## 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.

## Table of Contents

## Commission Summary

## Property Tax Administrator's Opinions and Recommendations

## Correlation Section

## Residential Real Property

I. Correlation
II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R\&O Median Ratios
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD
VII. Analysis of Changes in the Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

Commercial Real Property
I. Correlation
II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R\&O Median Ratios
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD
VII. Analysis of Changes in the Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

Agricultural Land
I. Correlation
II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R\&O Median Ratios
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD
VII. Analysis of Changes in the Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2006 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report

## Statistical Reports Section

R\&O Statistical Reports
Residential Real Property, Qualified
Commercial Real Property, Qualified
Agricultural Unimproved, Qualified
Preliminary Statistical Reports
Residential Real Property, Qualified
Commercial Real Property, Qualified
Agricultural Unimproved, Qualified

## Assessment Survey Section

## County Reports Section

2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
2007 County Agricultural Land Detail
County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
Special Valuation Section
Certification

Map Section

## Valuation History Chart Section

## 2007 Commission Summary

71 Platte

| Residential Real Property $\mathbf{- C u r r e n t ~}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Number of Sales |  | $\mathbf{9 7 0}$ | COD | $\mathbf{9 . 5 6}$ |
| Total Sales Price | $\$$ | 95962253 | PRD | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 9 3}$ |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 95952153 | COV | 14.66 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$$ | 89945795 | STD | 13.87 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 98919.75 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 9.06 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$$ | 92727.62 | Min | 32.00 |
| Median | $\mathbf{9 4 . 7 9}$ | Max | 200.00 |  |
| Wgt. Mean | 93.74 | 95\% Median C.I. | 93.96 to 95.50 |  |
| Mean | 94.61 | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. | 93.05 to 94.43 |  |
|  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. | 93.74 to 95.49 |  |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 45.89 |  |  |  |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  | 8.66 |  |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  | 8.96 |  |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  | 89,687 |  |


| Residential Real Property - History <br> Year <br> Number of Sales |  | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 4 . 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 9 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 965 | 97.43 | 9.28 | 101.20 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 988 | 97.13 | 9.77 | 100.15 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 977 | 96.95 | 8.70 | 101.18 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 1,008 | 97 | 7.18 | 100.87 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 1,076 | 94 | 12.74 | 100.58 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 1,051 | 92 | 13.31 | 100.77 |

## 2007 Commission Summary

71 Platte

Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales |  | $\mathbf{1 1 9}$ | COD | $\mathbf{1 4 . 3 6}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$$ | 21765994 | PRD | $\mathbf{9 9 . 4 8}$ |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 21745994 | COV | 26.24 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$$ | 21128395 | STD | 25.36 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 182739.45 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 13.87 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$$ | 177549.54 | Min | 32.80 |
| Median |  | $\mathbf{9 6 . 5 5}$ | Max | 247.00 |
| Wgt. Mean | 97.16 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 95.44 to 98.16 |  |
| Mean |  | 96.66 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 93.85 to 100.47 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 20.48 |
| :--- | ---: |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period | 8.14 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 4.71 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 306,570 |


| Commercial Real Property - History <br> Year <br> Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 9 . 4 8}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 110 | 96.50 | 16.51 | 99.34 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 100 | 94.93 | 19.17 | 98.97 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 103 | 96.30 | 15.27 | 99.76 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 132 | 98 | 13.08 | 99.57 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 146 | 100 | 16.13 | 100.32 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 169 | 95 | 22.26 | 97.02 |

## 2007 Commission Summary

71 Platte

| Agricultural Land - Current |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales |  | 88 | COD |  | 21.01 |
| Total Sales Price | \$ | 17233833 | PRD |  | 103.04 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | - \$ | 17087463 | COV |  | 30.98 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$ | 12168735 | STD |  | 22.73 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | - \$ | 194175.72 | Avg. |  | 15.10 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | \$ | 138281.08 | Min |  | 21.91 |
| Median |  | 71.89 | Max |  | 175.91 |
| Wgt. Mean |  | 71.21 | 95\% |  | 65.79 to 75.04 |
| Mean |  | 73.38 | 95\% |  | 67.60 to 74.83 |
|  |  |  | 95\% |  | 68.63 to 78.13 |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County |  |  |  |  | 35.36 |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  |  | 1.77 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  |  | 1.79 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  |  |  | 155,424 |
| Agricultural Land - History |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year N | Number of |  | Median | COD | PRD |
| 2007 | 88 |  | 71.89 | 21.01 | 103.04 |
| 2006 | 88 |  | 74.06 | 19.49 | 107.56 |
| 2005 | 108 |  | 74.02 | 19.31 | 104.86 |
| 2004 | 91 |  | 74.71 | 15.87 | 102.40 |
| 2003 | 91 |  | 74 | 18.05 | 103.42 |
| 2002 | 78 |  | 74 | 19.39 | 100.89 |
| 2001 | 95 |  | 74 | 16.73 | 103.5 |

## 2007 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Platte 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 Platte County is $95 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Platte County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Platte County is $97 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Platte County is 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 Platte County is $72 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Platte County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.


Property Tax Administrator

## 2007 Correlation Section for Platte County

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately. The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R\&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner. The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Platte 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 | 1288 | 970 | $\mathbf{7 5 . 3 1}$ |
| 2006 | 1278 | 965 | 75.51 |
| 2005 | 1285 | 988 | $\mathbf{7 6 . 8 9}$ |
| 2004 | 1228 | 977 | $\mathbf{7 9 . 5 6}$ |
| 2003 | 1253 | 1062 | 84.76 |
| 2002 | 1313 | 1076 | $\mathbf{8 1 . 9 5}$ |
| 2001 | 1300 | 1053 | $\mathbf{8 1}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: Table II indicates that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arm's length sales.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Platte 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 R\&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 | 94.63 | 0.2 | 94.82 | 94.79 |
| 2006 | 95.89 | 1.98 | 97.79 | 97.43 |
| 2005 | 94.87 | 3.73 | 98.4 | 97.13 |
| 2004 | 95.82 | 1.42 | 97.18 | 96.95 |
| 2003 | 91 | 6.41 | 96.83 | 97 |
| 2002 | 93.69 | 6.34 | 99.63 | 94 |
| 2001 | 92 | -0.46 | 91.58 | 92 |

RESIDENTIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R\&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

## 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.66 | 2007 | 0.2 |
| 2.64 | 2006 | 1.98 |
| 5.24 | 2005 | 3.73 |
| 1.66 | 2004 | 1.42 |
| 7 | 2003 | 6 |
| 6.94 | 2002 | 6.34 |
| 0.01 | 2001 | $-\mathbf{0 . 4 6}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population.

## 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 | $\mathbf{9 4 . 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 4 . 6 1}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value 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 | 9.56 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 9 3}$ |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 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 | 971 | 970 | $-\mathbf{1}$ |
| Median | 94.63 | 94.79 | 0.16 |
| Wgt. Mean | 93.44 | 93.74 | 0.3 |
| Mean | 94.31 | 94.61 | 0.3 |
| COD | 9.88 | 9.56 | $-\mathbf{0 . 3 2}$ |
| PRD | 100.93 | 100.93 | 0 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 32.00 | 32.00 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 180.86 | 200.00 | 19.14 |

RESIDENTIAL: One sale removed between the preliminary and final statistics is responsible for the difference. There were no assessment actions to this class of property for 2007.

## 2007 Correlation Section for Platte County

## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately. The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R\&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner. The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Platte 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 | 210 | 119 | 56.67 |
| 2006 | 213 | 110 | 51.64 |
| 2005 | 196 | 100 | 51.02 |
| 2004 | 217 | 103 | 47.47 |
| 2003 | 237 | 132 | 55.7 |
| 2002 | 247 | 153 | 61.94 |
| 2001 | 251 | 169 | 67.33 |

COMMERCIAL: Table II is indicative that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arm's length sales.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Platte 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 R\&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 Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 96.55 | -0.09 | 96.47 | 96.55 |
| 2006 | 86.79 | 9.26 | 94.83 | 96.50 |
| 2005 | 91.07 | 0.88 | 91.87 | 94.93 |
| 2004 | 96.33 | 0.66 | 96.97 | 96.30 |
| 2003 | 98 | -0.83 | 97.19 | 98 |
| 2002 | 86.18 | 6.54 | 91.82 | 100 |
| 2001 | 92 | 1.17 | 93.08 | 95 |

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ ratio suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

## 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) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.94 | 2007 | $-\mathbf{0 . 0 9}$ |
| 21.43 | 2006 | 9.26 |
| 5.86 | 2005 | 0.88 |
| 20.15 | 2004 | 0.66 |
| 0 | 2003 | -1 |
| 30.2 | 2002 | 6.54 |
| 9.65 | 2001 | 1.17 |

COMMERCIAL: There is a significant difference between the percent change in the sales file and the percent change in the abstract. Further analysis of the statistics indicates that the difference is attributable to the three sales removed between the preliminary and R\&O statistics. A minimal amount of change in assessed value of the sales file actually occurred, comparable to the percent change reflected in the abstract comparison.

## 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 | 96.55 | $\mathbf{9 7 . 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 6 6}$ |

COMMERCIAL: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value 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 | 14.36 | 99.48 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Platte 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 | 122 | 119 | -3 |
| Median | 96.55 | 96.55 | 0 |
| Wgt. Mean | 95.65 | 97.16 | 1.51 |
| Mean | 94.20 | 96.66 | 2.46 |
| COD | 16.84 | 14.36 | -2.48 |
| PRD | 98.49 | 99.48 | 0.99 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 22.18 | 32.80 | 10.62 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 247.00 | 247.00 | 0 |

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The difference in the number of qualified sales is a result of sales sustaining substantial physical changes for 2007 and being removed from the qualified sales roster.

## 2007 Correlation Section for Platte County

## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are slightly above the acceptable range. The hypothetical removal of one outlier ratio brings the quality statistics within the acceptable range. The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R\&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner. The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Platte 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 | 253 | $\mathbf{8 8}$ | 34.78 |
| 2006 | 251 | $\mathbf{8 8}$ | 35.06 |
| 2005 | 288 | 108 | 37.5 |
| 2004 | 277 | 91 | 32.85 |
| 2003 | 265 | 91 | 34.34 |
| 2002 | 223 | 78 | 34.98 |
| 2001 | 220 | 99 | 45 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table II is indicative that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arm's length sales.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Platte 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 R\&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 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 8 9}$ |
| 2006 | $\mathbf{6 7 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 0 6}$ |
| 2005 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 0 2}$ |
| 2004 | $\mathbf{6 8 . 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 7 1}$ |
| 2003 | 72 | $\mathbf{3 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ |
| 2002 | $\mathbf{7 2 . 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ |
| 2001 | $\mathbf{7 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ ratio suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

## 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.46 | 2007 | 2.59 |
| 15.29 | 2006 | 9.64 |
| 3.9 | 2005 | 2.81 |
| 7.84 | 2004 | 5.22 |
| 5 | 2003 | 3 |
| 1.94 | 2002 | 0.4 |
| 1.92 | 2001 | 0.72 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population.

## 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 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 3 8}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value 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 | 21.01 | 103.04 |
| Difference | $\mathbf{1 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 4}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are slightly above the acceptable range. The hypothetical removal of one outlier ratio brings the quality statistics within the acceptable range.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Platte 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 | 90 | 88 | -2 |
| Median | 70.56 | 71.89 | 1.33 |
| Wgt. Mean | 69.13 | 71.21 | 2.08 |
| Mean | 73.80 | 73.38 | -0.42 |
| COD | 23.55 | 21.01 | -2.54 |
| PRD | 106.76 | 103.04 | -3.72 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 21.91 | 21.91 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 320.50 | 175.91 | -144.59 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The two sales removed from the sales file were directed by the department.

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


 outbuildings is shown in line 7.


PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified

## 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:

95\% Median C.I.: 93.96 to 95.50
(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:
970
$95,962,253$
$95,952,153$
$89,945,795$
98,919
92,727
MEDIAN:
WGT. MEAN $:$
MEAN :
COD :
PRD $:$

| 94 | STD: | 13.87 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I.: 93.05 to 94.43 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 95 | 9.06 | $95 \%$ Mean C.I. | 93.74 to 95.49 |


| STYLE | COUNT |
| :--- | ---: |
| RANGE | 106 |
| (blank) | 17 |
| 100 | 533 |
| 101 | 62 |
| 102 | 49 |
| 103 | 140 |
| 104 | 4 |
| 106 | 39 |
| 111 | 10 |
| 301 | 3 |
| 304 | 1 |
| 305 | 6 |
| 307 |  |


| MIN Sales Ratio: | 32.00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| COD |  |

Printed: 04/02/2007 12:41:23

|  | 970 | 94.79 | 94.61 | 93.74 | 9.56 | 100.93 | 32.00 | 200.00 | 93.96 to 95.50 | 98,919 | 92,727 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CONDITION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 108 | 91.02 | 88.67 | 85.89 | 13.89 | 103.23 | 32.00 | 200.00 | 87.50 to 94.99 | 25,203 | 21,647 |
| 15 | 1 | 96.73 | 96.73 | 96.73 |  |  | 96.73 | 96.73 | N/A | 52,900 | 51,170 |
| 20 | 34 | 96.25 | 97.05 | 93.47 | 11.64 | 103.83 | 67.74 | 138.76 | 92.33 to 100.22 | 46,032 | 43,027 |
| 25 | 46 | 99.32 | 101.02 | 97.97 | 15.06 | 103.11 | 40.61 | 180.86 | 95.66 to 106.23 | 56,432 | 55,288 |
| 30 | 357 | 95.95 | 96.12 | 94.86 | 9.46 | 101.33 | 54.15 | 178.91 | 94.54 to 97.43 | 84,690 | 80,336 |
| 35 | 146 | 93.33 | 93.32 | 93.22 | 7.36 | 100.10 | 74.33 | 132.08 | 91.78 to 94.78 | 112,934 | 105,279 |
| 40 | 272 | 94.14 | 94.30 | 93.31 | 7.58 | 101.05 | 66.56 | 167.62 | 93.04 to 95.45 | 148,675 | 138,735 |
| 50 | 6 | 97.24 | 94.59 | 95.14 | 5.45 | 99.42 | 85.79 | 100.25 | 85.79 to 100.25 | 308,920 | 293,912 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 970 | 94.79 | 94.61 | 93.74 | 9.56 | 100.93 | 32.00 | 200.00 | 93.96 to 95.50 | 98,919 | 92,727 |



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

## Type: Qualified



## Type: Qualified

State Stat Run


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

State Stat Run

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | . | (2003 to 06/30/200 | - Posted | (1) | , |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | f Sale |  | 119 | MEDIAN: | 97 |  | COV: | 26.24 | 95\% | dian C.I.: 95.4 | to 98.16 | (!: AVTot=0) <br> (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | s Pric |  | ,994 | WGT. MEAN: | 97 |  | STD: | 25.36 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 93.8 | to 100.47 |  |
| TOT | L Adj. S | s Pric |  | , 994 | MEAN : | 97 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 13.87 |  | Mean C.I.: 92. | to 101.21 |  |
|  | AL Asse | d Valu |  | , 395 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | s Pric |  | , 739 | COD : | 14.36 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 247.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | , 549 | PRD : | 99.48 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 32.80 |  |  | Printed: 04/02 | 7 12:41:40 |
| ASSESSED VA | UE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 3 | 36.00 | 51.97 | 49.36 | 50.28 |  | 105.29 | 32.80 | 87.10 | N/A | 5,950 | 2,936 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 3 | 103.75 | 97.50 | 96.82 | 10.76 |  | 100.70 | 77.63 | 111.11 | N/A | 7,276 | 7,045 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 6 | 82.36 | 74.73 | 75.47 | 31.47 |  | 99.03 | 32.80 | 111.11 | 32.80 to 111.11 | 6,613 | 4,990 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 12 | 86.94 | 77.51 | 73.60 | 19.13 |  | 105.32 | 33.25 | 104.17 | 60.96 to 94.64 | 28,575 | 21,030 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 22 | 98.03 | 100.71 | 95.00 | 14.35 |  | 106.01 | 64.29 | 175.00 | 90.00 to 100.82 | 47,271 | 44,908 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 19 | 96.83 | 102.71 | 90.96 | 22.48 |  | 112.93 | 35.10 | 247.00 | 84.27 to 112.07 | 80,532 | 73,250 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 16 | 93.82 | 92.00 | 91.89 | 7.01 |  | 100.12 | 80.11 | 101.75 | 83.33 to 99.05 | 130,783 | 120,172 |
| 150000 тO | 249999 | 23 | 98.99 | 104.39 | 101.52 | 10.20 |  | 102.82 | 85.20 | 171.88 | 95.65 to 103.34 | 192,806 | 195,736 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 10 | 98.08 | 97.53 | 94.35 | 9.52 |  | 103.37 | 58.46 | 125.87 | 94.64 to 108.06 | 326,100 | 307,661 |
| 500000 + |  | 11 | 96.55 | 100.73 | 99.55 | 5.68 |  | 101.18 | 92.76 | 140.00 | 95.12 to 100.00 | 818,657 | 815,004 |
|  |  | 119 | 96.55 | 96.66 | 97.16 | 14.36 |  | 99.48 | 32.80 | 247.00 | 95.44 to 98.16 | 182,739 | 177,549 |
| COST RANK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 22 | 93.26 | 90.01 | 87.10 | 16.54 |  | 103.33 | 35.10 | 175.00 | 88.00 to 97.89 | 170,061 | 148,126 |
| 10 |  | 19 | 100.00 | 106.29 | 104.55 | 19.52 |  | 101.67 | 33.25 | 247.00 | 92.90 to 112.07 | 74,773 | 78,173 |
| 20 |  | 76 | 96.55 | 96.11 | 98.79 | 12.45 |  | 97.28 | 32.80 | 171.88 | 95.24 to 98.99 | 214,426 | 211,833 |
| 30 |  | 2 | 99.15 | 99.15 | 99.13 | 2.62 |  | 100.02 | 96.55 | 101.75 | N/A | 143,750 | 142,500 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 119 | 96.55 | 96.66 | 97.16 | 14.36 |  | 99.48 | 32.80 | 247.00 | 95.44 to 98.16 | 182,739 | 177,549 |



NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value: State Stat Run
(!: AVTot=0)

| $21,765,994$ |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| $21,745,994$ | WGT. MEAN: |
| $21,128,395$ |  |
| 182,739 |  |
| 177,549 | COD $:$ |
|  |  |

97 COV

95\% Median C.I.: 95.44 to 98.16
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 93.85 to 100.47
95\% Mean C.I.: 92.10 to 101.21

182,739
PRD:

| PROPERTY TYPE * |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN |
| 02 | 6 | 99.26 |
| 03 | 111 | 96.55 |
| 04 | 2 | 90.38 |
|  |  | 119 |
|  |  | 96.55 |


| MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: |
| 94.45 | 95.78 |
| 96.89 | 97.43 |
| 90.38 | 91.91 |
|  |  |
| 96.66 | 97.16 |

COD
6.12
14.89
5.73
14.36

| PRD | MIN |
| ---: | ---: |
| 98.62 | 73.60 |
| 99.44 | 32.80 |
| 98.34 | 85.20 |
|  |  |
| 99.48 | 32.80 |


| MAX | $95 \%$ Median C.I. |
| ---: | :---: |
| 101.75 | 73.60 to 101.75 |
| 247.00 | 95.24 to 98.16 |
| 95.56 | N/A |
| 247.00 | 95.44 to 98.16 |


| 202,233 | 193,697 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 178,719 | 174,123 |
| 347,355 | 319,250 |
|  |  |
| 182,739 | 177,549 |

71 - PLATTE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics

## Type: Qualified

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


11 - PLATTE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

PA\&T 2007 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/200


## AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED



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


## 11 - PLATTE COUNTY

 AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED
## Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2003 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:


95
93
Cov:
4.91
-
95\% Median C.I.: 93.93 to 95.46
(!: Derived)
95,986,253
GGt MEAN: MEAN

STD: 14.06
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 92.71 to 94.16
AVG.ABS.DEV: 9.35 95\% Mean C.I.: 93.42 to 95.19

98,907
92,414

## RANGE

07/01
10/01
$01 / 01$
$04 / 01$
$07 / 01$
$10 / 01$
$01 / 01$
$04 / 01$
$\qquad$
07/01/04 тO 09/30/0 10/01/04 TO 12/31/04 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 04/01/05 TO 06/30/05 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 10/01/05 тO 12/31/05 01/01/06 то 03/31/06
$\qquad$ Study Years $\qquad$ 07/01/04 то 06/30/05
$\qquad$ 01/01/05 TO 12/31/05
$\qquad$ ALI
ASSESSOR LOCATION
COLUMBUS
CORNLEA
CRESTON

| COUNT |
| :--- |


| 114 |
| ---: |
| 98 |
| 122 |
| 141 |
| 128 |
| 108 |
| 115 |
| 145 |
| 475 |
| 496 |
| 499 |

$\overline{971}$

|  | 9.21 | 94.61 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 971 | 94.63 | 94.31 |


| 971 | 94.63 | 94.31 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| COUNT MEDIAN | MEAN |  |

## CRESTON

 COUNMEDIA
94.59
162.93
136.43
98.69
97.24
99.99
93.91
64.0
95.02
93.53
92.

| 98.81 | 100.05 | 99.04 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 97.76 | 97.65 | 96.94 |
| 95.82 | 94.73 | 95.05 |
| 95.56 | 94.91 | 93.29 |
| 94.68 | 92.77 | 92.96 |
| 93.72 | 96.26 | 94.60 |
| 91.41 | 91.01 | 90.94 |
| 87.44 | 89.12 | 87.78 |
|  | 96.66 | 95.83 |
| 96.53 | 92.05 | 91.17 |
| 92.16 | 94.61 | 93.90 |


| 8.41 | 101.02 | 53.76 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8.07 | 100.73 | 64.00 |
| 8.13 | 99.66 | 32.00 |
| 8.47 | 101.73 | 49.23 |
| 7.86 | 99.80 | 40.61 |
| 10.06 | 101.75 | 48.00 |
| 13.22 | 100.08 | 43.67 |
| 11.10 | 101.53 | 39.02 |
|  |  |  |
| 8.43 | 100.87 | 32.00 |
| 10.83 | 100.97 | 39.02 |
|  |  |  |
| 8.59 | 100.76 | 32.00 |


$167.62 \quad 97$.
ale Price Assd.
IIAN
COUNT
731
DUNCAN
HUMP HREY
LINDSAY
NEWMAN GROVE

|  |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 94.49 | WGT. MEAN |
| 162.93 | 162.93 |
| 130.33 | 139.84 |

9.88

NEWMAN GROVE
PLATTE CENTER
RURAL
SUBDIVISION
TARNOV
$\qquad$

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: AVG. Assessed Value:


## 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:


95,986,253 96,039,153 89,734,225

98,907
92,414
MEAN路 93
94
RD:

95\% Median C.I.: 93.93 to 95.46
(!: Derived)
14.91

STD: $\quad 14.06$
AVG.ABS.DEV: 9.35
9.35
180.86
180.86
32.00
0.93 MIN Sales Ratio:

| YEAR BUILT * |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| RANGE |  |
| 0 | OR Blank |
| Prior | TO 1860 |
| 1860 | тO 1899 |
| 1900 | тO 1919 |
| 1920 | тO 1939 |
| 1940 | то 1949 |
| 1950 | то 1959 |
| 1960 | то 1969 |
| 1970 | то 1979 |
| 1980 | TO 1989 |
| 1990 | тO 1994 |
| 1995 | тO 1999 |
| 2000 TO Present |  |
|  | ALL |

SALE PRICE *

| RANGE |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Low \$ |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 |
| 5000 тO | 9999 |
| Total \$ |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 |
| 10000 то | 29999 |
| 30000 то | 59999 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 |
| 100000 то | 149999 |
| 150000 то | 249999 |
| 250000 то | 499999 |
| ALL |  |


| COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5 |  |  |  |
| 6 | 89.67 | 106.48 | 110.25 |
| 11 | 95.50 | 105.97 | 109.44 |
| 93 | 94.34 | 90.79 | 89.93 |
| 161 | 96.67 | 97.61 | 96.89 |
| 330 | 95.76 | 95.94 | 95.75 |
| 204 | 91.96 | 90.87 | 90.87 |
| 143 | 94.66 | 93.93 | 93.79 |
| 29 | 91.52 | 90.26 | 90.28 |
| 971 | 94.63 | 94.31 | 93.44 |

95\% Mean C.I.: 93.42 to 95.19


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


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

| DATE |
| :--- |
| RANGE |

07/01/
$10 / 01 / 03$
$01 / 01 /$
$04 / 01 / 0$
$07 / 01 /$
$10 / 01 /$
$01 / 01 /$
$04 / 01$
$07 / 01$
$10 / 01$
$01 / 01$
$04 / 01$ Qrtrs $\qquad$ (01/03 09/30/0 10/01/03 то 12/31/03 01/01/04 то 03/31/04 04/01/04 то 06/30/04 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 10/01/04 TO 12/31/04 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 04/01/05 TO 06/30/05 07/01/05 TO 09/30/05 10/01/05 TO 12/31/05
$\qquad$ tudy $06 / 30 / 0$
07/01/03 то 06/30/04 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06
$\qquad$ Calendar Yrs $\qquad$ 10 12/31/04
$\qquad$ ALI
$\ldots$ ALL__

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

COLUMBUS
CORNLEA
CRESTON
DUNCAN
HUMP HREY
MONROE
PLATTE CENTER
RURAL
SUBDIVISION
$\qquad$

COUNT MEDIAN

| 5 |
| ---: |
| 10 |
| 7 |
| 8 |
| 19 |
| 10 |
| 15 |
| 12 |
| 10 |
| 12 |
| 8 |
| 6 |
| 30 |
| 56 |
| 36 |
| 44 |
| 49 |


| 122 | MEDIAN: |
| ---: | ---: |
| $22,970,994$ | WGT. MEAN: |
| $22,950,994$ | MEAN: |
| $21,952,790$ |  |
| 188,122 |  |
| 179,940 |  |
|  | PRD $:$ |

COV
(!: Derived)
-

- RD:
98.49 MIN Sales Ratio: $\quad 22.18$
Printed: 02/17/2007 13:25:26

COD

95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 91.89 to 99.42
95\% Mean C.I.: 89.26 to 99.15
AVG.ABS.DEV: 16.26
247.00

COD
7.53
12.68
19.21
12.92
15.14
7.65
23.20
17.89
4.22
16.56
31.50
38.67

13.49
16.62
19.44
13.88
16.41
96.
100
96
99
94
96
116.
90.
99
94
114.
90.
97.
100
98
-

| 103.34 | 102.57 | 106.76 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 98.02 | 102.65 | 102.19 |
| 100.00 | 95.29 | 99.04 |
| 94.35 | 98.01 | 98.04 |
| 95.00 | 85.77 | 90.30 |
| 98.00 | 99.23 | 103.03 |
| 96.55 | 113.33 | 97.70 |
| 90.94 | 82.11 | 90.43 |
| 99.22 | 95.86 | 96.01 |
| 95.40 | 86.03 | 90.99 |
| 86.13 | 81.36 | 71.03 |
| 90.85 | 92.26 | 102.45 |
|  |  |  |
| 99.72 | 99.68 | 101.98 |
| 96.19 | 94.77 | 94.42 |
| 96.15 | 88.76 | 89.86 |
|  |  |  |
| 97.46 | 92.57 | 94.69 |
| 96.15 | 95.43 | 94.21 |

16.84
98.

| 122 | 96.55 | 94.20 | 95.65 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| 76 | 96.67 | 95.61 | 95.52 |
| 1 | 92.15 | 92.15 | 92.15 |
| 4 | 98.33 | 119.23 | 117.54 |
| 1 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| 7 | 61.07 | 71.40 | 73.36 |
| 2 | 74.07 | 74.07 | 71.96 |
| 2 | 68.49 | 68.49 | 91.16 |
| 11 | 96.55 | 98.86 | 98.79 |
| 18 | 96.69 | 93.60 | 95.33 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 122 | 96.55 | 94.20 | 95.65 |

16.84
COD
14.04
57.11
50.86
4.81
52.11
15.26
9.76
16.84
22

# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2003 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: AVG. Assessed Value:


## MEDIAN:

97
GGT. MEAN
95\% Median C.I.: 95.12 to 98.11
(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

# 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
Date Range: 07/01/2003 to 06/30/2006 Posted Before: 01/19/2007
State Stat Run
(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: VVG. Adj. Sales Price:

AVG. Assessed Value:
95\% Median C.I.: 95.12 to 98.11
(!: Derived)



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


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 Platte County

## I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1. Deputy(ies) on staff: $\mathbf{1}$
2. Appraiser(s) on staff: $\mathbf{1}$
3. Other full-time employees: 4
4. Other part-time employees: $\mathbf{1}$
5. Number of shared employees: $\mathbf{0}$
6. Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: \$300,375
7. Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system: $\mathbf{\$ 2 9 , 1 2 5}$
8. Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: \$290,382
9. Amount of total budget set aside for appraisal work: N/A
10. Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops: $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 0 0}$
11. Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
12. Other miscellaneous funds: N/A
13. Total budget: \$290,382
a. Was any of last year's budget not used? No
B. Residential Appraisal Information
(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)
14. Data collection done by: Appraiser and Assistant
15. Valuation done by: Assessor, Appraiser
16. Pickup work done by: Appraiser and Assistant

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 249 |  |  | 249 |

4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? The date is 2005 for all residential as Mobile homes use costing from 2006.
5. What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? Depreciation studies are done with subclass reviews, so 2007 was the most recent year of depreciation studies conducted in subclasses within Platte County.
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? N/A
7. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: Approximately 25
8. How are these defined? The neighborhoods are defined similar property characteristics.
9. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Yes
10. Does the location "suburban" mean something other than rural residential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) The suburban area exists around Columbus only and is valued as a separate market area.
11. Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner? Yes
C. Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information
12. Data collection done by: Appraiser and Assistant
13. Valuation done by: Assessor and Appraiser
14. Pickup work done by: Appraiser and Assistant

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | 65 |  |  | 65 |

4. What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? 2005
5. When was the last time the depreciation schedule for this property class or any subclass was developed using market-derived information? Depreciation studies are done with subclass reviews, so 2006 was the most recent year of depreciation studies conducted in subclasses within Platte County.
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? 2006
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? N/A
8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? 3
9. How are these defined? Areas are defined by town. Columbus and Humphrey are analyzed individually separate and all others are analyzed together.
10. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Yes
11. Does the location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) No

## D. Agricultural Appraisal Information

1. Data collection done by: Assessor and Deputy Assessor
2. Valuation done by: Assessor
3. Pickup work done by whom: Appraiser Assistant and Appraiser

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural | 102 |  | 255 | 357 |

3. Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? Yes

How is the agricultural land defined? To qualify for agricultural valuation the land has to be used for agricultural production
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? N/A
6. What is the date of the soil survey currently used? 2000
7. What date was the last countywide land use study completed? Currently studying with implementation of GIS
a. By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) GIS
b. By whom? Deputy Assessor and Appraiser Assistant
c. What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? Approximately 50\%
8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: 4
9. How are these defined? These areas are defined by topography and similar soil characteristics, and delineated by section lines.
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: County Solutions
2. CAMA software: County Solutions
3. Cadastral maps or GIS software:
a. Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? Deputy Assessor and Staff
4. Does the county have GIS software? Yes
a. Who maintains the GIS software and maps? Deputy Assessor and Appraiser Assistant
5. Personal Property software: County Solutions

## F. Zoning Information

1. Does the county have zoning? Yes
a. If so, is the zoning county wide? No
b. What municipalities in the county are zoned? Columbus
c. When was zoning implemented? Zoning has been implemented in Columbus for several years.

## G. Contracted Services

1. Appraisal Services: Industrial is contracted
2. Other Services: None
H. Additional comments or further explanations on any item from A through G :

The Platte County Assessor was interviewed for the information contained in this report.

## II. Assessment Actions

## Residential

There were no assessment actions to this class of property other than the pick-up work of new and omitted construction. The County conducted a market analysis and the statistics suggested that the level of value for the class was acceptable.

## Commercial

The County completed the pick-up work of new and omitted construction for 2007. Adjustments were also made to land values along highway 30 on east end of Columbus. Commercial property in the town of Humphrey was also reviewed and revalued for 2007.

## Agricultural

The County conducted a market analysis of qualified sales by land capability groupings and made value adjustments as indicated. In Market Area Six the dry land values were increased based on statistical indication of market activity in that area.

Parcels were also digitized and soil survey information was updated for Market Area Six. This sometimes resulted in minor changes to parcel values because of the combination of some soil types and elimination of spot symbols.

The County also completed the pick-up work of new and omitted construction

## County 71 - Platte



## County 71 - Platte



Exhibit 71 - Page 79

## County 71 - Platte

Schedule II:Tax Increment Financing (TIF)
Records

| edule V: A | Urban | Value | SubUrban | Value | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Records |  |  |  |  | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land | 0 | 0 | 170 | 13,326,920 | 3,264 | 404,543,175 | 3,434 | 417,870,095 |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 0 | 0 | 98 | 12,340,505 | 1,485 | 218,870,135 | 1,583 | 231,210,640 |
| 29. Ag-Improvements | 0 | 0 | 98 | 8,089,745 | 1,485 | 138,969,705 | 1,583 | 147,059,450 |
| 30. Ag-Total Taxable |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,017 | 796,140,185 |

## County 71 - Platte

| Schedule VI: Agricultural Records: Non-Agricultural Detail | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 65 | 71.800 | 798,000 |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 |  | 0 | 65 |  | 6,578,375 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 21 | 120.510 | 112,425 |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 79 | 538.790 | 614,605 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 0 |  | 0 | 87 |  | 1,511,370 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches | 0.000 |  |  | 255.729 |  |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 |  |  |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Total |  |  |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 25 | 22.322 | 270,000 | 25 | 22.322 | 270,000 |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 1,017 | 1,068.329 | 10,734,610 | 1,082 | 1,140.129 | 11,532,610 |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 1,036 |  | 76,414,870 | 1,101 |  | 82,993,245 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 1,126 | 1,162.451 | 94,795,855 |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 232 | 633.726 | 780,155 | 253 | 754.236 | 892,580 |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 1,320 | 5,460.794 | 7,338,845 | 1,399 | 5,999.584 | 7,953,450 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 1,410 |  | 62,554,835 | 1,497 |  | 64,066,205 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 1,750 | 6,753.820 | 72,912,235 |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |  | 8,033.774 |  |  | 8,289.503 |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0.000 | 0 |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 2,876 | 16,205.774 | 167,708,090 |
| Schedule VII: Agricultural Records: Ag Land Detail-Game \& Parks | Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1 | 6.000 | 18,000 |
|  | Rural |  | Value | Total |  |  |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 13 | 1,931.470 | 1,704,005 | 14 | 1,937.470 | 1,722,005 |
| 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 | Total 0 |  |  |
|  | Records | Rural Acres |  |  |  |  |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |

## County 71 - Platte <br> 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,577.145 | 8,206,605 | 12,917.568 | 28,937,735 | 16,494.713 | 37,144,340 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 1,235.538 | 2,656,415 | 10,873.757 | 23,378,615 | 12,109.295 | 26,035,030 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 501.678 | 964,365 | 8,677.052 | 15,794,115 | 9,178.730 | 16,758,480 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 1,055.175 | 1,820,190 | 6,763.871 | 11,623,995 | 7,819.046 | 13,444,185 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 366.466 | 595,505 | 5,971.458 | 9,703,740 | 6,337.924 | 10,299,245 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 481.813 | 722,720 | 12,237.218 | 18,355,840 | 12,719.031 | 19,078,560 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 869.813 | 1,138,580 | 6,739.842 | 8,424,860 | 7,609.655 | 9,563,440 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 21.660 | 19,495 | 417.738 | 375,960 | 439.398 | 395,455 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 8,109.288 | 16,123,875 | 64,598.504 | 116,594,860 | 72,707.792 | 132,718,735 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 616.824 | 1,183,970 | 4,666.090 | 8,370,320 | 5,282.914 | 9,554,290 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 496.548 | 856,555 | 7,965.962 | 13,739,335 | 8,462.510 | 14,595,890 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 220.136 | 335,720 | 4,852.306 | 6,766,660 | 5,072.442 | 7,102,380 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 503.429 | 692,235 | 2,601.795 | 3,466,805 | 3,105.224 | 4,159,040 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 106.508 | 141,130 | 4,417.424 | 5,843,170 | 4,523.932 | 5,984,300 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 227.422 | 278,590 | 11,507.957 | 14,086,320 | 11,735.379 | 14,364,910 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 555.936 | 528,145 | 7,165.323 | 6,803,565 | 7,721.259 | 7,331,710 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 10.000 | 7,250 | 895.736 | 647,925 | 905.736 | 655,175 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,736.803 | 4,023,595 | 44,072.593 | 59,724,100 | 46,809.396 | 63,747,695 |


| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 138.393 | 110,725 | 445.383 | 370,550 | 583.776 | 481,275 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 73.002 | 58,400 | 851.568 | 695,930 | 924.570 | 754,330 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 47.500 | 38,000 | 1,473.903 | 1,181,685 | 1,521.403 | 1,219,685 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 174.930 | 132,885 | 1,604.620 | 1,204,230 | 1,779.550 | 1,337,115 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 16.298 | 12,225 | 1,548.366 | 1,186,000 | 1,564.664 | 1,198,225 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 650.598 | 455,765 | 7,230.201 | 5,112,760 | 7,880.799 | 5,568,525 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 529.319 | 345,440 | 4,112.171 | 2,716,440 | 4,641.490 | 3,061,880 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 100.610 | 60,360 | 4,445.081 | 2,672,430 | 4,545.691 | 2,732,790 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,730.650 | 1,213,800 | 21,711.293 | 15,140,025 | 23,441.943 | 16,353,825 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 101.685 | 7,630 | 3,608.911 | 270,745 | 3,710.596 | 278,375 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 40.840 | 4,850 | 773.389 | 121,465 | 814.229 | 126,315 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 12,719.266 | 21,373,750 | 134,764.690 | 191,851,195 | 147,483.956 | 213,224,945 |
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| County 71 - Platte |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market A | 5 |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | $\begin{gathered} \text { SubU } \\ \text { Acres } \end{gathered}$ | Value | Rural |  | Total |  |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 81.700 | 155,230 | 0.000 | 0 | 81.700 | 155,230 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 113.000 | 175,150 | 40.000 | 62,000 | 153.000 | 237,150 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 3,900 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 3,900 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 809.360 | 971,230 | 110.000 | 132,000 | 919.360 | 1,103,230 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,700 | 7.000 | 6,300 | 10.000 | 9,000 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,010.060 | 1,308,210 | 157.000 | 200,300 | 1,167.060 | 1,508,510 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.140 | 21,025 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.140 | 21,025 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 13.870 | 18,030 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.870 | 18,030 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 222.770 | 222,770 | 0.000 | 0 | 222.770 | 222,770 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 10,400 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 10,400 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,400 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,400 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 264.780 | 273,625 | 0.000 | 0 | 264.780 | 273,625 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,400 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,400 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 23.000 | 17,250 | 0.000 | 0 | 23.000 | 17,250 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 1,057.290 | 740,100 | 3.000 | 2,100 | 1,060.290 | 742,200 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 147.580 | 95,930 | 0.000 | 0 | 147.580 | 95,930 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 440.800 | 264,485 | 77.000 | 46,200 | 517.800 | 310,685 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,671.670 | 1,120,165 | 80.000 | 48,300 | 1,751.670 | 1,168,465 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 852.969 | 63,975 | 13.000 | 975 | 865.969 | 64,950 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 40.990 | 2,670 | 0.000 | 0 | 40.990 | 2,670 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 3,840.469 | 2,768,645 | 250.000 | 249,575 | 4,090.469 | 3,018,220 |


| County 71 - Platte |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  | Market Area: 6 |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 16,951.680 | 40,673,245 | 16,951.680 | 40,673,245 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 17,252.387 | 39,247,360 | 17,252.387 | 39,247,360 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10,190.125 | 20,832,795 | 10,190.125 | 20,832,795 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,001.561 | 1,591,285 | 1,001.561 | 1,591,285 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13,665.703 | 24,939,600 | 13,665.703 | 24,939,600 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 32,129.187 | 55,422,600 | 32,129.187 | 55,422,600 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10,375.531 | 14,525,680 | 10,375.531 | 14,525,680 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 482.939 | 474,825 | 482.939 | 474,825 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 102,049.113 | 197,707,390 | 102,049.113 | 197,707,390 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13,794.183 | 31,303,725 | 13,794.183 | 31,303,725 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 18,674.489 | 40,523,620 | 18,674.489 | 40,523,620 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7,688.412 | 15,075,565 | 7,688.412 | 15,075,565 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,164.599 | 1,903,535 | 1,164.599 | 1,903,535 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13,465.169 | 23,294,580 | 13,465.169 | 23,294,580 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 36,095.417 | 59,188,990 | 36,095.417 | 59,188,990 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7,830.900 | 9,623,560 | 7,830.900 | 9,623,560 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 823.525 | 697,915 | 823.525 | 697,915 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 99,536.694 | 181,611,490 | 99,536.694 | 181,611,490 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 503.221 | 402,200 | 503.221 | 402,200 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,243.779 | 1,037,090 | 1,243.779 | 1,037,090 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,967.581 | 1,569,460 | 1,967.581 | 1,569,460 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,413.791 | 1,061,535 | 1,413.791 | 1,061,535 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 739.900 | 582,525 | 739.900 | 582,525 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,651.317 | 2,637,710 | 3,651.317 | 2,637,710 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,845.319 | 1,194,605 | 1,845.319 | 1,194,605 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,224.102 | 1,334,610 | 2,224.102 | 1,334,610 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13,589.010 | 9,819,735 | 13,589.010 | 9,819,735 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 700.663 | 52,560 | 700.663 | 52,560 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 527.043 | 40,010 | 527.043 | 40,010 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 216,402.523 | 389,231,185 | 216,402.523 | 389,231,185 |
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## County 71 - Platte

## 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 9,119.348 | 17,432,085 | 176,803.552 | 329,644,910 | 185,922.900 | 347,076,995 |
| 77.Dry Land | 0.000 | 0 | 3,001.583 | 4,297,220 | 146,187.959 | 244,289,485 | 149,189.542 | 248,586,705 |
| 78.Grass | 0.000 | 0 | 3,402.320 | 2,333,965 | 45,710.548 | 29,845,120 | 49,112.868 | 32,179,085 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 954.654 | 71,605 | 4,402.374 | 330,270 | 5,357.028 | 401,875 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 81.830 | 7,520 | 1,546.196 | 179,915 | 1,628.026 | 187,435 |
| 81.Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 0.000 | 0 | 16,559.735 | 24,142,395 | 374,650.629 | 604,289,700 | 391,210.364 | 628,432,095 |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 71 - Platte
Market Area:

| Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value ${ }^{\star}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| $37,144,340$ | $27.99 \%$ | $2,251.893$ |
| $26,035,030$ | $19.62 \%$ | $2,150.003$ |
| $16,758,480$ | $12.63 \%$ | $1,825.795$ |
| $13,444,185$ | $10.13 \%$ | $1,719.415$ |
| $10,299,245$ | $7.76 \%$ | $1,625.018$ |
| $19,078,560$ | $14.38 \%$ | $1,500.001$ |
| $9,563,440$ | $7.21 \%$ | $1,256.750$ |
| 395,455 | $0.30 \%$ | 899.992 |
| $132,718,735$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,825.371$ |


| Dry: |
| :--- |
| 1D1 $5,282.914$ $11.29 \%$ $9,554,290$ $14.99 \%$ $1,808.526$ <br> 1D $8,462.510$ $18.08 \%$ $14,595,890$ $22.90 \%$ $1,724.770$ <br> 2D1 $5,072.442$ $10.84 \%$ $7,102,380$ $11.14 \%$ $1,400.189$ <br> 2D $3,105.224$ $6.63 \%$ $4,159,040$ $6.52 \%$ $1,339.368$ <br> 3D1 $4,523.923$ $9.66 \%$ $5,984,300$ $9.39 \%$ $1,322.812$ <br> 3D $11,735.379$ $25.07 \%$ $14,364,910$ $22.53 \%$ $1,224.068$ <br> 4D1 $7,721.259$ $16.50 \%$ $7,331,710$ $11.50 \%$ 949.548 <br> 4D 905.736 $1.93 \%$ 655,175 $1.03 \%$ 723.362 <br> Dry Total $46,809.396$ $100.00 \%$ $63,747,695$ $100.00 \%$ $1,361.856$ |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 583.776 | $2.49 \%$ | 481,275 | $2.94 \%$ | 824.417 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 924.570 | $3.94 \%$ | 754,330 | $4.61 \%$ | 815.871 |
| 2G1 | $1,521.403$ | $6.49 \%$ | $1,219,685$ | $7.46 \%$ | 801.684 |
| 2G | $1,779.550$ | $7.59 \%$ | $1,337,115$ | $8.18 \%$ | 751.378 |
| 3G1 | $1,564.664$ | $6.67 \%$ | $1,198,225$ | $7.33 \%$ | 765.803 |
| 3G | $7,880.799$ | $33.62 \%$ | $5,568,525$ | $34.05 \%$ | 706.593 |
| 4G1 | $4,641.490$ | $19.80 \%$ | $3,061,880$ | $18.72 \%$ | 659.676 |
| 4G | $4,545.691$ | $19.39 \%$ | $2,732,790$ | $16.71 \%$ | 601.182 |
| Grass Total | $23,441.943$ | $100.00 \%$ | $16,353,825$ | $100.00 \%$ | 697.630 |
| Irrigated Total | $72,707.792$ | $49.30 \%$ | $132,718,735$ | $62.24 \%$ | $1,825.371$ |
| Dry Total | $46,809.396$ | $31.74 \%$ | $63,747,695$ | $29.90 \%$ | $1,361.856$ |
| Grass Total | $23,441.943$ | $15.89 \%$ | $16,353,825$ | $7.67 \%$ | 697.630 |
| Waste | $3,710.596$ | $2.52 \%$ | 278,375 | $0.13 \%$ | 75.021 |
| Other | 814.229 | $0.55 \%$ | 126,315 | $0.06 \%$ | 155.134 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,445.750$ |
| Market Area Total | $147,483.956$ | $100.00 \%$ | $213,224,945$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $72,707.792$ | $39.11 \%$ | $132,718,735$ | $38.24 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $46,809.396$ | $31.38 \%$ | $63,747,695$ | $25.64 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $23,441.943$ | $47.73 \%$ | $16,353,825$ | $50.82 \%$ |
| Waste | $3,710.596$ | $69.27 \%$ | 278,375 | $69.27 \%$ |
| Other | 814.229 | $50.01 \%$ | 126,315 | $67.39 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $147,483.956$ | $37.70 \%$ | $213,224,945$ | $33.93 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 71 - Platte
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 242.700 | 2.43\% | 546,075 | 3.61\% | 2,250.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 837.771 | 8.38\% | 1,591,770 | 10.51\% | 1,900.006 |
| 2A | 1,027.323 | 10.27\% | 1,772,135 | 11.70\% | 1,725.002 |
| 3A1 | 2,987.950 | 29.88\% | 4,855,460 | 32.07\% | 1,625.013 |
| 3A | 1,669.849 | 16.70\% | 2,504,770 | 16.54\% | 1,499.997 |
| 4A1 | 2,748.936 | 27.49\% | 3,436,190 | 22.69\% | 1,250.007 |
| 4A | 484.406 | 4.84\% | 435,960 | 2.88\% | 899.988 |
| Irrigated Total | 9,998.935 | 100.00\% | 15,142,360 | 100.00\% | 1,514.397 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 74.800 | 2.90\% | 134,640 | 4.56\% | 1,800.000 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 266.495 | 10.33\% | 406,415 | 13.76\% | 1,525.037 |
| 2D | 207.788 | 8.06\% | 285,715 | 9.67\% | 1,375.031 |
| 3D1 | 434.784 | 16.86\% | 576,100 | 19.50\% | 1,325.025 |
| 3D | 414.560 | 16.08\% | 507,845 | 17.19\% | 1,225.021 |
| 4D1 | 833.322 | 32.32\% | 791,655 | 26.80\% | 949.998 |
| 4D | 346.923 | 13.45\% | 251,525 | 8.52\% | 725.016 |
| Dry Total | 2,578.672 | 100.00\% | 2,953,895 | 100.00\% | 1,145.510 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 22.000 | $0.21 \%$ | 15,400 | $0.32 \%$ | 700.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 105.629 | $1.02 \%$ | 60,045 | $1.24 \%$ | 568.451 |
| 2G | 115.930 | $1.12 \%$ | 62,340 | $1.29 \%$ | 537.738 |
| 3G1 | $1,027.783$ | $9.95 \%$ | 538,645 | $11.14 \%$ | 524.084 |
| 3G | $1,940.412$ | $18.78 \%$ | 995,115 | $20.57 \%$ | 512.836 |
| 4G1 | $2,852.436$ | $27.61 \%$ | $1,355,285$ | $28.02 \%$ | 475.132 |
| 4G | $4,266.055$ | $41.30 \%$ | $1,810,230$ | $37.42 \%$ | 424.333 |
| Grass Total | $10,330.245$ | $100.00 \%$ | $4,837,060$ | $100.00 \%$ | 468.242 |
|  | $9,998.935$ | $43.04 \%$ | $15,142,360$ | $65.96 \%$ | $1,514.397$ |
| Irrigated Total | $2,578.672$ | $11.10 \%$ | $2,953,895$ | $12.87 \%$ | $1,145.510$ |
| Dry Total | $10,330.245$ | $44.46 \%$ | $4,837,060$ | $21.07 \%$ | 468.242 |
| Grass Total | 79.800 | $0.34 \%$ | 5,990 | $0.03 \%$ | 75.062 |
| Waste | 245.764 | $1.06 \%$ | 18,440 | $0.08 \%$ | 75.031 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 9 |
| Exempt | $23,233.416$ | $100.00 \%$ | $22,957,745$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $9,998.935$ | $5.38 \%$ | $15,142,360$ | $4.36 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,578.672$ | $1.73 \%$ | $2,953,895$ | $1.19 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $10,330.245$ | $21.03 \%$ | $4,837,060$ | $15.03 \%$ |
| Waste | 79.800 | $1.49 \%$ | 5,990 | $1.49 \%$ |
| Other | 245.764 | $15.10 \%$ | 18,440 | $9.84 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $23,233.416$ | $5.94 \%$ | $22,957,745$ | $3.65 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 71 - Platte
Market Area: $\quad 5$

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 81.700 | 7.00\% | 155,230 | 10.29\% | 1,900.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 153.000 | 13.11\% | 237,150 | 15.72\% | 1,550.000 |
| 3A1 | 3.000 | 0.26\% | 3,900 | 0.26\% | 1,300.000 |
| 3A | 919.360 | 78.78\% | 1,103,230 | 73.13\% | 1,199.997 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 10.000 | 0.86\% | 9,000 | 0.60\% | 900.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 1,167.060 | 100.00\% | 1,508,510 | 100.00\% | 1,292.572 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 13.140 | 4.96\% | 21,025 | 7.68\% | 1,600.076 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D | 13.870 | 5.24\% | 18,030 | 6.59\% | 1,299.927 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 222.770 | 84.13\% | 222,770 | 81.41\% | 1,000.000 |
| 4D1 | 13.000 | 4.91\% | 10,400 | 3.80\% | 800.000 |
| 4D | 2.000 | 0.76\% | 1,400 | 0.51\% | 700.000 |
| Dry Total | 264.780 | 100.00\% | 273,625 | 100.00\% | 1,033.405 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 3.000 | $0.17 \%$ | 2,400 | $0.21 \%$ | 800.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | 23.000 | $1.31 \%$ | 17,250 | $1.48 \%$ | 750.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | $1,060.290$ | $60.53 \%$ | 742,200 | $63.52 \%$ | 699.997 |
| 4G1 | 147.580 | $8.43 \%$ | 95,930 | $8.21 \%$ | 650.020 |
| 4G | 517.800 | $29.56 \%$ | 310,685 | $26.59 \%$ | 600.009 |
| Grass Total | $1,751.670$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,168,465$ | $100.00 \%$ | 667.057 |


| Irrigated Total | $1,167.060$ | $28.53 \%$ | $1,508,510$ | $49.98 \%$ | $1,292.572$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 264.780 | $6.47 \%$ | 273,625 | $9.07 \%$ | $1,033.405$ |
| Grass Total | $1,751.670$ | $42.82 \%$ | $1,168,465$ | $38.71 \%$ | 667.057 |
| Waste | 865.969 | $21.17 \%$ | 64,950 | $2.15 \%$ | 75.002 |
| Other | 40.990 | $1.00 \%$ | 2,670 | $0.09 \%$ | 65.137 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 737.860 |
| Market Area Total | $4,090.469$ | $100.00 \%$ | $3,018,220$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $1,167.060$ | $0.63 \%$ | $1,508,510$ | $0.43 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 264.780 | $0.18 \%$ | 273,625 | $0.11 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $1,751.670$ | $3.57 \%$ | $1,168,465$ | $3.63 \%$ |
| Waste | 865.969 | $16.17 \%$ | 64,950 | $16.16 \%$ |
| Other | 40.990 | $2.52 \%$ | 2,670 | $1.42 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $4,090.469$ | $1.05 \%$ | $3,018,220$ | $0.48 \%$ |

## 2007 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 71 - Platte

Market Area:

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |
| 16,951.680 |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 71 - Platte


| Total | $391,210.364$ | $\mathbf{6 2 8 , 4 3 2 , 0 9 5}$ | $391,210.364$ | $100.00 \%$ | $628,432,095$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,606.378$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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# PLATTE COUNTY <br> PLAN OF ASSESSMENT 

Vanora Mulligan<br>PLATTE COUNTY ASSESSOR<br>3 Year Plan<br>Introduction

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9.

## County Description of Real Property in Platte County:

Per the 2006 County Abstract, Platte County consists of the following real property types:

|  | Parcels | \%of Total Parcels | \% of Taxable | Value Base |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 11148 | $63 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $980,523,815$ |
| Commercial | 1403 | $8 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $281,234,885$ |
| Industrial | 65 | $.004 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $151,966,360$ |
| Recreational | 27 | $.002 \%$ | $.001 \%$ | $1,062,645$ |
| Agricultural | 4979 | $29 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $773,857,755$ |
| Special Value | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ |
|  | 17622 | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $2,188,645,460$ |

Agricultural land-taxable acres 390,531.204
New Property: For assessment year 2006, an estimated 402 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

## Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

Staff
1 Assessor
1 Deputy Assessor
3 Fulltime Clerks
1 Appraiser
2 Appraiser Assistants
Assessor prints and checks all reports. Helps with the sales review process for residential, Ag, and commercial properties. Tax corrections are written by the Assessor /Deputy Assessor.

## Assessor, Deputy Assessor and 3 Clerks work on Personal Property\& Homestead Exemptions, answers the phone.

Deputy Assessor- Updates the cadastral maps. Helps with implementing GIS entering land use. Reviews ag land sales.

Clerks in the assessor's office assist in all the general duties in the office. Personal property, homestead exemptions, entering date in the cama real estate system.

Appraiser and Appraiser Assistant- Sales review and appraisal review and pickup work for residential, commercial and ag properties.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property-
A. Real Estate Transfers Statements are updated within a few weeks of when received from the Register of Deeds Office. The Assessor and Appraiser review the sales. Once reviewed the transfer statements are passed to a clerk, she will update the computer with the new information and green sheets are filled out for the Department of Assessment and Taxation. Information statements are filled out either by making phone calls or mail. We also send letters for appointments so the Appraiser or Appraiser Assistant can make a physical review of the property.
B. Internal sales ratio studies are done by neighborhoods and Platte County works well the Field Liaison and review results.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2006:

| Property Class | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 97 | 9.28 | 101.20 |
| Commercial | 97 | 16.51 | 99.34 |
| Agricultural Land | 74 | 19.49 | 107.56 |

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2007:

## Residential

Sales Review of neighborhoods. Plan to review the towns of Creston (143) \& Tarnov (47). Rural residential review.

Commercial
Sales review checking the statistics. Commercial reappraisal planned for 2008.

## Agricultural

Plan to have new rural aerial photos for 2007. The new photos will be compared to the existing aerial photos and additions and deletions will update. Acreage improvement review. Review ag land sales.

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2008:

## Residential

Planned to update the Cama costing price and apply to all residential properties and check statistics. Review neighborhood A1 (Lake \& Golf Course areas) approximately (411) parcels. Review towns Duncan, Monroe \& Platte Center.

## Commercial

Commercial reappraisal is planned for 2008. All properties will be physically inspected by appraiser to verify the current listing and new digital pictures will be taken. The physical inspection will also include interior inspections whenever possible. All three approaches to value will be used whenever applicable to the property. The data collection process will also include gathering income information and analyzing current sales. We will also implement new replacement cost with a correlation report indicating the final value.

## Agricultural

Review ag land sales. Continue GIS.

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009

Residential- Sales review of all neighborhoods. Continue with the review using up dated cost tables \& Pick-up work. Review towns Creston, Humphrey \& Lindsay.

Commercial- Sales review of Commercial and Industrial. Pick-up work
Agricultural- Sales review on all land classes in each area.

## 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 Platte County County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70051160000112139652.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.



[^0]:    * Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Calculates

