## Preface

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Residential Real Property $\mathbf{- C u r r e n t ~}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Number of Sales |  | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | COD | $\mathbf{1 0 . 8 0}$ |
| Total Sales Price | $\$$ | 1472600 | PRD | $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 3 7}$ |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 1476600 | COV | 19.05 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$$ | 1443680 | STD | 19.07 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 39908.11 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 10.51 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$$ | 39018.38 | Min | 54.00 |
| Median | $\mathbf{9 7 . 3 2}$ | Max | 171.33 |  |
| Wgt. Mean | 97.77 | 95\% Median C.I. | 95.98 to 99.88 |  |
| Mean | 100.09 | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. | 94.15 to 101.39 |  |
|  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. | 93.95 to 106.24 |  |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 10.03 |  |  |  |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  | 5.04 |  |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  | 6.57 |  |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  | 29,959 |  |


| Residential Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 3 7}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 48 | 98.46 | 7.42 | 100.81 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 51 | 97.65 | 19.90 | 103.47 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 49 | 100.76 | 27.11 | 115.87 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 53 | 99 | 20.93 | 111.55 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 55 | 99 | 12.85 | 103.75 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 63 | 95 | 49.59 | 129.83 |

## 2007 Commission Summary

Rock

Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales |  | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | COD | $\mathbf{5 . 2 1}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$$ | 980062 | PRD | $\mathbf{1 0 1 . 2 7}$ |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 887062 | COV | 7.41 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$$ | 841105 | STD | 7.12 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$$ | 88706.20 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 5.02 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$$ | 84110.50 | Min | 84.43 |
| Median |  | $\mathbf{9 6 . 4 3}$ | Max | 111.00 |
| Wgt. Mean | 94.82 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 89.88 to 100.00 |  |
| Mean | 96.03 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 91.86 to 97.78 |  |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 2.93 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 7.14 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 13.09 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 45,881 |

Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 1 . 2 7}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 14 | 97.37 | 5.24 | 100.99 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 21 | 97.15 | 18.65 | 101.57 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 20 | 99.90 | 19.88 | 104.58 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 13 | 99 | 24.85 | 113.89 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 11 | 93 | 25.17 | 100.79 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 16 | 95 | 25.53 | 100.52 |

## 2007 Commission Summary

| Rock |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural Land - Current |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Sales |  | 38 | COD |  | 20.69 |
| Total Sales Price | \$ | 10112663 | PRD |  | 100.38 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | - \$ | 9492161 | COV |  | 26.69 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$ | 7092640 | STD |  | 20.02 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$ | 249793.71 | Avg. |  | 14.73 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | \$ | 186648.42 | Min |  | 39.75 |
| Median |  | 71.21 | Max |  | 123.05 |
| Wgt. Mean |  | 74.72 | 95\% |  | 62.52 to 79.85 |
| Mean |  | 75.00 | 95\% |  | 67.10 to 82.35 |
|  |  |  | 95\% |  | 68.64 to 81.37 |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County |  |  |  |  | 87.23 |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  |  | 1.71 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  |  | 9.76 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  |  |  | 86,160 |
| Agricultural Land - History |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year N | Number of |  | Median | COD | PRD |
| 2007 | 38 |  | 71.21 | 20.69 | 100.38 |
| 2006 | 35 |  | 78.51 | 17.90 | 103.37 |
| 2005 | 38 |  | 77.59 | 14.63 | 104.48 |
| 2004 | 39 |  | 76.88 | 12.96 | 102.21 |
| 2003 | 42 |  | 74 | 16.1 | 106.46 |
| 2002 | 39 |  | 75 | 26.88 | 118.28 |
| 2001 | 46 |  | 80 | 28.49 | 114.48 |

## 2007 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Rock 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 Rock County is $97 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Rock 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 Rock County is $96 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Rock 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 Rock County is $71 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Rock County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.


Property Tax Administrator

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the 2007 Residential statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the residential property in Rock County has been achieved. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range indicating the required level of value has been met. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both within the acceptable range indicating uniform and proportionate assessment for 2007. The six tables that follow along with the reported assessment actions all demonstrate a level of value within the acceptable range. There is no information available that would suggest that the qualified median is not the best indication of the level of value in the residential property class.

2007 Correlation Section<br>for Rock 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 | 60 | 37 | 61.67 |
| 2006 | 75 | 48 | 64 |
| 2005 | 73 | 51 | 69.86 |
| 2004 | 67 | 49 | 73.13 |
| 2003 | 68 | 53 | $\mathbf{7 7 . 9 4}$ |
| 2002 | 71 | 55 | 77.46 |
| 2001 | 73 | 63 | 86.3 |

RESIDENTIAL: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized an acceptable proportion of the available sales for the development of the qualified statistics. This indicates that the measurement of the class of property was done using all available sales.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Rock 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 | 97.17 | 2.09 | 99.2 | 97.32 |
| 2006 | 96.74 | 3.44 | 100.06 | 98.46 |
| 2005 | 99.79 | 5.4 | 105.18 | 97.65 |
| 2004 | 101.87 | -6.28 | 95.48 | 100.76 |
| 2003 | 99 | -0.77 | 98.24 | 99 |
| 2002 | 92.88 | 20.89 | 112.28 | 99 |
| 2001 | 91 | 2.66 | 93.42 | 95 |

RESIDENTIAL: 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.63 | 2007 | 2.09 |
| 8.35 | 2006 | 3.44 |
| 0.48 | 2005 | 5.4 |
| 1.32 | 2004 | -6.28 |
| 0 | 2003 | -0.77 |
| 15.27 | 2002 | 20.89 |
| 2.4 | 2001 | 2.66 |

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.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Rock County

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 97.32 | 97.77 | 100.09 |

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| R\&O Statistics | 10.80 | 102.37 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the 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 | 37 | 37 | 0 |
| Median | 97.17 | 97.32 | 0.15 |
| Wgt. Mean | 95.99 | 97.77 | 1.78 |
| Mean | 96.78 | 100.09 | 3.31 |
| COD | 9.70 | 10.80 | 1.1 |
| PRD | 100.83 | 102.37 | 1.54 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 54.00 | 54.00 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 150.00 | 171.33 | 21.33 |

RESIDENTIAL: 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.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Rock County

## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: A review of the 2007 Commercial statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the commercial property in Rock County has been achieved. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range indicating the required level of value has been met. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both within the acceptable range indicating uniform and proportionate assessment for 2007. The sales utilization grid indicates the total sales for the commercial class of property has slowly been on the decline the past few years. The assessor believes the market has been slowing down as well. There is no information available that would suggest that the qualified median is not the best indication of the level of value in the commercial property class.

2007 Correlation Section<br>for Rock 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 | 18 | 10 | 55.56 |
| 2006 | 24 | 14 | 58.33 |
| 2005 | 29 | 21 | 72.41 |
| 2004 | 26 | 20 | 76.92 |
| 2003 | 21 | 13 | 61.9 |
| 2002 | 20 | 11 | 55 |
| 2001 | 23 | 16 | 69.57 |

COMMERCIAL: A review of table II indicates the total number of sales as well as the qualified sales has been decreasing for the past three years. Indications are the measurement of the class of property was done using all available sales.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Rock 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 | 94.89 | -0.41 | 94.5 | 96.43 |
| 2006 | 95.90 | 13.86 | 109.19 | 97.37 |
| 2005 | 98.75 | -0.68 | 98.08 | 97.15 |
| 2004 | 99.45 | 3.01 | 102.44 | 99.90 |
| 2003 | 99 | 0.01 | 99.01 | 99 |
| 2002 | 89.37 | -0.68 | 88.76 | 93 |
| 2001 | 93 | 2.29 | 95.13 | 92 |

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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.49 | 2007 | $-\mathbf{0 . 4 1}$ |
| -4.04 | 2006 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 8 6}$ |
| -9.84 | 2005 | $-\mathbf{- 0 . 6 8}$ |
| 0.14 | 2004 | $\mathbf{3 . 0 1}$ |
| 0 | 2003 | 0.01 |
| 2.54 | 2002 | $-\mathbf{0 . 6 8}$ |
| 39.29 | 2001 | 2.29 |

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in the sale base and the percent change in the assessed base are slightly different, but not unreasonable. The difference implies that the assessment actions had more of an affect on the sales file base when compared to the assessed base.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Rock County

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 96.43 | 94.82 | 96.03 |

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 5.21 | 101.27 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the 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 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| Median | 94.89 | $\mathbf{9 6 . 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5 4}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | 93.28 | 94.82 | 1.54 |
| Mean | 93.04 | 96.03 | 2.99 |
| COD | 7.34 | 5.21 | -2.13 |
| PRD | 99.75 | 101.27 | 1.52 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 63.12 | 84.43 | 21.31 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 111.00 | 111.00 | 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.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Rock County

## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the 2007 Agricultural Unimproved statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the agricultural unimproved property in Rock County has been achieved. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range indicating the required level of value has been met. The price related differential is within the acceptable range while the coefficient of dispersion is just slightly above, but not unreasonable. The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is consistent suggesting that sold and unsold parcels were appraised similarly. The reported assessment actions for 2007 support the statistics from the preliminary to the final analysis. There is no information available that would suggest that the qualified median is not the best indication of the level of value in the agricultural unimproved property class.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Rock 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 | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | 38 | 54.29 |
| 2006 | $\mathbf{6 4}$ | 35 | 54.69 |
| 2005 | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | 38 | 47.5 |
| 2004 | $\mathbf{8 3}$ | 39 | 46.99 |
| 2003 | 78 | 42 | 53.85 |
| 2002 | 69 | 39 | 56.52 |
| 2001 | 70 | 46 | 65.71 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the table indicates that the county has stayed fairly consistent with the previous years indicating stability in the sales review procedures implemented and that the county has not excessively trimmed the sample.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Rock 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 | 67.06 | $\mathbf{9 . 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 . 2 1}$ |
| 2006 | 71.87 | $\mathbf{7 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 5 1}$ |
| 2005 | 73.82 | 5.35 | 77.77 | $\mathbf{7 7 . 5 9}$ |
| 2004 | 74.18 | $\mathbf{6 . 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 . 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 8 8}$ |
| 2003 | 74 | $\mathbf{9 . 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ |
| 2002 | 72.57 | $\mathbf{6 . 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 . 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 5}$ |
| 2001 | 73 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 . 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 5}$ |

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

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

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

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

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

| \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value in the Sales File |  | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8.26 | 2007 | 9.65 |
| 8.96 | 2006 | $\mathbf{7 . 9 2}$ |
| 1.29 | 2005 | 5.35 |
| 12.36 | 2004 | 6.22 |
| 4 | 2003 | 9.87 |
| 12.19 | 2002 | 6.85 |
| 6.46 | 2001 | 12.23 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: After review of the percent change report it appears that both sold and unsold properties were treated 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 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 0 0}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and support each other. The median is a reliable measure of the level of assessment in this class of property.

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 20.69 | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 3 8}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{0 . 6 9}$ | 0 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The price related differential is within the acceptable range and the coefficient of dispersion is slightly above the range at 20.69. The indication is this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 2007 Correlation Section <br> for Rock 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 | 38 | 38 | 0 |
| Median | 67.06 | 71.21 | 4.15 |
| Wgt. Mean | 68.95 | 74.72 | 5.77 |
| Mean | 69.03 | 75.00 | 5.97 |
| COD | 21.53 | 20.69 | -0.84 |
| PRD | 100.11 | 100.38 | 0.27 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 32.43 | 39.75 | 7.32 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 115.18 | 123.05 | 7.87 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The above table is reflective of the actions of the assessor in making valuation changes to the various land capability groups within each market area of Rock County. The statistical measurements appear to be a realistic reflection of the assessment actions taken for unimproved agricultural land in Rock County.

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

|  | 2006 CTL <br> County Total | 2007 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2007 Form 45-2006 CTL) | Percent Change | 2007 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 21,209,075 | 21,846,155 | 637,080 | 3 | 197,791 | 2.07 |
| 2. Recreational | 137,530 | 143,780 | 6,250 | 4.54 | 0 | 4.54 |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 9,185,865 | 9,328,445 | 142,580 | 1.55 | *------ | 1.55 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 30,532,470 | 31,318,380 | 785,910 | 2.57 | 197,791 | 1.93 |
| 5. Commercial | 6,449,845 | 6,423,340 | -26,505 | -0.41 | 0 | -0.41 |
| 6. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 5,666,900 | 7,156,410 | 1,489,510 | 26.28 | 313,023 | 20.76 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 12,116,745 | 13,579,750 | 1,463,005 | 12.07 | 0 | 12.07 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 42,649,215 | 44,898,130 | 2,248,915 | 5.27 | 510,814 | 4.08 |
| 11. Irrigated | 37,320,230 | 40,318,555 | 2,998,325 | 8.03 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 1,348,220 | 1,528,905 | 180,685 | 13.4 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 136,601,200 | 149,328,220 | 12,727,020 | 9.32 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 569050 | 1,158,850 | 589,800 | 103.65 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 364,215 | 863,200 | 498,985 | 137 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 176,202,915 | 193,197,730 | 16,994,815 | 9.65 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 218,852,130 | 238,095,860 | 19,243,730 | 8.79 | 510,814 | 8.56 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 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

_ALL $\qquad$

|  | 37 | 97.32 | 100.09 | 97.77 | 10.80 | 102.37 | 54.00 | 171.33 | 95.98 to 99.88 | 39,908 | 39,018 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHOOL DISTRICT * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09-0010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75-0100 | 37 | 97.32 | 100.09 | 97.77 | 10.80 | 102.37 | 54.00 | 171.33 | 95.98 to 99.88 | 39,908 | 39,018 |

NonValid School
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


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

## Type: Qualified



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

Type: Qualified



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



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

State Stat Run


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

## Type: Qualified



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

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


75 - ROCK COUNTY

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


75 - ROCK COUNTY

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

## Type: Qualified



75 - ROCK COUNTY

## AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

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

## Type: Qualified



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






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


Type: Qualified
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:

$$
980,062
$$

MEDIAN:

| 95 | COV: | 12.98 | $95 \%$ Median C.I.: 89.88 to 99.09 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 93 | STD: | 12.08 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 88.25 to 98.31 |

> WGT. MEAN: 887,062 827,450
88,706
82,745

MEAN :
$\begin{array}{rr}\text { STD: } & 12.08 \\ . \text { DEV: } & 6.97\end{array}$
AVG.ABS.DEV: 6.97
COD: 7.34 MAX Sales Ratio: 111.00
PRD: 99.75 MIN Sales Ratio: 63.12

## RANGE

07/01/
10/01/
$01 / 01 / 0$
$04 / 01 / 04$
$07 / 01$
$10 / 01$
$01 / 01$
$04 / 01$
$07 / 01$
$10 / 01$
$01 / 01$
$04 / 01$
$\qquad$

| $07 / 01 / 03$ | TO $09 / 30 / 03$ | 1 | 111.00 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $10 / 01 / 03$ | TO $12 / 31 / 03$ | 4 | 97.27 |
| $01 / 01 / 04$ | TO $03 / 31 / 04$ |  |  |
| $04 / 01 / 04$ | TO $06 / 30 / 04$ | 1 | 95.43 | 1/04 TO 06/30/04 10/01/04 TO 09/30/04 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 04/01/05 TO 06/30/05 07/01/05 TO 09/30/05 10/01/05 тO 12/31/05 01/01/06 то 03/31/06

$\qquad$ Study Years 07/01/03 то 06/30/04 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06
$\qquad$ Calendar Yrs $\qquad$ $-1$ 1
2

01/01/05 TO 12/31/05
$\qquad$ AL
ASSESSOR LOCATION
RANGE
BASSET
RURAL
RURAL

RURAL
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

|  | 95.43 | 95.43 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 77.03 | 77.03 |
| -10 | 94.89 | 93.04 |
|  |  |  |



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


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 Rock County

March 19, 2007

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

1. Deputy(ies) on staff:

1
2. Appraiser(s) on staff:

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

0
6. Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: $\$ 65,611$.
(This would be the "total budget" for the assessor's office)
7. Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system (How much is particularly part of the assessor budget, versus the amount that is part of the county budget?): \$4,517.
8. Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: same as above.
9. Amount of total budget set aside for appraisal work: none.
10. Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops: $\$ 0$.
11. Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget: $\$ 1,000$.
12. Other miscellaneous funds: $\$ 500$.
(Any amount not included in any of the above for equipping, staffing and funding the appraisal/assessment function. This would include any County Board, or general fund monies set aside for reappraisal, etc. If the assessor is ex-officio, this can be an estimate.) This money is for education and workshops.
13. Total budget: $\$ 65,611$.
a. Was any of last year's budget not used?

No
B. Residential Appraisal Information
(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1. Data collection done by:

Assessor and Deputy
2. Valuation done by:

Assessor and Deputy
3. Pickup work done by:

Assessor and Deputy

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

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

4 - Bassett, Newport, Suburban and Rural
8. How are these defined?

These market areas are defined by location, specifically by town and rural. Suburban properties are everything outside the City limits up to a one mile radius.
9. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity?

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

1. Data collection done by:

Assessor and Deputy
2. Valuation done by:

Assessor and Deputy
3. Pickup work done by whom:

Assessor and Deputy

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

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

4 - Bassett, Newport, Suburban and Rural
9. How are these defined?

These market areas are defined by location, specifically by town and rural. Suburban Properties are everything outside the City limits up to one mile radius.
10. Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? Yes
11. Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?)
Yes
D. Agricultural Appraisal Information

1. Data collection done by:

Assessor and Deputy
2. Valuation done by:

Assessor and Deputy
3. Pickup work done by whom:

Assessor and Deputy

| Property Type | \# of Permits | \# of Info. <br> Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

4. Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
At this time the County is in the process of developing a written policy to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages.
How is your agricultural land defined?
Agricultural land is defined according to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359.
5. When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
The income approach has never been utilized.
6. What is the date of the soil survey currently used? 1986
7. What date was the last countywide land use study completed? 2001
a. By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)

FSA maps and aerial photos
b. By whom?

Assessor and Deputy
c. What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
$100 \%$ is completed and implemented of the 2001 study.
8. Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class:

5
9. How are these defined?

By location, soil associations, topography and the market
10. Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county? No

## E. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1. Administrative software:

Terra Scan
2. CAMA software:

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

Yes
a. Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?

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

No
a. Who maintains the GIS software and maps?

N/A
4. Personal Property software:

Terra Scan

## F. Zoning Information

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

Yes
b. What municipalities in the county are zoned?

Bassett
c. When was zoning implemented?

1999

## G. Contracted Services

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

None
2. Other Services:

None
H. Additional comments or further explanations on any item from A through $G$ :

## II. Assessment Actions

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

## 1. Residential

For the assessment year 2007 all improvements in Newport were revalued based on a physical review and market study by the assessor. New pictures of all improvements were also taken.

The Rock County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. If there was no response from the questionnaire, a phone call was made or a physical review of the property was performed.

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

## 2. Commercial

For the assessment year 2007 all improvements in Newport were revalued based on a physical review and market study by the assessor. New pictures of all improvements were also taken.

The Rock County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. If
there was no response from the questionnaire, a phone call was made or a physical review of the property was performed.

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

## 3. Agricultural

For the assessment year 2007, the assessor completed a spreadsheet analysis of the unimproved agricultural sales and made valuation adjustments accordingly.

Changes in land valuation were made to land capability groups in all three market areas. In market areas 1, 2 and 3 Irrigated values were raised. In market areas 1 and 2 Grass Land values were raised and in market area 3 Dry Land values were raised. Home sites and shelterbelts were also raised based on the analysis.

Feedlots in the county were revalued on a per head acre basis.
All agricultural improvements are now updated to the June 2004 Marshall \& Swift pricing.

The Rock County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. If there was no response from the questionnaire, a phone call was made or a physical review of the property was performed.

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

## County 75 - Rock
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## County 75 - Rock




| County 75 - Rock | 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 | 2 | 2.000 | 8,000 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 114,730 |  |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5 | 152.760 | 86,550 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10 | 303.160 | 190,740 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 0 |  | 0 | 10 |  | 103,820 |  |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |  | 0.000 |  |  | 28.760 |  |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0.000 | 0 |  |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total <br> Acres | Value | Growth Value |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 6 | 6.000 | 24,000 | 6 | 6.000 | 24,000 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 260 | 315.000 | 1,257,000 | 262 | 317.000 | 1,265,000 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 265 |  | 7,924,715 | 267 |  | 8,039,445 | 313,023 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 273 | 323.000 | 9,328,445 |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 12 | 107.000 | 57,500 | 17 | 259.760 | 144,050 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 322 | 1,103.580 | 1,988,580 | 332 | 1,406.740 | 2,179,320 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 330 |  | 4,729,220 | 340 |  | 4,833,040 | 0 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 357 | 1,666.500 | 7,156,410 |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |  | 3,019.020 |  |  | 3,047.780 |  |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 8.000 | 0 |  | 8.000 | 0 |  |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 630 | 5,045.280 | 16,484,855 | 313,023 |
| Schedule VII: Agricultural Records: Ag Land Detail-Game \& Parks | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |  |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 2 | 0.000 | 166,950 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |  |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |  |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 10 | 897.000 | 210,665 | 12 | 897.000 | 377,615 |  |
| Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records: Special Value | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |  |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |  |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |  |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |  |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## County 75 - Rock <br> 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 75.000 | 60,000 | 236.000 | 188,320 | 311.000 | 248,320 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 82.000 | 61,500 | 82.000 | 61,500 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 40.000 | 30,000 | 748.000 | 560,850 | 788.000 | 590,850 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 89.000 | 64,525 | 2,348.000 | 1,706,940 | 2,437.000 | 1,771,465 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,767.000 | 2,011,005 | 2,767.000 | 2,011,005 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 38.000 | 27,550 | 6,190.000 | 4,527,190 | 6,228.000 | 4,554,740 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 458.000 | 324,240 | 458.000 | 324,240 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 242.000 | 182,075 | 12,829.000 | 9,380,045 | 13,071.000 | 9,562,120 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 78.000 | 31,200 | 78.000 | 31,200 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 164.000 | 63,960 | 164.000 | 63,960 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 62.000 | 22,940 | 62.000 | 22,940 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 436.000 | 161,320 | 436.000 | 161,320 |
| 60.4 D 1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 163.000 | 57,050 | 163.000 | 57,050 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 48.000 | 16,800 | 48.000 | 16,800 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 951.000 | 353,270 | 951.000 | 353,270 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 622.000 | 248,800 | 18,122.000 | 7,247,340 | 18,744.000 | 7,496,140 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 181.000 | 67,530 | 181.000 | 67,530 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 216.000 | 75,600 | 11,302.780 | 3,956,485 | 11,518.780 | 4,032,085 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,683.000 | 572,220 | 59,235.000 | 20,153,385 | 60,918.000 | 20,725,605 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10,416.360 | 3,438,745 | 10,416.360 | 3,438,745 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 263.000 | 63,120 | 37,596.100 | 9,180,995 | 37,859.100 | 9,244,115 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 33.000 | 7,590 | 17,832.000 | 4,114,810 | 17,865.000 | 4,122,400 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,817.000 | 967,330 | 154,685.240 | 48,159,290 | 157,502.240 | 49,126,620 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 82.000 | 8,200 | 3,027.000 | 302,700 | 3,109.000 | 310,900 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 18.000 | 8,100 | 611.000 | 275,150 | 629.000 | 283,250 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 928.710 |  | 928.710 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 3,159.000 | 1,165,705 | 172,103.240 | 58,470,455 | 175,262.240 | 59,636,160 |



## County 75 - Rock <br> 2007 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
3

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 314.000 | 321,850 | 314.000 | 321,850 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 26.000 | 26,650 | 26.000 | 26,650 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 334.000 | 342,350 | 334.000 | 342,350 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 22.000 | 22,550 | 3,386.000 | 3,470,650 | 3,408.000 | 3,493,200 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 61.000 | 62,525 | 11,102.000 | 11,379,550 | 11,163.000 | 11,442,075 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 9,225 | 9,763.000 | 10,007,075 | 9,772.000 | 10,016,300 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 306.000 | 306,000 | 306.000 | 306,000 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 92.000 | 94,300 | 25,231.000 | 25,854,125 | 25,323.000 | 25,948,425 |


| Dryland: |
| :--- |
| 54. 1D1 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 306.000 | 137,700 | 751.000 | 329,550 | 1,057.000 | 467,250 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 2,700 | 6.000 | 2,700 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 99.000 | 44,550 | 455.000 | 204,750 | 554.000 | 249,300 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 218.000 | 79,570 | 6,048.000 | 2,202,385 | 6,266.000 | 2,281,955 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 66.000 | 22,110 | 16,348.000 | 5,482,880 | 16,414.000 | 5,504,990 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 149.000 | 44,700 | 31,000.000 | 9,344,200 | 31,149.000 | 9,388,900 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 33,478.000 | 10,049,400 | 33,478.000 | 10,049,400 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 838.000 | 328,630 | 88,086.000 | 27,615,865 | 88,924.000 | 27,944,495 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 300 | 201.500 | 20,150 | 204.500 | 20,450 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 2,700 | 367.000 | 165,150 | 373.000 | 167,850 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 15.000 |  | 643.960 |  | 658.960 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 939.000 | 425,930 | 116,489.500 | 54,807,015 | 117,428.500 | 55,232,945 |

## County 75 - Rock

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

| AgLand | Acres | Value | SubU Acres | Value | Rural Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 76.Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 334.000 | 276,375 | 45,020.570 | 40,042,180 | 45,354.570 | 40,318,555 |
| 77.Dry Land | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,651.000 | 1,528,905 | 3,651.000 | 1,528,905 |
| 78.Grass | 0.000 | 0 | 3,655.000 | 1,295,960 | 566,526.270 | 148,032,260 | 570,181.270 | 149,328,220 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 85.000 | 8,500 | 11,503.500 | 1,150,350 | 11,588.500 | 1,158,850 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 24.000 | 10,800 | 1,873.000 | 852,400 | 1,897.000 | 863,200 |
| 81.Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 19.000 | 0 | 5,155.240 | 0 | 5,174.240 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 0.000 | 0 | 4,098.000 | 1,591,635 | 628,574.340 | 191,606,095 | 632,672.340 | 193,197,730 |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 75-Rock
Market Area:
Average Assessed Value*

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |
| 1A |
| 2A1 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $18,744.000$ | $11.90 \%$ | $7,496,140$ | $15.26 \%$ | 399.922 |
| 2G1 | 181.000 | $0.11 \%$ | 67,530 | $0.14 \%$ | 373.093 |
| 2G | $11,518.780$ | $7.31 \%$ | $4,032,085$ | $8.21 \%$ | 350.044 |
| 3G1 | $60,918.000$ | $38.68 \%$ | $20,725,605$ | $42.19 \%$ | 340.221 |
| 3G | $10,416.360$ | $6.61 \%$ | $3,438,745$ | $7.00 \%$ | 330.129 |
| 4G1 | $37,859.100$ | $24.04 \%$ | $9,244,115$ | $18.82 \%$ | 244.171 |
| 4G | $17,865.000$ | $11.34 \%$ | $4,122,400$ | $8.39 \%$ | 230.752 |
| Grass Total | $157,502.240$ | $100.00 \%$ | $49,126,620$ | $100.00 \%$ | 311.910 |
|  | $13,071.000$ | $7.46 \%$ | $9,562,120$ | $16.03 \%$ | 731.552 |
| Irrigated Total | 951.000 | $0.54 \%$ | 353,270 | $0.59 \%$ | 371.472 |
| Dry Total | $157,502.240$ | $89.87 \%$ | $49,126,620$ | $82.38 \%$ | 311.910 |
| Grass Total | $3,109.000$ | $1.77 \%$ | 310,900 | $0.52 \%$ | 100.000 |
| Waste | 629.000 | $0.36 \%$ | 283,250 | $0.47 \%$ | 450.317 |
| Other | 928.710 | $0.53 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Exempt | $175,262.240$ | $100.00 \%$ | $59,636,160$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  | 340.268 |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $13,071.000$ | $28.82 \%$ | $9,562,120$ | $23.72 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 951.000 | $26.05 \%$ | 353,270 | $23.11 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $157,502.240$ | $27.62 \%$ | $49,126,620$ | $32.90 \%$ |
| Waste | $3,109.000$ | $26.83 \%$ | 310,900 | $26.83 \%$ |
| Other | 629.000 | $33.16 \%$ | 283,250 | $32.81 \%$ |
| Exempt | 928.710 | $17.95 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $175,262.240$ | $27.70 \%$ | $59,636,160$ | $30.87 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail
County 75-Rock
Market Area: 2

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 122.000 | 1.75\% | 88,320 | 1.84\% | 723.934 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 628.000 | 9.02\% | 436,200 | 9.07\% | 694.585 |
| 3A1 | 1,109.000 | 15.93\% | 785,755 | 16.34\% | 708.525 |
| 3A | 611.000 | 8.78\% | 442,975 | 9.21\% | 725.000 |
| 4A1 | 3,956.070 | 56.84\% | 2,686,275 | 55.87\% | 679.026 |
| 4A | 534.500 | 7.68\% | 368,485 | 7.66\% | 689.401 |
| Irrigated Total | 6,960.570 | 100.00\% | 4,808,010 | 100.00\% | 690.749 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D | 30.000 | 31.25\% | 8,100 | 33.88\% | 270.000 |
| 3D1 | 19.000 | 19.79\% | 4,940 | 20.66\% | 260.000 |
| 3D | 3.000 | 3.13\% | 750 | 3.14\% | 250.000 |
| 4D1 | 44.000 | 45.83\% | 10,120 | 42.33\% | 230.000 |
| 4D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | 96.000 | 100.00\% | 23,910 | 100.00\% | 249.062 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $14,259.000$ | $4.40 \%$ | $4,277,700$ | $5.92 \%$ | 300.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | $11,621.000$ | $3.59 \%$ | $3,486,300$ | $4.82 \%$ | 300.000 |
| 3G1 | $50,480.000$ | $15.59 \%$ | $14,195,460$ | $19.65 \%$ | 281.209 |
| 3G | $2,110.000$ | $0.65 \%$ | 482,025 | $0.67 \%$ | 228.447 |
| 4G1 | $90,725.530$ | $28.02 \%$ | $19,738,255$ | $27.32 \%$ | 217.560 |
| 4G | $154,559.500$ | $47.74 \%$ | $30,077,365$ | $41.63 \%$ | 194.600 |
| Grass Total | $323,755.030$ | $100.00 \%$ | $72,257,105$ | $100.00 \%$ | 223.184 |
|  | $6,960.570$ | $2.05 \%$ | $4,808,010$ | $6.14 \%$ | 690.749 |
| Irrigated Total | 96.000 | $0.03 \%$ | 23,910 | $0.03 \%$ | 249.062 |
| Dry Total | $323,755.030$ | $95.23 \%$ | $72,257,105$ | $92.25 \%$ | 223.184 |
| Grass Total | $8,275.000$ | $2.43 \%$ | 827,500 | $1.06 \%$ | 100.000 |
| Waste | 895.000 | $0.26 \%$ | 412,100 | $0.53 \%$ | 460.446 |
| Other | $3,582.570$ | $1.05 \%$ |  |  | 2 |
| Exempt | $339,981.600$ | $100.00 \%$ | $78,328,625$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $6,960.570$ | $15.35 \%$ | $4,808,010$ | $11.93 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 96.000 | $2.63 \%$ | 23,910 | $1.56 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $323,755.030$ | $56.78 \%$ | $72,257,105$ | $48.39 \%$ |
| Waste | $8,275.000$ | $71.41 \%$ | 827,500 | $71.41 \%$ |
| Other | 895.000 | $47.18 \%$ | 412,100 | $47.74 \%$ |
| Exempt | $3,582.570$ | $69.24 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $339,981.600$ | $53.74 \%$ | $78,328,625$ | $40.54 \%$ |

2007 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 75 - Rock

Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 314.000 | 1.24\% | 321,850 | 1.24\% | 1,025.000 |
| 2A1 | 26.000 | 0.10\% | 26,650 | 0.10\% | 1,025.000 |
| 2A | 334.000 | 1.32\% | 342,350 | 1.32\% | 1,025.000 |
| 3A1 | 3,408.000 | 13.46\% | 3,493,200 | 13.46\% | 1,025.000 |
| 3A | 11,163.000 | 44.08\% | 11,442,075 | 44.10\% | 1,025.000 |
| 4A1 | 9,772.000 | 38.59\% | 10,016,300 | 38.60\% | 1,025.000 |
| 4A | 306.000 | 1.21\% | 306,000 | 1.18\% | 1,000.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 25,323.000 | 100.00\% | 25,948,425 | 100.00\% | 1,024.697 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 440.000 | 16.90\% | 198,000 | 17.19\% | 450.000 |
| 2D1 | 3.000 | 0.12\% | 1,350 | 0.12\% | 450.000 |
| 2D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D1 | 466.000 | 17.90\% | 209,700 | 18.21\% | 450.000 |
| 3D | 892.000 | 34.25\% | 401,400 | 34.85\% | 450.000 |
| 4D1 | 566.000 | 21.74\% | 240,550 | 20.89\% | 425.000 |
| 4D | 237.000 | 9.10\% | 100,725 | 8.75\% | 425.000 |
| Dry Total | 2,604.000 | 100.00\% | 1,151,725 | 100.00\% | 442.290 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $1,057.000$ | $1.19 \%$ | 467,250 | $1.67 \%$ | 442.052 |
| 2G1 | 6.000 | $0.01 \%$ | 2,700 | $0.01 \%$ | 450.000 |
| 2G | 554.000 | $0.62 \%$ | 249,300 | $0.89 \%$ | 450.000 |
| 3G1 | $6,266.000$ | $7.05 \%$ | $2,281,955$ | $8.17 \%$ | 364.180 |
| 3G | $16,414.000$ | $18.46 \%$ | $5,504,990$ | $19.70 \%$ | 335.383 |
| 4G1 | $31,149.000$ | $35.03 \%$ | $9,388,900$ | $33.60 \%$ | 301.418 |
| 4G | $33,478.000$ | $37.65 \%$ | $10,049,400$ | $35.96 \%$ | 300.179 |
| Grass Total | $88,924.000$ | $100.00 \%$ | $27,944,495$ | $100.00 \%$ | 314.251 |
| Irigated Total | $25,323.000$ | $21.56 \%$ | $25,948,425$ | $46.98 \%$ | $1,024.697$ |
| Dry Total | $2,604.000$ | $2.22 \%$ | $1,151,725$ | $2.09 \%$ | 442.290 |
| Grass Total | $88,924.000$ | $75.73 \%$ | $27,944,495$ | $50.59 \%$ | 314.251 |
| Waste | 204.500 | $0.17 \%$ | 20,450 | $0.04 \%$ | 100.000 |
| Other | 373.000 | $0.32 \%$ | 167,850 | $0.30 \%$ | 450.000 |
| Exempt | 658.960 | $0.56 \%$ |  |  | 4 |
| Market Area Total | $117,428.500$ | $100.00 \%$ | $55,232,945$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $25,323.000$ | $55.83 \%$ | $25,948,425$ | $64.36 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,604.000$ | $71.32 \%$ | $1,151,725$ | $75.33 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $88,924.000$ | $15.60 \%$ | $27,944,495$ | $18.71 \%$ |
| Waste | 204.500 | $1.76 \%$ | 20,450 | $1.76 \%$ |
| Other | 373.000 | $19.66 \%$ | 167,850 | $19.45 \%$ |
| Exempt | 658.960 | $12.74 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $117,428.500$ | $18.56 \%$ | $55,232,945$ | $28.59 \%$ |

## 2007 Agricultural Land Detail

County 75 - Rock

| AgLand | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 334.000 | 276,375 | 45,020.570 | 40,042,180 |
| Dry | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,651.000 | 1,528,905 |
| Grass | 0.000 | 0 | 3,655.000 | 1,295,960 56 | 566,526.270 | 148,032,260 |
| Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 85.000 | 8,500 | 11,503.500 | 1,150,350 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0 | 24.000 | 10,800 | 1,873.000 | 852,400 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 19.000 | 0 | 5,155.240 | 0 |
| Total | 0.000 | 0 | 4,098.000 | 1,591,635 628 | 628,574.340 | 191,606,095 |
| AgLand | Total <br> Acres | Value | Acres \% of Acres* | * Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| Irrigated | 45,354.570 | 40,318,555 | 45,354.570 7.17\% | 40,318,555 | 5 20.87\% | 888.963 |
| Dry | 3,651.000 | 1,528,905 | 3,651.000 0.58\% | 1,528,905 | 5 0.79\% | 418.763 |
| Grass | 570,181.270 | 149,328,220 | 570,181.270 90.12\% | 149,328,220 | 0 77.29\% | 261.896 |
| Waste | 11,588.500 | 1,158,850 | 11,588.500 1.83\% | 1,158,850 | 0 0.60\% | 100.000 |
| Other | 1,897.000 | 863,200 | 1,897.000 0.30\% | 863,200 | 0 0.45\% | 455.034 |
| Exempt | 5,174.240 | 0 | 5,174.240 0.82\% |  | 0 0.00\% | 0.000 |


| Total | $\mathbf{6 3 2 , 6 7 2 . 3 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 3 , 1 9 7 , 7 3 0}$ | $632,672.340$ | $100.00 \%$ | $193,197,730$ | $100.00 \%$ | 305.367 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Calculates


# 2006 Plan of Assessment for Rock County Assessment Years 2007, 2008, and 2009 

## Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the "plan"), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

## Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. 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 (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1) $100 \%$ of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2) $80 \%$ of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3) $80 \%$ of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344 and $80 \%$ of its recapture value as defined in §77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

## General Description of Real Property in Rock County:

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

|  | Parcels | \% of Total Parcels | \% of Taxable Value |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 735 | $23.5 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Commercial | 147 | $4.7 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| Industrial | - | - | - |
| Recreational | 9 | $1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Agricultural | 2215 | $70.8 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| Special Value | - | - | - |

Agricultural land - taxable acres 633,188
For more information see 2006 Reports \& Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

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

| Property Class |  | Median |  | COD $^{*}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  | PRD* |  |
| Residential |  | 98.46 |  | 7.42 |  |
| Commercial | 97.37 |  | 5.24 |  | 100.81 |
| Agricultural Land | 78.51 |  | 17.90 |  | 103.37 |

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2006 Reports \& Opinions.

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Years 2006, 2007 \& 2008:

For the year 2006-07 all classes of property will be reviewed to achieve the levels of value required by law. The village of Newport residential will be revalued, sketches drawn, pictures taken and new information will be added. All records will be updated to the June 2004 Marshall \& Swift pricing within the Terra Scan system. We will do the pickup work in house.

For the year 2007-08 all classes of property will be reviewed to achieve the levels of value required by law. Hopefully land use over the county will be reviewed.

For the year 2008-09 all classes of property will be reviewed to achieve the levels of value required by law.

This information is provided to the best of my knowledge with the information I have at this time. If anything changes in the future we will address it in an appropriate manner.

Other functions preformed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:

1. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
a. Abstracts (Real \& Personal Property)
b. Assessor Survey
c. Sales information to PA\&T rosters \& annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
e. School District Taxable Value Report
f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands \& Funds
i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
2. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 357 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
3. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
4. Taxable Government Owned Property - annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
5. Homestead Exemptions; administer 126 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
6. Centrally Assessed - review of valuations as certified by PA\&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
7. Tax Increment Financing - management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates - management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
9. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
10. Tax List Corrections - prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
11. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests - assemble and provide information
12. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
13. TERC Statewide Equalization - attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
14. Education: Assessor and Education - attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification

Respectfully submitted:
Gene Schaaf
Rock County Assessor

## 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 Rock County County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70051160000112139706.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2007.


