|  |  |
| 25.91 | 113.56 |

36.00
39.38
36.00
68.78
18.64
32.12
59.62
41.75
60.03
314.00
315.67
315.67
280.23
183.67
124.26
109.47
99.98
60.03
82.44 to 112.50

6,665
2,787
94.89 to 160.19

6,665
8,925
90.60 to 135.30

| 5,051 | 6,380 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 18,535 | 21,095 |
| 41,837 | 37,115 |
| 77,823 | 66,298 |
| 120,777 | 99,842 |
| 171,255 | 132,151 |
| 325,000 | 195,110 |

R

Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007



# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 

State Stat Run

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:


96

95\% Median C.I.: 86.08 to 99.12
(!: Derived)
7,812,260

GGt MEAN:
COV: MEAN :

92 AVG.ABS.DEV: 23.43
23.43

6,862,160
130,943
116,307

95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 76.55 to 101.09
95\% Mean C.I.: 84.48 to 100.24

Printed: 02/17/2007 13:16:56

| DATE OF SALE * |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/03 то 09/30/03 | 2 |
| 10/01/03 то 12/31/03 | 1 |
| 01/01/04 то 03/31/04 | 5 |
| 04/01/04 TO 06/30/04 | 7 |
| 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 | 7 |
| 10/01/04 TO 12/31/04 | 2 |
| 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 | 4 |
| 04/01/05 TO 06/30/05 | 9 |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 | 7 |
| 10/01/05 TO 12/31/05 |  |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 7 |
| 04/01/06 TO 06/30/06 | 8 |
| __Study Years__ |  |
| 07/01/03 TO 06/30/04 | 15 |
| 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 | 22 |
| 07/01/05 то 06/30/06 | 22 |
| $\qquad$ Calendar Yrs |  |
| 01/01/04 TO 12/31/04 | 21 |
| 01/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 20 |


| DATE OF SALE * |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/03 то 09/30/03 | 2 |
| 10/01/03 то 12/31/03 | 1 |
| 01/01/04 то 03/31/04 | 5 |
| 04/01/04 то 06/30/04 | 7 |
| 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 | 7 |
| 10/01/04 то 12/31/04 | 2 |
| 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 | 4 |
| 04/01/05 то 06/30/05 | 9 |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 | 7 |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 |  |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 7 |
| 04/01/06 TO 06/30/06 | 8 |
| Study Years |  |
| 07/01/03 то 06/30/04 | 15 |
| 07/01/04 то 06/30/05 | 22 |
| 07/01/05 то 06/30/06 | 22 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |
| 01/01/04 то 12/31/04 | 21 |
| 01/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 20 |
| ALL |  |

$\qquad$

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

ATKINSON
CHAMBERS
EWING
INMAN
O'NEILL
PAGE
RURAL
STUART
$\qquad$

| DATE OF SALE * |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/03 то 09/30/03 | 2 |
| 10/01/03 то 12/31/03 | 1 |
| 01/01/04 то 03/31/04 | 5 |
| 04/01/04 то 06/30/04 | 7 |
| 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 | 7 |
| 10/01/04 TO 12/31/04 | 2 |
| 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 | 4 |
| 04/01/05 то 06/30/05 | 9 |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 | 7 |
| 10/01/05 тO 12/31/05 |  |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 7 |
| 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 | 8 |
| Study Years |  |
| 07/01/03 то 06/30/04 | 15 |
| 07/01/04 то 06/30/05 | 22 |
| 07/01/05 то 06/30/06 | 22 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |
| 01/01/04 то 12/31/04 | 21 |
| 01/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 20 |

59

| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| 83.81 | 83.81 | 83.82 |
| 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| 90.00 | 88.04 | 91.14 |
| 95.54 | 88.65 | 70.65 |
| 95.60 | 93.15 | 65.79 |
| 93.41 | 93.41 | 92.32 |
| 72.24 | 77.62 | 97.32 |
| 98.36 | 103.96 | 98.08 |
| 110.74 | 110.11 | 104.40 |
|  |  |  |
| 96.63 | 100.35 | 96.10 |
| 68.03 | 70.33 | 59.98 |
|  |  |  |
| 90.00 | 88.56 | 83.40 |
| 95.90 | 94.77 | 91.03 |
| 93.79 | 92.54 | 85.22 |
|  |  |  |
| 95.54 | 90.46 | 73.02 |
| 103.45 | 100.84 | 98.59 |

Avg. Adj. Avg.

都
-
$95.54 \quad 92.36$

| COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 14 | 65.31 | 71.84 | 57.87 |
| 3 | 99.12 | 112.65 | 101.59 |
| 1 | 49.15 | 49.15 | 49.15 |
| 1 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| 25 | 98.36 | 104.23 | 100.47 |
| 2 | 70.65 | 70.65 | 65.69 |
| 8 | 97.71 | 97.37 | 97.81 |
| 5 | 83.04 | 86.03 | 58.02 |
| 59 | 95.54 | 92.36 | 88.82 |

24.52

| 3 |
| ---: |
| 103.98 |
|  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. |  |  |
| 39.58 | 124.14 | 37.35 | 130.82 | 42.64 to 102.53 | 78,750 | 45,573 |
| 15.32 | 110.89 | 96.63 | 142.20 | N/A | 11,833 | 12,021 |
|  |  | 49.15 | 49.15 | N/A | 26,000 | 12,780 |
|  |  | 100.00 | 100.00 | N/A | 12,520 | 12,520 |
| 22.26 | 103.75 | 44.35 | 164.00 | 90.00 to 119.39 | 85,731 | 86,131 |
| 22.33 | 107.55 | 54.87 | 86.42 | N/A | 17,500 | 11,495 |
| 10.41 | 99.55 | 75.66 | 119.21 | 75.66 to 119.21 | 455,687 | 445,703 |
| 28.37 | 148.28 | 35.14 | 144.92 | N/A | 145,068 | 84,173 |
| 24.52 | 103.98 | 35.14 | 164.00 | 86.08 to 99.12 | 130,943 | 116,307 |

# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 

State Stat Run


# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 

State Stat Run


# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 

State Stat Run


# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007 

State Stat Run


Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007



Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007

|  | NUMBER of Sales: |  | 191 | MEDIAN: | 70 |  | COV: | 29.98 | 95\% Median C.I.: 67.77 to 72.80 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (!: Derived) } \\ & \text { (!: land }+N A T=0) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: |  | 50,140,099 | WGT. MEAN: | 72 |  | STD: | 22.02 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 67.9 | to 75.20 |  |
| (AgLand) | tOTAL Adj. Sales Price: |  | 46,983,338 | MEAN : | 73 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 15.54 |  | Mean C.I.: | to 76.55 |  |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: |  | 33,629,585 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: |  | 245,986 | COD : | 22.12 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 171.96 |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: |  | 176,071 | PRD : | 102.59 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 7.61 |  |  | Printed: 02/24/2007 17:15:33 |  |
| SCHOOL | DISTRICT * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE <br> (blank) | COUNT | MEDIAN | N MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 02-0006 | 1 | 47.16 | $6 \quad 47.16$ | 47.16 |  |  |  | 47.16 | 47.16 | N/A | 80,000 | 37,725 |
| 02-0049 | 12 | 63.66 | $6 \quad 64.92$ | 66.87 | 14.01 |  | 97.09 | 52.88 | 87.84 | 54.86 to 73.53 | 289,733 | 193,736 |
| 08-0036 | 3 | 59.70 | - 57.86 | 58.19 | 5.74 |  | 99.44 | 51.80 | 62.08 | N/A | 376,001 | 218,790 |
| 08-0038 | 12 | 73.72 | 270.36 | 65.98 | 21.63 |  | 106.64 | 31.26 | 95.17 | 55.88 to 87.28 | 189,719 | 125,175 |
| 36-0100 | 5 | 97.33 | $3 \quad 99.91$ | 106.19 | 20.47 |  | 94.09 | 74.45 | 145.87 | N/A | 205,204 | 217,897 |
| 45-0007 | 77 | 68.51 | $1 \quad 69.24$ | 68.11 | 16.53 |  | 101.66 | 35.87 | 124.30 | 63.88 to 72.22 | 260,154 | 177,194 |
| 45-0029 | 13 | 77.23 | $3 \quad 71.80$ | 78.09 | 21.80 |  | 91.94 | 7.61 | 98.78 | 64.25 to 94.61 | 166,350 | 129,896 |
| 45-0044 | 13 | 72.09 | 980.51 | 78.42 | 24.89 |  | 102.66 | 60.64 | 171.96 | 61.08 to 90.80 | 406,035 | 318,424 |
| 45-0137 | 16 | 83.91 | 192.71 | 87.08 | 25.22 |  | 106.47 | 55.55 | 151.55 | 70.31 to 109.07 | 99,099 | 86,291 |
| 45-0239 | 39 | 67.77 | $7 \quad 74.00$ | 72.11 | 26.55 |  | 102.62 | 20.00 | 137.34 | 60.95 to 77.60 | 254,805 | 183,750 |

NonValid School
_ALL__

|  |  | 191 | 70.24 | 73.43 | 71.58 | 22.12 | 102.59 | 7.61 | 171.96 | 67.77 to 72.80 | 245,986 | 176,071 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACRES IN SALERANGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
|  |  | Count | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 0.01 TO | 10.00 | 1 | 60.64 | 60.64 | 60.64 |  |  | 60.64 | 60.64 | N/A | 7,000 | 4,245 |
| 10.01 то | 30.00 | 1 | 171.96 | 171.96 | 171.96 |  |  | 171.96 | 171.96 | N/A | 12,000 | 20,635 |
| 30.01 то | 50.00 | 6 | 60.16 | 60.43 | 45.55 | 39.78 | 132.67 | 7.61 | 95.17 | 7.61 to 95.17 | 36,433 | 16,594 |
| 50.01 TO | 100.00 | 15 | 73.00 | 77.12 | 73.40 | 19.54 | 105.07 | 44.39 | 151.55 | 68.85 to 85.25 | 83,245 | 61,103 |
| 100.01 TO | 180.00 | 101 | 68.49 | 71.19 | 68.92 | 19.77 | 103.29 | 20.00 | 129.74 | 64.25 to 72.22 | 182,965 | 126,099 |
| 180.01 TO | 330.00 | 32 | 70.88 | 69.95 | 67.67 | 16.88 | 103.36 | 46.21 | 124.30 | 58.62 to 77.60 | 341,668 | 231,220 |
| 330.01 TO | 650.00 | 25 | 72.58 | 75.01 | 67.72 | 22.23 | 110.76 | 31.26 | 126.46 | 63.09 to 82.02 | 340,026 | 230,272 |
| 650.01 + |  | 10 | 90.66 | 96.94 | 88.31 | 26.11 | 109.78 | 59.70 | 145.87 | 61.38 to 137.34 | 758,348 | 669,667 |
| _ALL_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 191 | 70.24 | 73.43 | 71.58 | 22.12 | 102.59 | 7.61 | 171.96 | 67.77 to 72.80 | 245,986 | 176,071 |

Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007


# 2007 Assessment Survey for Holt County <br> March 19, 2007 

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

1. Deputy(ies) on staff:

1
2. Appraiser(s) on staff:

0
3. Other full-time employees:
(Does not include anyone counted in 1 and 2 above)
3
4. Other part-time employees:
(Does not include anyone counted in 1 through 3 above)
0
5. Number of shared employees:
(Employees who are shared between the assessor's office and other county officeswill not include anyone counted in 1 through 4 above).

0
6. Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: $\$ 168,713$.
(This would be the "total budget" for the assessor's office)
7. Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system (How much is particularly part of the assessor budget, versus the amount that is part of the county budget?): \$10,005.
8. Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: $\$ 152,613$.
9. Amount of total budget set aside for appraisal work: $\$ 56,194$.
10. Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops: $\$ 500$.
11. Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget: None.
12. Other miscellaneous funds: $\$ 750$.
(Any amount not included in any of the above for equipping, staffing and funding the appraisal/assessment function. This would include any County Board, or general fund monies set aside for reappraisal, etc. If the assessor is ex-officio, this can be an estimate.) This amount is additional money from the county general fund for continuing education separate from the assessor's budget.
13. Total budget: $\$ 152,613$.
a. Was any of last year's budget not used?

Yes, $\$ 6,424$ was turned back to the county general fund.
B. Residential Appraisal Information
(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1. Data collection done by:

Assessor and deputy
2. Valuation done by:

Assessor, deputy and staff determine the valuation, with the assessor being responsible for the final value of the property.
3. Pickup work done by:

Assessor and deputy

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 54 | 12 | 0 | 66 |

4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
June 2002 Marshall-Swift
5. What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? 2004
6. What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?
The assessor does not currently use the sales comparison approach.
7. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:

9 - Atkinson, Chambers, Emmet, Ewing, Inman, O’Neill, Page, Stuart and Rural
8. How are these defined?

These market areas are defined by location, specifically by town and rural.
9. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity?

Yes
10. Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural residential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) Yes
11. Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner?
Yes

## C. Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1. Data collection done by:

Assessor and deputy
2. Valuation done by:

Assessor and deputy determine the valuation, with the assessor being responsible for the final value of the property.
3. Pickup work done by whom:

Assessor and deputy

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
June 2002 Marshall-Swift
5. When was the last time the depreciation schedule for this property class or any subclass was developed using market-derived information?
2004
6. When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
The income approach has not been utilized.
7. When was the last time that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class?
The assessor does not currently use the sales comparison approach.
8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class?

9 - Atkinson, Chambers, Emmet, Ewing, Inman, O’Neill, Page, Stuart and Rural
9. How are these defined?

These market areas are defined by location, specifically by town and rural.
10. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity?

Yes
11. Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?)
Yes
D. Agricultural Appraisal Information

1. Data collection done by:

Assessor and deputy
2. Valuation done by:

Assessor
3. Pickup work done by whom:

Assessor and deputy

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural | 0 | 25 | 40 | 65 |

4. Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
At this time the County does not have a written policy, but plans to develop one for future use.
How is your agricultural land defined?
Agricultural land is defined according to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359.
5. When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
The income approach has never been utilized.
6. What is the date of the soil survey currently used?

1995
7. What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
1987. Review began in the fall of 2005.
a. By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) Physical inspection and FSA maps
b. By whom?

Assessor and deputy
c. What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
$30 \%$ of the review started in 2005 is implemented at this time.
8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: 2
9. How are these defined?

The market areas are defined by location.
10. Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county? No

## E. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1. Administrative software:

Terra Scan
2. CAMA software:

Terra Scan
3. Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?

Yes
a. Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?

Assessor and clerk
4. Does the county have GIS software?

No
a. Who maintains the GIS software and maps?

N/A
4. Personal Property software:

Terra Scan

## F. Zoning Information

1. Does the county have zoning? Yes
a. If so, is the zoning countywide?

Yes
b. What municipalities in the county are zoned?

Atkinson, Ewing, O'Neill and Stuart
c. When was zoning implemented?

1998
G. Contracted Services

1. Appraisal Services: (are these contracted, or conducted "in-house?")

In-House
2. Other Services:
H. Additional comments or further explanations on any item from A through G:

## II. Assessment Actions

## 2007 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

## 1. Residential

For assessment year 2007 the Holt County Assessor updated to the June 2002 Marshall-Swift costing of all residential improvements within the Terra Scan computer system. A market study was also performed on lots in the town of Stuart and adjusted accordingly.

The Holt County Assessor reviewed all residential sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

Pick up work was completed and placed on the 2007 assessment roll.

## 2. Commercial

For assessment year 2007 the Holt County Assessor updated to the June 2002 Marshall-Swift costing of all commercial improvements within the Terra Scan computer system. Commercial properties within Atkinson were revalued based on a sales study performed by the Assessor.

The Holt County Assessor reviewed all commercial sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

Pick up work was completed and placed on the 2007 assessment roll.

## 3. Agricultural

For the assessment year 2007 the Holt County Assessor performed a spreadsheet analysis of agricultural sales and adjusted values according to the market.

Market area 1 values stayed the same for 2007. In market area 2 the top six classes of irrigated were increased by $10 \%$. 4G1 and 4G were raised by $\$ 10$ an acre based on the analysis.

A land use study of the county began in the fall of 2005 with $30 \%$ now being implemented for assessment year 2007. The planned on-site review of rural improvements has still not begun. Once this begins, new property record cards for agricultural properties will be implemented.

The assessor does map all agricultural sales in a book within the office to provide information to the public about current land valuation.

The Holt County Assessor reviewed all agricultural sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

All agricultural improvements were updated to the June 2002 Marshall-Swift costing within the Terra Scan computer system.

Pick up work was completed and placed on the 2007 assessment roll.

## County 45 - Holt
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County 45 - Holt

| Total Real Property Value |  |  | ecords |  | Value 1,13 | 8,280 | (Sum 17, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Growth } \\ , \& 41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 6,576,293 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule I:Non-Agricultural Records (Com and Ind) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 9. Comm UnImp Land | 79 | 430,945 | 8 | 83,850 | 17 | 73,195 | 104 | 587,990 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10. Comm } \\ & \text { Improv Land } \end{aligned}$ | 509 | 3,382,685 | 25 | 201,035 | 69 | 690,655 | 603 | 4,274,375 |  |
| 11. Comm Improvements | 521 | 32,944,585 | 28 | 2,172,265 | 87 | 9,232,480 | 636 | 44,349,330 |  |
| 12. Comm Total \% of Total | 600 | 36,758,215 | 36 | 2,457,150 | 104 | 9,996,330 | 740 | 49,211,695 | 972,215 |
|  | 81.08 | 74.69 | 4.86 | 4.99 | 14.05 | 20.31 | 6.16 | 4.32 | 14.78 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13. Ind } \\ & \text { UnImp Land } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5,390 | 1 | 32,960 | 2 | 38,350 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14. Ind } \\ & \text { Improv Land } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 147,065 | 2 | 12,060 | 4 | 57,720 | 7 | 216,845 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15. Ind } \\ & \text { Improvements } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 125,765 | 2 | 551,970 | 4 | 5,199,665 | 7 | 5,877,400 |  |
| 16. Ind Total \% of Total | 1 | 272,830 | 3 | 569,420 | 5 | 5,290,345 | 9 | 6,132,595 | 0 |
|  | 11.11 | 4.44 | 33.33 | 9.28 | 55.55 | 86.26 | 0.07 | 0.53 | 0.00 |
| Comm+Ind Total <br> \% of Total | 601 | 37,031,045 | 39 | 3,026,570 | 109 | 15,286,675 | 749 | 55,344,290 | 972,215 |
|  | 80.24 | 66.91 | 5.20 | 5.46 | 14.55 | 27.62 | 6.23 | 4.86 | 14.78 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 17. Taxable } \\ \text { Total } \\ \% \text { of Total } \end{gathered}$ | 4,114 | 182,139,155 | 405 | 28,722,570 | 567 | 44,150,535 | 5,086 | 255,012,260 | 5,238,438 |
|  | 80.88 | 71.42 | 7.96 | 10.07 | 11.14 | 11.31 | 42.34 | 22.42 | 79.65 |
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## County 45 - Holt

| Schedule VI: Agricultural Records: Non-Agricultural Detail | Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 4 | 4.000 | 12,000 | 4 | 3.330 | 10,000 |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 2 |  | 120,345 | 2 |  | 20,720 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 4 | 4.600 | 2,645 | 4 | 5.150 | 2,960 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 4 |  | 52,515 | 7 |  | 265,965 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |  | 8.810 |  |  | 0.760 |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0.000 | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total <br> Acres | Value |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 31 | 31.820 | 95,460 | 31 | 31.820 | 95,460 |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 1,213 | 1,327.290 | 3,981,870 | 1,221 | 1,334.620 | 4,003,870 |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 1,220 |  | 47,940,460 | 1,224 |  | 48,081,525 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 1,255 | 1,366.440 | 52,180,855 |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 68 | 73.410 | 42,270 | 68 | 73.410 | 42,270 |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 1,675 | 2,223.960 | 1,281,945 | 1,683 | 2,233.710 | 1,287,550 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 1,887 |  | 38,521,375 | 1,898 |  | 38,839,855 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 1,966 | 2,307.120 | 40,169,675 |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |  | 18,377.660 |  |  | 18,387.230 |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0.000 | 0 |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 3,221 | 22,060.790 | 92,350,530 |
| Schedule VII: Agricultural Records: Ag Land Detail-Game \& Parks | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total <br> Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 5 | 740.390 | 237,785 | 5 | 740.390 | 237,785 |
| Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records: Special Value | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |

## County 45 - Holt <br> 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 45. 1A1 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 292.000 | 195,235 | 292.000 | 195,235 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6,137.960 | 3,907,600 | 6,137.960 | 3,907,600 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10,148.770 | 6,338,360 | 10,148.770 | 6,338,360 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 9,968.600 | 5,776,035 | 9,968.600 | 5,776,035 |
| 58. 3D1 | 3.550 | 1,990 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,510.870 | 3,073,350 | 5,514.420 | 3,075,340 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 17,898.480 | 9,291,380 | 17,898.480 | 9,291,380 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6,231.410 | 1,930,890 | 6,231.410 | 1,930,890 |
| 61.4D | 0.500 | 145 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,324.720 | 1,544,160 | 5,325.220 | 1,544,305 |
| 62. Total | 4.050 | 2,135 | 0.000 | 0 | 61,512.810 | 32,057,010 | 61,516.860 | 32,059,145 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 228.200 | 111,820 | 228.200 | 111,820 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 9,400.520 | 4,599,640 | 9,400.520 | 4,599,640 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 19,950.480 | 9,769,260 | 19,950.480 | 9,769,260 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 28,763.980 | 14,050,835 | 28,763.980 | 14,050,835 |
| 67.3G1 | 67.530 | 32,800 | 0.000 | 0 | 13,433.510 | 6,428,860 | 13,501.040 | 6,461,660 |
| 68. 3G | 97.060 | 41,980 | 122.780 | 61,670 | 225,680.640 | 113,180,690 | 225,900.480 | 113,284,340 |
| 69.4G1 | 91.110 | 27,960 | 292.000 | 103,660 | 449,786.200 | 176,255,595 | 450,169.310 | 176,387,215 |
| 70.4G | 25.020 | 6,915 | 407.170 | 118,080 | 331,273.510 | 97,021,485 | 331,705.700 | 97,146,480 |
| 71. Total | 280.720 | 109,655 | 821.950 | 283,410 | 1,078,517.040 | 421,418,185 | 1,079,619.710 | 421,811,250 |


| 72. Waste | 4.000 | 120 | 21.000 | 630 | $62,146.560$ | $1,963,500$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 73. Other | 10.000 | 1,000 | 6.000 | 600 | $7,120.790$ | 709,985 | $7,136.790$ | $1,964,250$ |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 125.750 |  |  |  |
| 75. Total | 314.120 | 133,415 | 848.950 | 284,640 | $1,415,696.280$ | $697,030,305$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 1 6 , 8 5 9}$ |  |

## County 45 - Holt <br> 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
2

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 3,280 | 3,650.000 | 5,986,000 | 3,652.000 | 5,989,280 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.130 | 1,855 | 10,313.200 | 16,913,650 | 10,314.330 | 16,915,505 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,605.780 | 9,193,485 | 5,605.780 | 9,193,485 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,775.980 | 4,549,485 | 2,775.980 | 4,549,485 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 19,754.970 | 32,338,285 | 19,754.970 | 32,338,285 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,115.640 | 2,367,715 | 2,115.640 | 2,367,715 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,044.500 | 1,676,490 | 2,044.500 | 1,676,490 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 3.130 | 5,135 | 46,260.070 | 73,025,110 | 46,263.200 | 73,030,245 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 6.180 | 3,990 | 1,191.630 | 768,610 | 1,197.810 | 772,600 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,395.810 | 2,122,465 | 3,395.810 | 2,122,465 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 899.160 | 521,510 | 899.160 | 521,510 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 432.480 | 241,435 | 432.480 | 241,435 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 26.000 | 14,300 | 1,227.970 | 675,385 | 1,253.970 | 689,685 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 200.500 | 62,095 | 200.500 | 62,095 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 257.410 | 74,650 | 257.410 | 74,650 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 32.180 | 18,290 | 7,604.960 | 4,466,150 | 7,637.140 | 4,484,440 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 8.230 | 4,525 | 1,130.960 | 622,040 | 1,139.190 | 626,565 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.360 | 2,950 | 4,077.890 | 2,240,825 | 4,083.250 | 2,243,775 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,219.780 | 1,213,410 | 2,219.780 | 1,213,410 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 846.780 | 461,280 | 846.780 | 461,280 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 22.670 | 13,440 | 13,325.130 | 7,111,995 | 13,347.800 | 7,125,435 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,696.680 | 1,321,050 | 3,696.680 | 1,321,050 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,287.290 | 1,509,340 | 5,287.290 | 1,509,340 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 36.260 | 20,915 | 30,584.510 | 14,479,940 | 30,620.770 | 14,500,855 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 775.500 | 23,145 | 775.500 | 23,145 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 986.460 | 98,445 | 986.460 | 98,445 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 71.570 | 44,340 | 86,211.500 | 92,092,790 | 86,283.070 | 92,137,130 |

## County 45 - Holt

2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

| Urban |  |  | U | Rural |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 15.350 | 20,505 | 3.130 | 5,135 | 252,659.150 | 313,906,735 | 252,677.630 | 313,932,375 |
| 77.Dry Land | 4.050 | 2,135 | 32.180 | 18,290 | 69,117.770 | 36,523,160 | 69,154.000 | 36,543,585 |
| 78.Grass | 280.720 | 109,655 | 858.210 | 304,325 | 1,109,101.550 | 435,898,125 | 1,110,240.480 | 436,312,105 |
| 79.Waste | 4.000 | 120 | 21.000 | 630 | 62,922.060 | 1,986,645 | 62,947.060 | 1,987,395 |
| 80.Other | 10.000 | 1,000 | 6.000 | 600 | 8,107.250 | 808,430 | 8,123.250 | 810,030 |
| 81.Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 125.750 | 0 | 125.750 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 314.120 | 133,415 | 920.520 | 328,980 | 1,501,907.780 | 789,123,095 | 1,503,142.420 | 789,585,490 |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 45 - Holt

Market Area:

| Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value ${ }^{*}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 888,610 | $0.37 \%$ | $1,598.219$ |
| $18,030,170$ | $7.48 \%$ | $1,558.945$ |
| $31,825,100$ | $13.21 \%$ | $1,489.266$ |
| $28,572,610$ | $11.86 \%$ | $1,448.186$ |
| $18,631,300$ | $7.73 \%$ | $1,334.777$ |
| $92,304,940$ | $38.32 \%$ | $1,256.074$ |
| $37,527,715$ | $15.58 \%$ | 779.470 |
| $13,121,685$ | $5.45 \%$ | 745.427 |
| $240,902,130$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,167.079$ |


| Dry: |
| :--- |
| 1D1 292.000 $0.47 \%$  608 60.613 <br> 1D $6,137.960$ $9.98 \%$ 195,235 $0.61 \%$ 636.628 <br> 2D1 $10,148.770$ $16.50 \%$ $3,907,600$ $12.19 \%$ 624.544 <br> 2D $9,968.600$ $16.20 \%$ $6,338,360$ $19.77 \%$ 579.422 <br> 3D1 $5,514.420$ $8.96 \%$ $5,776,035$ $18.02 \%$ 557.690 <br> 3D $17,898.480$ $29.10 \%$ $3,075,340$ $9.59 \%$ 519.115 <br> 4D1 $6,231.410$ $10.13 \%$ $9,291,380$ $28.98 \%$ 309.864 <br> 4D $5,325.220$ $8.66 \%$ $1,930,890$ $6.02 \%$ 289.998 <br> Dry Total $61,516.860$ $100.00 \%$ $1,544,305$ $4.82 \%$ 521.144 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 228.200 | $0.02 \%$ | 111,820 | $0.03 \%$ | 490.008 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $9,400.520$ | $0.87 \%$ | $4,599,640$ | $1.09 \%$ | 489.296 |
| 2G1 | $19,950.480$ | $1.85 \%$ | $9,769,260$ | $2.32 \%$ | 489.675 |
| 2G | $28,763.980$ | $2.66 \%$ | $14,050,835$ | $3.33 \%$ | 488.487 |
| 3G1 | $13,501.040$ | $1.25 \%$ | $6,461,660$ | $1.53 \%$ | 478.604 |
| 3G | $225,900.480$ | $20.92 \%$ | $113,284,340$ | $26.86 \%$ | 501.478 |
| 4G1 | $450,169.310$ | $41.70 \%$ | $176,387,215$ | $41.82 \%$ | 391.824 |
| 4G | $331,705.700$ | $30.72 \%$ | $97,146,480$ | $23.03 \%$ | 292.869 |
| Grass Total | $1,079,619.710$ | $100.00 \%$ | $421,811,250$ | $100.00 \%$ | 390.703 |
|  | $206,414.430$ | $14.57 \%$ | $240,902,130$ | $34.54 \%$ | $1,167.079$ |
| Irrigated Total | $61,516.860$ | $4.34 \%$ | $32,059,145$ | $4.60 \%$ | 521.144 |
| Dry Total | $1,079,619.710$ | $76.20 \%$ | $421,811,250$ | $60.48 \%$ | 390.703 |
| Grass Total | $62,171.560$ | $4.39 \%$ | $1,964,250$ | $0.28 \%$ | 31.594 |
| Waste | $7,136.790$ | $0.50 \%$ | 711,585 | $0.10 \%$ | 99.706 |
| Other | 125.750 | $0.01 \%$ |  |  | 4 |
| Exempt | $1,416,859.350$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $206,414.430$ | $81.69 \%$ | $240,902,130$ | $76.74 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $61,516.860$ | $88.96 \%$ | $32,059,145$ | $87.73 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $1,079,619.710$ | $97.24 \%$ | $421,811,250$ | $96.68 \%$ |
| Waste | $62,171.560$ | $98.77 \%$ | $1,964,250$ | $98.84 \%$ |
| Other | $7,136.790$ | $87.86 \%$ | 711,585 | $87.85 \%$ |
| Exempt | 125.750 | $100.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $1,416,859.350$ | $94.26 \%$ | $697,448,360$ | $88.33 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 45 - Holt

Market Area: 2

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |
| 1A |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $1,139.190$ | $3.72 \%$ | 626,565 | $4.32 \%$ | 550.009 |
| 2G1 | $4,083.250$ | $13.33 \%$ | $2,243,775$ | $15.47 \%$ | 549.507 |
| 2G | $2,219.780$ | $7.25 \%$ | $1,213,410$ | $8.37 \%$ | 546.635 |
| 3G1 | 846.780 | $2.77 \%$ | 461,280 | $3.18 \%$ | 544.745 |
| 3G | $13,347.800$ | $43.59 \%$ | $7,125,435$ | $49.14 \%$ | 533.828 |
| 4G1 | $3,696.680$ | $12.07 \%$ | $1,321,050$ | $9.11 \%$ | 357.361 |
| 4G | $5,287.290$ | $17.27 \%$ | $1,509,340$ | $10.41 \%$ | 285.465 |
| Grass Total | $30,620.770$ | $100.00 \%$ | $14,500,855$ | $100.00 \%$ | 473.562 |
| Irigated Total | $46,263.200$ | $53.62 \%$ | $73,030,245$ | $79.26 \%$ | $1,578.581$ |
| Dry Total | $7,637.140$ | $8.85 \%$ | $4,484,440$ | $4.87 \%$ | 587.188 |
| Grass Total | $30,620.770$ | $35.49 \%$ | $14,500,855$ | $15.74 \%$ | 473.562 |
| Waste | 775.500 | $0.90 \%$ | 23,145 | $0.03 \%$ | 29.845 |
| Other | 986.460 | $1.14 \%$ | 98,445 | $0.11 \%$ | 99.796 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,067.847$ |
| Market Area Total | $86,283.070$ | $100.00 \%$ | $92,137,130$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $46,263.200$ | $18.31 \%$ | $73,030,245$ | $23.26 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $7,637.140$ | $11.04 \%$ | $4,484,440$ | $12.27 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $30,620.770$ | $2.76 \%$ | $14,500,855$ | $3.32 \%$ |
| Waste | 775.500 | $1.23 \%$ | 23,145 | $1.16 \%$ |
| Other | 986.460 | $12.14 \%$ | 98,445 | $12.15 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $86,283.070$ | $5.74 \%$ | $92,137,130$ | $11.67 \%$ |

## 2007 Agricultural Land Detail

County 45 - Holt


| Total | $\mathbf{1 , 5 0 3 , 1 4 2 . 4 2 0}$ | $789,585,490$ | $1,503,142.420$ | $100.00 \%$ | $789,585,490$ | $100.00 \%$ | 525.289 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Calculates


## PLAN OF ASSESSMENT HOLT COUNTY

Pursuant to section 77-1311 of the statutes of Nebraska, as amended, submitted herewith is the 3-year Plan of Assessment. Said plan is originally submitted to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 of each year and a copy sent to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

Holt County has a total count of 11,961 taxable parcels, being further identified as: $36 \%$ $(4,301)$ residential parcels; $6 \%(751)$ commercial/industrial parcels; and $58 \%(6,909)$ agricultural parcels. There are also 400 exempt parcels.

For 2006, 2264 personal property schedules were filed, plus applications taken for homestead exemptions. Applications for exemption and/or affidavits for continuing exemption are received annually. For 2006, applications were filed by 66 organizations.

Staff for the office consists of the elected assessor, one deputy, and three full-time clerks. Maintenance of property record cards is performed by any staff member. Changes due to transfer are primarily completed by either the assessor or one of the clerks. Personal property filings are managed by the assessor, the deputy or another of the clerks. The third clerk assists with maintaining computer files of real property, plus wherever else needed. Reports required are prepared by the assessor with assistance of all personnel.

The budget request for 2006-07 is $\$ 168,713$, approximately $\$ 61,494$ of which is expected to be used for appraisal maintenance. The CAMA portion within the appraisal maintenance includes a cost of about $\$ 10,000$.

The assessor anticipates attending the 2006 Workshop, which offers hours of continuing education for maintaining the Assessor's certificate. To date, the assessor has accumulated 123 hours, more than enough to renew the certificate. The deputy has accumulated at least 54.5 hours toward his renewal. No other staff member holds an Assessor's certificate.

Cadastral maps are maintained by the assessor and the clerk processing the transfer statements. Photo background of the cadastral maps is 1966. Ownership and descriptions are kept current by the assessor and said clerk.

Reports are generated as follows:

- Real Estate Abstract is to be submitted on or before March 19.
- The Personal Property Abstract is to be submitted on or before June 15.
- A report on the review of ownership and use of all cemetery real property is to be presented to the county board of equalization on or before August 1.
- Certificates of value for taxing authorities are to be submitted on or before August 20.
- School District Taxable Value Report is to be submitted on or before August 25.
- The Plan of Assessment is to be submitted on or before July 31.
- The report of the average assessed value of single-family residential properties is to be reported on or before September 1.
- A list of trusts owning agricultural land is certified to the Nebraska Secretary of State by October 1.
- The Tax Roll is to be delivered to the County Treasurer by November 22, along with tax bills.
- Homestead Exemption Tax Loss is to be certified on or before November 30.
- The Certificate of Taxes Levied is to be submitted on or before December 1.

Tax List Corrections are periodically submitted to the County Board of Equalization for approval, showing reasons for said corrections. Meetings of the County Board of Equalization are attended by the County Assessor.

Notice that a list of the applications from organizations seeking tax exemption, descriptions of the property, and the recommendation of the county assessor are available in the county assessor's office, is published in local newspapers at least ten days prior to consideration of the applications by the county board of equalization.

By March 1, governmental subdivisions are notified of intent to tax property not used for a public purpose, and not paying an in-lieu-of tax.

Property record cards contain all information required by Reg. 10-004, including legal description, property owner, classification codes and supporting documentation. New property record cards were obtained for residential properties for 2001 and for commercial/industrial properties for 2002 . New property record cards for agricultural properties have been obtained for use for 2008.

Applications for Homestead Exemption are accepted February 1 through June 30, according to statute. Approximately 621 applications were received in 2006. News releases and newspaper ads are prepared to alert property owners of the time period in which to file, and to summarize qualifications. Information guides prepared by the Department of Revenue are made available to the public. Approved Homestead Exemption applications are sent to the Department of Revenue by August 1.

Personal property schedules are to be filed by May 1 to be timely. Post cards are mailed in January to previous filers to notify them of the need to file again. In early April, ads are placed in the local newspapers and news releases given to the local radio to remind taxpayers of the filing deadline, the necessary documentation to submit, and of the penalties for not filing in a timely manner. Schedules filed May 1 and before July 31 receive a $10 \%$ penalty. Filings after July 31 receive a $25 \%$ penalty. 13AGs received periodically during the year had been indications of changes necessary for the subsequent year. This source of information is no longer available. Schedules are pre-printed as soon after the first of the year as possible. Verification is achieved from depreciation worksheets and personal contacts with owners.

Real property is up-dated annually through pick-up work and maintenance. Pick-up work, done by the assessor or deputy, involves physical inspection of properties flagged on computer records as having building permits or other information meriting attention. Lists of approved building permits are gathered from city clerks where permits are required. Improvement Information Statements are received where permits are not required. Personal observation by the staff also triggers flags for possible required changes.

On or before June 1, certification of the real estate assessment roll is made and published in the local newspapers. Also by that date, Notices of Valuation Change are mailed by first-class mail to owners of any real property that has changed in value from the previous year. By June 6, assessment/sales ratio statistics (as determined by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission) are mailed to media and posted in the Assessor's Office.

All residential property (urban, suburban, and rural) was re-appraised for 2001 under contract with High Plains Appraisal Service. New photos were taken and listings were verified and/or corrected, re-measuring where necessary. Properties were sketched into computer records. Costs were generated using CAMA of ASI, utilizing Marshall \& Swift costs of June 1999. For 2006, the median level of value for residential property is $97 \%$. The COD is 19.06 and the PRD is 105.78 . Subsequent sales need to be studied to determine trends and changes in the market.

Commercial and industrial properties were re-appraised for 2002. New photos were taken, and improvements re-measured and inspected. Properties were sketched into computer records. Costs were generated using CAMA by ASI, utilizing Marshall \& Swift costs of June 1999. A depreciation study was made. Income data was gathered where appropriate. The median level of assessment of commercial/industrial properties for 2006 is $96 \%$. The COD is 25.52 and the PRD is 108.33 . Subsequent sales need to be studied to determine trends and changes in the market.

The median level of assessment of agricultural property for 2006 is $77 \%$. The COD is 23.09 and the PRD is 100.38 . Agricultural improvements need to be re-appraised. Plans were to begin the process, anticipated to require two years, in 2005. Properties will be inspected by the assessor and/or deputy, measurements confirmed and condition noted. Interior inspections are to be completed wherever possible. New record cards have been obtained for this use. Appropriate sketches of improvements will be entered into computer records by the clerks and improvements re-priced using CAMA. A depreciation study is to be completed. Land use needs to be up-dated, with plans for the assessor and/or deputy to physically view and verify land use in 2005 and 2006 for the 2007 tax year.

Real estate transfer statements are filed in as timely of a manner as possible considering other time demands of the assessor. Completion of the supplemental data is by the assessor and the clerk who assists in maintaining cadastral records. Questionnaires are mailed to both the buyers and sellers of properties sold to assist the assessor in verifying sales. The response rate is approximately $76 \%$.

For 2007, any changes in land use observed in the 2006 review will be implemented. Field work by the assessor and/or deputy will continue for the re-appraisal of farm improvements, concentrating on the Southeast quadrant of the county, involving approximately 334 farmsteads. If time permits, work will expand into the Southwest quadrant of the county, approximately 237 additional farmsteads. It appears concentrated review residential of properties in the town of Ewing needs to be done for 2007. Sales of residential and commercial properties will be analyzed for any needed adjustments. Strive to improve quality and uniformity in assessments of both residential and commercial properties. Pick-up work will be completed. Change of Valuation Notices will be mailed as required.

For 2008, continue field work by the assessor and/or deputy on re-appraisal of farm improvements, extending work into the north half of the county. The Northeast quadrant includes approximately 282 farmsteads, and the Northwest quadrant approximately 385. Study sales for possible adjustments needed for residential or commercial properties. Adjust for changes in agricultural land use. Complete pick-up work. Send notices as required.

For 2009, complete pick-up work. Adjust for changes in agricultural land use as required. Study sales for market-based changes of residential, commercial and agricultural properties. The assessor and/or deputy will begin on-site review of residential properties in towns for discovery of change in characteristics or condition. Mail Change of Valuation notices as appropriate.

Respectfully

Holt County Assessor

June 15, 2006

## AMENDMENTS:

The approved budget for 2006-2007 is $\$ 152,613.27$. The amount included therein for appraisal maintenance (including the CAMA portion) is $\$ 56,193.73$.
Due to time and money constraints, field work for re-appraisal of farm improvements will in all probability not be completed until 2008.

## Certification

This is to certify that the 2007 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:
-Five copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

- One copy to the Holt County County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70051160000112138433.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.


