## 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

## Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 69 | COD | 24.01 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 6,253,355$ | PRD | 129.77 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 6,259,355$ | COV | 35.46 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 4,630,642$ | STD | 34.04 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 90,715$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 23.29 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 67,111$ | Min | 27.62 |
| Median | 97.03 | Max | 216.09 |
| Wgt. Mean | 73.98 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 92.58 to 99.38 |
| Mean | 96.00 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 55.25 to 92.71 |
|  |  | $95 \%$ Mean C.I. | 87.97 to 104.04 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 4.93 |
| :--- | ---: |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period | 8.82 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 8.13 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 72,797 |


| Commercial Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 69 | 97.03 | 24.01 | 129.77 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 62 | 98.22 | 13.00 | 127.24 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 59 | 98.98 | 24.40 | 111.71 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 46 | 86.07 | 33.22 | 97.75 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 53 | 93.96 | 37.44 | 108.38 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 58 | 95 | 40.87 | 103.62 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 67 | 97 | 50.77 | 111.84 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 76 | 98 | 85.48 | 138.34 |

## 2008 Commission Summary



Opinions

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Custer 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 Custer County is $98 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Custer County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Commercial Real Property

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

## Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land in Custer County is $69 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Custer County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. In order to move the level of value of Assessor Location of Market Area 1 with-in the acceptable range, I have recommended an adjustment of $7 \%$.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 
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# Custer County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses: 

## Residential

The assessor had made a request in the 2008-2009 budget that funds be approved for the hiring of Stanard Appraisal Service to assist in the physical review of improvements throughout the county as part of the three-year plan and statutory six-year cycle. This budget request was denied. The assessor noted that she will again address the issue next year, but for the 2008 assessment year she hired another part-time lister and tried to accomplish as much as possible with the staff available to her.

In Callaway and Oconto each property was physically inspected and the improvements were repriced using the 2007 Marshall \& Swift costing, and the depreciation was adjusted to market. In keeping with the three-year plan only Mason City failed to be reviewed, it will be re-scheduled when the three-year plan is updated next year.

Delight and Wood River townships were reviewed this year as part of the six-year cycle, only one person is doing this work.

Market conditions seem to be holding strong in Broken Bow and the suburban area surrounding the city, however there was not sufficient staff or time to do a thorough review. The assessor feels the high end properties may be having an impact, for the time being those properties dated 1950 and newer and those with major remodeling were re-priced with the 2007 Marshall \& Swift costing and the depreciation tables were adjusted.

The residential properties in Comstock were not physically inspected but they were re-priced using the 2007 Marshall \& Swift costing and the depreciation was also re-adjusted.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Custer County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 part-time listers |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | The assessor makes the final determination of value. |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | All pickup work will be done by the part-time listers. |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | Most all of the residential property class has been priced with the July of 2004 costing tables with the exception of Callaway and Oconto. Going into the new sixyear cycle as the towns and rural homes are re-priced the July of 2007 costing tables will be utilized. |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | This would vary by town depending upon the statistical analyses and re-calibration of depreciation tables manually prepared by the assessor using data derived from the market. The new depreciation tables are not entered into the CAMA system, instead the assessor will manually override the CAMA generated depreciation as the parcels are reviewed. |
| 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? |
|  | Sales are used to established depreciation as part of the cost approach to value. The sales comparison approach as it pertains to the use of plus or minus adjustments to comparable properties to arrive at a value for a subject property is not utilized. The TerraScan CAMA System currently used by the assessor has this capability, but the assessor is not familiar with the procedures it would take to set parameters to pull comparables for subject properties. |
| 7. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: |
|  | There are eleven towns or villages, the suburban area which is designated as a three mile area outside the city limits of Broken Bow and a one mile area outside the limits of each of the other towns or villages, and the rural area out in the remainder of the county. |


| 8. | How are these defined? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | These areas are defined by the political boundaries of each town or village, the <br> suburban area is that area outside of the city limits where a city may be granted legal <br> zoning jurisdiction for a specific area based on the class of the city, and the rural <br> area is anything past these described boundaries, including unincorporated villages. <br> Each town is uniquely different in its distance from Broken Bow and its proximity <br> to major highways. |
| 9. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
| 10. | Des <br> residential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | Suburban properties seem to experience similar market influences as those <br> properties located within the town or village they are associated with. Therefore <br> under the substrata "Assessor Location" the suburban sales have been included with <br> the adjoining town or village. |


| 11. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> 001.07B? (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.) |
| :--- | :--- |
| The assessor analyzes the suburban properties in the same manner as other <br> subdivisions and neighborhoods in and around Broken Bow, or the town or village <br> they are associated with, as they seem to experience similar market influences. |  |
| 12. | Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified <br> and valued in the same manner? |
|  | The assessor stated they were. |

Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85 | 300 | 0 | 385 |

This count also includes agricultural homes and outbuildings.

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
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:


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
368
$18,273,016$
$18,300,016$
$17,346,550$
49,728
47,137


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

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 1/2005 to 06/30/2 | Posted | ore: 01/1 | 2008 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | of Sale |  | 368 | MEDIAN: | 98 |  | COV: | 38.22 | 95\% | dian C.I.: 96.76 | to 98.73 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | es Pric |  | , 016 | WGT. MEAN: | 95 |  | STD: | 40.28 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 92.5 | to 96.99 |  |
| TOT | L Adj. S | es Pric |  | , 016 | MEAN : | 105 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 20.41 |  | Mean C.I.: 101 | 8 to 109.51 |  |
| TO | AL Asse | d Valu |  | , 550 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | es Pric |  | , 728 | COD: | 20.87 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 407.28 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | , 137 | PRD : | 111.19 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 11.12 |  |  | Printed: 03/31 | 19:12:17 |
| SALE PRICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 26 | 109.84 | 139.57 | 157.95 | 50.01 |  | 88.36 | 42.27 | 407.28 | 94.50 to 142.33 | 2,370 | 3,743 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 33 | 118.58 | 139.21 | 136.94 | 50.14 |  | 101.66 | 18.22 | 295.46 | 98.62 to 183.17 | 6,895 | 9,443 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 59 | 113.28 | 139.37 | 141.42 | 50.80 |  | 98.55 | 18.22 | 407.28 | 99.16 to 143.50 | 4,901 | 6,931 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 105 | 101.22 | 109.19 | 107.61 | 20.72 |  | 101.47 | 37.88 | 261.14 | 98.70 to 105.20 | 18,636 | 20,055 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 88 | 95.45 | 93.93 | 93.45 | 11.88 |  | 100.51 | 11.12 | 144.47 | 93.16 to 98.29 | 43,463 | 40,618 |
| 60000 тO | 99999 | 68 | 96.60 | 94.59 | 94.54 | 5.44 |  | 100.04 | 50.25 | 114.75 | 95.60 to 98.03 | 75,367 | 71,256 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 34 | 96.69 | 93.76 | 93.75 | 5.60 |  | 100.01 | 69.28 | 100.46 | 94.79 to 98.54 | 120,367 | 112,846 |
| 150000 то | 249999 | 10 | 93.49 | 91.31 | 91.70 | 7.94 |  | 99.57 | 67.01 | 107.34 | 77.76 to 98.73 | 186,915 | 171,401 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 4 | 76.08 | 75.04 | 75.37 | 22.31 |  | 99.56 | 53.23 | 94.76 | N/A | 285,625 | 215,282 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 368 | 97.78 | 105.40 | 94.79 | 20.87 |  | 111.19 | 11.12 | 407.28 | 96.76 to 98.73 | 49,728 | 47,137 |
| ASSESSED VA | UE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 28 | 93.40 | 88.79 | 68.50 | 31.73 |  | 129.61 | 18.22 | 214.00 | 68.80 to 103.13 | 3,317 | 2,272 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 18 | 99.31 | 100.77 | 72.51 | 30.89 |  | 138.96 | 11.12 | 196.70 | 73.47 to 118.58 | 9,978 | 7,235 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 46 | 95.19 | 93.47 | 71.15 | 32.04 |  | 131.38 | 11.12 | 214.00 | 81.67 to 102.68 | 5,923 | 4,214 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 122 | 101.31 | 122.58 | 105.23 | 33.16 |  | 116.49 | 38.44 | 407.28 | 98.70 to 105.91 | 18,068 | 19,012 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 92 | 97.29 | 100.54 | 95.35 | 15.50 |  | 105.44 | 50.25 | 261.14 | 94.80 to 99.99 | 45,424 | 43,313 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 65 | 97.11 | 96.72 | 95.83 | 4.39 |  | 100.93 | 69.28 | 117.72 | 95.91 to 98.37 | 78,424 | 75,151 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 33 | 97.63 | 93.04 | 91.31 | 6.34 |  | 101.90 | 53.23 | 100.46 | 94.79 to 98.54 | 129,587 | 118,321 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 8 | 94.86 | 92.67 | 90.29 | 7.51 |  | 102.63 | 62.90 | 107.34 | 62.90 to 107.34 | 211,893 | 191,316 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 2 | 92.01 | 92.01 | 91.89 | 2.99 |  | 100.14 | 89.26 | 94.76 | N/A | 287,500 | 264,172 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 368 | 97.78 | 105.40 | 94.79 | 20.87 |  | 111.19 | 11.12 | 407.28 | 96.76 to 98.73 | 49,728 | 47,137 |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 46 | 94.45 | 87.15 | 73.52 | 30.54 |  | 118.53 | 11.12 | 214.00 | 73.47 to 99.16 | 22,432 | 16,492 |
| 10 |  | 1 | 90.36 | 90.36 | 90.36 |  |  |  | 90.36 | 90.36 | N/A | 47,000 | 42,471 |
| 20 |  | 159 | 99.60 | 116.39 | 98.81 | 28.03 |  | 117.80 | 50.25 | 407.28 | 97.47 to 101.25 | 32,568 | 32,180 |
| 30 |  | 152 | 96.91 | 100.17 | 94.95 | 11.15 |  | 105.51 | 53.23 | 232.20 | 95.71 to 98.42 | 69,236 | 65,737 |
| 40 |  | 10 | 97.95 | 95.53 | 94.59 | 3.74 |  | 100.99 | 82.06 | 100.08 | 89.26 to 99.67 | 151,880 | 143,669 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 368 | 97.78 | 105.40 | 94.79 | 20.87 |  | 111.19 | 11.12 | 407.28 | 96.76 to 98.73 | 49,728 | 47,137 |
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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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2008 Correlation Section<br>for Custer County

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: Two of the central measures of tendency will support the actions taken by Custer County and the arithmetic mean goes above the range. It is believed that low dollar sales that are scattered throughout the county, in particular the twelve assessor locations, are affecting this measure. If hypothetically removed from the "mix" the mean moves to 98.91 and within the range. The qualitative measures as well are affected by these sales and when hypothetically removed the coefficient of dispersion meets the standard and the price related differential is out only by 3.18 points. For direct equalization purposes the R\&O Median will be used in determining the level of value.

The adopted three-year plan, preliminary statistics, the 2008 Reports and Opinions statistics, and the 2008 Assessment Survey all support that Custer County has achieved an acceptable overall level of value.
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 | $\mathbf{5 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 4 4}$ |
| 2007 | 506 | 365 | $\mathbf{7 2 . 1 3}$ |
| 2006 | 547 | 439 | $\mathbf{8 0 . 2 6}$ |
| 2005 | 533 | 428 | $\mathbf{8 0 . 3}$ |
| 2004 | 475 | 342 | $\mathbf{7 2}$ |
| 2003 | 487 | 402 | $\mathbf{8 2 . 5 5}$ |
| 2002 | 521 | 445 | $\mathbf{8 5 . 4 1}$ |
| 2001 | 527 | 298 | $\mathbf{5 6 . 5 5}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The number of total sales and the number of qualified sales has stayed consistence with 2007 , as well as the percent of usage at $72.44 \%$. There is indication that a sufficient number of sales are utilized to do an adequate measurement of the residential class of property.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Custer County

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Custer County

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 | 94.93 | 6.52 | 101.12 |  |
| 2007 | 94.47 | 3.39 | 97.68 | 96.36 |
| 2006 | 90.95 | 8.18 | 98.39 | 96.55 |
| 2005 | 91.43 | 10.35 | 100.89 | 97.06 |
| 2004 | 93.72 | 5.21 | 98.6 | 94.43 |
| 2003 | 91 | 1.38 | 92.26 | 93 |
| 2002 | 93 | 1.55 | 94.44 | 94 |
| 2001 | 94 | 2.05 | 95.93 | 96 |

RESIDENTIAL: The two statistics are barely similar and offer weak support of each other. There is no other information available to suggest that the R\&O Median is not the best indication of the level of value for the residential class of property in Custer County.

## 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17.89 | 2008 | 6.52 |
| 6.51 | 2007 | 3.39 |
| 9.98 | 2006 | $\mathbf{8 . 1 8}$ |
| 15.31 | 2005 | 10.35 |
| 1.91 | 2004 | 5.21 |
| 2.41 | 2003 | 1.38 |
| 0.99 | 2002 | 1.55 |
| 1.63 | 2001 | 2.05 |

RESIDENTIAL: An examination of the percent change to the sales file compared to the percent change to assessed value (excluding growth) reveals an approximate 11.37 point difference. The difference implies that the assessment actions had more of a pronounced effect on the sample compared to the population as a whole. The sales file is evidence of the assessment actions in that 108 out of the 189 sales (approximately $57 \%$ ) occurring in the last year of the study period received a change in value if located in Callaway, Oconto, Comstock or was properties dated 1950 and newer in Broken Bow and the suburban area surrounding the city.

## 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.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Custer County

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 97.78 | 94.79 | 105.40 |

RESIDENTIAL: Of the three measures of central tendency only the mean is outside of the acceptable parameters. The mean is being heavily affected by the low dollar sales that are scattered among the twelve assessor locations throughout the county. Excluding Broken Bow and the rural residential the remaining ten towns have a population ranging from approximately 110 to 649 . If all sales under $\$ 10,000$ ( 59 in number) were hypothetically removed from the analysis the median and weighted mean would move very little, 97.20 and 94.04 respectively, however the mean moves to 98.91 . For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used as the best indicator in determining the level of value for the residential class of property and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio.

## 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 | 20.87 | $\mathbf{1 1 1 . 1 9}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{5 . 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 1 9}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are above the acceptable ranges and would typically indicate issues with uniformity. The preliminary coefficient of dispersion was 26.74 and the price related differential was 118.45. The qualitative measures are more an indication of the disparity within the twelve assessor locations in the county and the disproportionate measurements between low dollar sales. Hypothetically removing the low dollar sales under $\$ 10,000$ would move the COD to 13.30 and the PRD to 105.18 for the remaining 309 sales. It is believed the residential properties are being treated in as uniform and proportionate a manner as possible.

## 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 | 369 | $\mathbf{3 6 8}$ | -1 |
| Median | 94.93 | 97.78 | 2.85 |
| Wgt. Mean | $\mathbf{8 5 . 2 0}$ | 94.79 | 9.59 |
| Mean | 100.93 | 105.40 | 4.47 |
| COD | 26.74 | 20.87 | -5.87 |
| PRD | 118.45 | 111.19 | -7.26 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 11.12 | 11.12 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 296.00 | 407.28 | 111.28 |

RESIDENTIAL: The change from the Preliminary Statistics to the R\&O Statistics is a reflection of the assessment actions for 2008 in that property in Callaway and Oconto was physically inspected and re-priced, properties dated 1950 and newer in Broken Bow and the suburban area surrounding the city were re-priced, and properties in Comstock were re-priced. All with updated 2007 Marshall \& Swift costing and the depreciation was re-adjusted. There is one less sale in the R\&O Statistics that was substantially changed.

# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 

## Type: Qualified
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## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified
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## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008



## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008



## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics



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

## Commercial

The county board of commissioners continues to allow funding in the assessor's budget for the use of Stanard Appraisal Service in the routine maintenance of the commercial class of property. For assessment year 2008 there will be some new construction as well as the normal maintenance. There was no other significant action planned for the commercial class.

# 2008 Assessment Survey for Custer County 

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information



| 9. | How are these defined? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | These areas are defined by the political boundaries of each town or village, the <br> suburban area is that area outside of the city limits where a city may be granted legal <br> zoning jurisdiction for a specific area based on the class of the city, and the rural <br> area is anything past these described boundaries, including unincorporated villages. <br> Each town is uniquely different in its distance from Broken Bow and its proximity <br> to major highways. |
| 10. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
| 11. | Yes <br> commer the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than ruralSuburban properties seem that to experience similar market influences as those <br> properties located within the town or village they are associated with. Therefore <br> under the substrata "Assessor Location" the suburban sales have been included with <br> the adjoining town or village. |

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.)
The assessor analyzes the suburban properties in the same manner as other subdivisions and neighborhoods in and around Broken Bow, or the town or village they are associated with, as they seem to experience similar market influences.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 |  |  | 10 |

# PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics <br> Type: Qualified 

|  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 01/2004 to 06/30/2 | 007 Posted | fore: 01/1 | 2008 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER of | Sales: |  | 69 | MEDIAN: | 97 |  | COV: | 35.46 | 95\% | Median C.I.: 92.5 | to 99.38 | (!: Derived) |
| TOTAL Sales | Price: |  | 6,253,355 | WGT. MEAN: | 74 |  | STD: | 34.04 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 55. | to 92.71 |  |
| TOTAL Adj. Sales | Price: |  | 6,259,355 | MEAN : | 96 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 23.29 |  | Mean C.I.: 87 | to 104.04 |  |
| TOTAL Assessed | d Value: |  | 4,630,642 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Adj. Sales | Price: |  | 90,715 | COD : | 24.01 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 216.09 |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Assessed | d Value: |  | 67,110 | PRD : | 129.77 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 27.62 |  |  | Printed: 03/31/ | 8 19:12:22 |
| DATE OF SALE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 | 4 | 102.81 | 102.62 | 101.80 | 4.12 |  | 100.81 | 97.84 | 107.03 | N/A | 36,125 | 36,775 |
| 10/01/04 TO 12/31/04 | 8 | 99.61 | 107.00 | 100.28 | 9.59 |  | 106.70 | 92.58 | 165.74 | 92.58 to 165.74 | 26,918 | 26,994 |
| 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 | 3 | 85.53 | 91.39 | 85.59 | 15.84 |  | 106.78 | 74.00 | 114.65 | N/A | 128,666 | 110,128 |
| 04/01/05 TO 06/30/05 | 7 | 97.03 | 96.90 | 96.45 | 3.18 |  | 100.46 | 87.97 | 102.98 | 87.97 to 102.98 | 21,785 | 21,012 |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 | 5 | 97.78 | 91.20 | 87.79 | 8.00 |  | 103.89 | 66.53 | 99.62 | N/A | 70,422 | 61,822 |
| 10/01/05 TO 12/31/05 | 2 | 102.47 | 102.47 | 98.43 | 4.62 |  | 104.10 | 97.73 | 107.20 | N/A | 13,500 | 13,288 |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 6 | 78.54 | 77.58 | 64.97 | 16.37 |  | 119.41 | 54.03 | 96.28 | 54.03 to 96.28 | 622,750 | 404,584 |
| 04/01/06 TO 06/30/06 | 4 | 91.46 | 96.98 | 89.64 | 23.33 |  | 108.18 | 61.31 | 143.68 | N/A | 16,993 | 15,234 |
| 07/01/06 TO 09/30/06 | 9 | 104.11 | 114.71 | 111.59 | 30.45 |  | 102.80 | 54.36 | 216.09 | 76.22 to 138.36 | 33,024 | 36,852 |
| 10/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 6 | 78.86 | 99.12 | 74.86 | 42.50 |  | 132.40 | 56.97 | 182.67 | 56.97 to 182.67 | 52,050 | 38,965 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 7 | 87.02 | 92.25 | 72.39 | 36.56 |  | 127.43 | 34.75 | 149.83 | 34.75 to 149.83 | 36,000 | 26,061 |
| 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 | 8 | 52.53 | 77.27 | 69.04 | 82.72 |  | 111.92 | 27.62 | 147.90 | 27.62 to 147.90 | 39,487 | 27,261 |
| __Study Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 | 22 | 99.13 | 100.86 | 93.56 | 7.91 |  | 107.80 | 74.00 | 165.74 | 96.72 to 100.48 | 40,834 | 38,205 |
| 07/01/05 то 06/30/06 | 17 | 93.03 | 89.08 | 67.51 | 15.94 |  | 131.96 | 54.03 | 143.68 | 66.53 to 99.06 | 246,093 | 166,125 |
| 07/01/06 TO 06/30/07 | 30 | 90.62 | 96.37 | 82.04 | 42.49 |  | 117.46 | 27.62 | 216.09 | 67.70 to 124.71 | 39,247 | 32,199 |
| __Calendar Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01/01/05 TO 12/31/05 | 17 | 97.73 | 94.91 | 88.62 | 7.45 |  | 107.10 | 66.53 | 114.65 | 87.97 to 99.62 | 53,977 | 47,833 |
| 01/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 25 | 92.95 | 99.22 | 69.19 | 30.61 |  | 143.41 | 54.03 | 216.09 | 76.22 to 104.11 | 176,559 | 122,156 |
|  | 69 | 97.03 | 96.00 | 73.98 | 24.01 |  | 129.77 | 27.62 | 216.09 | 92.58 to 99.38 | 90,715 | 67,110 |
| ASSESSOR LOCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| ANSELMO | 2 | 113.53 | 113.53 | 84.01 | 45.99 |  | 135.13 | 61.31 | 165.74 | N/A | 11,500 | 9,661 |
| ANSLEY | 8 | 108.82 | 98.77 | 76.77 | 32.35 |  | 128.65 | 27.62 | 147.90 | 27.62 to 147.90 | 32,621 | 25,044 |
| ARNOLD | 4 | 81.43 | 83.68 | 80.52 | 40.62 |  | 103.92 | 33.50 | 138.36 | N/A | 22,625 | 18,217 |
| BROKEN BOW | 35 | 94.22 | 89.22 | 67.11 | 18.77 |  | 132.94 | 34.75 | 145.65 | 85.53 to 98.96 | 133,006 | 89,261 |
| CALLAWAY | 4 | 99.35 | 98.97 | 99.81 | 1.35 |  | 99.16 | 96.72 | 100.48 | N/A | 21,837 | 21,797 |
| COMSTOCK | 1 | 182.67 | 182.67 | 182.67 |  |  |  | 182.67 | 182.67 | N/A | 300 | 548 |
| MASON CITY | 6 | 94.81 | 112.07 | 116.10 | 39.20 |  | 96.53 | 54.36 | 216.09 | 54.36 to 216.09 | 17,166 | 19,930 |
| MERNA | 4 | 98.45 | 106.60 | 102.95 | 18.13 |  | 103.55 | 79.66 | 149.83 | N/A | 27,875 | 28,696 |
| SARGENT | 5 | 99.47 | 94.47 | 96.15 | 11.04 |  | 98.25 | 62.71 | 107.20 | N/A | 185,500 | 178,367 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 69 | 97.03 | 96.00 | 73.98 | 24.01 |  | 129.77 | 27.62 | 216.09 | 92.58 to 99.38 | 90,715 | 67,110 |

# PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics 
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PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
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|  | NUMBER of Sales: |  |  |  |  | Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 |  |  | Posted Before: 01/18/2008 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 69 |  | 97 |  | COV: | 35.46 | 95\% Median C |  | C.I.: 92.58 to 99.38 |  | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL Sales | s Pric |  | 6,253,355 | WGT. MEAN: | 74 |  | STD: | 34.04 | 95\% Wg | Mean C | C.I.: 55.25 | to 92.71 |  |
|  | TOTAL Adj. Sales | s Pric |  | 6,259,355 | MEAN : | 96 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 23.29 |  | Mean C | C.I.: 87. | to 104.04 |  |
|  | TOTAL Assessed | d Valu |  | 4,630,642 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales | s Pric |  | 90,715 | COD : | 24.01 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 216.09 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: |  |  | 67,110 | PRD : | 129.77 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 27.62 | Printed: 03/31/2008 19:12:22 |  |  |  |  |
| OCCUPANCY | Y CODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Me | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 6 | 99.19 | 87.91 | 79.79 | 30.65 |  | 110.18 | 33.50 | 147.90 | 33.50 | to 147.90 | 14,216 | 11,343 |
| 299 |  | 1 | 87.97 | 87.97 | 87.97 |  |  |  | 87.97 | 87.97 |  | N/A | 30,000 | 26,391 |
| 300 |  | 3 | 66.53 | 76.14 | 66.61 | 15.81 |  | 114.30 | 65.16 | 96.72 |  | N/A | 66,333 | 44,186 |
| 309 |  | 1 | 96.66 | 96.66 | 96.66 |  |  |  | 96.66 | 96.66 |  | N/A | 9,000 | 8,699 |
| 326 |  | 4 | 99.63 | 118.63 | 99.55 | 24.85 |  | 119.17 | 92.58 | 182.67 |  | N/A | 22,575 | 22,473 |
| 330 |  | 2 | 75.16 | 75.16 | 64.45 | 28.11 |  | 116.62 | 54.03 | 96.28 |  | N/A | 1,825,000 | 1,176,123 |
| 340 |  | 1 | 165.74 | 165.74 | 165.74 |  |  |  | 165.74 | 165.74 |  | N/A | 5,000 | 8,287 |
| 343 |  | 1 | 114.65 | 114.65 | 114.65 |  |  |  | 114.65 | 114.65 |  | N/A | 80,000 | 91,718 |
| 344 |  | 6 | 99.27 | 92.29 | 91.93 | 25.22 |  | 100.40 | 34.75 | 128.29 | 34.75 | to 128.29 | 43,166 | 39,682 |
| 349 |  | 1 | 100.48 | 100.48 | 100.48 |  |  |  | 100.48 | 100.48 |  | N/A | 35,350 | 35,521 |
| 350 |  | 2 | 120.76 | 120.76 | 108.00 | 18.98 |  | 111.81 | 97.84 | 143.68 |  | N/A | 15,737 | 16,997 |
| 351 |  | 1 | 105.95 | 105.95 | 105.95 |  |  |  | 105.95 | 105.95 |  | N/A | 26,000 | 27,546 |
| 352 |  | 3 | 85.60 | 105.59 | 90.88 | 23.41 |  | 116.19 | 85.53 | 145.65 |  | N/A | 66,200 | 60,164 |
| 353 |  | 15 | 98.96 | 93.68 | 88.42 | 12.41 |  | 105.94 | 54.36 | 138.36 | 87.02 | 2 to 99.47 | 43,952 | 38,865 |
| 406 |  | 5 | 89.97 | 90.54 | 84.14 | 20.69 |  | 107.61 | 62.71 | 134.95 |  | N/A | 15,600 | 13,125 |
| 418 |  | 1 | 124.71 | 124.71 | 124.71 |  |  |  | 124.71 | 124.71 |  | N/A | 80,000 | 99,765 |
| 426 |  | 1 | 97.73 | 97.73 | 97.73 |  |  |  | 97.73 | 97.73 |  | N/A | 25,000 | 24,433 |
| 442 |  | 5 | 129.65 | 117.25 | 83.15 | 42.46 |  | 141.01 | 33.71 | 216.09 |  | N/A | 49,200 | 40,911 |
| 451 |  | 2 | 101.20 | 101.20 | 100.87 | 5.76 |  | 100.33 | 95.37 | 107.03 |  | N/A | 47,750 | 48,164 |
| 470 |  | 3 | 79.66 | 81.71 | 81.73 | 12.59 |  | 99.98 | 67.70 | 97.78 |  | N/A | 47,370 | 38,714 |
| 499 |  | 1 | 76.22 | 76.22 | 76.22 |  |  |  | 76.22 | 76.22 |  | N/A | 62,430 | 47,585 |
| 528 |  | 4 | 71.01 | 67.44 | 57.98 | 30.05 |  | 116.32 | 27.62 | 100.15 |  | N/A | 43,000 | 24,933 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 69 | 97.03 | 96.00 | 73.98 | 24.01 |  | 129.77 | 27.62 | 216.09 | 92.58 | 8 to 99.38 | 90,715 | 67,110 |

Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: Two of the measures of central tendency will support the action taken by Custer County, the weighted mean is being effected by a high dollar sale in the amount of $\$ 2,750,000$ (a care home for the elderly) book 216 page 995 sale date $03 / 14 / 06$. When this sale is hypothetically removed the effects are mitigated and the weighted mean is improved 89.62, median 97.38 , and mean 96.62 . As well this sale is having an impact on the qualitative statistics when the outlier is hypothetically removed from the "mix" the qualitative measures are improved but still above the standards, COD 23.62 and PRD 107.82.

The median measure of central tendency will be used in determining the level of value for the commercial class of property and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio.

2008 Correlation Section<br>for Custer County

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(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 | 106 | 69 | 65.09 |
| 2007 | 106 | 62 | 58.49 |
| 2006 | 88 | 59 | 67.05 |
| 2005 | 86 | 46 | 53.49 |
| 2004 | 88 | 53 | 60.23 |
| 2003 | 93 | 58 | 62.37 |
| 2002 | 93 | 67 | 72.04 |
| 2001 | 112 | 76 | 67.86 |

COMMERCIAL: The above table indicates that over the past eight years there has been a continuous up and down movement in the percent of sales used. The number of total sales and the number of qualified sales has stayed somewhat consistence with 2007, but the percent of usage has actually increased for 2008. After a review of the total sales file there is indication that a sufficient number of sales are utilized to do an adequate measurement of the commercial class of property.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Custer County

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Custer County

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 | 96.72 | 1.3 | 97.98 |  |
| 2007 | 98.22 | 0.63 | 98.84 | 98.22 |
| 2006 | 92.60 | 18.14 | 109.4 | 98.98 |
| 2005 | 78.07 | 6.18 | 82.89 | $\mathbf{8 6 . 0 7}$ |
| 2004 | 90.22 | 0.19 | 90.39 | 93.96 |
| 2003 | 95 | -0.7 | 94.34 | 95 |
| 2002 | 98 | -0.11 | 97.89 | 97 |
| 2001 | 98 | 1.26 | 99.23 | 98 |

COMMERCIAL: The two statistics are similar and tend to support each other. There is less than a one point difference (.95). There is no other information available to suggest that the R\&O Median is not the best indication of the level of value for the commercial class of property in Custer County.

## 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.71 | 2008 | 1.3 |
| 0.64 | 2007 | 0.63 |
| 24.1 | 2006 | 18.14 |
| 20 | 2005 | 6.18 |
| 1.87 | 2004 | 0.19 |
| 5.1 | 2003 | -0.7 |
| -2.65 | 2002 | -0.11 |
| -3.96 | 2001 | 1.26 |

COMMERCIAL: An examination of the percent change to the sales file compared to the percent change to assessed value (excluding growth) reveals an approximate 4.41 point difference. The difference implies that the assessment actions had more of a pronounced effect on the sample compared to the population as a whole and is evidenced by the effects of two sales in the file. In particular one sale that was missed being removed and coded a (3) substantially changed book 07 page 2705 sale date $05 / 09 / 07$, property is being remodeled, and the other is due to the correction of the lot value for sale 07 page 2587 sale date $02 / 161 / 07$. The change in the overall base would be due to routine maintenance and the cleanup of some land values due to rounding issues.

## 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 | $\mathbf{9 7 . 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 0 0}$ |

COMMERCIAL: Of the three measures of central tendency the median and arithmetic mean are within the prescribed parameter. The weighted mean is being effected by a high dollar sale in the amount of $\$ 2,750,000$ (a care home for the elderly) book 216 page 995 sale date $03 / 14 / 06$. When this sale is hypothetically removed the effects are mitigated and the weighted mean is improved 89.62 , median 97.38 , and mean 96.62 . For direct equalization purposes the median will be used to describe the level of value for the commercial class of property.

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

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. 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 | 24.01 | 129.77 |
| Difference | 4.01 | 26.77 |

COMMERCIAL: Both of the qualitative measures, the coefficient of dispersion and the pricerelated differential, are above the prescribed standards. When the outlier, a high dollar sale in the amount of $\$ 2,750,000$ (a care home for the elderly) book 216 page 995 sale date $03 / 14 / 06$, is hypothetically removed from the "mix" the qualitative measures are improved but still above the standards, COD 23.62 and PRD 107.82. It is believed the dispersion among the assessor locations and the diversity of the commercial properties are causing the affect. The commercial properties are being treated in as uniform and proportionate a manner as possible.

## 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 | 75 | 69 | -6 |
| Median | 96.72 | 97.03 | 0.31 |
| Wgt. Mean | 73.71 | 73.98 | 0.27 |
| Mean | 94.28 | 96.00 | 1.72 |
| COD | 24.43 | 24.01 | $-\mathbf{0 . 4 2}$ |
| PRD | 127.91 | 129.77 | 1.86 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 25.93 | 27.62 | 1.69 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 216.09 | 216.09 | 0 |

COMMERCIAL: There are six less sales from the Preliminary Statistics to the R\&O Statistics due to the removal of sales that were coded (3) substantially changed and (4) do not use because they were duplicate sales. It is reported in the 2008 Assessment Survey for Custer County that only routine maintenance was done within the commercial class of property, the change in the above comparison is due to one sale that was missed being removed and coded a (3) substantially changed book 07 page 2705 sale date $05 / 09 / 07$, property is being remodeled. The other is due to the correction of the lot value for sale 07 page 2587 sale date $02 / 161 / 07$.

## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008



## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics
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## AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008




# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 



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

## Agricultural

Within the agricultural class of property a considerable amount of time has been spent reviewing irrigated acres, comparing what is on the property record card to the certified acres on the Natural Resource District (NRD) maps for assessment year 2008.

As well the assessor's office is preparing to implement a new soil conversion utilizing a software program she has purchased called AgriData for assessment year 2009.

An analysis of each market area was done and as a result of the changing market conditions the values changed per market area as follows:

Market Area 1 - changes within the grassland only

|  | $\underline{2007}$ | $\underline{2008}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1G1 | -- | -- |
| 1G | 396 | 395 |
| 2G1 | 385 | 390 |
| 2G | 374 | 385 |
| 3G1 | 363 | 380 |
| 3G | 358 | 378 |
| 4G1 | 352 | 375 |
| 4G | 347 | 370 |

Market Area 2 - No changes for 2008

Market Area 3 - changes within the dry land and grassland only

|  | $\underline{2007}$ | $\underline{2008}$ |  | $\underline{2007}$ | $\underline{2008}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1D1 | - | -- |  | 1G1 | -- | -- |
| 1D | 520 | 470 |  | 1G | 360 | 350 |
| 2D1 | 465 | 465 |  | 2G1 | 350 | 345 |
| 2D | 460 | 460 |  | 2G | 340 | 340 |
| 3D1 | 330 | 335 |  | 3G1 | 330 | 330 |
| 3D | 310 | 330 |  | 3G | 325 | 330 |
| 4D1 | 305 | 300 |  | 4G1 | 320 | 325 |
| 4D | 250 | 250 |  | 4G | 315 | 320 |

Market Area 4 - changes within the dry land and grassland only

|  | $\underline{2007}$ | $\underline{2008}$ |  | $\underline{2007}$ | $\underline{2008}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1D1 | - | -- |  | 1G1 | -- | -- |
| 1D | 450 | 470 |  | 1G | 340 | 340 |
| 2D1 | 410 | 410 |  | 2G1 | 305 | 305 |
| 2D | 395 | 395 |  | 2G | 280 | 280 |
| 3D1 | 370 | 390 |  | 3G1 | 265 | 275 |
| 3D | 335 | 345 |  | 3G | 260 | 270 |
| 4D1 | 330 | 340 |  | 4G1 | 255 | 268 |
| 4D | 300 | 300 |  | 4G | 250 | 265 |

Market Area 5 - changes within the grassland only

|  | $\underline{2007}$ | $\underline{2008}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1G1 | -- | -- |
| 1G | 400 | 405 |
| 2G1 | 394 | 390 |
| 2G | 388 | 380 |
| 3G1 | 346 | 350 |
| 3G | 340 | 345 |
| 4G1 | 328 | 340 |
| 4G | 316 | 330 |

Market Area 6 - changes within the irrigated and grassland only

|  | $\underline{2007}$ | $\underline{2008}$ |  | $\underline{2007}$ | $\underline{2008}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1A1 | -- | -- |  | 1G1 | -- | -- |
| 1A | 1385 | 1390 |  | 1G | 380 | 380 |
| 2A1 | 1220 | 1220 |  | 2G1 | 375 | 375 |
| 2A | 1100 | 1105 |  | 2G | 370 | 370 |
| 3A1 | 1080 | 1080 |  | 3G1 | 360 | 368 |
| 3A | 1075 | 1075 |  | 3G | 355 | 365 |
| 4A1 | 860 | 865 |  | 4G1 | 350 | 360 |
| 4A | 783 | 785 |  | 4G | 345 | 355 |

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Custer County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

\(\left.\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline 1 . & \begin{array}{l}\text { Data collection done by: } \\
2 \text { part-time listers }\end{array} \\
\hline 2 . & \begin{array}{l}\text { Valuation done by: }\end{array} \\
\hline 3 . & \begin{array}{l}\text { Pickup work done by whom: } \\
\text { All pickup work will be done by the part-time listers. }\end{array} \\
\hline 4 . & \begin{array}{l}\text { Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically } \\
\text { define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? }\end{array} \\
\hline \text { a. } & \begin{array}{l}\text { How is agricultural land defined in this county? }\end{array} \\
\hline \text { A parcel of land used exclusively for the production of agricultural products. } \\
\text { Rural Acreages - A parcel of land under 40 acres that has no influence of } \\
\text { adjoining agricultural parcels under the same ownership. }\end{array}
$$ \right\rvert\, \begin{array}{l}Suburban - An area outside the limits of an incorporated city or village <br>
but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village. An <br>
area of residential expansion shall be valued as suburban; Broken Bow <br>
shall be within 3 miles of the city and all other towns and villages shall <br>

be within 1 mile.\end{array}\right\}\)| Urban - A parcel of real property located within the limits of an |
| :--- |
| incorporated city or village. |


| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) <br> Through discovery by, including but not limited to, physical inspection, NRD, FSA <br> maps, well registrations, taxpayers, real estate agents, personal property listings, and <br> so forth. |
| ---: | :--- |
| b. | By whom? <br> Office staff and the part-time listers. |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? <br> Again, land use within the county is monitored on a continual basis. |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class: |
| Six agricultural market areas have been established within Custer County. |  |
|  | How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class? |
| Market Area 1 - this is the predominant market area and is considered the better <br> farm ground. It is made up of harder soils and has the best irrigation potential. <br> Market Area 2 - is the Sandhills and best suited for pasture only. The bulk of this <br> land consists of a soil type known as valentine sand. <br> Market Area 3 - is considered a buffer zone between the better farmland and the <br> Sandhills. This ground is still sandy but the loamier soils are starting to show up to <br> start farming. The sales will start to show that a higher amount will be paid in this <br> area than in area two, but still less than what would be paid in area one. <br> Market Area 4 - this area has a carryover market influence from Lincoln County. It <br> is farm ground with deep wells. <br> Market Area 5 - this area is primarily canyons with some farming done on the <br> plateaus. The bulk of the sales will be for grass. This area lies south of the South <br> Loup River in the southern part of the county. <br> Market Area 6 - this area is north of the Middle Loup River in the northern part of <br> the county and will show a slight variance from market area one because of being <br> north of the river. |  |
| 10. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special <br> valuation for agricultural land within the county? |
| Not at this time. |  |

## Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural homes and outbuildings are included in the residential count. |  |  |  |

21 - CUSTER COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | NUMBER of Sales: | 119 |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $21,932,616$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $21,932,616$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $14,286,285$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 184,307 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 120,052 |

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

| RANGE | COUNT |
| :---: | :---: |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 | 8 |
| 10/01/04 то 12/31/04 | 9 |
| 01/01/05 TO 03/31/05 | 6 |
| 04/01/05 TO 06/30/05 | 2 |
| 07/01/05 TO 09/30/05 | 8 |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 8 |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 1 |
| 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 | 14 |
| 07/01/06 то 09/30/06 | 6 |
| 10/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 12 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 12 |
| 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 $\qquad$ Study Years $\qquad$ | 13 |
| 07/01/04 то 06/30/05 | 35 |
| 07/01/05 то 06/30/06 | 41 |
| 07/01/06 то 06/30/07 $\qquad$ Calendar Yrs $\qquad$ | 43 |
| 01/01/05 TO 12/31/05 | 34 |
| 01/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 43 |
| ALL |  |
|  | 119 |


| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 73.49 | 74.88 | 63.89 |
| 67.84 | 66.01 | 63.47 |
| 82.88 | 81.19 | 77.42 |
| 68.94 | 75.21 | 74.25 |
| 67.31 | 65.28 | 68.93 |
| 72.94 | 67.78 | 71.02 |
| 63.53 | 63.95 | 58.81 |
| 74.46 | 72.76 | 71.27 |
| 53.66 | 54.98 | 54.78 |
| 67.74 | 67.67 | 72.30 |
| 67.90 | 64.61 | 63.31 |
| 52.99 | 54.40 | 53.20 |
| 71.96 | 73.79 | 68.46 |
| 70.88 | 67.97 | 67.55 |
| 62.28 | 61.03 | 61.85 |
| 71.53 | 72.18 | 72.62 |
| 70.02 | 66.61 | 66.53 |
| 68.76 | 67.18 | 65.14 |

103.13

| COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21.40 | 117.20 | 36.39 | 111.57 | 36.39 to 111.57 | 178,580 | 114,096 |
| 16.79 | 104.00 | 37.00 | 94.22 | 55.89 to 75.21 | 156,078 | 99,065 |
| 15.81 | 104.87 | 51.00 | 105.68 | 51.00 to 105.68 | 117,758 | 91,164 |
| 16.51 | 101.29 | 56.68 | 101.82 | 63.95 to 91.75 | 103,518 | 76,867 |
| 13.84 | 94.70 | 49.24 | 78.90 | 49.24 to 78.90 | 104,782 | 72,228 |
| 17.16 | 95.44 | 39.64 | 85.64 | 39.64 to 85.64 | 182,364 | 129,516 |
| 17.08 | 108.75 | 33.70 | 87.35 | 46.16 to 81.38 | 175,847 | 103,412 |
| 7.82 | 102.08 | 53.45 | 86.65 | 64.53 to 79.48 | 205,102 | 146,184 |
| 15.95 | 100.36 | 33.77 | 70.16 | 33.77 to 70.16 | 215,824 | 118,229 |
| 14.49 | 93.60 | 39.74 | 85.74 | 59.86 to 76.45 | 238,799 | 172,654 |
| 12.96 | 102.06 | 31.08 | 81.41 | 59.88 to 74.36 | 248,375 | 157,237 |
| 22.72 | 102.25 | 21.77 | 108.32 | 39.30 to 62.69 | 223,578 | 118,953 |
| 18.85 | 107.80 | 36.39 | 111.57 | 67.14 to 75.50 | 136,632 | 93,535 |
| 13.98 | 100.61 | 33.70 | 87.35 | 63.53 to 74.80 | 173,242 | 117,026 |
| 19.76 | 98.68 | 21.77 | 108.32 | 53.89 to 68.16 | 233,664 | 144,522 |
| 17.18 | 99.40 | 39.64 | 105.68 | 65.46 to 78.20 | 124,880 | 90,686 |
| 14.60 | 100.11 | 33.70 | 87.35 | 62.28 to 74.07 | 208,518 | 138,728 |
| 18.11 | 103.13 | 21.77 | 111.57 | 64.53 to 70.85 | 184,307 | 120,052 |
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21 - CUSTER COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | NUMBER of Sales: | 119 |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $21,932,616$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $21,932,616$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $14,286,285$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 184,307 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 120,052 |

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
4.39
74.39
70.81
60.09
72.33
79.30
51.94
63.38
47.99
69.27
58.51
74.08
75.49
70.16
70.82
$\begin{array}{ll}71.83 & 70.82 \\ \end{array}$
78.01
61.92
60.19
70.06
76.60
69.97
51.89
71.31
47.99
79.45
61.43
74.90
74.36
70.16
70.82
70.84

| 69 | COV: | 24.39 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 65 | STD : | 16.38 |

95\% Median C.I.: 64.53 to 70.85
(!: Derived) MEDIAN:

| 65 | STD: | 16.38 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 67 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 12.45 |

95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.85 to 68.42
(.. Derived) MEAN:

AVG.ABS.DEV
2.45

95\% Mean C.I.: 64.23 to 70.12
COD: 18.11 MAX Sales Ratio: 111.57
21.77

Printed: 03/31/2008 19:12:38

| 9.66 | 95.37 | 63.53 | 85.13 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 20.00 | 114.36 | 53.45 | 100.58 |
| 5.16 | 99.83 | 57.11 | 65.97 |
| 10.93 | 103.24 | 61.96 | 89.63 |
| 5.43 | 103.53 | 75.06 | 87.35 |
| 8.12 | 107.61 | 69.18 | 81.41 |
| 2.60 | 100.10 | 49.34 | 53.48 |
| 18.01 | 88.88 | 51.96 | 74.79 |
|  |  | 47.99 | 47.99 |
| 20.38 | 87.19 | 53.42 | 91.73 |
| 14.96 | 95.24 | 46.16 | 76.93 |
| 1.85 | 98.91 | 72.71 | 75.45 |
| 5.82 | 101.51 | 71.09 | 79.88 |
|  |  | 70.16 | 70.16 |
|  |  | 70.82 | 70.82 |
| 2.52 | 101.40 | 69.15 | 74.36 |

N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A
N/A

| 115,024 | 89,726 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 196,177 | 121,475 |
| 66,902 | 40,267 |
| 128,331 | 89,913 |
| 176,073 | 134,873 |
| 320,750 | 224,438 |
| 193,936 | 100,628 |
| 88,500 | 63,107 |
| 18,149 | 8,710 |
| 74,206 | 58,955 |
| 221,156 | 135,857 |
| 196,978 | 147,536 |
| 181,500 | 134,965 |
| 287,955 | 202,020 |
| 115,000 | 81,440 |
| 67,881 | 48,084 |
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PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


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


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


# 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Custer County 

## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: As noted in the 2008 Assessment Survey for Custer County the assessment actions were done from an analysis of each market area and as a result of the changing market conditions the values changed per market area. The percent of change would not necessarily be an equal amount for each market area and would be dependent upon the amount of the various land classifications within each.

The R\&O Statistics are indicating from an overall perspective that an acceptable level of value has been obtained, the median measure of central tendency is 68.67 . However from a more in-depth analysis of the R\&O Statistics by individual market area, it is revealed that market area one with 62 sales (the most out of all six) is below the acceptable level and would have a significant impact on all measures.

For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the overall level of value for Custer County, but a recommendation will be made to increase Market Area 1 to the midpoint of the range to achieve an acceptable level of value for assessment year 2008.

## 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 | 282 | 119 | 42.2 |
| 2007 | 270 | 140 | 51.85 |
| 2006 | 264 | 166 | 62.88 |
| 2005 | 261 | 149 | 57.09 |
| 2004 | 240 | 134 | 55.83 |
| 2003 | 257 | 134 | 52.14 |
| 2002 | 248 | 140 | 56.45 |
| 2001 | 281 | 160 | 56.94 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The table is indicating a decrease in the percent of sales used for 2008 even though the total number of sales increased from 2007. Eleven percent of the 163 disqualified sales were sales that were coded (3) substantially improved, of the $47 \%$ coded (4) do not use $25 \%$ of them were family transactions, $21 \%$ were centrally assessed (most of these sales involved the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Company), $12 \%$ were partial interests, $12 \%$ were land exchanges, and the remainder were such things as foreclosures, corrective deeds, split outs, and land use changes. There has been an attempt to use all available sales in the measurement of the agricultural unimproved class of property.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Custer County

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Custer County

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 | $\mathbf{6 1 . 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 . 4 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 . 7 6}$ |
| 2007 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 8 5}$ |
| 2006 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 0 . 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 5 4}$ |
| 2005 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 9 7}$ |
| 2004 | 70.77 | 5 | $\mathbf{7 4 . 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 7 0}$ |
| 2003 | 72 | 5.61 | $\mathbf{7 6 . 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 5}$ |
| 2002 | 72 | 2.84 | $\mathbf{7 4 . 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ |
| 2001 | 74 | 1.99 | $\mathbf{7 5 . 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The two statistics are dissimilar and do not support each other. There is no other information available to suggest that the R\&O Ratio is not the best indication of the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class of property in Custer County.

## 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11.68 | 2008 | 5.54 |
| 1.35 | 2007 | 1.75 |
| 7.55 | 2006 | 13.11 |
| 3.08 | 2005 | 0.35 |
| 7.66 | 2004 | 5 |
| 5.88 | 2003 | 5.64 |
| 1.04 | 2002 | 2.84 |
| 1.38 | 2001 | 1.99 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is a 6.14 point difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the base (excluding growth). The calculation for the sales file is made from 43 sales represented in the last year of the study period, $07 / 01 / 06$ to $06 / 30 / 07,51 \%$ or 22 of them are for market area one, none in market area two, one in market area three, 5 in market area four, 9 in market area five, and 6 in market area six. The assessment actions were done from an analysis of each market area and as a result of the changing market conditions the values changed per market area. The percent of change would not necessarily be an equal amount for each market area and would be dependent upon the amount of the various land classifications within each.

## 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.

2008 Correlation Section<br>for Custer County

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 68.76 | 65.14 | 67.18 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Of the three measures of central tendency only the median is within the acceptable range. As reported in the 2008 Assessment Actions for Custer County an analysis of each market area and as a result of the changing market conditions the values changed per market area. The percent of change would not necessarily be an equal amount for each market area and would be dependent upon the amount of the various land classifications within each.

From an analysis of the R\&O Statistics of the six market areas, market area one, with 62 sales (the most out of all six), is below the acceptable level and would have a significant impact on all measures. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the overall level of value for Custer County, but a recommendation will be made to increase Market Area 1 to the midpoint of the range to achieve an acceptable level of value for assessment year 2008.

## 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 | 18.11 | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 1 3}$ |
| Difference | 0 | 0.13 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The slight point indication showing the price related differential to be above the standard is of no concern, both of the measures are indicating that the qualitative standards have met the required standards.It is believed that the agricultural unimproved properties have been treated in a uniform and proportionate manner within Custer County.

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 141 | 119 | -22 |
| Median | 61.10 | 68.76 | 7.66 |
| Wgt. Mean | 60.24 | 65.14 | 4.9 |
| Mean | 61.11 | 67.18 | 6.07 |
| COD | 25.11 | 18.11 | -7 |
| PRD | 101.45 | 103.13 | 1.68 |
| Min Sales Ratio | -0.07 | 21.77 | 21.84 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 166.32 | 111.57 | -54.75 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There are twenty-two less sales in the file due to a coding error that was discovered in the sales file and corrected; these sales had been coded a (2) unimproved when they should have been coded (1) improved. The assessment actions as stated in the 2008 Assessment Actions for Custer County reports an analysis of each market area was done and as a result of the changing market conditions the values changed per market area.

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE
Query: 6350
What If ID: 5348
Desc: New Whatif for Query ID: 6350

| Strata Hdg. | Strata | Chg.Value | Chg.Type | Pct.Chg. | Group | Priority |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area (market) | 1 | Land | Increase | 7.000 | A | 1 |

## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

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

|  | NUMBER of Sales: |
| ---: | ---: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: |


| DATE OF SALE * |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| RANGE |  |
| Qrt |  |
| 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 | 8 |
| 10/01/04 то 12/31/04 | 9 |
| 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 | 6 |
| 04/01/05 то 06/30/05 | 12 |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 | 8 |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 8 |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 11 |
| 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 | 14 |
| 07/01/06 то 09/30/06 | 6 |
| 10/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 12 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 2 |
| 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 Study Years | 13 |
| 07/01/04 то 06/30/05 | 35 |
| 07/01/05 то 06/30/06 | 41 |
| 07/01/06 то 06/30/07 $\qquad$ Calendar Yrs $\qquad$ | 43 |
| 01/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 34 |
| 01/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 43 |
| _ ALL__ |  |
|  | 11 |

119
$21,932,616$
$21,932,616$
$14,823,843$
184,307
124,570
(!: Derived) MEDIAN: WGT. MEAN: MEAN :

|  | 70 AVG.ABS.DEV: | 12.99 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | 18.53 MAX Sales Ratio: | 119.38 |

PRD: 103.03 MIN Sales Ratio: |  | 23.29 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |

| COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg. Adj. } \\ & \text { Sale Price } \end{aligned}$ | Avg. Assd Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21.11 | 117.65 | 38.93 | 119.38 | 38.93 to 119.38 | 178,580 | 117,351 |
| 17.21 | 105.18 | 39.60 | 100.82 | 55.89 to 80.48 | 156,078 | 102,625 |
| 14.98 | 103.54 | 54.57 | 113.08 | 54.57 to 113.08 | 117,758 | 95,451 |
| 17.24 | 101.09 | 60.65 | 108.95 | 66.68 to 98.15 | 103,518 | 79,845 |
| 14.19 | 94.34 | 49.24 | 84.42 | 49.24 to 84.42 | 104,782 | 75,158 |
| 18.61 | 94.44 | 39.64 | 91.09 | 39.64 to 91.09 | 182,364 | 135,853 |
| 16.53 | 107.92 | 33.70 | 87.35 | 49.39 to 87.08 | 175,847 | 107,486 |
| 8.90 | 101.34 | 53.45 | 92.72 | 64.53 to 82.47 | 205,102 | 153,297 |
| 16.29 | 103.07 | 33.77 | 71.22 | 33.77 to 71.22 | 215,824 | 119,323 |
| 14.50 | 92.85 | 42.52 | 91.74 | 64.04 to 80.73 | 238,799 | 180,907 |
| 12.97 | 101.67 | 33.26 | 82.32 | 62.81 to 74.36 | 248,375 | 161,875 |
| 25.00 | 103.78 | 23.29 | 115.91 | 39.30 to 67.08 | 223,578 | 121,892 |
| 18.95 | 107.92 | 38.93 | 119.38 | 68.43 to 80.48 | 136,632 | 96,951 |
| 15.51 | 99.81 | 33.70 | 92.72 | 64.53 to 79.61 | 173,242 | 122,356 |
| 18.88 | 98.97 | 23.29 | 115.91 | 57.11 to 69.18 | 233,664 | 149,161 |
| 18.37 | 98.67 | 39.64 | 113.08 | 67.74 to 83.68 | 124,880 | 94,674 |
| 15.35 | 99.71 | 33.70 | 92.72 | 64.53 to 77.33 | 208,518 | 144,542 |
| 18.53 | 103.03 | 23.29 | 119.38 | 66.92 to 72.59 | 184,307 | 124,570 |
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## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
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21 - CUSTER COUNTY

## agricultural unimproved

|  | NUMBER of Sales: | 119 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $21,932,616$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $21,932,616$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $14,823,843$ |
|  | AVG.Adj. Sales Price: | 184,307 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 124,570 |

## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

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

| MEDIAN: | 70 | COV: | 24.90 | 95\% Median C.I.: | 66.92 to 72.59 | ed) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WGT. MEAN: | 68 | STD: | 17.34 | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 64.01 to 71.16 | (!: land+NAT=0) |
| MEAN : | 70 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 12.99 | 95\% Mean C.I.: | 66.52 to 72.75 |  |
| COD : | 18.53 | MAX Sales Ratio: | 119.38 |  |  |  |
| PRD: | 103.03 | MIN Sales Ratio: | 23.29 |  | Printed: 04 | 2008 14:32:26 |


| 2745 | 3 | 74.52 | 76.38 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2747 | 5 | 62.81 | 70.81 |
| 2749 | 3 | 57.18 | 60.09 |
| 2889 | 4 | 68.87 | 72.33 |
| 2891 | 3 | 75.50 | 79.30 |
| 2893 | 2 | 75.30 | 75.30 |
| 2895 | 3 | 52.99 | 51.94 |
| 2897 | 2 | 65.20 | 65.20 |
| 2901 | 1 | 51.35 | 51.35 |
| 3029 | 3 | 67.05 | 74.11 |
| 3031 | 4 | 59.35 | 62.60 |
| 3033 | 2 | 79.27 | 79.27 |
| 3037 | 2 | 75.49 | 75.49 |
| 3039 | 1 | 70.16 | 70.16 |
| 3041 | 1 | 70.82 | 70.82 |
| 3045 | 4 | 71.90 | 71.83 |




Exhibit 21 - Page 85

21 - CUSTER COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

|  | NUMBER of Sales: |
| :--- | ---: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: |

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

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

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


## County 21 - Custer
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## County 21 - Custer

Schedule II:Tax Increment Financing (TIF)
Records

| Schedule V: Agricultural Records | Urban | Value | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Records |  |  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land | 34 | 314,508 | 9 | 99,471 | 6,584 | 541,657,825 | 6,627 | 542,071,804 |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 4 | 30,646 | 7 | 215,959 | 1,982 | 262,755,599 | 1,993 | 263,002,204 |
| 29. Ag-Improvements | 7 | 195,692 | 7 | 229,806 | 2,038 | 96,217,878 | 2,052 | 96,643,376 |
| 30. Ag-Total Taxable |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8,679 | 901,717,384 |

Exhibit 21 - Page 91

## County 21 - Custer

| Schedule VI: Agricultural Records: Non-Agricultural Detail | Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 3 | 2.260 | 13,762 | 2 | 3.000 | 19,970 |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 4 |  | 96,019 | 2 |  | 175,457 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 1 | 6.200 | 16,120 | 5 | 28.760 | 32,068 |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6 | 31.300 | 39,673 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 7 |  | 99,673 | 7 |  | 54,349 |

38. FarmSite Total

| 39. Road \& Ditches | 0.000 |  |  | 4.780 |  |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0.000 | 0 |  |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total <br> Acres | Value |  |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 17 | 19.000 | 117,800 | 17 | 19.000 | 117,800 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 1,337 | 1,406.780 | 8,645,846 | 1,342 | 1,412.040 | 8,679,578 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 1,338 |  | 64,068,994 | 1,344 |  | 64,340,470 | 3,494,578 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 1,361 | 1,431.040 | 73,137,848 |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 25 | 88.300 | 93,587 | 31 | 123.260 | 141,775 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 1,543 | 2,546.910 | 3,954,089 | 1,549 | 2,578.210 | 3,993,762 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 1,911 |  | 32,148,884 | 1,925 |  | 32,302,906 |  |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 1,956 | 2,701.470 | 36,438,443 |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |  | 16,019.510 |  |  | 16,024.290 |  |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.750 | 0 |  | 0.750 | 0 |  |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 3,317 | 20,157.550 | 109,576,291 | 3,494,578 |


| Schedule VII: Agricultural Records: Ag Land Detail-Game \& Parks | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 13 | 2,353.070 | 222,846 | 13 | 2,353.070 | 222,846 |
| Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records: Special Value | Records | Urban <br> Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total <br> Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
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Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 61.050 | 98,086 | 0.000 | 0 | 68,169.110 | 117,835,301 | 68,230.160 | 117,933,387 |
| 47. 2A1 | 20.620 | 13,818 | 22.500 | 29,760 | 10,673.550 | 16,241,936 | 10,716.670 | 16,285,514 |
| 48. 2A | 21.460 | 29,914 | 36.600 | 47,543 | 21,608.100 | 29,765,094 | 21,666.160 | 29,842,551 |
| 49. 3A1 | 5.900 | 7,711 | 0.000 | 0 | 13,752.890 | 17,733,511 | 13,758.790 | 17,741,222 |
| 50. 3A | 3.740 | 4,302 | 1.800 | 965 | 3,514.970 | 4,020,345 | 3,520.510 | 4,025,612 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.100 | 115 | 13.700 | 13,684 | 24,159.720 | 26,975,814 | 24,173.520 | 26,989,613 |
| 52. 4A | 2.400 | 2,509 | 6.200 | 6,479 | 28,951.310 | 28,893,425 | 28,959.910 | 28,902,413 |
| 53. Total | 115.270 | 156,455 | 80.800 | 98,431 | 170,829.650 | 241,465,426 | 171,025.720 | 241,720,312 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 2.840 | 1,900 | 61.190 | 67,056 | 25,979.320 | 17,386,804 | 26,043.350 | 17,455,760 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 15.100 | 9,362 | 5,915.580 | 3,667,657 | 5,930.680 | 3,677,019 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10,836.510 | 6,523,584 | 10,836.510 | 6,523,584 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 14,178.610 | 7,842,209 | 14,178.610 | 7,842,209 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 792.330 | 363,342 | 792.330 | 363,342 |
| 60. 4D1 | 1.050 | 349 | 2.000 | 664 | 19,886.250 | 6,602,226 | 19,889.300 | 6,603,239 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 17,014.430 | 4,901,677 | 17,014.430 | 4,901,677 |
| 62. Total | 3.890 | 2,249 | 78.290 | 77,082 | 94,603.030 | 47,287,499 | 94,685.210 | 47,366,830 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 19.540 | 11,974 | 0.000 | 0 | 18,887.900 | 7,507,218 | 18,907.440 | 7,519,192 |
| 65. 2G1 | 14.230 | 5,550 | 0.000 | 0 | 11,091.390 | 4,327,113 | 11,105.620 | 4,332,663 |
| 66. 2G | 0.150 | 58 | 1.550 | 597 | 18,921.840 | 7,310,131 | 18,923.540 | 7,310,786 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.400 | 152 | 0.000 | 0 | 8,579.910 | 3,281,079 | 8,580.310 | 3,281,231 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4,045.060 | 1,531,727 | 4,045.060 | 1,531,727 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.600 | 225 | 47,740.090 | 17,884,294 | 47,740.690 | 17,884,519 |
| 70.4G | 18.130 | 11,044 | 43.600 | 16,132 | 478,520.360 | 173,303,204 | 478,582.090 | 173,330,380 |
| 71. Total | 52.450 | 28,778 | 45.750 | 16,954 | 587,786.550 | 215,144,766 | 587,884.750 | 215,190,498 |


| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 9.460 | 312 | $3,777.670$ | 124,466 | $3,787.130$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 19.200 | 19.200 | 5,920 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.430 |  | 158.690 | 3,778 |  |  |  |
| 75. Total | 171.610 | 187,482 | 214.300 | 192,779 | $857,016.100$ | $504,028,077$ | 8 |
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Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
3

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,359.560 | 2,232,224 | 2,359.560 | 2,232,224 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 765.270 | 700,096 | 765.270 | 700,096 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,486.900 | 2,996,433 | 3,486.900 | 2,996,433 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 686.590 | 555,109 | 686.590 | 555,109 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,421.870 | 1,115,345 | 1,421.870 | 1,115,345 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,149.840 | 1,714,761 | 3,149.840 | 1,714,761 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,176.460 | 1,326,736 | 3,176.460 | 1,326,736 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 15,046.490 | 10,640,704 | 15,046.490 | 10,640,704 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,234.040 | 580,000 | 1,234.040 | 580,000 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 144.860 | 67,361 | 144.860 | 67,361 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,449.460 | 1,126,751 | 2,449.460 | 1,126,751 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 498.970 | 167,158 | 498.970 | 167,158 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 477.360 | 157,529 | 477.360 | 157,529 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,592.520 | 485,733 | 1,592.520 | 485,733 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,207.630 | 301,910 | 1,207.630 | 301,910 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7,604.840 | 2,886,442 | 7,604.840 | 2,886,442 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,327.930 | 464,779 | 1,327.930 | 464,779 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 472.820 | 163,123 | 472.820 | 163,123 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,286.230 | 1,797,318 | 5,286.230 | 1,797,318 |
| 67. 3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,614.980 | 541,026 | 1,614.980 | 541,026 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,218.980 | 732,264 | 2,218.980 | 732,264 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 9,940.290 | 3,223,690 | 9,940.290 | 3,223,690 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 52,186.620 | 15,404,836 | 52,186.620 | 15,404,836 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 73,047.850 | 22,327,036 | 73,047.850 | 22,327,036 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 306.910 | 7,675 | 306.910 | 7,675 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 213.200 |  | 213.200 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 96,006.090 | 35,861,857 | 96,006.090 | 35,861,857 |
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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 | 11,788.040 | 16,143,831 | 11,788.040 | 16,143,831 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,150.740 | 2,708,224 | 2,150.740 | 2,708,224 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,783.060 | 3,950,277 | 3,783.060 | 3,950,277 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4,533.900 | 3,806,321 | 4,533.900 | 3,806,321 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 402.400 | 321,542 | 402.400 | 321,542 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6,679.850 | 5,490,764 | 6,679.850 | 5,490,764 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,742.240 | 933,466 | 1,742.240 | 933,466 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 31,080.230 | 33,354,425 | 31,080.230 | 33,354,425 |


| 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 | 5,850.750 | 1,989,255 | 5,850.750 | 1,989,255 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,004.190 | 611,282 | 2,004.190 | 611,282 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4,065.540 | 1,138,353 | 4,065.540 | 1,138,353 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,267.620 | 898,601 | 3,267.620 | 898,601 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 520.160 | 140,443 | 520.160 | 140,443 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11,400.810 | 3,110,390 | 11,400.810 | 3,110,390 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 69,063.200 | 17,561,690 | 69,063.200 | 17,561,690 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 96,172.270 | 25,450,014 | 96,172.270 | 25,450,014 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 700.210 | 22,408 | 700.210 | 22,408 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 643.250 |  | 643.250 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 155,858.330 | 69,900,537 | 155,858.330 | 69,900,537 |
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| County 21 - Custer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: 5 |  |  |  |
| Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| Irrigated: | 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 | 14,247.970 | 14,772,544 | 14,247.970 | 14,772,544 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,087.280 | 3,156,923 | 3,087.280 | 3,156,923 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,474.130 | 4,757,735 | 5,474.130 | 4,757,735 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,068.280 | 1,744,710 | 2,068.280 | 1,744,710 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,272.610 | 989,437 | 1,272.610 | 989,437 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,834.470 | 2,830,424 | 3,834.470 | 2,830,424 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,642.120 | 1,681,212 | 2,642.120 | 1,681,212 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 32,626.860 | 29,932,985 | 32,626.860 | 29,932,985 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,661.230 | 3,594,930 | 5,661.230 | 3,594,930 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,314.760 | 808,599 | 1,314.760 | 808,599 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,399.730 | 1,451,856 | 2,399.730 | 1,451,856 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,896.940 | 1,593,317 | 2,896.940 | 1,593,317 |
| 59. 3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 428.950 | 193,028 | 428.950 | 193,028 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,154.730 | 977,970 | 3,154.730 | 977,970 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,111.400 | 580,276 | 2,111.400 | 580,276 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 17,967.740 | 9,199,976 | 17,967.740 | 9,199,976 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,944.910 | 2,407,766 | 5,944.910 | 2,407,766 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4,191.300 | 1,634,608 | 4,191.300 | 1,634,608 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,250.090 | 1,995,034 | 5,250.090 | 1,995,034 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,881.940 | 1,008,681 | 2,881.940 | 1,008,681 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,731.400 | 598,750 | 1,731.400 | 598,750 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 12,303.740 | 4,181,808 | 12,303.740 | 4,181,808 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 147,089.760 | 47,421,327 | 147,089.760 | 47,421,327 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 179,393.140 | 59,247,974 | 179,393.140 | 59,247,974 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,375.990 | 41,282 | 1,375.990 | 41,282 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 686.630 |  | 686.630 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 231,363.730 | 98,422,217 | 231,363.730 | 98,422,217 |
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Grass:
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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 | 11.160 | 15,513 | 18.840 | 26,188 | 11,499.520 | 15,984,023 | 11,529.520 | 16,025,724 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 551.140 | 671,634 | 551.140 | 671,634 |
| 48. 2A | 40.160 | 44,377 | 4.300 | 4,752 | 5,474.680 | 6,046,758 | 5,519.140 | 6,095,887 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 481.020 | 518,383 | 481.020 | 518,383 |
| 50. 3A | 58.100 | 62,458 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,744.920 | 2,903,476 | 2,803.020 | 2,965,934 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,883.300 | 1,617,530 | 1,883.300 | 1,617,530 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,301.440 | 1,020,239 | 1,301.440 | 1,020,239 |
| 53. Total | 109.420 | 122,348 | 23.140 | 30,940 | 23,936.020 | 28,762,043 | 24,068.580 | 28,915,331 |


| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,118.450 | 732,592 | 1,118.450 | 732,592 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 36.800 | 23,184 | 36.800 | 23,184 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 999.020 | 619,393 | 999.020 | 619,393 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 969.330 | 552,518 | 969.330 | 552,518 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 98.870 | 46,469 | 98.870 | 46,469 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,608.130 | 530,683 | 1,608.130 | 530,683 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 627.440 | 175,683 | 627.440 | 175,683 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5,458.040 | 2,680,522 | 5,458.040 | 2,680,522 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,533.970 | 582,908 | 1,533.970 | 582,908 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 461.190 | 172,947 | 461.190 | 172,947 |
| 66. 2G | 4.430 | 1,639 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,108.400 | 780,108 | 2,112.830 | 781,747 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,132.300 | 416,686 | 1,132.300 | 416,686 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6,046.980 | 2,212,886 | 6,046.980 | 2,212,886 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6,947.050 | 2,420,247 | 6,947.050 | 2,420,247 |
| 70.4G | 7.600 | 2,698 | 0.000 | 0 | 42,282.050 | 14,263,175 | 42,289.650 | 14,265,873 |
| 71. Total | 12.030 | 4,337 | 0.000 | 0 | 60,511.940 | 20,848,957 | 60,523.970 | 20,853,294 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 980.850 | 29,426 | 980.850 | 29,426 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 62.330 |  | 22.120 |  | 1,165.570 |  | 1,250.020 |  |
| 75. Total | 121.450 | 126,685 | 23.140 | 30,940 | 90,886.850 | 52,320,948 | 91,031.440 | 52,478,573 |
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## County 21 - Custer

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 | 225.690 | 279,908 | 103.940 | 129,371 | 275,622.950 | 344,912,923 | 275,952.580 | 345,322,202 |
| 77.Dry Land | 3.890 | 2,249 | 78.290 | 77,082 | 154,317.570 | 73,353,938 | 154,399.750 | 73,433,269 |
| 78.Grass | 64.480 | 33,115 | 45.750 | 16,954 | 1,172,424.690 | 373,089,660 | 1,172,534.920 | 373,139,729 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 9.460 | 312 | 7,861.830 | 239,661 | 7,871.290 | 239,973 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 19.200 | 5,920 | 19.200 | 5,920 |
| 81.Exempt | 62.760 | 0 | 180.810 | 0 | 6,460.670 | 0 | 6,704.240 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 294.060 | 315,272 | 237.440 | 223,719 | 1,610,246.240 | 791,602,102 | 1,610,777.740 | 792,141,093 |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 21 - Custer
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 | 68,230.160 | 39.89\% | 117,933,387 | 48.79\% | 1,728.464 |
| 2A1 | 10,716.670 | 6.27\% | 16,285,514 | 6.74\% | 1,519.643 |
| 2A | 21,666.160 | 12.67\% | 29,842,551 | 12.35\% | 1,377.380 |
| 3A1 | 13,758.790 | 8.04\% | 17,741,222 | 7.34\% | 1,289.446 |
| 3A | 3,520.510 | 2.06\% | 4,025,612 | 1.67\% | 1,143.474 |
| 4A1 | 24,173.520 | 14.13\% | 26,989,613 | 11.17\% | 1,116.494 |
| 4A | 28,959.910 | 16.93\% | 28,902,413 | 11.96\% | 998.014 |
| Irrigated Total | 171,025.720 | 100.00\% | 241,720,312 | 100.00\% | 1,413.356 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 26,043.350 | 27.51\% | 17,455,760 | 36.85\% | 670.257 |
| 2D1 | 5,930.680 | 6.26\% | 3,677,019 | 7.76\% | 619.999 |
| 2D | 10,836.510 | 11.44\% | 6,523,584 | 13.77\% | 602.000 |
| 3D1 | 14,178.610 | 14.97\% | 7,842,209 | 16.56\% | 553.101 |
| 3D | 792.330 | 0.84\% | 363,342 | 0.77\% | 458.574 |
| 4D1 | 19,889.300 | 21.01\% | 6,603,239 | 13.94\% | 331.999 |
| 4D | 17,014.430 | 17.97\% | 4,901,677 | 10.35\% | 288.089 |
| Dry Total | 94,685.210 | 100.00\% | 47,366,830 | 100.00\% | 500.255 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $18,907.440$ | $3.22 \%$ | $7,519,192$ | $3.49 \%$ | 397.684 |
| 2G1 | $11,105.620$ | $1.89 \%$ | $4,332,663$ | $2.01 \%$ | 390.132 |
| 2G | $18,923.540$ | $3.22 \%$ | $7,310,786$ | $3.40 \%$ | 386.332 |
| 3G1 | $8,580.310$ | $1.46 \%$ | $3,281,231$ | $1.52 \%$ | 382.414 |
| 3G | $4,045.060$ | $0.69 \%$ | $1,531,727$ | $0.71 \%$ | 378.666 |
| 4G1 | $47,740.690$ | $8.12 \%$ | $17,884,519$ | $8.31 \%$ | 374.617 |
| 4G | $478,582.090$ | $81.41 \%$ | $173,330,380$ | $80.55 \%$ | 362.174 |
| Grass Total | $587,884.750$ | $100.00 \%$ | $215,190,498$ | $100.00 \%$ | 366.041 |
|  | $171,025.720$ | $19.95 \%$ | $241,720,312$ | $47.92 \%$ | $1,413.356$ |
| Irrigated Total | $94,685.210$ | $11.04 \%$ | $47,366,830$ | $9.39 \%$ | 500.255 |
| Dry Total | $587,884.750$ | $68.57 \%$ | $215,190,498$ | $42.66 \%$ | 366.041 |
| Grass Total | $3,787.130$ | $0.44 \%$ | 124,778 | $0.02 \%$ | 32.947 |
| Waste | 19.200 | $0.00 \%$ | 5,920 | $0.00 \%$ | 308.333 |
| Other | $3,749.250$ | $0.44 \%$ |  |  | 588 |
| Exempt | $857,402.010$ | $100.00 \%$ | $504,408,338$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $171,025.720$ | $61.98 \%$ | $241,720,312$ | $70.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $94,685.210$ | $61.32 \%$ | $47,366,830$ | $64.50 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $587,884.750$ | $50.14 \%$ | $215,190,498$ | $57.67 \%$ |
| Waste | $3,787.130$ | $48.11 \%$ | 124,778 | $52.00 \%$ |
| Other | 19.200 | $100.00 \%$ | 5,920 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | $3,749.250$ | $55.92 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $857,402.010$ | $53.23 \%$ | $504,408,338$ | $63.68 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 21 - Custer
Market Area: 2

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 39.000 | 1.85\% | 31,200 | 4.12\% | 800.000 |
| 2A1 | 36.000 | 1.71\% | 21,976 | 2.90\% | 610.444 |
| 2A | 92.000 | 4.37\% | 45,546 | 6.01\% | 495.065 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 146.000 | 6.94\% | 55,209 | 7.29\% | 378.143 |
| 4A1 | 946.300 | 44.98\% | 342,683 | 45.25\% | 362.129 |
| 4A | 844.400 | 40.14\% | 260,726 | 34.43\% | 308.770 |
| Irrigated Total | 2,103.700 | 100.00\% | 757,340 | 100.00\% | 360.003 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 80.500 | 10.34\% | 40,250 | 17.82\% | 500.000 |
| 2D1 | 48.000 | 6.17\% | 21,120 | 9.35\% | 440.000 |
| 2D | 102.000 | 13.11\% | 40,800 | 18.07\% | 400.000 |
| 3D1 | 46.000 | 5.91\% | 14,030 | 6.21\% | 305.000 |
| 3D | 75.600 | 9.71\% | 21,547 | 9.54\% | 285.013 |
| 4D1 | 220.000 | 28.27\% | 56,100 | 24.84\% | 255.000 |
| 4D | 206.200 | 26.49\% | 31,962 | 14.15\% | 155.004 |
| Dry Total | 778.300 | 100.00\% | 225,809 | 100.00\% | 290.131 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 138.250 | $0.08 \%$ | 29,033 | $0.10 \%$ |
| 2G1 | 219.000 | $0.12 \%$ | 44,895 | $0.15 \%$ |
| 2G | $1,411.000$ | $0.80 \%$ | 282,200 | $0.94 \%$ |
| 3G1 | 325.540 | $0.19 \%$ | 63,480 | $0.21 \%$ |
| 3G | 792.100 | $0.45 \%$ | 150,499 | $0.50 \%$ |
| 4G1 | $15,652.760$ | $8.92 \%$ | $2,817,497$ | $9.37 \%$ |
| 4G | $156,974.290$ | $89.44 \%$ | $26,683,309$ | $88.73 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $175,512.940$ | $100.00 \%$ | $30,070,913$ | $100.00 \%$ |
| Irrigated Total | $2,103.700$ | $1.17 \%$ | 757,340 | 200.000 |
| Dry Total | 778.300 | $0.43 \%$ | 225,809 | $0.73 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $175,512.940$ | $97.99 \%$ | $30,070,913$ | $96.79 \%$ |
| Waste | 720.200 | $0.40 \%$ | 14,404 | $0.05 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 |
| Exempt | 161.890 | $0.09 \%$ |  | 190.000 |
| Market Area Total | $179,115.140$ | $100.00 \%$ |  | 180.000 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $2,103.700$ | $0.76 \%$ | 757,340 | $0.22 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 778.300 | $0.50 \%$ | 225,809 | $0.31 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $175,512.940$ | $14.97 \%$ | $30,070,913$ | $8.06 \%$ |
| Waste | 720.200 | $9.15 \%$ | 14,404 | $6.00 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 161.890 | $2.41 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $179,115.140$ | $11.12 \%$ | $31,068,466$ | $3.92 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 21 - Custer
Market Area: 3

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 2,359.560 | 15.68\% | 2,232,224 | 20.98\% | 946.034 |
| 2A1 | 765.270 | 5.09\% | 700,096 | 6.58\% | 914.835 |
| 2A | 3,486.900 | 23.17\% | 2,996,433 | 28.16\% | 859.340 |
| 3A1 | 686.590 | 4.56\% | 555,109 | 5.22\% | 808.501 |
| 3A | 1,421.870 | 9.45\% | 1,115,345 | 10.48\% | 784.421 |
| 4A1 | 3,149.840 | 20.93\% | 1,714,761 | 16.12\% | 544.396 |
| 4A | 3,176.460 | 21.11\% | 1,326,736 | 12.47\% | 417.677 |
| Irrigated Total | 15,046.490 | 100.00\% | 10,640,704 | 100.00\% | 707.188 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 1,234.040 | 16.23\% | 580,000 | 20.09\% | 470.000 |
| 2D1 | 144.860 | 1.90\% | 67,361 | 2.33\% | 465.007 |
| 2D | 2,449.460 | 32.21\% | 1,126,751 | 39.04\% | 459.999 |
| 3D1 | 498.970 | 6.56\% | 167,158 | 5.79\% | 335.006 |
| 3D | 477.360 | 6.28\% | 157,529 | 5.46\% | 330.000 |
| 4D1 | 1,592.520 | 20.94\% | 485,733 | 16.83\% | 305.009 |
| 4D | 1,207.630 | 15.88\% | 301,910 | 10.46\% | 250.002 |
| Dry Total | 7,604.840 | 100.00\% | 2,886,442 | 100.00\% | 379.553 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $1,327.930$ | $1.82 \%$ | 464,779 | $2.08 \%$ |
| 2G1 | 472.820 | $0.65 \%$ | 163,123 | $0.73 \%$ |
| 2G | $5,286.230$ | $7.24 \%$ | $1,797,318$ | $8.05 \%$ |
| 3G1 | $1,614.980$ | $2.21 \%$ | 541,026 | $2.42 \%$ |
| 3G | $2,218.980$ | $3.04 \%$ | 732,264 | $3.28 \%$ |
| 4G1 | $9,940.290$ | $13.61 \%$ | $3,223,690$ | $14.44 \%$ |
| 4G | $52,186.620$ | $71.44 \%$ | $15,404,836$ | $69.00 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $73,047.850$ | $100.00 \%$ | $22,327,036$ | $100.00 \%$ |
|  |  |  | 345.000 |  |
| Irrigated Total | $15,046.490$ | $15.67 \%$ | $10,640,704$ | $29.67 \%$ |
| Dry Total | $7,604.840$ | $7.92 \%$ | $2,886,442$ | $8.05 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $73,047.850$ | $76.09 \%$ | $22,327,036$ | $62.26 \%$ |
| Waste | 306.910 | $0.32 \%$ | 7,675 | $0.02 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 |
| Exempt | 213.200 | $0.22 \%$ |  | 330.004 |
| Market Area Total | $96,006.090$ | $100.00 \%$ |  | 324.305 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $15,046.490$ | $5.45 \%$ | $10,640,704$ | $3.08 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $7,604.840$ | $4.93 \%$ | $2,886,442$ | $3.93 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $73,047.850$ | $6.23 \%$ | $22,327,036$ | $5.98 \%$ |
| Waste | 306.910 | $3.90 \%$ | 7,675 | $3.20 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 213.200 | $3.18 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $96,006.090$ | $5.96 \%$ | $35,861,857$ | $4.53 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 21 - Custer
Market Area: 4

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 11,788.040 | 37.93\% | 16,143,831 | 48.40\% | 1,369.509 |
| 2A1 | 2,150.740 | 6.92\% | 2,708,224 | 8.12\% | 1,259.205 |
| 2A | 3,783.060 | 12.17\% | 3,950,277 | 11.84\% | 1,044.201 |
| 3A1 | 4,533.900 | 14.59\% | 3,806,321 | 11.41\% | 839.524 |
| 3A | 402.400 | 1.29\% | 321,542 | 0.96\% | 799.060 |
| 4A1 | 6,679.850 | 21.49\% | 5,490,764 | 16.46\% | 821.989 |
| 4A | 1,742.240 | 5.61\% | 933,466 | 2.80\% | 535.784 |
| Irrigated Total | 31,080.230 | 100.00\% | 33,354,425 | 100.00\% | 1,073.171 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 7,884.760 | 28.26\% | 3,710,354 | 33.51\% | 470.572 |
| 2D1 | 1,339.710 | 4.80\% | 549,281 | 4.96\% | 409.999 |
| 2D | 3,055.040 | 10.95\% | 1,206,749 | 10.90\% | 395.002 |
| 3D1 | 7,096.340 | 25.43\% | 2,767,573 | 24.99\% | 390.000 |
| 3D | 163.030 | 0.58\% | 56,248 | 0.51\% | 345.016 |
| 4D1 | 6,565.240 | 23.53\% | 2,232,181 | 20.16\% | 339.999 |
| 4D | 1,801.500 | 6.46\% | 551,304 | 4.98\% | 306.024 |
| Dry Total | 27,905.620 | 100.00\% | 11,073,690 | 100.00\% | 396.826 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $5,850.750$ | $6.08 \%$ | $1,989,255$ | $7.82 \%$ | 340.000 |
| 2G1 | $2,004.190$ | $2.08 \%$ | 611,282 | $2.40 \%$ | 305.002 |
| 2G | $4,065.540$ | $4.23 \%$ | $1,138,353$ | $4.47 \%$ | 280.000 |
| 3G1 | $3,267.620$ | $3.40 \%$ | 898,601 | $3.53 \%$ | 275.001 |
| 3G | 520.160 | $0.54 \%$ | 140,443 | $0.55 \%$ | 269.999 |
| 4G1 | $11,400.810$ | $11.85 \%$ | $3,110,390$ | $12.22 \%$ | 272.821 |
| 4G | $69,063.200$ | $71.81 \%$ | $17,561,690$ | $69.00 \%$ | 254.284 |
| Grass Total | $96,172.270$ | $100.00 \%$ | $25,450,014$ | $100.00 \%$ | 264.629 |
| Irrigated Total | $31,080.230$ | $19.94 \%$ |  | $33,354,425$ | $47.72 \%$ |
| Dry Total | $27,905.620$ | $17.90 \%$ | $11,073,690$ | $15.84 \%$ | $1,073.171$ |
| Grass Total | $96,172.270$ | $61.70 \%$ | $25,450,014$ | $36.41 \%$ | 396.826 |
| Waste | 700.210 | $0.45 \%$ | 22,408 | $0.03 \%$ | 264.629 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 | $32.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 643.250 | $0.41 \%$ |  |  | 0.001 |
| Market Area Total | $155,858.330$ | $100.00 \%$ | $69,900,537$ | $100.00 \%$ | 0.0 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $31,080.230$ | $11.26 \%$ | $33,354,425$ | $9.66 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $27,905.620$ | $18.07 \%$ | $11,073,690$ | $15.08 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $96,172.270$ | $8.20 \%$ | $25,450,014$ | $6.82 \%$ |
| Waste | 700.210 | $8.90 \%$ | 22,408 | $9.34 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 643.250 | $9.59 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $155,858.330$ | $9.68 \%$ | $69,900,537$ | $8.82 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 21 - Custer
Market Area: $\quad 5$

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 14,247.970 | 43.67\% | 14,772,544 | 49.35\% | 1,036.817 |
| 2A1 | 3,087.280 | 9.46\% | 3,156,923 | 10.55\% | 1,022.558 |
| 2A | 5,474.130 | 16.78\% | 4,757,735 | 15.89\% | 869.130 |
| 3A1 | 2,068.280 | 6.34\% | 1,744,710 | 5.83\% | 843.556 |
| 3A | 1,272.610 | 3.90\% | 989,437 | 3.31\% | 777.486 |
| 4A1 | 3,834.470 | 11.75\% | 2,830,424 | 9.46\% | 738.152 |
| 4A | 2,642.120 | 8.10\% | 1,681,212 | 5.62\% | 636.311 |
| Irrigated Total | 32,626.860 | 100.00\% | 29,932,985 | 100.00\% | 917.433 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 5,661.230 | 31.51\% | 3,594,930 | 39.08\% | 635.008 |
| 2D1 | 1,314.760 | 7.32\% | 808,599 | 8.79\% | 615.016 |
| 2D | 2,399.730 | 13.36\% | 1,451,856 | 15.78\% | 605.008 |
| 3D1 | 2,896.940 | 16.12\% | 1,593,317 | 17.32\% | 550.000 |
| 3D | 428.950 | 2.39\% | 193,028 | 2.10\% | 450.001 |
| 4D1 | 3,154.730 | 17.56\% | 977,970 | 10.63\% | 310.001 |
| 4D | 2,111.400 | 11.75\% | 580,276 | 6.31\% | 274.829 |
| Dry Total | 17,967.740 | 100.00\% | 9,199,976 | 100.00\% | 512.027 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $5,944.910$ | $3.31 \%$ | $2,407,766$ | $4.06 \%$ | 405.013 |
| 2G1 | $4,191.300$ | $2.34 \%$ | $1,634,608$ | $2.76 \%$ | 390.000 |
| 2G | $5,250.090$ | $2.93 \%$ | $1,995,034$ | $3.37 \%$ | 379.999 |
| 3G1 | $2,881.940$ | $1.61 \%$ | $1,008,681$ | $1.70 \%$ | 350.000 |
| 3G | $1,731.400$ | $0.97 \%$ | 598,750 | $1.01 \%$ | 345.818 |
| 4G1 | $12,303.740$ | $6.86 \%$ | $4,181,808$ | $7.06 \%$ | 339.881 |
| 4G | $147,089.760$ | $81.99 \%$ | $47,421,327$ | $80.04 \%$ | 322.397 |
| Grass Total | $179,393.140$ | $100.00 \%$ | $59,247,974$ | $100.00 \%$ | 330.268 |
|  | $32,626.860$ | $14.10 \%$ | $29,932,985$ | $30.41 \%$ | 917.433 |
| Irrigated Total | $17,967.740$ | $7.77 \%$ | $9,199,976$ | $9.35 \%$ | 512.027 |
| Dry Total | $179,393.140$ | $77.54 \%$ | $59,247,974$ | $60.20 \%$ | 330.268 |
| Grass Total | $1,375.990$ | $0.59 \%$ | 41,282 | $0.04 \%$ | 30.001 |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Other | 686.630 | $0.30 \%$ |  |  | 0.000 |
| Exempt | $231,363.730$ | $100.00 \%$ | $98,422,217$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  | 4 |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $32,626.860$ | $11.82 \%$ | $29,932,985$ | $8.67 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $17,967.740$ | $11.64 \%$ | $9,199,976$ | $12.53 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $179,393.140$ | $15.30 \%$ | $59,247,974$ | $15.88 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,375.990$ | $17.48 \%$ | 41,282 | $17.20 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 686.630 | $10.24 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $231,363.730$ | $14.36 \%$ | $98,422,217$ | $12.42 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 21 - Custer
Market Area: 6

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

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $1,533.970$ | $2.53 \%$ | 582,908 | $2.80 \%$ | 379.999 |
| 2G1 | 461.190 | $0.76 \%$ | 172,947 | $0.83 \%$ | 375.001 |
| 2G | $2,112.830$ | $3.49 \%$ | 781,747 | $3.75 \%$ | 369.999 |
| 3G1 | $1,132.300$ | $1.87 \%$ | 416,686 | $2.00 \%$ | 367.999 |
| 3G | $6,046.980$ | $9.99 \%$ | $2,212,886$ | $10.61 \%$ | 365.948 |
| 4G1 | $6,947.050$ | $11.48 \%$ | $2,420,247$ | $11.61 \%$ | 348.384 |
| 4G | $42,289.650$ | $69.87 \%$ | $14,265,873$ | $68.41 \%$ | 337.337 |
| Grass Total | $60,523.970$ | $100.00 \%$ | $20,853,294$ | $100.00 \%$ | 344.546 |
| Irigated Total | $24,068.580$ | $26.44 \%$ | $28,915,331$ | $55.10 \%$ | $1,201.372$ |
| Dry Total | $5,458.040$ | $6.00 \%$ | $2,680,522$ | $5.11 \%$ | 491.114 |
| Grass Total | $60,523.970$ | $66.49 \%$ | $20,853,294$ | $39.74 \%$ | 344.546 |
| Waste | 980.850 | $1.08 \%$ | 29,426 | $0.06 \%$ | 30.000 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | $1,250.020$ | $1.37 \%$ |  |  | 0.000 |
| Market Area Total | $91,031.440$ | $100.00 \%$ | $52,478,573$ | $100.00 \%$ | 5 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $24,068.580$ | $8.72 \%$ | $28,915,331$ | $8.37 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $5,458.040$ | $3.54 \%$ | $2,680,522$ | $3.65 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $60,523.970$ | $5.16 \%$ | $20,853,294$ | $5.59 \%$ |
| Waste | 980.850 | $12.46 \%$ | 29,426 | $12.26 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | $1,250.020$ | $18.65 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $91,031.440$ | $5.65 \%$ | $52,478,573$ | $6.62 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 21 - Custer

| AgLand | Urban |  | SubUrban Acres |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | 225.690 | 279,908 | 103. | 940 | 129,371 | 5,622.950 | 344,912,923 |
| Dry | 3.890 | 2,249 |  | 290 | 77,082 | 4,317.570 | 73,353,938 |
| Grass | 64.480 | 33,115 |  | 750 | 16,954 1,17 | 2,424.690 | 373,089,660 |
| Waste | 0.000 | 0 |  | 460 | 312 | 7,861.830 | 239,661 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0 |  | . 000 | 0 | 19.200 | 5,920 |
| Exempt | 62.760 | 0 | 180. | 810 | 0 | 6,460.670 | 0 |
| Total | 294.060 | 315,272 | 237. | 440 | 223,719 1,61 | ,246.240 | 791,602,102 |
| AgLand | Total <br> Acres | Value | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average <br> Assessed Value* |
| Irrigated | 275,952.580 | 345,322,202 | 275,952.580 | 17.13\% | 345,322,202 | 43.59\% | 1,251.382 |
| Dry | 154,399.750 | 73,433,269 | 154,399.750 | 9.59\% | 73,433,269 | 9.27\% | 475.604 |
| Grass | 1,172,534.920 | 373,139,729 | 1,172,534.920 | 72.79\% | 373,139,729 | 47.11\% | 318.233 |
| Waste | 7,871.290 | 239,973 | 7,871.290 | 0.49\% | 239,973 | 0.03\% | 30.487 |
| Other | 19.200 | 5,920 | 19.200 | 0.00\% | 5,920 | 0.00\% | 308.333 |
| Exempt | 6,704.240 | 0 | 6,704.240 | 0.42\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Total | 1,610,777.740 | 792,141,093 | 1,610,777.740 | 100.00\% | 792,141,093 | 100.00\% | 491.775 |

* 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 | 180,097,090 | 196,049,823 | 15,952,733 | 8.86 | 4,204,468 | 6.52 |
| 2. Recreational | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 69,350,546 | 73,137,848 | 3,787,302 | 5.46 | *---------- | 5.46 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 249,447,636 | 269,187,671 | 19,740,035 | 7.91 | 4,204,468 | 6.23 |
| 5. Commercial | 48,312,480 | 51,430,315 | 3,117,835 | 6.45 | 2,417,717 | 1.45 |
| 6. Industrial | 5,495,223 | 5,496,763 | 1,540 | 0.03 | 0 | 0.03 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 34,180,449 | 36,438,443 | 2,257,994 | 6.61 | 3,494,578 | -3.62 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 87,988,152 | 93,365,521 | 5,377,369 | 6.11 | 2,417,717 | 3.36 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 337,435,788 | 362,553,192 | 25,117,404 | 7.44 | 10,116,763 | 4.45 |
| 11. Irrigated | 311,623,934 | 345,322,202 | 33,698,268 | 10.81 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 80,361,248 | 73,433,269 | -6,927,979 | -8.62 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 358,279,599 | 373,139,729 | 14,860,130 | 4.15 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 311,042 | 239,973 | -71,069 | -22.85 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 11,600 | 11,600 | -5,680 | -48.97 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 750,587,423 | 792,141,093 | 41,553,670 | 5.54 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 1,088,023,211 | 1,154,694,285 | 66,671,074 | 6.13 | 10,116,763 | 5.2 |

[^0]
## Introduction

Pursuant to NE Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9 the assessor shall submit a plan of assessment, which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter to the county board of equalization on or before July 31, 2007. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. After the budget is approved by the county board a copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue on or before October 31 each year.

## Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as "the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade." NE Rev. Stat. 77-112. (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1) $100 \%$ of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2) $75 \%$ of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3) $75 \%$ of special value for agricultural and horticultural land that meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 75\% of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

General Description of Real Property in Custer County
Per the 2007 County Abstract, Custer County consists of the following real property types:
Parcels \% of Total Parcels \% of Taxable Value

Base

| Residential | 3952 | $27.72 \%$ | $16.52 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | 663 | $4.65 \%$ | $4.45 \%$ |
| Industrial | 2 | $.014 \%$ | $.215 \%$ |
| Recreational | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |
| Agricultural | 9636 | $67.76 \%$ | $78.48 \%$ |
| Special Value | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |

Agricultural land-taxable acres were 1,610,741.76 Acres

Other pertinent facts: Custer County is predominately agricultural and 74\% is grassland.
For more information see 2007 Reports \& Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources:
A. Staff/Budget/Training:

Assessor/\$38,793.48/I hold the assessor's certificate when I passed the test in the early 1980's. I have attended many of the IAAO courses and classes of the PA\&T. I have all the hours needed at this time to keep the certificate current. (2007/2008 salary set by county board is $\mathbf{\$ 4 0 , 2 7 6}$.) Deputy Assessor/\$29,095.08/She also holds the assessor's certificate, passing the test in 2004. She has completed all her hours needed at this time to keep the certificate current. (2007/2008 salary set by county board is $\$ 30,207$.)
2 full time clerks-One clerk has 6 years experience in the assessor's office and the other has 1 year experience. ( $\mathbf{3}$ full time clerks as of Oct. 16, 2007)

1 part time clerk works at least 21 hours a week and has worked for the assessor for a lot of years as full time employees only changing to part time in 2004. (The part time clerk has now retired)
1 part time lister. The lister was hired in the fall of 2004 in place of hiring an appraisal firm to finish up the areas of the county that had not been updated for a number of years. (2 part time listers, the new one started work Sept. 1, 2007)
1 part time cadastral mapper./The cadastral mapper also works with the Register of Deeds part time as a budget cut for 2004/2005.
B. The Cadastral Maps were flown in the 1970 but are in good condition. They are kept current with monthly land sales. The county also used mylar maps to count acres in the different soil types and land use. (The County Board has agreed to hire Great Plains GIS Consulting to help the county get started with a GIS program and we are using agridatainc.com to measure land by soil types and land use.)
C. The Property Record cards list all information required by statute with current photos and sketches.
D. The county uses the TERASCAN software package. There are 5 terminals and 1 public use terminal.

At this time we do not have a GIS program because of budget restraints.
E. The county has a Web site but none of the assessment information is available.
A. Discovery: The County now has zoning and has a zoning administrator. Before any construction is allowed the property owner must file a permit with the zoning administrator and in turn the assessor is notified. At the beginning of the year each property is reviewed for $\%$ of completion and valued accordingly. In Real Estate Transfers the name is changed within the month the deed is filed, cadastral maps updated, and a sales review is mailed to the new owner.
B. Data Collection: The 2 part time lister's travel throughout the different areas each year, measuring each home, and outbuilding, taking new pictures, and interviewing each property owner as to the interior work. Approximately a fifth of the county is reviewed each year. In new construction \& remodeling the property is inspected inside and out. As sales occur, the sale is used for 3 years to set property values.
C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions: The area Field Liaison works very hard with the assessor and staff and with the help of an excel program we enter sales data to be able to adjust the problem areas.
D. Approaches to Value:

1. Market Approach; sales comparison: Using the sales of the various styles, conditions, and ages, I use the information to adjust the depreciation.
2. Cost Approach: The RCN is figured with the July 2004 Marshall and Swift values from the TeraScan software system.
3. Income Approach: income and expense data collection/analysis from the market is done by the Commercial Appraiser that is hired to value commercial and industrial properties.
4. Sales of agricultural land is mapped out and when a trend in sales indicate a market area
Is required will be the only time areas will change. One market area is set with soil type boundaries and two with natural boundaries such as rivers.
After assessment action, a review of the sales ratio is a top priority.
Notices of valuation changes are mailed to all property owners that have a change of value and notices are also published in the local newspaper.

Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity of assessment year 2005:
Property Class Median

Residential 96\%
Commercial 98\%
Agricultural Land $\quad 71 \%$
Special Value Agland 00

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2007 Reports \& Opinions.

RESIDENTIAL PLAN:
2008
I will hire the Stanard Appraisal Services to appraise the villages of Callaway, Mason City, and Oconto.
RCN from the Marshall \& Swift cost will be updated to the 2007 and depreciation will be adjusted to reflect the 3-year sales history. (The county board did not approve the budget for the hiring of Stanard Appraisal Services so I have hired another part time lister to physically review the villages listed)
$\underline{2009}$
With the help of the staff from Stanard Appraisal Services the villages of Ansley, Berwyn and Comstock will be physically reviewed and revalued. (The county board did not approve the hiring os Stanard Appraisal Services in 2007 but I will address the issue again in 2008)

2010
With the help of the staff from Stanard Appraisal Services the city of Broken Bow will be physically reviewed and revalued. (The county board did not approve the hiring of Stanard Appraisal Services in 2007 but I will address the issue again in 2009)

## COMMERCIAL PLAN:

 2008Reappraisal of all commercial properties was completed in 2006 by Stanard Appraisal Servoces., so only new construction or new commercial properties will need to be revalued.
$\underline{2009}$
Only new construction or new commercial properties will need to be revalued unless sales indicate a need for further action.
$\underline{2010}$
Only new construction or new commercial properties will need to be revalued unless sales indicate a need for further action.

## AGRICULTURAL LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS:

$$
\underline{2008}
$$

All irrigated land will be certified to the landowners for the NRD's and new measurements figured if necessary. Land values will be figured at $75 \%$ of sales in a 3-year history and these values will be applied to each parcel in each market
area. Great Plains GIS Consulting will be hired to help implement the computer mapping needed to do a more through job of tracking land use and counting acres in each land classification. I am planning to hire Stanard Appraisal Services to physically review the improvements in the townships of Loup, Elk Creek, Algernon, Myrtle, Wood River, Grant, and Delight. The 2007 RCN from Marshall \& Swift will be implemented and depreciation factors will be arrived from the 3 -year sales history. (The county board did not approve the budget for hiring Stanard Appraisal Services so I have hired another part time lister to help physically review the improvements in the townships listed)

2009
Land values will be figured at $75 \%$ of sales in a 3-year history and these values will be applied to each parcel in each market area. The staff from Stanard Appraisal Services will physically review the improvements in the townships of Ansley, Berwyn, Westerville, Garfield, Douglas Grove, Spring Creek, and Lillian. (The county board did not approve the budget for hiring Stanard Appraisal Services in 2007 but I will address the issue again in 2008)

2010
Land values will be figured at 75\% of sales in a 3-year history and these values will be applied to each parcel in each market area. The staff from Stanard Appraisal Services will physically review the improvements in Broken Bow Township. (The county board did not approve the budget for hiring Stanard Appraisal Serivces in 2007 but I will address the issue again in 2009)

Other functions preformed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:
I will continue to maintain the parcel records on each property owner making changes monthly of ownership and maintain accurate cadastral maps with ownership changes.

I will continually perform the duties required of me by law to serve the property owners of Custer County and to maintain equality in assessment for all. I will file all the administrative reports required by law/regulations such as abstracts, both real \& personal property, the assessors survey, the sales information to PA\&T rosters \& annual assessed value updates, school district taxable value report, homestead exemption tax loss report, and certificate of taxes levied report. I will certify the value to political subdivisions, and report the current values to the Board of Education Lands \& Funds of properties they own and report the exempt property and taxable property owned by governmental subdivisions. I will also report to the county board the annual plan of assessment.

I will continually administer the annual filing of all personal property schedules and notify the taxpayer of incomplete filings, failure to file and penalties applied.

I will send the applications for annual filings for permissive exemptions, review and make recommendations to the county board.

I will send notices of intent to tax to the governmental owned property not used for public purpose.

I will administer approximately 620 annual filings of applications for homestead exemptions and assist where necessary and continue to monitor approval/denial process and send out denial notification.

I will continue to review the centrally assessed valuation certified by PA\&T for railroads and public service entities, and establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

I will continue to manage the record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects (TIFF) and administer the reports and allocate the ad valorem tax.

I will continue to manage the tax entity boundaries making changes only when legal changes dictate and review the tax rates used for the tax billing process.

I will continue to prepare tax lists and certify these to the county treasurer for real estate, personal, and centrally assessed.

I will continue to prepare tax list corrections documents for the county boards approval.
I will continue to attend the county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests and assemble and provide necessary information.

I will prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC to defend county valuations.

I will continue to attend hearing if applicable to the county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.

I will continue to attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education for maintaining my assessors certificate.

## Conclusion:

The assessor maintains two budgets: the assessor's functions budget and the reappraisal budget. The assessor's office budget will remain almost the same reflecting cost of living raises at $\$ 133,393$. (The county board reduced my budget to $\$ 131,893$ )The reappraisal budget will need to be $\$ 87,400$ to meet the new legislative requirement to review $1 / 6$ of the county a year. (The county board reduced my reappraisal budget to \$47,300)

Respectfully submitted:
Assessor signature:

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Custer County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
| 3. | Other full-time employees |
|  | 3 clerks |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 2 part-time listers |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 1 employee shared with the Register of Deeds |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
|  | \$ 133,393 |
| 7. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
|  | The clerk controls a budget for the computer system of the entire courthouse. |
| 8. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
|  | \$ 131,893 |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
|  | \$ - - |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
| $\$ 1,800$ |  |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | \$ 47,300 is levied separately from the assessor budget. The listers are funded <br> through this budget. |
| Other miscellaneous funds |  |
|  | \$ - - - |
|  |  |


| 13. | Total budget |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\$ 179,193$ |  |$|$| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | Yes $-\$ 33,811 ; \$ 30,000$ from the appraisal budget and $\$ 3,811$ from the assessor's <br> budget. |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | TerraScan |
| 2. | CAMA software |
|  | TerraScan |
| 3. | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
|  | Yes |
| 4. | Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
|  | These maps are not digitized, the maintenance is shared between the Assessors Office and the Register of Deeds. The maps were flown in the 1970's. |
| 5. | Does the county have GIS software? |
|  | The county has hired Great Plains GIS Consulting to help them get a GIS system in place. |
| 6. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
|  | The county is just now in the infancy stages of getting a GIS system up and running. |
| 7. | Personal Property software: |
|  | TerraScan |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Yes |
| 2. | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
|  | Yes |


| 3. | What municipalities in the county are zoned? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4. | Broken Bow only. |
|  | 2005 |

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | The commercial class of real property is contracted through a private appraisal <br> company and the remainder of the appraisal work is done in-house. |
| 2. | Other services |
|  | There are none. |

## 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 Custer County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70062760000063875531.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.


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

