## 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., 2007). 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., 2007) 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 Revenue Property Assessment Division, hereinafter referred to as the Division, 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 Division 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 Division is required by Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2007) to develop and maintain a state-wide sales file of all arm's length transactions. From this sales file the Division 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 Division prepares statistical analysis from a non-randomly 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 Division. 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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## 2008 Commission Summary

| Number of Sales | 434 | COD | 15.49 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Sales Price | \$34,868,092 | PRD | 106.09 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$34,963,092 | COV | 37.60 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$34,037,772 | STD | 38.83 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$80,560 | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 15.31 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | \$78,428 | Min | 23.97 |
| Median | 98.85 | Max | 554.55 |
| Wgt. Mean | 97.35 | 95\% Median C.I. | 98.63 to 99.06 |
| Mean | 103.28 | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. | 95.73 to 98.98 |
|  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. | 99.62 to 106.93 |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County |  |  | 46.89 |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  | 9.69 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  | 12.33 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  | 61,643 |


| Residential Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 434 | 98.85 | 15.49 | 106.09 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 402 | 97.30 | 22.63 | 109.00 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 323 | 98.79 | 15.15 | 105.15 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 275 | 98.93 | 9.39 | 103.66 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 269 | 94.57 | 21.52 | 107.64 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 264 | 94 | 18.42 | 103.28 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 298 | 93 | 17.58 | 102.03 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 380 | 94 | 19.64 | 103.39 |

## 2008 Commission Summary



## 2008 Commission Summary



Opinions

# 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Box Butte 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 Box Butte County is $98.85 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Box Butte County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. In order to move the level of value of Assessor Location of Rural Res 1 with-in the acceptable range, I have recommended an adjustment of $13.45 \%$. In order to move the level of value of Assessor Location of Rural Res 2 with-in the acceptable range, I have recommended an adjustment of 19.18\%.

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Box Butte County is $97.22 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Box Butte County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. In order to move the level of value of Assessor Location of "Status: Impr, Unimp \& IOLL," range 2, Unimproved with-in the acceptable range, I have recommended an adjustment of $19 \%$.

## Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land in Box Butte County is $70.04 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Box Butte County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator
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# Box Butte County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses: 

## Residential

For Assessment Year 2008, the Assessor implemented a new depreciation schedule for the city of Alliance, based on the market. Hemingford lot values in Uhrig's Addition were increased by $\$ 1$ per square foot. Houses in the Rural Residential 1 Assessor Location were increased by 5\%.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Contracted appraisal firm and office staff. |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor, assisted by the contracted appraisal company. |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Contracted appraisal firm and office staff. |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | Alliance 2004; Hemingford \& rural 1999. |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | Alliance 2005; Hemingford \& rural 2001 |
| 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? |
|  | As defined by the IAAO, the Market or Sales Comparison Approach is not regularly used as an estimate of market value. It is more likely used during the protest period, on an individual property basis. |
| 7. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: |
|  | In Alliance, 5; Hemingford, 6; Rural 3 |
| 8. | How are these defined? |
|  | Mostly by geographic location and physical characteristics. |
| 9. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | Yes, as presently used by the assessor. |
| 10. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural residential? (That is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | The Assessor does not use "suburban" as an identifiable market area, or as an Assessor Location. |


| 11. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> $\mathbf{0 0 1 . 0 7 B}$ ? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the <br> limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Property fitting the Regulation definition is classified as part of the city and valued <br> as such. |
| 12. | Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified <br> and valued in the same manner? |
|  | Both are classified the same, but are valued from different RCN indexes, and both <br> have a different depreciation schedule. |

## Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 0}$ |

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
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## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the following tables shows that the median and weighted mean measures of central tendency are within acceptable range and the mean appears to be approximately three points above the upper limit of acceptable range. Further analysis of the sales file reveals that the mean is outside of acceptable range due to the influence of outliers. If these were removed, all three measures of central tendency would be within acceptable range. For purposes of direct equalization, the median will be used as the point estimate of the overall residential level of value, particularly since it falls within the rather narrow $95 \%$ Median Confidence Interval range of 98.63 to 99.06 , and is also supported by a COD that when outliers are removed, is well within acceptable parameters.

Regarding the qualitative statistics, the coefficient of dispersion is slightly above the accepted range for residential property (approximately one-half point, rounded). The price-related differential appears to be slightly more than three points higher than the upper limit of its recommended parameters. However, the removal of extreme outlying sales would bring both qualitative statistics within their respective acceptable range.

A further review of the residential statistical profile indicates under the heading "Assessor Location," Rural Res 1 with 33 sales and the following statistics: a median of 84.62 , a mean of 110.25 , and a weighted mean of 83.52 ; the COD for this subclass is 54.11 and the PRD is 132.00. The removal of the six extreme outlying sales would produce a revised median of 86.93 , a mean of 94.64 , a weighted mean of 87.48 , would move the COD to 25.79 and the PRD to 108.18. Also under the same heading (Assessor Location), Rural Res 2 has 9 sales with a median of 80.55 , a mean of 77.68 , a weighted mean of 81.59 , a COD of 15.02 and a PRD of 95.21 . The removal of one extreme outlying sale would move the median to 81.31 , the mean to 80.12 , the weighted mean to 84.55 , and would improve the COD by several points (13.30), and would move the PRD to 94.77 . Continuing with the analysis of the rural subclasses, it should be noted that under the heading "Locations: Urban, Suburban \& Rural," the Range of " 3 ," Rural includes not only the 42 sales comprised of Assessor Locations Rural Res 1 and Rural Res 2, but also includes the eleven Assessor Location "Rainbow Subdv" sales that have a median of 96.44 , and a COD of 23.25. The Box Butte County Assessor stated that she is currently collecting data to completely revalue rural properties for 2009.

Therefore, if a non-binding recommendation for adjustment is to be made, it is suggested that it would treat only the Rural Res 1 and Rural Res 2 subclasses (as found under the heading Assessor Location). To bring the median of both subclasses within the mid-point of acceptable range, an overall increase (to land and improvements) of $13.45 \%$ would be necessary for Assessor Location "Rural Res 1." An overall increase of $19.18 \%$ would be necessary to bring the median level to the mid-point of the range for Assessor Location "Rural Res 2."

## 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(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) 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 Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), 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 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 534 | $\mathbf{4 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 . 2 7}$ |
| 2007 | 510 | 402 | $\mathbf{7 8 . 8 2}$ |
| 2006 | 417 | 323 | $\mathbf{7 7 . 4 6}$ |
| 2005 | 381 | 275 | $\mathbf{7 2 . 1 8}$ |
| 2004 | 380 | 269 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 7 9}$ |
| 2003 | 359 | 264 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 5 4}$ |
| 2002 | 371 | 298 | $\mathbf{8 0 . 3 2}$ |
| 2001 | 441 | 380 | $\mathbf{8 6 . 1 7}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: As shown in the above table, the Assessor has used a significant amount of the total available residential sales for the sales study (in fact, the percentage of sales used for 2008 is historically the second largest percentage used as indicated by Table II).

2008 Correlation Section<br>for Box Butte 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 R\&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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | $\mathbf{8 8 . 8 6}$ | 6.71 | 94.82 |  |
| 2007 | 96.41 | 1.57 | 97.92 | 97.30 |
| 2006 | 98.83 | 0.98 | 99.8 | 98.79 |
| 2005 | 93.17 | 12.26 | 104.59 | 98.93 |
| 2004 | 94.57 | 2.6 | 97.03 | 94.57 |
| 2003 | 94 | -0.08 | 93.92 | 94 |
| 2002 | 93 | 0.72 | 93.67 | 93 |
| 2001 | 93 | 2.64 | 95.46 | 94 |

RESIDENTIAL: Table III reveals that there is very little support for the R\&O median provided by the Trended Preliminary Ratio, since the difference between the two figures is slightly more than four points (4.03).

## 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 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 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 sales 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 <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13.08 | 2008 | 6.71 |
| 2 | 2007 | 1.57 |
| 0.59 | 2006 | 0.98 |
| 6.5 | 2005 | 12.26 |
| -0.3 | 2004 | 2.6 |
| 0 | 2003 | $-\mathbf{0 . 0 8}$ |
| -0.42 | 2002 | 0.72 |
| 1.95 | 2001 | 2.64 |

RESIDENTIAL: A comparison of the percent change in the sales file with the percent change in assessed value (excluding growth) reveals a statistically significant difference ( 6.37 points) between the two figures. To discover a possible reason for the large difference, a review of the assessment actions taken to address the residential property class for 2008 will be made: it was noted in the Assessment Actions section of this document that the Assessor implemented a new depreciation schedule for the city of Alliance, based on the market. She also raised Hemingford lot values in Uhrig's Addition by $\$ 1$ per square foot. Houses in the Rural Residential 1 Assessor Location were also increased by 5\%.

Taking the assessment actions into account (via the sales file), it should be noted that 386 of the 434 sales (or about $89 \%$ ) in the statistical profile were affected by the assessment actions. In dollar amounts, of the $\$ 34,037,772$ total assessed value for the 434 properties appearing in the statistical profile, $\$ 30,893,499$, or approximately $91 \%$ of the assessed value consisted of sales that were affected by assessment actions taken for 2008.

Regarding the residential base, the total residential value excluding growth (taken from Form 45 ) would be $\$ 276,032,760-\$ 1,560,257=\$ 274,472,503$. The sales file total assessed value consists of approximately twelve percent of residential value within Box Butte County $(\$ 34,037,772 / \$ 274,472,503=12.40 \%)$. Further, the sales within the sample that were affected by the assessment actions are approximately $11.26 \%$ of total residential value (represented by the base). Therefore, the higher percent change to the sales file of $13.08 \%$, compared to the $6.71 \%$ percent change to the base is hardly surprising, since the assessment actions taken to address residential property affected $91 \%$ of the sales file, compared to only $11 \%$ of the residential base (excluding growth).

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has 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. Since 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 the 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, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 8 . 8 5}$ | 97.35 | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 2 8}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: As shown in the above table, the median and weighted mean measures of central tendency are within acceptable range. Further analysis of the sales file reveals that the mean is outside of acceptable range due to the influence of outliers. If these were removed, all three measures of central tendency would be within acceptable range.

## 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. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. 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. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. 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 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6 . 0 9}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{0 . 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0 9}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: It appears from Table VI that the coefficient of dispersion is slightly above the accepted range for residential property. The price-related differential appears to be slightly more than three points higher than the upper limit of acceptable range. However, the removal of extreme outlying sales would bring both qualitative statistics within their respective acceptable range.

## 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 | 438 | 434 | -4 |
| Median | 88.86 | 98.85 | 9.99 |
| Wgt. Mean | 87.65 | 97.35 | 9.7 |
| Mean | 96.74 | 103.28 | 6.54 |
| COD | 24.91 | 15.49 | -9.42 |
| PRD | 110.37 | 106.09 | -4.28 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 18.02 | 23.97 | 5.95 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 554.55 | 554.55 | 0 |

RESIDENTIAL: The difference of four sales between the Preliminary and the R\&O statistics is due to three sales removed because they were substantially changed (remodeling, additions, etc.), and one sale was coded " 4 " not to be used, since review found it was not offered on the open market.

Assessment actions taken to address the residential property class for 2008 included: the implementation of a new depreciation schedule for the city of Alliance, based on the market. Hemingford lot values in Uhrig's Addition were increased by $\$ 1$ per square foot. Houses in the Rural Residential 1 Assessor Location were increased by 5\%.

Table VII appears to reflect these assessment actions.

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE
Query: 6526
What If ID: 5314
Desc: New Whatif for Query ID: 6526

| Strata Hdg. | Strata | Chg.Value | Chg.Type | Pct.Chg. | Group | Priority |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessor Location | Rural Res1 | Total | Increase | 13.450 | A | 1 |
| Assessor Location | Rural Res2 | Total | Increase | 19.180 | B | 1 |



Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


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

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified


# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 

## Type: Qualified



## Type: Qualified



# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 



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

| 62 | MEDIAN: | 97 |  | COV: | 102.77 | 95\% Me | edian C.I.: 91.47 | to 100.03 | (! $:$ AVTot=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9,059,660 | WGT. MEAN: | 98 |  | STD: | 125.42 | 95\% Wgt | Mean C.I.: 89.34 | to 106.57 |  |
| 8,921,660 | MEAN : | 122 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 41.73 | 95\% | Mean C.I.: 90. | 2 to 153.26 |  |
| 8,739,314 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 143,897 | COD: | 42.92 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 1019.17 |  |  |  |  |
| 140,956 | PRD : | 124.58 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 48.25 |  |  | Printed: 02/09/2008 | 8 11:50:36 |
| MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |
| 181.14 | 65.43 | 133.97 |  | 276.83 | 49.88 | 1019.17 | 58.10 to 266.03 | 51,721 | 33,843 |
| 72.52 | 72.52 |  |  |  | 72.52 | 72.52 | N/A | 24,500 | 17,767 |
| 104.74 | 104.74 |  |  |  | 104.74 | 104.74 | N/A | 2,200,000 | 2,304,332 |
| 91.47 | 91.47 |  |  |  | 91.47 | 91.47 | N/A | 60,000 | 54,884 |
| 100.03 | 100.03 |  |  |  | 100.03 | 100.03 | N/A | 1,300,000 | 1,300,436 |
| 93.78 | 95.35 | 4.55 |  | 98.35 | 80.92 | 98.40 | 80.92 to 98.40 | 97,142 | 92,627 |
| 102.86 | 104.51 | 3.85 |  | 98.42 | 98.90 | 106.81 | N/A | 223,500 | 233,575 |
| 106.60 | 103.52 | 5.96 |  | 102.97 | 98.98 | 117.45 | N/A | 78,333 | 81,093 |
| 101.60 | 112.18 | 11.84 |  | 90.57 | 76.12 | 124.00 | 76.12 to 124.00 | 173,465 | 194,597 |
| 117.98 | 100.71 | 39.84 |  | 117.14 | 49.47 | 247.10 | 78.05 to 180.17 | 55,550 | 55,946 |
| 128.35 | 128.35 |  |  |  | 128.35 | 128.35 | N/A | 58,700 | 75,342 |
| 127.39 | 127.34 | 32.62 |  | 100.04 | 84.25 | 232.06 | 84.25 to 232.06 | 47,850 | 60,933 |
| 48.25 | 48.25 |  |  |  | 48.25 | 48.25 | N/A | 375,000 | 180,939 |
| 90.47 | 90.47 |  |  |  | 90.47 | 90.47 | N/A | 170,000 | 153,798 |
| 87.21 | 87.21 |  |  |  | 87.21 | 87.21 | N/A | 75,000 | 65,410 |
| 106.78 | 106.78 |  |  |  | 106.78 | 106.78 | N/A | 25,000 | 26,694 |
| 93.19 | 93.19 |  |  |  | 93.19 | 93.19 | N/A | 260,000 | 242,296 |
| 113.59 | 113.59 |  |  |  | 113.59 | 113.59 | N/A | 68,000 | 77,239 |
| 78.19 | 74.03 | 23.08 |  | 105.63 | 60.15 | 96.24 | N/A | 81,250 | 60,149 |
| 122.04 | 97.96 | 42.92 |  | 124.58 | 48.25 | 1019.17 | 91.47 to 100.03 | 143,897 | 140,956 |

## Box Butte County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

## Commercial

All pickup work was completed. After conducting an analysis of commercial sales activity in Hemingford, the assessor lowered commercial improvements by $10 \%$.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Contracted appraisal firm. |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | The Assessor, with help from the contracted appraisal firm. |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Contracted appraisal firm. |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | Alliance 2005; Hemingford and rural 1999. |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | Alliance 2005; Hemingford \& rural 2001. |
| 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? |
|  | In Alliance, 2005; It is unknown when this approach was used for the remaining commercial property within the County. |
| 7. | When was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | As defined by the IAAO, the Market or Sales Comparison Approach is not used to estimate market value of commercial property-rather, this approach would be used for individual taxpayer protests. |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? |
|  | There are three commercial property neighborhoods, and within these, commercial land is valued by six different locations in Hemingford and twelve in Alliance. |
| 9. | How are these defined? |
|  | By location: Alliance, Hemingford and Rural |
| 10. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | Yes. |
| 11. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (That is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | The assessor location, "suburban" is not utilized by the County. |

12. What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)

Property fitting the Regulation definition is classified as part of the city and valued as such.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{3 3}$ |

NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
DATE OF SALE *

| RANGE |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/04 | TO 09/30/04 |
| 10/01/04 | TO 12/31/04 |
| 01/01/05 | то 03/31/05 |
| 04/01/05 | TO 06/30/05 |
| 07/01/05 | TO 09/30/05 |
| 10/01/05 | TO 12/31/05 |
| 01/01/06 | TO 03/31/06 |
| 04/01/06 | TO 06/30/06 |
| 07/01/06 | TO 09/30/06 |
| 10/01/06 | TO 12/31/06 |
| 01/01/07 | TO 03/31/07 |
| 04/01/07 | TO 06/30/07 |


| Study Years |
| :--- |
| $07 / 01 / 04$ TO $06 / 30 / 05$ |
| $07 / 01 / 05$ TO 06/30/06 |
| $07 / 01 / 06$ TO $06 / 30 / 07$ |

$\qquad$ Calendar Yrs

COUNT
MEDIAN
$8,991,060$
$8,853,060$
$8,579,101$
147,551
142,985
AVG. Assessed Value

NUMBER of Sales TOTAL Sales Price: OTAL Adj.Sales Price: VG. Adj Sales Price:

AVG. Assessed Value:

| 1 |
| ---: |
| 6 |
| 4 |
| 8 |
| 1 |
| 6 |
| 2 |
| 8 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
| 3 |
| 8 |
| 19 |
| 17 |
| 24 |
| 19 |
| 23 |
| 60 |

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
97 COV: 45.42 95\% Median C.I.: 91.01 to 100.03


5\% Wgt


| T | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 94.97 | 94.97 | 94.97 |
| 6 | 90.16 | 129.36 | 117.67 |
| 4 | 100.89 | 101.94 | 96.51 |
| 8 | 97.72 | 93.81 | 93.49 |
| 1 | 180.17 | 180.17 | 180.17 |
| 6 | 98.45 | 94.09 | 97.97 |
| 2 | 70.70 | 70.70 | 58.56 |
| 8 | 86.94 | 104.82 | 101.14 |
| 6 | 96.50 | 99.08 | 99.60 |
| 7 | 94.78 | 124.38 | 91.43 |
| 3 | 91.01 | 74.33 | 45.66 |
| 8 | 105.76 | 102.88 | 102.25 |
|  |  | 98.40 | 106.81 |

COD
rinted: 03/31/2008 19:05:07
01/01/05
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06
$66.83 \quad 109.94$
94.97
__ALL TO 12/31/06
ASSESSOR LOCATION
RANGE
ALLIANCE COMM
HEMINGFORD COMM
RURAL COMM

—_ALL_- $\quad$| 1 |
| :--- |
| 60 |

| COUNT |
| ---: |
| 52 |
| 7 |
| 1 |





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


## COMMERCIAL



Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: As the subsequent tables and accompanying narratives will show, only the median and the weighted mean are within acceptable range. The trimmed mean is approximately one rounded point outside of the upper limit of acceptable range. The Trended Preliminary Ratio provides rather strong support for the median, with less than one point difference between them (0.93).

For the above reasons, and by the fact that the trimmed COD falls within acceptable parameters without greatly distorting the two compliant measures of central tendency, the median will serve as the point estimate for overall level of value for the commercial property class.

Regarding the quality of assessment for the commercial property class, both the COD and PRD appear to be outside of their acceptable parameters. However, the removal of the four extreme outlying sales (as mentioned in the narrative to Table V, below) would markedly improve the two figures ( 20.37 and 102.69, respectively), and would bring both within compliance.

Thus, the County is within acceptable range for overall level of value, and regarding quality of assessment, the uninfluenced COD and PRD are in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Further analysis of the various commercial subclasses reveals that under the heading "Status: Improved, Unimproved, \& IOLL," the range " 2 " or unimproved subclass has eleven sales with a median of 80.68 , a mean of 123.08 , a weighted mean of 89.75 , a COD of 70.41 and a PRD of 137.14. Eliminating the two most extreme outlying sales within this subclass would minimally affect the median-it would be now 80.30 , but would remarkably improve the mean with a value of 86.90 , the weighted mean would become 80.61 , the COD would dramatically fall to 29.63 , and the PRD would likewise drop to 107.80 . Nevertheless, the three measures of central tendency are outside of acceptable range. Review of the sales file indicates that the eleven unimproved commercial parcels are comprised of one Hemingford commercial lot and the remaining are all Alliance lots. Conversation with the Box Butte County Assessor reveals that these are "odd-size commercial lots," that are scattered around the City of Alliance.

To move the median of the eleven "Status 2, Unimproved" commercial lots to the mid-point of acceptable range, a non-binding recommendation of $19 \%$ increase to land only would be made.

## 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(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) 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 Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 6 7}$ |
| 2007 | 97 | 58 | $\mathbf{5 9 . 7 9}$ |
| 2006 | 119 | 56 | 47.06 |
| 2005 | 92 | 42 | $\mathbf{4 5 . 6 5}$ |
| 2004 | 77 | 39 | 50.65 |
| 2003 | 63 | 39 | $\mathbf{6 1 . 9}$ |
| 2002 | 80 | 52 | $\mathbf{6 5}$ |
| 2001 | $\mathbf{8 1}$ | 49 | $\mathbf{6 0 . 4 9}$ |

COMMERCIAL: A review of the above table reveals that for assessment year 2008 the Assessor used a larger percentage of the total commercial sales occurring during the timeframe of the sales study than she had in previous years. This suggests that the Assessor is not excessively trimming the sales file.

2008 Correlation Section<br>for Box Butte 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 R\&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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 97.22 | -0.95 | 96.29 |  |
| 2007 | 98.21 | 1.34 | 99.52 | 98.21 |
| 2006 | 99.97 | 7.73 | 107.7 | 98.52 |
| 2005 | 98.65 | 4.05 | 102.64 | 99.32 |
| 2004 | 98.65 | 0.01 | 98.66 | 98.65 |
| 2003 | 85 | -3.09 | 82.37 | 99 |
| 2002 | 98 | 0.77 | 98.75 | 97 |
| 2001 | 91 | 3.55 | 94.23 | 95 |

COMMERCIAL: Table III reveals that there is less than one point difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R\&O Median (0.93), and thus, each figure provides strong support for the other.

## 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 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 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 sales 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 <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -1.4 | 2008 | $-\mathbf{0 . 9 5}$ |
| 0.02 | 2007 | 1.34 |
| -3.95 | 2006 | 7.73 |
| 0.21 | 2005 | 4.05 |
| 0 | 2004 | 0.01 |
| 2.56 | 2003 | -3.09 |
| -0.31 | 2002 | 0.77 |
| 4.24 | 2001 | 3.55 |

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in assessed value (excluding growth) is statistically negligible ( -0.45 ), and indicates that there is no appreciable difference between the assessment of the sold versus the unsold property.

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has 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. Since 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 the 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, (2007). 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 | 97.22 | 96.91 | $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 4 2}$ |

COMMERCIAL: Of the three measures of central tendency shown in the above table, only the median and the weighted mean are within acceptable range. The mean is approximately slightly more than one point outside of the upper limit of acceptable range. The removal of the four extreme outlying sales would leave the median unchanged, and would raise the weighted mean to 98.17 . This action would still fail to bring the mean within acceptable range, since it would now be at 100.81 .

## 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. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. 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. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. 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 | 27.99 | $\mathbf{1 0 7 . 7 5}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{7 . 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 7 5}$ |

COMMERCIAL: Table VI reveals that both qualitative measures-the COD and PRD are outside of their acceptable parameters. The removal of the four extreme outlying sales (as mentioned in the narrative to Table V) would markedly improve the two figures-20.37 and 102.69 , respectively-and bring both within compliance.

## 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 | 62 | 60 | -2 |
| Median | 97.22 | 97.22 | 0 |
| Wgt. Mean | 97.96 | 96.91 | -1.05 |
| Mean | 122.04 | 104.42 | -17.62 |
| COD | 42.92 | 27.99 | -14.93 |
| PRD | 124.58 | 107.75 | -16.83 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 48.25 | 18.51 | -29.74 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 1019.17 | 305.75 | -713.42 |

COMMERCIAL: The two sale difference between the Preliminary and the R\&O Statistics is due to sale book 95, page 183 a change in use to residential, and the other sale book 93, page 595 that was discovered upon review to not be an arm's-length transaction. Assessment actions taken to address the commercial property class for 2008 included: the completion of pickup work. After conducting an analysis of commercial sales activity in Hemingford, the assessor lowered commercial improvements by $10 \%$.

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE
Query: 6603
What If ID: 5321
Desc: New Whatif for Query ID: 6603

| Strata Hdg. | Strata | Chg.Value | Chg.Type | Pct.Chg. | Group | Priority |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: Improved, | 2 | Land | Increase | 19.000 | A | 1 |




|  |  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 01/2004 to 06/30/2 | 7 Posted | ore: 01/1 | 2008 |  | (!: AVTot=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | f Sale |  | 60 | MEDIAN: | 98 |  | COV: | 50.60 | 95\% | edian C.I.: 94.0 | to 103.37 | (.. AVTot=0) |
|  | TOTAL S | es Pric |  | , 060 | WGT. MEAN: | 97 |  | STD: | 55.00 | 95\% W | Mean C.I.: 88.18 | to 106.13 |  |
| TOTA | L Adj. S | es Pric |  | , 060 | MEAN : | 109 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 28.70 |  | Mean C.I.: 94. | to 122.62 |  |
| TOT | AL Asse | d Valu |  | , 353 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. | Adj. S | es Pric |  | , 551 | COD : | 29.23 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 363.85 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | , 355 | PRD : | 111.89 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 18.51 |  |  | Printed: 04/03/ | 13:47:15 |
| YEAR BUILT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 0 OR Blank |  | 13 | 96.01 | 136.03 | 67.62 | 62.87 |  | 201.18 | 58.10 | 363.85 | 64.45 to 174.06 | 55,653 | 37,631 |
| Prior TO 1860 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1860 TO 1899 |  | 3 | 95.19 | 94.29 | 92.92 | 3.59 |  | 101.47 | 88.71 | 98.96 | N/A | 81,166 | 75,420 |
| 1900 то 1919 |  | 12 | 105.74 | 121.24 | 120.86 | 29.28 |  | 100.31 | 80.92 | 232.06 | 89.68 to 138.71 | 41,966 | 50,720 |
| 1920 TO 1939 |  | 5 | 98.98 | 93.55 | 98.04 | 9.81 |  | 95.42 | 72.52 | 105.29 | N/A | 75,200 | 73,724 |
| 1940 TO 1949 |  | 6 | 107.50 | 106.73 | 101.99 | 11.15 |  | 104.65 | 84.25 | 124.00 | 84.25 to 124.00 | 89,793 | 91,577 |
| 1950 TO 1959 |  | 1 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |  |  |  | 100.00 | 100.00 | N/A | 127,500 | 127,495 |
| 1960 то 1969 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1970 TO 1979 |  | 12 | 90.16 | 82.10 | 75.76 | 28.80 |  | 108.37 | 18.51 | 163.06 | 48.25 to 98.40 | 122,041 | 92,456 |
| 1980 то 1989 |  | 3 | 106.81 | 107.13 | 116.16 | 9.87 |  | 92.22 | 91.47 | 123.11 | N/A | 339,000 | 393,794 |
| 1990 TO 1994 |  | 1 | 98.90 | 98.90 | 98.90 |  |  |  | 98.90 | 98.90 | N/A | 130,000 | 128,566 |
| 1995 TO 1999 |  | 4 | 102.39 | 100.67 | 102.24 | 9.41 |  | 98.46 | 82.03 | 115.87 | N/A | 932,175 | 953,057 |
| 2000 TO Pres | nt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 60 | 98.20 | 108.71 | 97.16 | 29.23 |  | 111.89 | 18.51 | 363.85 | 94.04 to 103.37 | 147,551 | 143,355 |
| SALE PRICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| _ Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 2 | 340.22 | 340.22 | 332.33 | 6.95 |  | 102.37 | 316.58 | 363.85 | N/A | 3,000 | 9,970 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 5 | 95.55 | 114.03 | 116.77 | 43.27 |  | 97.65 | 59.36 | 174.06 | N/A | 7,814 | 9,124 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 7 | 166.60 | 178.66 | 145.47 | 53.59 |  | 122.81 | 59.36 | 363.85 | 59.36 to 363.85 | 6,438 | 9,366 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 11 | 96.01 | 99.06 | 98.74 | 12.18 |  | 100.32 | 72.52 | 138.71 | 83.29 to 108.31 | 19,266 | 19,024 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 14 | 102.14 | 115.90 | 114.64 | 24.82 |  | 101.10 | 64.45 | 232.06 | 94.78 to 123.94 | 43,664 | 50,056 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 9 | 87.60 | 93.65 | 93.62 | 27.07 |  | 100.03 | 29.61 | 163.06 | 76.12 to 130.82 | 72,277 | 67,665 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 9 | 96.45 | 88.74 | 90.17 | 16.54 |  | 98.41 | 18.51 | 124.00 | 78.05 to 100.02 | 123,584 | 111,440 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 3 | 98.40 | 94.60 | 94.97 | 7.23 |  | 99.61 | 82.03 | 103.37 | N/A | 183,333 | 174,108 |
| 250000 то | 499999 | 3 | 93.19 | 82.75 | 80.02 | 20.95 |  | 103.41 | 48.25 | 106.81 | N/A | 317,333 | 253,940 |
| 500000 + |  | 4 | 102.39 | 96.50 | 100.20 | 17.02 |  | 96.30 | 58.10 | 123.11 | N/A | 1,180,000 | 1,182,408 |
| _ALL |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 60 | 98.20 | 108.71 | 97.16 | 29.23 |  | 111.89 | 18.51 | 363.85 | 94.04 to 103.37 | 147,551 | 143,355 |

## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified

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

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


## 

## COMMERCIAL

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

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
OCCUPANCY CODE

| RANGE |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| (blank) | COUNT |
| 326 | 13 |
| 330 | 1 |
| 336 | 1 |
| 343 | 1 |
| 344 | 1 |
| 349 | 7 |
| 350 | 2 |
| 352 | 3 |
| 353 | 7 |
| 384 | 10 |
| 406 | 1 |
| 407 | 6 |
| 419 | 1 |
| 442 | 1 |
| 470 | 1 |
| 477 | 1 |
| 531 | 1 |
|  | 2 |

$60 \quad 98.20$
60
$8,991,060$
$8,853,060$
$8,601,353$
147,551
143,355

95\% Med
95\% Wgt Mean 94.04 to 103.37
95\% Mean C.I.: 94.79 to 122.62

Printed: 04/03/2008 13:47:15
MEDIAN
96.01
72.52
104.7
91.47
100.03
98.00
102.86
103.37
103.37
98.96
100.24
115.87
110.19
48.25
82.03
87.60
106.78
93.19
24.06
$98.20 \quad 108.71 \quad 97.16$
29.23
111.89
MIN
58.10
72.52
104.74
91.47
100.03
80.92
98.90
98.98
76.12
78.05
115.87
83.29
48.25
82.03
87.60
106.78
93.19
18.51

| MAX | 95\% Median C.I. |
| ---: | :---: |
| 363.85 | 64.45 to 174.06 |
| 72.52 | N/A |
| 104.74 | N/A |
| 91.47 | N/A |
| 100.03 | N/A |
| 163.06 | 80.92 to 163.06 |
| 106.81 | N/A |
| 108.21 | N/A |
| 124.00 | 76.12 to 124.00 |
| 180.17 | 88.71 to 138.71 |
| 115.87 | N/A |
| 232.06 | 83.29 |
| 48.25 | to 232.06 |
| 82.03 | N/A |
| 87.60 | N/A |
| 106.78 | N/A |
| 93.19 | N/A |
| 29.61 |  |
|  | N/A |
| 363.85 | 94.04 |


| Sale Price | Assd Val |
| ---: | ---: |
| 55,653 | 37,631 |
| 24,500 | 17,767 |
| $2,200,000$ | $2,304,332$ |
| 60,000 | 54,884 |
| $1,300,000$ | $1,300,436$ |
| 97,142 | 98,515 |
| 223,500 | 233,575 |
| 78,333 | 80,632 |
| 173,465 | 194,597 |
| 55,550 | 55,092 |
| 58,700 | 68,017 |
| 47,850 | 60,477 |
| 375,000 | 180,939 |
| 170,000 | 139,446 |
| 75,000 | 65,698 |
| 25,000 | 26,694 |
| 260,000 | 242,296 |
| 81,250 | 18,508 |
|  |  |
| 147,551 | 143,355 |

## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

|  | NUMBER of Sales: | 32 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $4,371,432$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $4,084,082$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $2,686,833$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 127,627 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 83,963 |


| GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP \# |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| RANGE |  |
| 0851 | COUNT |
| 1087 | 1 |
| 1093 | 2 |
| 1095 | 3 |
| 1125 | 6 |
| 1127 | 2 |
| 1129 | 1 |
| 1131 | 1 |
| 1133 | 1 |
| 1363 | 2 |
| 1367 | 2 |
| 1369 | 1 |
| 1399 | 1 |
| 1405 | 1 |
| 847 |  |
| 855 | 4 |
| 857 | 1 |

_ALL__ $\quad$| 32 |
| :--- |

MEDIAN
87.48
56.71
88.14
69.58
76.04
76.88
54.68
60.56
70.42
58.98
85.57
70.08
54.87
49.15
81.77
82.31
57.35


## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics




# Box Butte County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses: 

## Agricultural

For assessment year 2008, the Box Butte County Assessor addressed agricultural land by designated market area: In Market Area 2, the LCG subclass 1D was lowered by $\$ 25$ per acre. In Market Area 3, the irrigated subclass 1A and the dryland subclass 1D were both increased by $\$ 120$ per acre.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | The assessor and her staff. |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | The assessor. |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | The contracted appraisal firm. |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | Yes. |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | The definition is taken from §77-1539 to §77-1363. In addition, the assessor has delineated that to be designated agricultural land, 1) land must be used for the commercial production of a crop; and 2) an income must be derived from the use of the land whether by animal or crop production. |
| 5. | When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | It is not known if the Income Approach was ever used to estimate or establish market value for the agricultural land class. |
| 6. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 1983 |
| 7. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | The last physical inspection of land was conducted in 1995. |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | Mostly by taxpayer reporting. |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | The assessor and her staff. |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | The assessor estimates that approximately $90-95 \%$ of the county is correct at this time. |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class: |
|  | Four |
| 9. | How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class? |
|  | By location, topography and soil types. |

> | 10. | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special } \\ \text { valuation for agricultural land within the county? }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| No, the county has not implemented, or is in the process of implementing special |  |
| valuation. |  |

## Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |

07 - BOX BUTTE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008



NUMBER of Sales:

## DATE

## ALE *

$\qquad$
01/04 TO 09/30/04 10/01/04 тO 12/31/04 01/01/05 TO 03/31/05 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 01/01/06 TO 03/31/06 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 07/01/06 то 09/30/06 10/01/06 тO 12/31/06 04/01/07 то 03/31/0
$\qquad$ Study Years $\qquad$ 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06 07/01/06 TO 06/30/07
$\qquad$ Calendar Yrs $\qquad$ 01/01/05 TO 12/31/05 01/01/06 TO 12/31/06
$\qquad$ ALL $\qquad$
$\qquad$




PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

NUMBER of Sales:
(AgLand)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: (AgLand)
34
$4,961,912$
$4,674,562$
$3,008,542$
137,487
88,486
MEDIAN:
WGT. MEAN :
MEAN :
COD :
PRD

| 70 | COV: | 22.14 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 64 | STD: | 15.28 |
| 69 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 11.88 |

.Median C.I.: 58.41 to 74.84
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 59.03 to 69.69
95\% Mean C.I.: 63.89 to 74.16

| AVG. Assessed Value: |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP \# |  |
| RANGE |  |
| 0851 | COUNT |
| 1087 | 1 |
| 1093 | 2 |
| 1095 | 3 |
| 1125 | 6 |
| 1127 | 2 |
| 1129 | 1 |
| 1131 | 1 |
| 1133 | 1 |
| 1363 | 2 |
| 1367 | 2 |
| 1369 | 1 |
| 1399 | 2 |
| 1405 | 1 |
| 847 | 4 |
| 853 | 1 |
| 855 | 1 |
| 857 | 1 |



## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/200



## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Analysis of the statistical profile indicates that only the median and the mean are within acceptable range. The weighted mean is almost five points below the minimum percent of compliance. The removal of the two extreme outliers would fail to bring the weighted mean within compliance. The median receives strong support from the Trended Preliminary Ratio (as will be shown in Table III) with less than one point (0.72) difference between them. Further, since the coefficient of dispersion is well within range, the median will be used as the point estimate for overall level of value for agricultural land.

Regarding the qualitative statistics, only the coefficient of dispersion is within compliance-the PRD is slightly more than four points above its prescribed range. The removal of the two extreme outliers would further improve the COD with a new value of 15.05, but would fail to bring the price-related differential within range (it would only move to 106.20 ).

Further review of the statistical profile reveals that under the heading "School District," district 07-0006 shows twelve sales with a median of 62.19. However, this is the Alliance school district and covers all four Market Areas. With Market Areas 1, 2, and 3 within range (and only 5 sales in Market Area 4 -two $95 \%$ dry, one N/A dry; two $95 \%$ grass and one N/A grass), no non-binding recommendation will be made to adjust by such a broad subclass.

## 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(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) 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 Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 54 | 34 | $\mathbf{6 2 . 9 6}$ |
| 2007 | 78 | 46 | 58.97 |
| 2006 | 106 | 53 | 50 |
| 2005 | 122 | 57 | $\mathbf{4 6 . 7 2}$ |
| 2004 | 100 | 50 | 50 |
| 2003 | 130 | 66 | 50.77 |
| 2002 | 119 | 71 | 59.66 |
| 2001 | 127 | 71 | 55.91 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percentage of sales used for assessment year 2008 is, according to the above table, the highest percentage used historically.

2008 Correlation Section<br>for Box Butte 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 R\&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

|  | Preliminary Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 69.05 | 2.48 | 70.76 | 70.04 |
| 2007 | 73.87 | -0.42 | 73.56 | 72.69 |
| 2006 | 74.82 | 3.37 | 77.34 | 75.84 |
| 2005 | 74.94 | 7.54 | 80.59 | 77.05 |
| 2004 | 73.85 | 0.04 | 73.88 | 75.12 |
| 2003 | 77 | -0.12 | 76.91 | 77 |
| 2002 | 76 | -0.67 | 75.49 | 75 |
| 2001 | 74 | 6.76 | 79 | 75 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R\&O Median is less than one point (0.72), and suggests that each figure provides quite strong support for the other.

## 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 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 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 sales 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 <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -6.29 | 2008 | 2.48 |
| 0 | 2007 | $-\mathbf{0 . 4 2}$ |
| 6.35 | 2006 | 3.37 |
| 0.22 | 2005 | 7.54 |
| 1.56 | 2004 | 0.04 |
| 2.74 | 2003 | $-\mathbf{0 . 1 2}$ |
| -1.15 | 2002 | $-\mathbf{0 . 6 7}$ |
| 1.29 | 2001 | 6.76 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: As revealed in Table IV, there is an absolute point difference of 8.77 between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in assessed value (excluding growth). A summary of the assessment actions taken to address agricultural land for assessment year 2008 would be: in Market Area 2, the LCG subclass 1D was lowered by $\$ 25$ per acre. In Market Area 3, the irrigated subclass 1A and the dryland subclass 1D were both increased by $\$ 120$ per acre.

From a sale count perspective, this means that seven of the eleven sales within Market Area 2 were subject to the action taken; and five of the six sales within Market Area 3 were affected by the assessment actions. From an acre standpoint, in Market Area 2, of the 2,085.29 acres sold, $1,112.29$ acres, or $53.34 \%$ were affected by the assessment actions. In Market Area 3, of the $1,205.96$ acres sold, 716.49 (or $59.41 \%$ ) were affected. Merely noting the number of sales and acres in the small sample affected by the assessment actions, it is not surprising to have the differences between the two percent change columns as shown above.

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has 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. Since 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 the 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, (2007). 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 | 70.04 | $\mathbf{6 4 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 . 0 3}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: As indicated by Table V, only the median and the mean are within acceptable range. The weighted mean is almost five points below the minimum percent of compliance. The removal of the two extreme outliers would fail to bring the weighted mean within compliance. Due to the fact that the coefficient of dispersion is well within range, and for purposes of direct equalization, the median will be used as the point estimate for overall level of value for agricultural land.

## 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. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. 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. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. 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 | 16.97 | $\mathbf{1 0 7 . 2 5}$ |
| Difference | 0 | 4.25 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Regarding the qualitative statistics, only the coefficient of dispersion is within compliance-the PRD is slightly more than four points above its prescribed range. The removal of the two extreme outliers would further improve the COD with a new value of 15.05 , but would fail to bring the price-related differential within range (it would only move to 106.20 ).

## 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 | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| Median | $\mathbf{6 9 . 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 9}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | 65.79 | $\mathbf{6 4 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 4 3}$ |
| Mean | $\mathbf{6 9 . 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 . 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 1 6}$ |
| COD | 17.56 | 16.97 | $\mathbf{- 0 . 5 9}$ |
| PRD | 105.17 | $\mathbf{1 0 7 . 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0 8}$ |
| Min Sales Ratio | 45.36 | $\mathbf{3 6 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 9 . 2 5}$ |
| Max Sales Ratio | $\mathbf{9 7 . 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 7}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The two sale difference between the Preliminary and the R\&O Statistics is due to those agricultural sales being found to be in reality unimproved. They were then added to the ag unimproved sample. For assessment year 2008, the Box Butte County Assessor addressed agricultural land by designated market area: In Market Area 2, the LCG subclass 1D was lowered by $\$ 25$ per acre. In Market Area 3, the irrigated subclass 1A and the dryland subclass 1D were both increased by $\$ 120$ per acre. Market Area 1 values were not changed for assessment year 2008.
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## County 7 - Box Butte

| Schedule II:Tax Increment Financing (TIF) |  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value Base | Value Excess | Records | Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 3 | 58,458 | 248,937 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural Value Base | Value Excess | Records | Total Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 58,458 | 248,937 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  | 3 | 58,458 | 248,937 |



|  | Total |  | Growth |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25. Mineral Interest Total | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| 26. Exempt | 414 | 30 | 123 | 567 |



## County 7 - Box Butte

| Schedule VI: Agricultural Records: Non-Agricultural Detail | Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1 | 1.000 | 2,775 |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 48 | 55.000 | 365,275 |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 |  | 0 | 42 |  | 4,018,118 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2 | 2.000 | 800 |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 44 | 163.000 | 327,050 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 0 |  | 0 | 51 |  | 945,068 |

38. FarmSite Total

| 39. Road \& Ditches | 4.000 |  |  | 384.230 |  |  | GrowthValue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0.000 | 0 |  |
|  | Records | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Records | Total <br> Acres | Value |  |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 35 | 45.000 | 129,500 | 36 | 46.000 | 132,275 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 461 | 514.230 | 3,549,433 | 509 | 569.230 | 3,914,708 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 400 |  | 26,000,379 | 442 |  | 30,018,497 | 150,361 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 478 | 615.230 | 34,065,480 |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 59 | 130.920 | 120,150 | 61 | 132.920 | 120,950 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 496 | 1,996.230 | 2,797,722 | 540 | 2,159.230 | 3,124,772 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 567 |  | 9,748,769 | 618 |  | 10,693,837 | 0 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 679 | 2,292.150 | 13,939,559 |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |  | 6,328.380 |  |  | 6,716.610 |  |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0.000 | 0 |  |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 1,157 | 9,623.990 | 48,005,039 | 150,361 |
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## County 7 - Box Butte

2008 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 | 607.000 | 287,495 | 14,350.630 | 6,870,128 | 14,957.630 | 7,157,623 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 546.000 | 262,080 | 546.000 | 262,080 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 198.000 | 92,620 | 10,887.960 | 5,060,698 | 11,085.960 | 5,153,318 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 206.000 | 87,550 | 10,003.200 | 4,243,125 | 10,209.200 | 4,330,675 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 247.000 | 103,740 | 14,276.500 | 5,965,310 | 14,523.500 | 6,069,050 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 2,015.000 | 453,375 | 2,604.900 | 586,103 | 4,619.900 | 1,039,478 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 3,273.000 | 1,024,780 | 52,669.190 | 22,987,444 | 55,942.190 | 24,012,224 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 480.170 | 120,044 | 32,538.880 | 8,134,724 | 33,019.050 | 8,254,768 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 197.000 | 49,250 | 197.000 | 49,250 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 175.000 | 44,635 | 13,844.710 | 3,386,916 | 14,019.710 | 3,431,551 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 65.000 | 10,075 | 1,880.280 | 291,098 | 1,945.280 | 301,173 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 134.000 | 21,130 | 9,315.090 | 1,350,341 | 9,449.090 | 1,371,471 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 417.320 | 52,166 | 756.000 | 94,500 | 1,173.320 | 146,666 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,271.490 | 248,050 | 58,531.960 | 13,306,829 | 59,803.450 | 13,554,879 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 20.000 | 4,900 | 15,415.350 | 3,798,812 | 15,435.350 | 3,803,712 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,553.460 | 314,392 | 1,553.460 | 314,392 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 329.000 | 59,220 | 20,871.250 | 3,847,400 | 21,200.250 | 3,906,620 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 120.000 | 15,000 | 26,595.890 | 3,337,083 | 26,715.890 | 3,352,083 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 378.000 | 47,250 | 91,081.620 | 11,410,864 | 91,459.620 | 11,458,114 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 971.520 | 116,583 | 78,330.550 | 9,404,052 | 79,302.070 | 9,520,635 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,818.520 | 242,953 | 233,848.120 | 32,112,603 | 235,666.640 | 32,355,556 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 25.000 | 375 | 2,647.300 | 39,710 | 2,672.300 | 40,085 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 26.000 | 2,100 | 2,177.430 | 295,806 | 2,203.430 | 297,906 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 1,004.900 |  | 4,707.080 |  | 5,711.980 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 6,414.010 | 1,518,258 | 349,874.000 | 68,742,392 | 356,288.010 | 70,260,650 |

## County 7 - Box Butte

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
2

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 703.000 | 412,675 | 26,317.310 | 15,357,334 | 27,020.310 | 15,770,009 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 162.000 | 86,090 | 162.000 | 86,090 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 253.000 | 132,250 | 8,244.870 | 4,241,809 | 8,497.870 | 4,374,059 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 30.000 | 13,500 | 35.900 | 16,155 | 65.900 | 29,655 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 53.000 | 16,430 | 2,885.800 | 884,358 | 2,938.800 | 900,788 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 134.600 | 30,285 | 134.600 | 30,285 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,039.000 | 574,855 | 37,780.480 | 20,616,031 | 38,819.480 | 21,190,886 |


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

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4,314.850 | 1,224,413 | 4,314.850 | 1,224,413 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 659.500 | 171,083 | 659.500 | 171,083 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 1,600 | 3,530.690 | 720,763 | 3,538.690 | 722,363 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 4.000 | 460 | 70.000 | 8,050 | 74.000 | 8,510 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 525 | 5,876.220 | 656,782 | 5,881.220 | 657,307 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,891.000 | 260,490 | 2,891.000 | 260,490 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 17.000 | 2,585 | 17,342.260 | 3,041,581 | 17,359.260 | 3,044,166 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 25.000 | 375 | 536.200 | 8,063 | 561.200 | 8,438 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 300 | 1,694.140 | 291,961 | 1,696.140 | 292,261 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 14.900 |  | 140.940 |  | 155.840 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,907.370 | 840,922 | 109,217.380 | 40,600,882 | 111,124.750 | 41,441,804 |
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## County 7 - Box Butte <br> 2008 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 | 6,252.350 | 4,372,465 | 21,285.560 | 14,678,352 | 27,537.910 | 19,050,817 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 293.000 | 157,380 | 293.000 | 157,380 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 1,594.020 | 818,925 | 10,595.310 | 5,380,146 | 12,189.330 | 6,199,071 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 36.000 | 13,980 | 2,614.000 | 1,113,680 | 2,650.000 | 1,127,660 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 254.000 | 78,300 | 2,917.000 | 902,150 | 3,171.000 | 980,450 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 62.000 | 13,125 | 1,464.130 | 329,070 | 1,526.130 | 342,195 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 8,198.370 | 5,296,795 | 39,169.000 | 22,560,778 | 47,367.370 | 27,857,573 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 23.800 | 11,781 | 2,080.410 | 1,030,410 | 16,060.110 | 7,949,759 | 18,164.320 | 8,991,950 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 650 | 101.000 | 32,825 | 103.000 | 33,475 |
| 57.2D | 22.000 | 6,600 | 755.000 | 226,500 | 9,017.580 | 2,705,274 | 9,794.580 | 2,938,374 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 16.000 | 3,600 | 1,783.200 | 401,221 | 1,799.200 | 404,821 |
| 60. 4D1 | 2.000 | 450 | 97.220 | 21,875 | 2,624.600 | 590,535 | 2,723.820 | 612,860 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 20.000 | 3,800 | 710.100 | 134,919 | 730.100 | 138,719 |
| 62. Total | 47.800 | 18,831 | 2,970.630 | 1,286,835 | 30,296.590 | 11,814,533 | 33,315.020 | 13,120,199 |


| 63. 1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 1.000 | 315 | 80.000 | 25,650 | 2,755.450 | 883,552 | 2,836.450 | 909,517 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 82.000 | 21,260 | 82.000 | 21,260 |
| 66. 2G | 4.000 | 1,020 | 66.000 | 16,855 | 5,258.110 | 1,358,430 | 5,328.110 | 1,376,305 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 16.000 | 2,800 | 3,177.230 | 565,533 | 3,193.230 | 568,333 |
| 69.4G1 | 6.000 | 960 | 42.000 | 6,720 | 6,593.460 | 1,066,333 | 6,641.460 | 1,074,013 |
| 70.4G | 12.050 | 1,687 | 38.000 | 5,320 | 5,769.910 | 812,267 | 5,819.960 | 819,274 |
| 71. Total | 23.050 | 3,982 | 242.000 | 57,345 | 23,636.160 | 4,707,375 | 23,901.210 | 4,768,702 |
| 72. Waste | 11.000 | 165 | 94.610 | 1,419 | 1,401.400 | 21,257 | 1,507.010 | 22,841 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 32.000 | 5,935 | 1,003.710 | 174,298 | 1,035.710 | 180,233 |
| 74. Exempt | 1.000 |  | 243.320 |  | 368.810 |  | 613.130 |  |
| 75. Total | 81.850 | 22,978 | 11,537.610 | 6,648,329 | 95,506.860 | 39,278,241 | 107,126.320 | 45,949,548 |

## County 7 - Box Butte

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
4

| 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 | 4,302.100 | 2,128,310 | 4,302.100 | 2,128,310 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.000 | 4,800 | 10.000 | 4,800 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,956.000 | 907,510 | 1,956.000 | 907,510 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 469.000 | 194,125 | 469.000 | 194,125 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 233.000 | 94,250 | 233.000 | 94,250 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 66.000 | 14,745 | 66.000 | 14,745 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7,036.100 | 3,343,740 | 7,036.100 | 3,343,740 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 25,183.180 | 9,443,696 | 25,183.180 | 9,443,696 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 73.000 | 23,725 | 73.000 | 23,725 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13,985.130 | 4,195,539 | 13,985.130 | 4,195,539 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,858.170 | 868,089 | 3,858.170 | 868,089 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,840.800 | 864,181 | 3,840.800 | 864,181 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 427.000 | 81,130 | 427.000 | 81,130 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 47,367.280 | 15,476,360 | 47,367.280 | 15,476,360 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4,672.610 | 1,302,487 | 4,672.610 | 1,302,487 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 20.000 | 4,500 | 20.000 | 4,500 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7,156.570 | 1,472,644 | 7,156.570 | 1,472,644 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,651.130 | 720,641 | 5,651.130 | 720,641 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6,556.750 | 828,094 | 6,556.750 | 828,094 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4,869.900 | 584,591 | 4,869.900 | 584,591 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 28,926.960 | 4,912,957 | 28,926.960 | 4,912,957 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 563.000 | 8,445 | 563.000 | 8,445 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 863.920 | 135,694 | 863.920 | 135,694 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 84,757.260 | 23,877,196 | 84,757.260 | 23,877,196 |
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## County 7 - Box Butte

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 12,510.370 | 6,896,430 | 136,654.770 | 69,507,993 | 149,165.140 | 76,404,423 |
| 77.Dry Land | 47.800 | 18,831 | 5,066.490 | 1,797,692 | 188,060.130 | 57,240,968 | 193,174.420 | 59,057,491 |
| 78.Grass | 23.050 | 3,982 | 2,077.520 | 302,883 | 303,753.500 | 44,774,516 | 305,854.070 | 45,081,381 |
| 79.Waste | 11.000 | 165 | 144.610 | 2,169 | 5,147.900 | 77,475 | 5,303.510 | 79,809 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 60.000 | 8,335 | 5,739.200 | 897,759 | 5,799.200 | 906,094 |
| 81.Exempt | 1.000 | 0 | 1,263.120 | 0 | 5,216.830 | 0 | 6,480.950 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 81.850 | 22,978 | 19,858.990 | 9,007,509 | 639,355.500 | 172,498,711 | 659,296.340 | 181,529,198 |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 7 - Box Butte
Market Area:
Average Assessed Value*

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 14,957.630 | 26.74\% | 7,157,623 | 29.81\% | 478.526 |
| 2A1 | 546.000 | 0.98\% | 262,080 | 1.09\% | 480.000 |
| 2A | 11,085.960 | 19.82\% | 5,153,318 | 21.46\% | 464.850 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 10,209.200 | 18.25\% | 4,330,675 | 18.04\% | 424.193 |
| 4A1 | 14,523.500 | 25.96\% | 6,069,050 | 25.27\% | 417.877 |
| 4A | 4,619.900 | 8.26\% | 1,039,478 | 4.33\% | 225.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 55,942.190 | 100.00\% | 24,012,224 | 100.00\% | 429.232 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 33,019.050 | 55.21\% | 8,254,768 | 60.90\% | 250.000 |
| 2D1 | 197.000 | 0.33\% | 49,250 | 0.36\% | 250.000 |
| 2D | 14,019.710 | 23.44\% | 3,431,551 | 25.32\% | 244.766 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 1,945.280 | 3.25\% | 301,173 | 2.22\% | 154.822 |
| 4D1 | 9,449.090 | 15.80\% | 1,371,471 | 10.12\% | 145.143 |
| 4D | 1,173.320 | 1.96\% | 146,666 | 1.08\% | 125.000 |
| Dry Total | 59,803.450 | 100.00\% | 13,554,879 | 100.00\% | 226.657 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $15,435.350$ | $6.55 \%$ | $3,803,712$ | $11.76 \%$ | 246.428 |
| 2G1 | $1,553.460$ | $0.66 \%$ | 314,392 | $0.97 \%$ | 202.381 |
| 2G | $21,200.250$ | $9.00 \%$ | $3,906,620$ | $12.07 \%$ | 184.272 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | $26,715.890$ | $11.34 \%$ | $3,352,083$ | $10.36 \%$ | 125.471 |
| 4G1 | $91,459.620$ | $38.81 \%$ | $11,458,114$ | $35.41 \%$ | 125.280 |
| 4G | $79,302.070$ | $33.65 \%$ | $9,520,635$ | $29.43 \%$ | 120.055 |
| Grass Total | $235,666.640$ | $100.00 \%$ | $32,355,556$ | $100.00 \%$ | 137.293 |
|  | $55,942.190$ | $15.70 \%$ | $24,012,224$ | $34.18 \%$ | 429.232 |
| Irrigated Total | $59,803.450$ | $16.79 \%$ | $13,554,879$ | $19.29 \%$ | 226.657 |
| Dry Total | $235,666.640$ | $66.14 \%$ | $32,355,556$ | $46.05 \%$ | 137.293 |
| Grass Total | $2,672.300$ | $0.75 \%$ | 40,085 | $0.06 \%$ | 15.000 |
| Waste | $2,203.430$ | $0.62 \%$ | 297,906 | $0.42 \%$ | 135.201 |
| Other | $5,711.980$ | $1.60 \%$ |  |  | 190 |
| Exempt | $356,288.010$ | $100.00 \%$ | $70,260,650$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $55,942.190$ | $37.50 \%$ | $24,012,224$ | $31.43 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $59,803.450$ | $30.96 \%$ | $13,554,879$ | $22.95 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $235,666.640$ | $77.05 \%$ | $32,355,556$ | $71.77 \%$ |
| Waste | $2,672.300$ | $50.39 \%$ | 40,085 | $50.23 \%$ |
| Other | $2,203.430$ | $38.00 \%$ | 297,906 | $32.88 \%$ |
| Exempt | $5,711.980$ | $88.13 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $356,288.010$ | $54.04 \%$ | $70,260,650$ | $38.70 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 7 - Box Butte
Market Area: 2

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 27,020.310 | 69.61\% | 15,770,009 | 74.42\% | 583.635 |
| 2A1 | 162.000 | 0.42\% | 86,090 | 0.41\% | 531.419 |
| 2A | 8,497.870 | 21.89\% | 4,374,059 | 20.64\% | 514.724 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 65.900 | 0.17\% | 29,655 | 0.14\% | 450.000 |
| 4A1 | 2,938.800 | 7.57\% | 900,788 | 4.25\% | 306.515 |
| 4A | 134.600 | 0.35\% | 30,285 | 0.14\% | 225.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 38,819.480 | 100.00\% | 21,190,886 | 100.00\% | 545.882 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 32,518.350 | 61.72\% | 11,381,428 | 67.32\% | 350.000 |
| 2D1 | 159.000 | 0.30\% | 51,675 | 0.31\% | 325.000 |
| 2D | 13,008.080 | 24.69\% | 3,904,625 | 23.10\% | 300.169 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 251.000 | 0.48\% | 56,475 | 0.33\% | 225.000 |
| 4D1 | 6,540.640 | 12.41\% | 1,471,646 | 8.70\% | 225.000 |
| 4D | 211.600 | 0.40\% | 40,204 | 0.24\% | 190.000 |
| Dry Total | 52,688.670 | 100.00\% | 16,906,053 | 100.00\% | 320.866 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $4,314.850$ | $24.86 \%$ | $1,224,413$ | $40.22 \%$ | 283.767 |
| 2G1 | 659.500 | $3.80 \%$ | 171,083 | $5.62 \%$ | 259.413 |
| 2G | $3,538.690$ | $20.39 \%$ | 722,363 | $23.73 \%$ | 204.132 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | 74.000 | $0.43 \%$ | 8,510 | $0.28 \%$ | 115.000 |
| 4G1 | $5,881.220$ | $33.88 \%$ | 657,307 | $21.59 \%$ | 111.763 |
| 4G | $2,891.000$ | $16.65 \%$ | 260,490 | $8.56 \%$ | 90.103 |
| Grass Total | $17,359.260$ | $100.00 \%$ | $3,044,166$ | $100.00 \%$ | 175.362 |
|  | $38,819.480$ | $34.93 \%$ |  | $51,190,886$ | $51.13 \%$ |
| Irrigated Total | $52,688.670$ | $47.41 \%$ | $16,906,053$ | $40.79 \%$ | 345.882 |
| Dry Total | $17,359.260$ | $15.62 \%$ | $3,044,166$ | $7.35 \%$ | 320.866 |
| Grass Total | 561.200 | $0.51 \%$ | 8,438 | $0.02 \%$ | 175.362 |
| Waste | $1,696.140$ | $1.53 \%$ | 292,261 | $0.71 \%$ | 15.035 |
| Other | 155.840 | $0.14 \%$ |  | 172.309 |  |
| Exempt | $111,124.750$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $38,819.480$ | $26.02 \%$ | $21,190,886$ | $27.74 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $52,688.670$ | $27.28 \%$ | $16,906,053$ | $28.63 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $17,359.260$ | $5.68 \%$ | $3,044,166$ | $6.75 \%$ |
| Waste | 561.200 | $10.58 \%$ | 8,438 | $10.57 \%$ |
| Other | $1,696.140$ | $29.25 \%$ | 292,261 | $32.26 \%$ |
| Exempt | 155.840 | $2.40 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $111,124.750$ | $16.86 \%$ | $41,441,804$ | $22.83 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 7 - Box Butte
Market Area: 3

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 27,537.910 | 58.14\% | 19,050,817 | 68.39\% | 691.803 |
| 2A1 | 293.000 | 0.62\% | 157,380 | 0.56\% | 537.133 |
| 2A | 12,189.330 | 25.73\% | 6,199,071 | 22.25\% | 508.565 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 2,650.000 | 5.59\% | 1,127,660 | 4.05\% | 425.532 |
| 4A1 | 3,171.000 | 6.69\% | 980,450 | 3.52\% | 309.192 |
| 4A | 1,526.130 | 3.22\% | 342,195 | 1.23\% | 224.224 |
| Irrigated Total | 47,367.370 | 100.00\% | 27,857,573 | 100.00\% | 588.117 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 18,164.320 | 54.52\% | 8,991,950 | 68.54\% | 495.033 |
| 2D1 | 103.000 | 0.31\% | 33,475 | 0.26\% | 325.000 |
| 2D | 9,794.580 | 29.40\% | 2,938,374 | 22.40\% | 300.000 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 1,799.200 | 5.40\% | 404,821 | 3.09\% | 225.000 |
| 4D1 | 2,723.820 | 8.18\% | 612,860 | 4.67\% | 225.000 |
| 4D | 730.100 | 2.19\% | 138,719 | 1.06\% | 190.000 |
| Dry Total | 33,315.020 | 100.00\% | 13,120,199 | 100.00\% | 393.822 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $2,836.450$ | $11.87 \%$ | 909,517 | $19.07 \%$ | 320.653 |
| 2G1 | 82.000 | $0.34 \%$ | 21,260 | $0.45 \%$ | 259.268 |
| 2G | $5,328.110$ | $22.29 \%$ | $1,376,305$ | $28.86 \%$ | 258.310 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | $3,193.230$ | $13.36 \%$ | 568,333 | $11.92 \%$ | 177.980 |
| 4G1 | $6,641.460$ | $27.79 \%$ | $1,074,013$ | $22.52 \%$ | 161.713 |
| 4G | $5,819.960$ | $24.35 \%$ | 819,274 | $17.18 \%$ | 140.769 |
| Grass Total | $23,901.210$ | $100.00 \%$ | $4,768,702$ | $100.00 \%$ | 199.517 |
|  | $47,367.370$ | $44.22 \%$ | $27,857,573$ | $60.63 \%$ | 588.117 |
| Irrigated Total | $33,315.020$ | $31.10 \%$ | $13,120,199$ | $28.55 \%$ | 393.822 |
| Dry Total | $23,901.210$ | $22.31 \%$ | $4,768,702$ | $10.38 \%$ | 199.517 |
| Grass Total | $1,507.010$ | $1.41 \%$ | 22,841 | $0.05 \%$ | 15.156 |
| Waste | $1,035.710$ | $0.97 \%$ | 180,233 | $0.39 \%$ | 174.018 |
| Other | 613.130 | $0.57 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Exempt | $107,126.320$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  | 4 |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $47,367.370$ | $31.75 \%$ | $27,857,573$ | $36.46 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $33,315.020$ | $17.25 \%$ | $13,120,199$ | $22.22 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $23,901.210$ | $7.81 \%$ | $4,768,702$ | $10.58 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,507.010$ | $28.42 \%$ | 22,841 | $28.62 \%$ |
| Other | $1,035.710$ | $17.86 \%$ | 180,233 | $19.89 \%$ |
| Exempt | 613.130 | $9.46 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $107,126.320$ | $16.25 \%$ | $45,949,548$ | $25.31 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 7 - Box Butte
Market Area: 4

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 4,302.100 | 61.14\% | 2,128,310 | 63.65\% | 494.714 |
| 2A1 | 10.000 | 0.14\% | 4,800 | 0.14\% | 480.000 |
| 2A | 1,956.000 | 27.80\% | 907,510 | 27.14\% | 463.962 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 469.000 | 6.67\% | 194,125 | 5.81\% | 413.912 |
| 4A1 | 233.000 | 3.31\% | 94,250 | 2.82\% | 404.506 |
| 4A | 66.000 | 0.94\% | 14,745 | 0.44\% | 223.409 |
| Irrigated Total | 7,036.100 | 100.00\% | 3,343,740 | 100.00\% | 475.226 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 25,183.180 | 53.17\% | 9,443,696 | 61.02\% | 375.000 |
| 2D1 | 73.000 | 0.15\% | 23,725 | 0.15\% | 325.000 |
| 2D | 13,985.130 | 29.52\% | 4,195,539 | 27.11\% | 300.000 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 3,858.170 | 8.15\% | 868,089 | 5.61\% | 225.000 |
| 4D1 | 3,840.800 | 8.11\% | 864,181 | 5.58\% | 225.000 |
| 4D | 427.000 | 0.90\% | 81,130 | 0.52\% | 190.000 |
| Dry Total | 47,367.280 | 100.00\% | 15,476,360 | 100.00\% | 326.731 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $4,672.610$ | $16.15 \%$ | $1,302,487$ | $26.51 \%$ | 278.749 |
| 2G1 | 20.000 | $0.07 \%$ | 4,500 | $0.09 \%$ | 225.000 |
| 2G | $7,156.570$ | $24.74 \%$ | $1,472,644$ | $29.97 \%$ | 205.775 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | $5,651.130$ | $19.54 \%$ | 720,641 | $14.67 \%$ | 127.521 |
| 4G1 | $6,556.750$ | $22.67 \%$ | 828,094 | $16.86 \%$ | 126.296 |
| 4G | $4,869.900$ | $16.84 \%$ | 584,591 | $11.90 \%$ | 120.041 |
| Grass Total | $28,926.960$ | $100.00 \%$ | $4,912,957$ | $100.00 \%$ | 169.840 |
| Irigated Total | $7,036.100$ | $8.30 \%$ | $3,343,740$ | $14.00 \%$ | 475.226 |
| Dry Total | $47,367.280$ | $55.89 \%$ | $15,476,360$ | $64.82 \%$ | 326.731 |
| Grass Total | $28,926.960$ | $34.13 \%$ | $4,912,957$ | $20.58 \%$ | 169.840 |
| Waste | 563.000 | $0.66 \%$ | 8,445 | $0.04 \%$ | 15.000 |
| Other | 863.920 | $1.02 \%$ | 135,694 | $0.57 \%$ | 157.067 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 2 |
| Market Area Total | $84,757.260$ | $100.00 \%$ | $23,877,196$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $7,036.100$ | $4.72 \%$ | $3,343,740$ | $4.38 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $47,367.280$ | $24.52 \%$ | $15,476,360$ | $26.21 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $28,926.960$ | $9.46 \%$ | $4,912,957$ | $10.90 \%$ |
| Waste | 563.000 | $10.62 \%$ | 8,445 | $10.58 \%$ |
| Other | 863.920 | $14.90 \%$ | 135,694 | $14.98 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $84,757.260$ | $12.86 \%$ | $23,877,196$ | $13.15 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 7 - Box Butte


| Total | $\mathbf{6 5 9}, 296.340$ | $\mathbf{1 8 1 , 5 2 9 , 1 9 8}$ | $659,296.340$ | $100.00 \%$ | $181,529,198$ | $100.00 \%$ | 275.337 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Calculates


## 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

|  | 2007 CTL <br> County Total | 2008 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2007 Form 45-2006 CTL) | Percent Change | 2008 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 257,215,803 | 276,032,760 | 18,816,957 | 7.32 | 1,560,257 | 6.71 |
| 2. Recreational | 0 | 4,435 | 4,435 |  | 0 |  |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 34,760,569 | 34,065,480 | -695,089 | -2 | *--------- | -2 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 291,976,372 | 310,102,675 | 18,126,303 | 6.21 | 1,560,257 | 5.67 |
| 5. Commercial | 73,039,307 | 72,826,369 | -212,938 | -0.29 | 581,869 | -1.09 |
| 6. Industrial | 10,330,729 | 10,330,729 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 14,236,017 | 13,939,559 | -296,458 | -2.08 | 150,361 | -3.14 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 97,606,053 | 97,096,657 | -509,396 | -0.52 | 581,869 | -1.12 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 389,582,425 | 407,199,332 | 17,616,907 | 4.52 | 2,292,487 | 3.93 |
| 11. Irrigated | 73,306,359 | 76,404,423 | 3,098,064 | 4.23 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 57,826,820 | 59,057,491 | 1,230,671 | 2.13 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 45,022,168 | 45,081,381 | 59,213 | 0.13 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 80,604 | 79,809 | -795 | -0.99 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 901,934 | 901,934 | 4,160 | 0.46 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 177,137,885 | 181,529,198 | 4,391,313 | 2.48 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 566,720,310 | 588,728,530 | 22,008,220 | 3.88 | 2,292,487 | 3.48 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
# BOX BUTTE COUNTY <br> THREE YEAR PLAN <br> OF ASSESSMENT <br> 2007 

## Requirement

The assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263 Section 9, on or before June 15 each year. The assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 each year. A copy of the plan and any amendments made shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

## General Description of Real Property in Box Butte County

Per 2007 county abstract, Box Butte County consists of the following real property types:

|  | Parcels | \% of Total | \% of Taxable Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 4,450 | 55 | 45 |
| Commercial | 787 | 10 | 13 |
| I ndustrial | 6 | . 07 | 1.9 |
| Recreational | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Agricultural | 2,790 | 35 | 40 |
| Totals | 8,033 | 100 | 99.9 |

## Current Resources

- Staff
- Assessor with current certification and hours of continuing education
- Three full-time clerical employees
- Hired appraiser from Stanard Appraisal
- Our lister is employed by Stanard Appraisal
- Part-time, local
- Budget
- Our fiscal year is July 1-J une 30 each year
- Currently we are at the end of the 2006-2007 budget year
- The operating budget is $\$ 168,550$
- \$50,000 is appraisal budget
- Equipment
- Leased CAMA program with Terra Scan

Equipment cont.

- Deed plotter (1998 version) software program
- Microsoft Windows Server 2003
" Internet access with local provider
- Four workstations
- Cadastral books maintained monthly with real estate transfers


## Current Assessment Procedures

- Update ownership by receipt of real estate transfers from register of deeds office
- Maintain sales file with monthly qualified sales
- Conduct sales study with help of appraisal service
- Receive building permits monthly from the city office
" Review properties as "pick-up" work annually
- Zoning is county wide, however the county does not enforce building permits for rural improvements
" Our pick-up work for rural is currently by discovery
- Data collection is constant
- Application for value change from discovery is applied annually between J anuary 1 and March 19 each year
- Approaches to value are used in accordance with IAAO mass appraisal techniques
- The income approach is applied to Alliance commercial properties (due to cycle of reappraisal)
- Collected income and expense data
- Analyzed data with market depreciation
- The cost approach is used for all parcels
- Marshall \& Swift pricing system is used
- Market depreciation applied
" Market approach is used on all properties in regard to market depreciation
- Agricultural land sales are studied and valuations adjusted accordingly in their respective market areas
- Agricultural land has four market areas
- Change of value notices are sent pursuant state statute 77-1315
- Levels of value are published in local newspapers and delivered to local radio station pursuant state statute 77-1315

|  | Median | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential | $97 \%$ | 22.63 | 109 |
| Commercial | $98 \%$ | 39.86 | 127.03 |
| Agricultural land | $73 \%$ | 15.14 | 104.45 |

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2008

- Residential
- Alliance
- Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
- Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly
- Possible adjustment to ranch style houses
- Possible adjustment to higher end houses
- Hemingford
- Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
- Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly if need be
- Possible adjustment to higher end houses
- Rural Residential
- Continue with rural review in anticipation of finishing rural review, depending on the budget outcome
- Apply new cost index with market depreciation
- Study sales and adjust values accordingly
- Agricultural land
- Study sales and make adjustments if necessary
- Commercial
- Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
- Study sales and adjust values accordingly
- Review rural commercial properties during rural review


## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009

- Residential
- Alliance \& Hemingford
- Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
- Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly
- Rural Residential
- Continue with rural review if not completed for 2008
- Apply new cost index with market depreciation
- Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly
- Commercial
" Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
- Study sales and adjust values accordingly
- Agricultural land
- Study sales and make adjustments if necessary


## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010

- Residential
- Hemingford
- Start on a whole town review if not started for 2009
- Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
- Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly
- Alliance
- Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
- Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly
- Rural Residential
- Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
= Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly
- Commercial
- Hemingford
- Review properties with residential
- Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
- Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly
- Alliance
- Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
- Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly
- Rural
- Continue with rural review if not completed for 2008
- Apply new cost index with market depreciation
- Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly
- Agricultural land
- Study sales and make adjustments if necessary


## 2008 Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | None |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
|  | None |
| 3. | Other full-time employees |
|  | Three |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | None |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | None |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
|  | \$177,736 |
| 7. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
|  | None-The County uses a separate account for the computer system. |
| 8. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
|  | \$177,800 |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
|  | \$50,000 |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | \$6,500 |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | None. It is part of the total assessor's budget. |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | None. |
| 13. | Total budget |
|  | \$177,800 |

a. Was any of last year's budget not used:

No.

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Terra Scan |
|  | CAMA software |
| 3. | Terra Scan |
|  | Yeadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
| 4. | Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
|  | Staff |
| 5. | Does the county have GIS software? |
|  | Not at this time. |
| 6. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
|  | N/A |
| 7. | Personal Property software: |
|  | Terra Scan |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Yes |
|  | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
| 3. | Yes |
|  | What municipalities in the county are zoned? |
| 4. | When was zoning implemented? |
|  | 2001 |
|  |  |

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Stanard Appraisal |
|  | Other services |
|  | PTAS CAMA for administrative, CAMA and personal property software. |

## Certification

This is to certify that the 2008 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 Box Butte County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70062760000063875395.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.


[^0]:     outbuildings is shown in line 7.

