## 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

| Residential Real Property - Current |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 316 | COD |  | 9.38 |
| Total Sales Price | \$14,533,246 | PRD |  | 105.19 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | - \$14,512,246 | COV |  | 13.47 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$13,194,408 | STD |  | 12.89 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$45,925 | Avg. |  | 8.94 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | \$41,754 | Min |  | 48.64 |
| Median | 95.29 | Max |  | 151.31 |
| Wgt. Mean | 90.92 | 95\% |  | 94.51 to 97.14 |
| Mean | 95.64 | 95\% | C.I. | 88.87 to 92.97 |
|  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. |  | 94.22 to 97.06 |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County |  |  |  | 22.56 |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  | 6.54 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  | 7.95 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  |  | 34,319 |
| Residential Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| Year N | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| 2008 | 316 | 95.29 | 9.38 | 105.19 |
| 2007 | 316 | 96.12 | 10.30 | 106.50 |
| 2006 | 326 | 96.20 | 13.17 | 107.07 |
| 2005 | 339 | 96.13 | 17.22 | 110.64 |
| 2004 | 285 | 97.14 | 20.96 | 116.11 |
| 2003 | 321 | 95 | 20.51 | 111.5 |
| 2002 | 334 | 91 | 26.81 | 107.65 |
| 2001 | 324 | 95 | 40.35 | 123.54 |

## 2008 Commission Summary

Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 48 | COD | 6.28 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 2,706,532$ | PRD | 102.55 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 2,317,232$ | COV | 9.78 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 2,246,605$ | STD | 9.73 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 48,276$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 6.21 |
| Av. Assessed Value | $\$ 46,804$ | Min | 68.02 |
| Median | 98.85 | Max | 125.50 |
| Wgt. Mean | 96.95 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 96.50 to 100.19 |
| Mean | 99.43 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 90.45 to 103.46 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 3.77 |
| :--- | ---: |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period | 8.19 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 8.1 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 47,350 |


| Commercial Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 48 | 98.85 | 6.28 | 102.55 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 54 | 97.70 | 12.07 | 96.20 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 44 | 97.50 | 27.84 | 95.40 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 45 | 97.50 | 23.75 | 104.43 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 52 | 97.42 | 25.94 | 116.46 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 50 | 98 | 29.1 | 118.39 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 53 | 99 | 28.49 | 121.31 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 54 | 100 | 31.57 | 124.99 |

## 2008 Commission Summary



Opinions

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Knox 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 Knox County is $95 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Knox 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 Knox County is $99 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Knox 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 Knox County is $73 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Knox County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator
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## Type: Qualified



## Type: Qualified

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


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

## Residential

Appraisal maintenance, continuing to work on a general review of towns. Based on a sales comparison approach of the residential properties, there will be some changes to towns of Creighton, Crofton, Wausa and some lake areas.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Knox County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Staff |
|  | Valuation done by: |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Staff |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are <br> used to value this property class? |
|  | June 2004 |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was <br> developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2007 |
| 6. | What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was <br> used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | 2007 |
| 7. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: |
|  | 12 <br> 8.How are these defined?By assessor location, indicating villages, towns, lake and rural areas including lake <br> development |
| 9. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | Yes <br> 10. <br> Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural <br> residential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | No |


| 11. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> $\mathbf{0 0 1 . 0 7 B}$ ? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the <br> limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Currently none |
| 12. | Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified <br> and valued in the same manner? <br> Yes |
|  |  |

Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 107 |  | 156 | 263 |
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NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
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## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Knox County

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The information provided by the county in the 3-year plan as well as the survey indicated that a field review was continued in the city and lake properties. The field review consisted of a physical inspection, comparison with the property record card to verify physical information and new digital photos.

The county has utilized a reasonable percentage of available sales and has not excessively trimmed sales. The trended preliminary median ratio and the R\&O median ratio are relatively close. There was a small difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value. The median and mean measures of central tendency are within the range while the weighted mean is slightly below the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion is within range and the price related differential is slightly above the acceptable range. The analysis of the changes in statistics due to assessor actions was reduced by one parcel, and the remainder of the information reflects the assessment actions completed for 2008.

Analysis of all six tables indicates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value for the residential class for the 2008 assessment year. Based on the information available and the assessment practices of the county I believe that the best indicator of level of value is best represented by the median for the 2008 assessment year.

## 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 | 479 | $\mathbf{3 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 9 7}$ |
| 2007 | 467 | $\mathbf{3 1 6}$ | 67.67 |
| 2006 | 483 | 326 | 67.49 |
| 2005 | 475 | 339 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 3 7}$ |
| 2004 | 398 | 285 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 6 1}$ |
| 2003 | 425 | 321 | $\mathbf{7 5 . 5 3}$ |
| 2002 | 414 | 334 | $\mathbf{8 0 . 6 8}$ |
| 2001 | 393 | 324 | $\mathbf{8 2 . 4 4}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: A brief review of the non arm's length sales revealed that the county has utilized a reasonable percentage of all available sales for the sales study and indicates that the county has not excessively trimmed the residential sales.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Knox County

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 94.11 | $\mathbf{3 . 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 9 8}$ |  |
| 2007 | 94.82 | 4.56 | 99.15 | 96.29 |
| 2006 | 94.19 | 4.5 | 98.42 | 96.20 |
| 2005 | 92.58 | 4.32 | 96.58 | 96.13 |
| 2004 | 95.58 | 2.45 | 97.92 | 97.14 |
| 2003 | 92 | 1.76 | 93.62 | 95 |
| 2002 | 89 | -0.08 | $\mathbf{8 8 . 9 3}$ | 91 |
| 2001 | 95 | -0.95 | 94.1 | 95 |

RESIDENTIAL: The trended preliminary median ratio and the R\&O median ratio are relatively close. Both ratios are within the acceptable range. There is no information available to suggest that the median ratio is not the best representation of the level of value for the residential class.

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

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

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.56 | 2008 | $\mathbf{3 . 0 5}$ |
| 15.34 | 2007 | 4.56 |
| 12.39 | 2006 | 4.5 |
| 10.33 | 2005 | 4.32 |
| 4.72 | 2004 | 2.45 |
| 4 | 2003 | 2 |
| 4.87 | 2002 | $-\mathbf{0 . 0 8}$ |
| -0.51 | 2001 | $\mathbf{- 0 . 9 5}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value base is $3.51 \%$. The county has been aggressive in the assessment of the residential class and this difference does not indicate that the sold and unsold properties are not treated the same.

## 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 | 95.29 | 90.92 | 95.64 |

RESIDENTIAL: The three measures of central tendency are reasonably close. The median and mean are within the acceptable range and the weighted mean is slightly below. The median is supported by the Trended Preliminary Ratio and for direct equalization purposes will most likely be used in determining the level of value for Knox County.

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

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. 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 | 9.38 | $\mathbf{1 0 5 . 1 9}$ |
| Difference | 0 | $\mathbf{2 . 1 9}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range. The price related differential is slightly above the range.

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 317 | 316 | -1 |
| Median | 94.11 | 95.29 | 1.18 |
| Wgt. Mean | 86.75 | 90.92 | 4.17 |
| Mean | 94.64 | 95.64 | 1 |
| COD | 19.11 | 9.38 | -9.73 |
| PRD | 109.10 | 105.19 | -3.91 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 16.80 | 48.64 | 31.84 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 241.75 | 151.31 | -90.44 |

RESIDENTIAL: Book 41 page 514 was removed from the sale file since the preliminary statistics. Further review clarified that the buyer owned the majority of the block and wanted this parcel to complete full ownership of the whole block. The county decision that this was not an arm's length transaction is supported. The remainder of the statistical differences is a reflection of the assessment actions completed by the county in the 2008 assessment and support the efforts to achieve
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## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

|  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 01/2004 to 06/30/2 | 07 Posted | efore: 01/1 | 8/2008 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBER of Sales: |  | 50 | MEDIAN: | 99 |  | COV: | 15.86 |  | Median C | C.I.: 96.4 | to 100.19 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL Sales Price: |  | 2,724,032 | WGT. MEAN: | 97 |  | STD: | 15.52 | 95\% W | Mean C | C.I.: 90.33 | to 103.98 |  |
|  | total Adj. Sales Price: |  | 2,334,732 | MEAN : | 98 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 9.04 |  | \% Mean C | C.I.: 93. | 5 to 102.15 |  |
|  | TOTAL Assessed Value: |  | 2,268,245 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: |  | 46,694 | COD : | 9.16 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 127.22 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: |  | 45,364 | PRD : | 100.72 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 33.60 |  |  |  | Printed: 02/09/ | 8 12:32:19 |
| OCCUPANCY | Y CODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Me | edian C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 7 | 98.17 | 87.90 | 96.23 | 11.39 |  | 91.34 | 33.60 | 100.00 | 33.60 | to 100.00 | 26,785 | 25,777 |
| 297 | 1 | 97.98 | 97.98 | 97.98 |  |  |  | 97.98 | 97.98 |  | N/A | 45,000 | 44,090 |
| 343 | 1 | 127.22 | 127.22 | 127.22 |  |  |  | 127.22 | 127.22 |  | N/A | 179,777 | 228,710 |
| 344 | 7 | 101.37 | 103.43 | 102.17 | 5.72 |  | 101.23 | 92.70 | 115.43 | 92.70 | to 115.43 | 24,436 | 24,967 |
| 350 | 1 | 94.75 | 94.75 | 94.75 |  |  |  | 94.75 | 94.75 |  | N/A | 85,000 | 80,535 |
| 352 | 1 | 100.05 | 100.05 | 100.05 |  |  |  | 100.05 | 100.05 |  | N/A | 42,500 | 42,520 |
| 353 | 12 | 104.87 | 101.96 | 103.74 | 9.19 |  | 98.29 | 51.63 | 123.18 | 98.60 | to 111.13 | 25,875 | 26,841 |
| 384 | 1 | 124.85 | 124.85 | 124.85 |  |  |  | 124.85 | 124.85 |  | N/A | 10,000 | 12,485 |
| 386 | 1 | 93.98 | 93.98 | 93.98 |  |  |  | 93.98 | 93.98 |  | N/A | 82,500 | 77,535 |
| 406 | 5 | 96.27 | 96.62 | 94.39 | 7.13 |  | 102.36 | 81.39 | 107.44 |  | N/A | 15,880 | 14,989 |
| 442 | 1 | 79.32 | 79.32 | 79.32 |  |  |  | 79.32 | 79.32 |  | N/A | 45,000 | 35,695 |
| 476 | 1 | 93.96 | 93.96 | 93.96 |  |  |  | 93.96 | 93.96 |  | N/A | 500,000 | 469,780 |
| 483 | 1 | 91.35 | 91.35 | 91.35 |  |  |  | 91.35 | 91.35 |  | N/A | 31,000 | 28,320 |
| 528 | 3 | 96.50 | 96.08 | 96.85 | 3.09 |  | 99.20 | 91.39 | 100.34 |  | N/A | 43,500 | 42,130 |
| 531 | 3 | 94.61 | 86.44 | 77.61 | 10.10 |  | 111.38 | 68.02 | 96.69 |  | N/A | 95,933 | 74,455 |
| 556 | 1 | 96.46 | 96.46 | 96.46 |  |  |  | 96.46 | 96.46 |  | N/A | 7,200 | 6,945 |
| 558 | 3 | 100.19 | 99.65 | 99.72 | 0.54 |  | 99.92 | 98.56 | 100.19 |  | N/A | 46,666 | 46,538 |
| $\ldots$ ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 50 | 98.60 | 97.85 | 97.15 | 9.16 |  | 100.72 | 33.60 | 127.22 | 96.46 | to 100.19 | 46,694 | 45,364 |

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

## Commercial

Implemented new cost tables and depreciation. Reviewed door to door. All towns currently reviewed with the exception of Bloomfield. Market analysis completed.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Knox County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Staff |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Deputy |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Staff |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | 2004 |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2007 market |
| 6. | When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | Not Used |
| 7. | When was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | 2007 |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? |
|  | $12$ |
| 9. | How are these defined? |
|  | By assessor location, indicating villages, towns, lakes, rural areas including lake development |
| 10. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | Yes |
| 11. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | Currently, none |


| 12. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> $\mathbf{0 0 1 . 0 7 B}$ ? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the <br> limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Currently none |

Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |


|  |  |  |  |  | Date Range | e: 07/0 | 01/2004 to 06/30/2 | 07 Posted | fore: 01/1 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER of | f Sales: |  | 48 | MEDIAN: | 99 |  | COV: | 9.78 |  | dian | C.I.: 96.5 | to 100.19 | (!: Derived) |
| total Sales | Price: |  | 2,706,532 | WGT. MEAN: | 97 |  | STD: | 9.73 | 95\% Wgt | Mean | C.I.: 90.4 | to 103.46 |  |
| TOTAL Adj. Sales | S Price: |  | 2,317,232 | MEAN : | 99 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 6.21 |  | Mean | C.I.: 96. | 8 to 102.18 |  |
| total Assessed | d Value: |  | 2,246,605 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Adj. Sales | Price: |  | 48,275 | COD : | 6.28 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 125.50 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Assessed | d Value: |  | 46,804 | PRD: | 102.55 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 68.02 |  |  |  | Printed: 03/31/ | 8 19:29:31 |
| DATE OF SALE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Qrtrs_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 тO 09/30/04 | 4 | 97.25 | 97.92 | 96.04 | 3.51 |  | 101.96 | 92.70 | 104.50 |  | N/A | 19,138 | 18,380 |
| 10/01/04 TO 12/31/04 | 6 | 99.29 | 98.62 | 98.77 | 1.51 |  | 99.85 | 96.27 | 100.19 | 96.27 | 7 to 100.19 | 46,083 | 45,515 |
| 01/01/05 тO 03/31/05 | 1 | 105.56 | 105.56 | 105.56 |  |  |  | 105.56 | 105.56 |  | N/A | 9,000 | 9,500 |
| 04/01/05 TO 06/30/05 | 3 | 100.00 | 105.52 | 116.92 | 10.62 |  | 90.25 | 92.35 | 124.22 |  | N/A | 78,259 | 91,500 |
| 07/01/05 TO 09/30/05 | 1 | 98.56 | 98.56 | 98.56 |  |  |  | 98.56 | 98.56 |  | N/A | 40,000 | 39,425 |
| 10/01/05 тO 12/31/05 | 8 | 99.52 | 99.88 | 98.60 | 2.87 |  | 101.30 | 93.98 | 110.63 | 93.98 | 8 to 110.63 | 45,000 | 44,371 |
| 01/01/06 тO 03/31/06 | 3 | 93.96 | 104.17 | 94.55 | 11.51 |  | 110.17 | 93.06 | 125.50 |  | N/A | 172,400 | 163,010 |
| 04/01/06 TO 06/30/06 | 5 | 103.87 | 97.75 | 95.46 | 7.71 |  | 102.39 | 75.72 | 106.43 |  | N/A | 34,060 | 32,515 |
| 07/01/06 TO 09/30/06 | 4 | 98.76 | 99.08 | 97.76 | 4.47 |  | 101.35 | 91.35 | 107.44 |  | N/A | 41,225 | 40,300 |
| 10/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 3 | 102.38 | 100.69 | 98.29 | 3.41 |  | 102.44 | 94.61 | 105.08 |  | N/A | 29,333 | 28,831 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 2 | 105.87 | 105.87 | 114.48 | 11.63 |  | 92.48 | 93.56 | 118.18 |  | N/A | 15,000 | 17,172 |
| 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 | 8 | 96.35 | 94.75 | 82.27 | 9.01 |  | 115.16 | 68.02 | 115.43 | 68.02 | 2 to 115.43 | 43,750 | 35,993 |
| ___Study Years_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 | 14 | 99.29 | 100.40 | 105.66 | 4.58 |  | 95.02 | 92.35 | 124.22 | 96.27 | 7 to 104.50 | 42,630 | 45,043 |
| 07/01/05 тO 06/30/06 | 17 | 99.10 | 99.93 | 96.18 | 6.28 |  | 103.90 | 75.72 | 125.50 | 93.98 | 8 to 106.03 | 63,970 | 61,529 |
| 07/01/06 то 06/30/07 | 17 | 97.98 | 98.12 | 90.06 | 7.64 |  | 108.95 | 68.02 | 118.18 | 93.56 | 6 to 105.08 | 37,229 | 33,528 |
| __Calendar Yrs__ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01/01/05 TO 12/31/05 | 13 | 99.94 | 101.52 | 105.38 | 4.76 |  | 96.34 | 92.35 | 124.22 | 96.40 | 0 to 105.56 | 49,521 | 52,184 |
| 01/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 15 | 99.53 | 99.98 | 95.63 | 7.59 |  | 104.54 | 75.72 | 125.50 | 93.96 | 6 to 106.03 | 62,693 | 59,953 |
|  | 48 | 98.85 | 99.43 | 96.95 | 6.28 |  | 102.55 | 68.02 | 125.50 | 96.50 | 0 to 100.19 | 48,275 | 46,804 |
| ASSESSOR LOCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE Cou | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| BLOOMFIELD | 12 | 99.52 | 101.35 | 99.79 | 5.17 |  | 101.57 | 92.70 | 118.18 | 94.86 | 6 to 105.08 | 41,379 | 41,293 |
| CENTER | 1 | 107.44 | 107.44 | 107.44 |  |  |  | 107.44 | 107.44 |  | N/A | 3,900 | 4,190 |
| CREIGHTON | 14 | 98.58 | 100.08 | 97.64 | 7.53 |  | 102.50 | 68.02 | 125.50 | 96.27 | 7 to 103.87 | 51,591 | 50,372 |
| CROFTON | 3 | 93.96 | 94.45 | 94.08 | 1.16 |  | 100.39 | 93.06 | 96.32 |  | N/A | 179,400 | 168,780 |
| NIOBRARA | 2 | 100.57 | 100.57 | 100.95 | 0.57 |  | 99.62 | 100.00 | 101.14 |  | N/A | 15,000 | 15,142 |
| RURAL | 2 | 98.02 | 98.02 | 98.22 | 1.55 |  | 99.79 | 96.50 | 99.53 |  | N/A | 75,000 | 73,662 |
| RURAL V | 1 | 104.50 | 104.50 | 104.50 |  |  |  | 104.50 | 104.50 |  | N/A | 1,000 | 1,045 |
| VERDIGRE | 7 | 99.50 | 95.80 | 90.34 | 8.16 |  | 106.03 | 75.72 | 106.03 | 75.72 | 2 to 106.03 | 18,428 | 16,649 |
| WAUSA | 6 | 95.65 | 98.68 | 97.50 | 6.18 |  | 101.21 | 91.35 | 110.63 | 91.35 | 5 to 110.63 | 41,050 | 40,023 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 48 | 98.85 | 99.43 | 96.95 | 6.28 |  | 102.55 | 68.02 | 125.50 | 96.50 | 0 to 100.19 | 48,275 | 46,804 |
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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


## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Knox County

## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: A door to door review was completed with the exception of Bloomfield. Statistically, the village is within the acceptable range. Knox County implemented new costing and depreciation tables.

Based on the following tables it is evident that the county did not excessively trim the sales file. The trended preliminary median ratio and the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio are relatively close. The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value base is minimal. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable level. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are also within the acceptable parameters. The decrease of two sales since the preliminary statistics is reflective of substantially changed parcels after the sale. The remainder of Table VII is representative of the assessment actions in Knox County.

Analysis of all six tables indicates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value for the 2008 assessment year. Based on the assessment practices of Knox County the median appears to be the most reliable indicator of the 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 | $\mathbf{8 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 4 7}$ |
| 2007 | $\mathbf{8 7}$ | 54 | 62.07 |
| 2006 | 77 | 44 | 57.14 |
| 2005 | 83 | 45 | 54.22 |
| 2004 | 86 | 52 | $\mathbf{6 0 . 4 7}$ |
| 2003 | 78 | 50 | 64.1 |
| 2002 | 80 | 53 | 66.25 |
| 2001 | 86 | 54 | 62.79 |

COMMERCIAL: The table represents that the county has utilized a reasonable portion of the total sales file and has not excessively trimmed the qualified sales.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Knox County

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 98.60 | $-\mathbf{0 . 6 9}$ | 97.92 |  |
| 2007 | 94.63 | 4.07 | 98.48 | 97.70 |
| 2006 | 94.45 | 2.75 | 97.04 | 97.50 |
| 2005 | 97.50 | -0.98 | 96.55 | 97.50 |
| 2004 | 97.42 | -0.41 | 97.02 | 97.42 |
| 2003 | 98 | 0.54 | 98.53 | 98 |
| 2002 | 99 | 1.76 | 100.74 | 99 |
| 2001 | 98 | -16.29 | 82.04 | 100 |

COMMERCIAL: The trended preliminary median ratio and the R\&O median ratio are relatively close and supportive of each other. There is no information available to suggest that the median ratio is not the best representation of the level of value for the commercial class.

## 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.17 | 2008 | $-\mathbf{0 . 6 9}$ |
| 18.89 | 2007 | 4.07 |
| 0.37 | 2006 | 2.75 |
| 3.46 | 2005 | $-\mathbf{0 . 9 8}$ |
| 0.47 | 2004 | $-\mathbf{0 . 4 1}$ |
| 0 | 2003 | 1 |
| 0 | 2002 | 1.76 |
| 3.24 | 2001 | -16.29 |

COMMERCIAL: The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value base is minimal. The county reported that a revaluation of the commercial property was completed for the 2008 assessment year.

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

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

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

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for "indirect" equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 8 . 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 9 . 4 3}$ |

COMMERCIAL: The median, weighted mean and the mean ratios are statistically within the acceptable range.

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 6.28 | $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 5 5}$ |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are well within the acceptable levels and support the assessment efforts by the county for the commercial class.

## 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 | 50 | 48 | -2 |
| Median | 98.60 | 98.85 | 0.25 |
| Wgt. Mean | 97.15 | 96.95 | -0.2 |
| Mean | 97.85 | 99.43 | 1.58 |
| COD | 9.16 | 6.28 | -2.88 |
| PRD | 100.72 | 102.55 | 1.83 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 33.60 | 68.02 | 34.42 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 127.22 | 125.50 | -1.72 |

COMMERCIAL: Two sales were removed since the preliminary statistics due to substantial changes. The preliminary statistics, the 2008 Reports and Opinions statistics, and the 2008 Assessment Survey, Assessment Actions all support that assessment action was taken to the commercial class of property and statistically improved the commercial class.

## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

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





70-0542
NonValid School
$\qquad$

|  |  | 153 | 64.31 | 64.17 | 59.46 | 22.95 | 107.91 | 20.66 | 108.06 | 60.89 to 67.59 | 164,971 | 98,095 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACRES IN | SALE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 0.01 TO | 10.00 | 2 | 92.74 | 92.74 | 92.52 | 4.76 | 100.23 | 88.32 | 97.15 | N/A | 10,500 | 9,715 |
| 10.01 TO | 30.00 | 8 | 65.58 | 60.37 | 49.13 | 21.93 | 122.90 | 22.90 | 92.02 | 22.90 to 92.02 | 23,162 | 11,378 |
| 30.01 TO | 50.00 | 9 | 55.96 | 61.11 | 59.01 | 23.71 | 103.55 | 42.33 | 97.80 | 42.61 to 78.32 | 41,177 | 24,300 |
| 50.01 TO | 100.00 | 37 | 63.05 | 60.06 | 54.79 | 20.13 | 109.62 | 26.69 | 98.82 | 52.21 to 67.50 | 82,426 | 45,160 |
| 100.01 TO | 180.00 | 56 | 62.31 | 63.83 | 56.90 | 25.05 | 112.18 | 20.66 | 108.06 | 57.77 to 71.41 | 168,955 | 96,139 |
| 180.01 то | 330.00 | 32 | 68.30 | 67.21 | 61.22 | 20.85 | 109.78 | 36.03 | 100.26 | 58.31 to 76.83 | 247,034 | 151,237 |
| 330.01 TO | 650.00 | 6 | 79.16 | 77.32 | 73.96 | 17.32 | 104.54 | 57.44 | 95.71 | 57.44 to 95.71 | 288,686 | 213,519 |
| 650.01 + |  | 3 | 64.29 | 62.59 | 59.80 | 19.20 | 104.68 | 43.23 | 80.26 | N/A | 838,398 | 501,341 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 153 | 64.31 | 64.17 | 59.46 | 22.95 | 107.91 | 20.66 | 108.06 | 60.89 to 67.59 | 164,971 | 98,095 |

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


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

## Agricultural

All 5 ag land classes will increase. Within each, all irrigated, dry and grass will increase. Statistics show such a huge market increase from 2004 - 2005 to the current 2007 market.

Market analysis done. Reviewed market area boundaries.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Knox County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Staff |
|  | Staff |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Staff |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically <br> define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | Knox follows the Statutes and Regulations as written |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
| Statute 77-1359 |  |
| 5. | When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or <br> establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | Not used |
| 6. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 1930 |
| 7. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | 1999, The county updates land use when reviewing the GIS |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | Physical inspection, FSA maps |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | Staff |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | 98\% Finalizing and reviewing parcel work and land use |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class: |
|  | 5 |
|  |  |


| 9. | How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class? |
| :--- | :--- |
| Market activity and location |  |$|$| Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special |
| :--- |
| valuation for agricultural land within the county? |
| No |

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 115 | 0 | 170 | 285 |



54 - KNOX COUNTY


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 Knox County

## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The county reported that a market analysis was completed resulting in all five market areas implementing increased land values.

The tables indicate that the county utilized a reasonable percentage of sales. The trended preliminary ratio is relatively close to the R\&O median. The percentage difference between the sales file and assessed value file is two percentage points different. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion is acceptable while the price related differential is slightly above the acceptable level.

Analysis of all six tables indicates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value for the 2008 assessment year. Based on the assessment practices of Knox County it is believed that the median level of value is the most reliable indicator of the level of value for the agricultural class.

## 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 | 279 | 153 | 54.84 |
| 2007 | 261 | 138 | 52.87 |
| 2006 | 230 | 128 | 55.65 |
| 2005 | 177 | 93 | 52.54 |
| 2004 | 189 | 103 | 54.5 |
| 2003 | 196 | 115 | 58.67 |
| 2002 | 224 | 154 | 68.75 |
| 2001 | 361 | 221 | 61.22 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percentage of sales used gives a historical background that there have been sufficient sales utilized to establish a reliable background for the sales file.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Knox County

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

|  | Preliminary Median | \% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 64.31 | 14.17 | 73.42 | 72.53 |
| 2007 | 66.34 | 6.18 | 70.44 | 72.22 |
| 2006 | 68.71 | 8.64 | 74.65 | 75.80 |
| 2005 | 70.74 | 11.49 | 78.87 | 74.89 |
| 2004 | 70.05 | 10.96 | 77.72 | 76.76 |
| 2003 | 73 | 2.26 | 74.65 | 77 |
| 2002 | 69 | 6.71 | 76.63 | 74 |
| 2001 | 69 | 10.61 | 76.32 | 75 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The trended preliminary ratio is relatively close to the indicated R\&O median ratio and both statistics are within the acceptable range for the level of value.

## 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16.17 | 2008 | 14.17 |
| 12.04 | 2007 | 6.18 |
| 10.39 | 2006 | 8.64 |
| 8.28 | 2005 | 11.49 |
| 10.23 | 2004 | 10.96 |
| 8 | 2003 | 2 |
| 9.23 | 2002 | 10.79 |
| 9.29 | 2001 | 10.61 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value base is two percentage points different and does not suggest that sold and unsold properties are treated differently.

## 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 | $\mathbf{7 2 . 5 3}$ | 67.66 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 2 5}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median and mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, the weighted mean is slightly below the acceptable level.

## 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 | 22.01 | 108.27 |
| Difference | $\mathbf{2 . 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2 7}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are slightly above the acceptable ranges. However, knowledge of the sales file indicates that the older sales have an influence on these statistics.

## 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 | 153 | 153 | 0 |
| Median | 64.31 | 72.53 | 8.22 |
| Wgt. Mean | 59.46 | 67.66 | 8.2 |
| Mean | 64.17 | 73.25 | 9.08 |
| COD | 22.95 | 22.01 | -0.94 |
| PRD | 107.91 | 108.27 | 0.36 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 20.66 | 21.68 | 1.02 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 108.06 | 128.83 | 20.77 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The above table is a reflection of the assessment actions implemented for the 2008 assessment year. The county increased values significantly to achieve the acceptable level of value.

## County 54 - Knox



Exhibit 54 - Page 81

| Total Real Property Value Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 30) |  |  | cords |  | Value 73 | 3,035 | (Sum 17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Growth } \\ & , \quad \& 41) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 3,798,107 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule I:Non-Agricultural Records (Com and Ind) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records Urban ${ }^{\text {Value }}$ |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
|  |  |  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9. Comm } \\ & \text { UnImp Land } \end{aligned}$ | 66 | 200,035 | 7 | 23,785 | 4 | 142,240 | 77 | 366,060 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10. Comm } \\ & \text { Improv Land } \end{aligned}$ | 453 | 1,784,370 | 23 | 235,830 | 17 | 605,575 | 493 | 2,625,775 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11. Comm } \\ & \text { Improvements } \end{aligned}$ | 459 | 16,231,045 | 24 | 1,114,525 | 26 | 7,409,855 | 509 | 24,755,425 |  |
| 12. Comm Total \% of Total | 525 | 18,215,450 | 31 | 1,374,140 | 30 | 8,157,670 | 586 | 27,747,260 | 240,065 |
|  | 89.59 | 65.64 | 5.29 | 4.95 | 5.11 | 29.39 | 5.42 | 3.77 | 6.32 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13. Ind } \\ & \text { UnImp Land } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14. Ind } \\ & \text { Improv Land } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15 . \text { Ind } \\ & \text { Improvements } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 16. Ind Total \% of Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Comm+Ind Total <br> \% of Total | 525 | 18,215,450 | 31 | 1,374,140 | 30 | 8,157,670 | 586 | 27,747,260 | 240,065 |
|  | 89.59 | 65.64 | 5.29 | 4.95 | 5.11 | 29.39 | 5.42 | 3.77 | 6.32 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 17. Taxable } \\ \text { Total } \\ \text { \% of Total } \end{gathered}$ | 3,133 | 102,648,990 | 116 | 5,419,415 | 2,171 | 85,575,465 | 5,420 | 193,643,870 | 2,223,297 |
|  | 57.80 | 53.00 | 2.14 | 2.08 | 40.05 | 39.97 | 50.21 | 26.33 | 58.53 |
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## County 54 - Knox
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## County 54 - Knox



## County 54 - Knox <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 27.880 | 46,980 | 23.500 | 39,600 | 51.380 | 86,580 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 135.000 | 223,425 | 1,176.420 | 1,946,975 | 1,311.420 | 2,170,400 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 175.150 | 287,245 | 1,102.570 | 1,808,220 | 1,277.720 | 2,095,465 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 337.870 | 538,900 | 4,178.570 | 6,664,830 | 4,516.440 | 7,203,730 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 255.640 | 398,800 | 2,717.850 | 4,239,865 | 2,973.490 | 4,638,665 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 507.050 | 785,930 | 6,409.460 | 9,934,690 | 6,916.510 | 10,720,620 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,173.500 | 1,373,010 | 1,173.500 | 1,373,010 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,438.590 | 2,281,280 | 16,781.870 | 26,007,190 | 18,220.460 | 28,288,470 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 41.930 | 53,045 | 424.650 | 537,185 | 466.580 | 590,230 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 149.900 | 188,125 | 1,550.070 | 1,945,360 | 1,699.970 | 2,133,485 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 676.090 | 841,730 | 6,163.100 | 7,673,130 | 6,839.190 | 8,514,860 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 1,111.040 | 1,361,035 | 11,233.120 | 13,760,700 | 12,344.160 | 15,121,735 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 908.070 | 985,260 | 15,144.210 | 16,431,560 | 16,052.280 | 17,416,820 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 1,024.200 | 1,065,170 | 9,503.510 | 9,883,635 | 10,527.710 | 10,948,805 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 61. 4D | 0.000 | 0 | 56.260 | 37,975 | 2,565.620 | 1,731,825 | 2,621.880 | 1,769,800 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 3,967.490 | 4,532,340 | 46,584.280 | 51,963,395 | 50,551.770 | 56,495,735 |


| 63. 1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 74.520 | 59,615 | 577.850 | 462,275 | 652.370 | 521,890 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 67.820 | 50,530 | 67.820 | 50,530 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 809.030 | 602,745 | 5,794.360 | 4,316,855 | 6,603.390 | 4,919,600 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 139.230 | 83,540 | 139.230 | 83,540 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 497.800 | 298,675 | 7,333.450 | 4,400,070 | 7,831.250 | 4,698,745 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 405 | 1.000 | 405 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 46.250 | 18,735 | 1,494.160 | 605,160 | 1,540.410 | 623,895 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,427.600 | 979,770 | 15,407.870 | 9,918,835 | 16,835.470 | 10,898,605 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 77.490 | 3,875 | 415.390 | 20,770 | 492.880 | 24,645 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 6,600 | 11.000 | 6,600 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 146.030 |  | 751.910 |  | 897.940 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 6,911.170 | 7,797,265 | 79,200.410 | 87,916,790 | 86,111.580 | 95,714,055 |

## County 54 - Knox <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 54.300 | 82,755 | 54.300 | 82,755 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 4,590 | 472.640 | 723,140 | 475.640 | 727,730 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 392.250 | 600,150 | 2,823.000 | 4,317,475 | 3,215.250 | 4,917,625 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 191.030 | 251,210 | 4,529.700 | 5,950,800 | 4,720.730 | 6,202,010 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 85.540 | 102,645 | 3,601.800 | 4,306,935 | 3,687.340 | 4,409,580 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 116.510 | 139,230 | 3,897.290 | 4,642,635 | 4,013.800 | 4,781,865 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 3.340 | 3,375 | 402.280 | 405,905 | 405.620 | 409,280 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 791.670 | 1,101,200 | 15,781.010 | 20,429,645 | 16,572.680 | 21,530,845 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 953.880 | 1,116,045 | 953.880 | 1,116,045 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 107.200 | 122,210 | 2,830.170 | 3,226,385 | 2,937.370 | 3,348,595 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,243.560 | 1,405,230 | 9,333.870 | 10,547,300 | 10,577.430 | 11,952,530 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 703.330 | 787,730 | 10,879.990 | 12,185,590 | 11,583.320 | 12,973,320 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 72.180 | 77,595 | 19,581.040 | 21,049,815 | 19,653.220 | 21,127,410 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 411.820 | 411,820 | 13,616.840 | 13,616,840 | 14,028.660 | 14,028,660 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 185.730 | 120,725 | 185.730 | 120,725 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 190.390 | 121,850 | 3,766.390 | 2,410,475 | 3,956.780 | 2,532,325 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,728.480 | 2,926,435 | 61,147.910 | 64,273,175 | 63,876.390 | 67,199,610 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 14.230 | 11,595 | 14.230 | 11,595 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 25.300 | 20,620 | 857.150 | 698,585 | 882.450 | 719,205 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 21.470 | 15,890 | 21.470 | 15,890 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 781.810 | 578,545 | 6,039.870 | 4,469,505 | 6,821.680 | 5,048,050 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 92.400 | 64,680 | 92.400 | 64,680 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 570.490 | 399,335 | 15,682.880 | 10,977,995 | 16,253.370 | 11,377,330 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 40.000 | 21,200 | 40.000 | 21,200 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 263.290 | 139,545 | 12,693.290 | 6,727,450 | 12,956.580 | 6,866,995 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,640.890 | 1,138,045 | 35,441.290 | 22,986,900 | 37,082.180 | 24,124,945 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 149.880 | 7,500 | 1,670.200 | 83,520 | 1,820.080 | 91,020 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 440.090 | 264,055 | 440.090 | 264,055 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 68.840 |  | 681.700 |  | 750.540 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 5,310.920 | 5,173,180 | 114,480.500 | 108,037,295 | 119,791.420 | 113,210,475 |

## County 54 - Knox <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 97.530 | 137,515 | 97.530 | 137,515 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 45.450 | 61,360 | 230.960 | 311,805 | 276.410 | 373,165 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 99.900 | 128,870 | 1,530.400 | 1,974,225 | 1,630.300 | 2,103,095 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 125.100 | 161,380 | 2,932.310 | 3,782,700 | 3,057.410 | 3,944,080 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 19.250 | 24,640 | 1,191.520 | 1,525,150 | 1,210.770 | 1,549,790 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 8.300 | 10,625 | 5,200.290 | 6,656,375 | 5,208.590 | 6,667,000 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 38.250 | 42,075 | 6,432.000 | 7,075,195 | 6,470.250 | 7,117,270 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 336.250 | 428,950 | 17,615.010 | 21,462,965 | 17,951.260 | 21,891,915 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 257.040 | 244,190 | 1,046.030 | 993,735 | 1,303.070 | 1,237,925 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 405.890 | 385,600 | 2,650.390 | 2,517,885 | 3,056.280 | 2,903,485 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,886.320 | 1,188,390 | 4,598.710 | 2,897,200 | 6,485.030 | 4,085,590 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 1,609.050 | 949,340 | 9,891.650 | 5,836,105 | 11,500.700 | 6,785,445 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 656.840 | 377,695 | 6,689.200 | 3,846,390 | 7,346.040 | 4,224,085 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 456.480 | 262,485 | 20,980.650 | 12,064,205 | 21,437.130 | 12,326,690 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 428.810 | 231,550 | 428.810 | 231,550 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 579.280 | 309,925 | 31,507.460 | 16,856,745 | 32,086.740 | 17,166,670 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 5,850.900 | 3,717,625 | 77,792.900 | 45,243,815 | 83,643.800 | 48,961,440 | Grass:


| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.130 | 2,580 | 9.130 | 7,530 | 12.260 | 10,110 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 344.450 | 284,190 | 1,987.010 | 1,639,330 | 2,331.460 | 1,923,520 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 32.930 | 21,900 | 32.930 | 21,900 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 1,444.890 | 960,845 | 9,092.500 | 6,046,600 | 10,537.390 | 7,007,445 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 360.590 | 219,950 | 360.590 | 219,950 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 746.440 | 455,330 | 34,244.900 | 20,889,515 | 34,991.340 | 21,344,845 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,384.380 | 837,550 | 1,384.380 | 837,550 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 4,992.390 | 3,020,395 | 204,633.720 | 123,803,705 | 209,626.110 | 126,824,100 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 7,531.300 | 4,723,340 | 251,745.160 | 153,466,080 | 259,276.460 | 158,189,420 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 911.700 | 45,605 | 19,536.230 | 979,565 | 20,447.930 | 1,025,170 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 40.500 | 11,550 | 1,923.240 | 218,210 | 1,963.740 | 229,760 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 1,707.480 |  | 18,361.510 |  | 20,068.990 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 14,670.650 | 8,927,070 | 368,612.540 | 221,370,635 | 383,283.190 | 230,297,705 |


| County 54 - Knox |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | SubUrban |  | Ru | 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 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.750 | 6,180 | 5.750 | 6,180 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 37.000 | 35,335 | 37.000 | 35,335 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 141.750 | 85,760 | 141.750 | 85,760 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 184.500 | 127,275 | 184.500 | 127,275 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 20.580 | 24,080 | 20.580 | 24,080 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 538.780 | 614,215 | 538.780 | 614,215 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,842.390 | 3,211,900 | 2,842.390 | 3,211,900 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 574.970 | 643,970 | 574.970 | 643,970 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 150.600 | 161,895 | 150.600 | 161,895 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,389.960 | 1,389,960 | 1,389.960 | 1,389,960 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 745.920 | 477,390 | 745.920 | 477,390 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 6,263.200 | 6,523,410 | 6,263.200 | 6,523,410 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 284.700 | 236,305 | 284.700 | 236,305 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 967.080 | 681,805 | 967.080 | 681,805 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 29.950 | 20,665 | 29.950 | 20,665 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,184.840 | 817,545 | 1,184.840 | 817,545 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11,398.270 | 6,838,945 | 11,398.270 | 6,838,945 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13,864.840 | 8,595,265 | 13,864.840 | 8,595,265 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,156.520 | 57,830 | 1,156.520 | 57,830 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 1,666.650 |  | 1,666.650 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 21,469.060 | 15,303,780 | 21,469.060 | 15,303,780 |
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Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

| Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 2,566.510 | 3,811,430 | 55,368.890 | 73,198,675 | 57,935.400 | 77,010,105 |
| 77.Dry Land | 0.000 | 0 | 12,553.970 | 11,180,485 | 199,940.160 | 172,503,295 | 212,494.130 | 183,683,780 |
| 78.Grass | 0.000 | 0 | 10,672.040 | 6,882,000 | 345,589.190 | 211,165,285 | 356,261.230 | 218,047,285 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 1,139.070 | 56,980 | 24,813.110 | 1,243,440 | 25,952.180 | 1,300,420 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 40.500 | 11,550 | 2,384.330 | 500,415 | 2,424.830 | 511,965 |
| 81.Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 1,922.350 | 0 | 21,564.650 | 0 | 23,487.000 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 0.000 | 0 | 26,972.090 | 21,942,445 | 628,095.680 | 458,611,110 | 655,067.770 | 480,553,555 |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 54 - Knox
Market Area:
Average Assessed Value*

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1A1 | 51.380 | $0.28 \%$ | 86,580 | $0.31 \%$ | $1,685.091$ |
| 1A | $1,311.420$ | $7.20 \%$ | $2,170,400$ | $7.67 \%$ | $1,654.999$ |
| 2A1 | $1,277.720$ | $7.01 \%$ | $2,095,465$ | $7.41 \%$ | $1,640.003$ |
| 2A | $4,516.440$ | $24.79 \%$ | $7,203,730$ | $25.47 \%$ | $1,595.001$ |
| 3A1 | $2,973.490$ | $16.32 \%$ | $4,638,665$ | $16.40 \%$ | $1,560.006$ |
| 3A | $6,916.510$ | $37.96 \%$ | $10,720,620$ | $37.90 \%$ | $1,550.004$ |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4A | $1,173.500$ | $6.44 \%$ |  | $4.85 \%$ | $1,170.012$ |
| Irrigated Total | $18,220.460$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,373,010$ |
| Dry: |  |  | $28,288,470$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,552.566$ |
| 1D1 | $1,699.970$ | $3.36 \%$ |  |  | $1,265.013$ |
| 1D | $6,839.190$ | $13.53 \%$ | $2,133,485$ | $3.78 \%$ | $1,255.013$ |
| 2D1 | $12,344.160$ | $24.42 \%$ | $8,514,860$ | $15.07 \%$ | $1,245.010$ |
| 2D | $16,052.280$ | $31.75 \%$ | $15,121,735$ | $26.77 \%$ | $1,225.011$ |
| 3D1 | $10,527.710$ | $20.83 \%$ | $17,416,820$ | $30.83 \%$ | $1,085.005$ |
| 3D | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | $10,948,805$ | $19.38 \%$ | $1,039.998$ |
| 4D1 | $2,621.880$ | $5.19 \%$ |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 652.370 | $3.87 \%$ | 521,890 | $4.79 \%$ | 799.990 |
| 2G1 | 67.820 | $0.40 \%$ | 50,530 | $0.46 \%$ | 745.060 |
| 2G | $6,603.390$ | $39.22 \%$ | $4,919,600$ | $45.14 \%$ | 745.011 |
| 3G1 | 139.230 | $0.83 \%$ | 83,540 | $0.77 \%$ | 600.014 |
| 3G | $7,831.250$ | $46.52 \%$ | $4,698,745$ | $43.11 \%$ | 599.999 |
| 4G1 | 1.000 | $0.01 \%$ | 405 | $0.00 \%$ | 405.000 |
| 4G | $1,540.410$ | $9.15 \%$ | 623,895 | $5.72 \%$ | 405.018 |
| Grass Total | $16,835.470$ | $100.00 \%$ | $10,898,605$ | $100.00 \%$ | 647.359 |
| Irigated Total | $18,220.460$ | $21.16 \%$ | $28,288,470$ | $29.56 \%$ | $1,552.566$ |
| Dry Total | $50,551.770$ | $58.70 \%$ | $56,495,735$ | $59.03 \%$ | $1,117.581$ |
| Grass Total | $16,835.470$ | $19.55 \%$ | $10,898,605$ | $11.39 \%$ | 647.359 |
| Waste | 492.880 | $0.57 \%$ | 24,645 | $0.03 \%$ | 50.002 |
| Other | 11.000 | $0.01 \%$ | 6,600 | $0.01 \%$ | 600.000 |
| Exempt | 897.940 | $1.04 \%$ |  |  | 1 |
| Market Area Total | $86,111.580$ | $100.00 \%$ | $95,714,055$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $18,220.460$ | $31.45 \%$ | $28,288,470$ | $36.73 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $50,551.770$ | $23.79 \%$ | $56,495,735$ | $30.76 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $16,835.470$ | $4.73 \%$ | $10,898,605$ | $5.00 \%$ |
| Waste | 492.880 | $1.90 \%$ | 24,645 | $1.90 \%$ |
| Other | 11.000 | $0.45 \%$ | 6,600 | $1.29 \%$ |
| Exempt | 897.940 | $3.82 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $86,111.580$ | $13.15 \%$ | $95,714,055$ | $19.92 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 54 - Knox

Market Area: 2

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 54.300 | 0.33\% | 82,755 | 0.38\% | 1,524.033 |
| 1A | 475.640 | 2.87\% | 727,730 | 3.38\% | 1,530.001 |
| 2A1 | 3,215.250 | 19.40\% | 4,917,625 | 22.84\% | 1,529.468 |
| 2 A | 4,720.730 | 28.49\% | 6,202,010 | 28.81\% | 1,313.781 |
| 3A1 | 3,687.340 | 22.25\% | 4,409,580 | 20.48\% | 1,195.870 |
| 3A | 4,013.800 | 24.22\% | 4,781,865 | 22.21\% | 1,191.356 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 405.620 | 2.45\% | 409,280 | 1.90\% | 1,009.023 |
| Irrigated Total | 16,572.680 | 100.00\% | 21,530,845 | 100.00\% | 1,299.177 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 953.880 | 1.49\% | 1,116,045 | 1.66\% | 1,170.005 |
| 1D | 2,937.370 | 4.60\% | 3,348,595 | 4.98\% | 1,139.997 |
| 2D1 | 10,577.430 | 16.56\% | 11,952,530 | 17.79\% | 1,130.003 |
| 2D | 11,583.320 | 18.13\% | 12,973,320 | 19.31\% | 1,120.000 |
| 3D1 | 19,653.220 | 30.77\% | 21,127,410 | 31.44\% | 1,075.010 |
| 3D | 14,028.660 | 21.96\% | 14,028,660 | 20.88\% | 1,000.000 |
| 4D1 | 185.730 | 0.29\% | 120,725 | 0.18\% | 650.002 |
| 4D | 3,956.780 | 6.19\% | 2,532,325 | 3.77\% | 639.996 |
| Dry Total | 63,876.390 | 100.00\% | 67,199,610 | 100.00\% | 1,052.025 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 14.230 | $0.04 \%$ | 11,595 | $0.05 \%$ | 814.827 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 882.450 | $2.38 \%$ | 719,205 | $2.98 \%$ | 815.009 |
| 2G1 | 21.470 | $0.06 \%$ | 15,890 | $0.07 \%$ | 740.102 |
| 2G | $6,821.680$ | $18.40 \%$ | $5,048,050$ | $20.92 \%$ | 740.001 |
| 3G1 | 92.400 | $0.25 \%$ | 64,680 | $0.27 \%$ | 700.000 |
| 3G | $16,253.370$ | $43.83 \%$ | $11,377,330$ | $47.16 \%$ | 699.998 |
| 4G1 | 40.000 | $0.11 \%$ | 21,200 | $0.09 \%$ | 530.000 |
| 4G | $12,956.580$ | $34.94 \%$ | $6,866,995$ | $28.46 \%$ | 530.000 |
| Grass Total | $37,082.180$ | $100.00 \%$ | $24,124,945$ | $100.00 \%$ | 650.580 |
|  | $16,572.680$ | $13.83 \%$ | $21,530,845$ | $19.02 \%$ | $1,299.177$ |
| Irrigated Total | $63,876.390$ | $53.32 \%$ | $67,199,610$ | $59.36 \%$ | $1,052.025$ |
| Dry Total | $37,082.180$ | $30.96 \%$ | $24,124,945$ | $21.31 \%$ | 650.580 |
| Grass Total | $1,820.080$ | $1.52 \%$ | 91,020 | $0.08 \%$ | 50.008 |
| Waste | 440.090 | $0.37 \%$ | 264,055 | $0.23 \%$ | 600.002 |
| Other | 750.540 | $0.63 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Exempt | $119,791.420$ | $100.00 \%$ | $113,210,475$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $16,572.680$ | $28.61 \%$ | $21,530,845$ | $27.96 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $63,876.390$ | $30.06 \%$ | $67,199,610$ | $36.58 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $37,082.180$ | $10.41 \%$ | $24,124,945$ | $11.06 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,820.080$ | $7.01 \%$ | 91,020 | $7.00 \%$ |
| Other | 440.090 | $18.15 \%$ | 264,055 | $51.58 \%$ |
| Exempt | 750.540 | $3.20 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $119,791.420$ | $18.29 \%$ | $113,210,475$ | $23.56 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 54 - Knox

Market Area: 3

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

Grass:

| 1G1 | 12.260 | $0.00 \%$ | 10,110 | $0.01 \%$ | 824.632 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | $2,331.460$ | $0.90 \%$ | $1,923,520$ | $1.22 \%$ | 825.028 |
| 2G1 | 32.930 | $0.01 \%$ | 21,900 | $0.01 \%$ | 665.047 |
| 2G | $10,537.390$ | $4.06 \%$ | $7,007,445$ | $4.43 \%$ | 665.007 |
| 3G1 | 360.590 | $0.14 \%$ | 219,950 | $0.14 \%$ | 609.972 |
| 3G | $34,991.340$ | $13.50 \%$ | $21,344,845$ | $13.49 \%$ | 610.003 |
| 4G1 | $1,384.380$ | $0.53 \%$ | 837,550 | $0.53 \%$ | 605.000 |
| 4G | $209,626.110$ | $80.85 \%$ | $126,824,100$ | $80.17 \%$ | 605.001 |
| Grass Total | $259,276.460$ | $100.00 \%$ | $158,189,420$ | $100.00 \%$ | 610.118 |
|  | $17,951.260$ | $4.68 \%$ | $21,891,915$ | $9.51 \%$ | $1,219.519$ |
| Irrigated Total | $83,643.800$ | $21.82 \%$ | $48,961,440$ | $21.26 \%$ | 585.356 |
| Dry Total | $259,276.460$ | $67.65 \%$ | $158,189,420$ | $68.69 \%$ | 610.118 |
| Grass Total | $20,447.930$ | $5.33 \%$ | $1,025,170$ | $0.45 \%$ | 50.135 |
| Waste | $1,963.740$ | $0.51 \%$ | 229,760 | $0.10 \%$ | 117.001 |
| Other | $20,068.990$ | $5.24 \%$ |  |  | 600 |
| Exempt | $383,283.190$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $17,951.260$ | $30.98 \%$ | $21,891,915$ | $28.43 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $83,643.800$ | $39.36 \%$ | $48,961,440$ | $26.66 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $259,276.460$ | $72.78 \%$ | $158,189,420$ | $72.55 \%$ |
| Waste | $20,447.930$ | $78.79 \%$ | $1,025,170$ | $78.83 \%$ |
| Other | $1,963.740$ | $80.98 \%$ | 229,760 | $44.88 \%$ |
| Exempt | $20,068.990$ | $85.45 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $383,283.190$ | $58.51 \%$ | $230,297,705$ | $47.92 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 54 - Knox

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 5.750 | 3.12\% | 6,180 | 4.86\% | 1,074.782 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 37.000 | 20.05\% | 35,335 | 27.76\% | 955.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 141.750 | 76.83\% | 85,760 | 67.38\% | 605.008 |
| Irrigated Total | 184.500 | 100.00\% | 127,275 | 100.00\% | 689.837 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 20.580 | 0.33\% | 24,080 | 0.37\% | 1,170.068 |
| 1D | 538.780 | 8.60\% | 614,215 | 9.42\% | 1,140.010 |
| 2D1 | 2,842.390 | 45.38\% | 3,211,900 | 49.24\% | 1,129.999 |
| 2D | 574.970 | 9.18\% | 643,970 | 9.87\% | 1,120.006 |
| 3D1 | 150.600 | 2.40\% | 161,895 | 2.48\% | 1,075.000 |
| 3D | 1,389.960 | 22.19\% | 1,389,960 | 21.31\% | 1,000.000 |
| 4D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D | 745.920 | 11.91\% | 477,390 | 7.32\% | 640.001 |
| Dry Total | 6,263.200 | 100.00\% | 6,523,410 | 100.00\% | 1,041.545 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 G$ | 284.700 | $2.05 \%$ | 236,305 | $2.75 \%$ | 830.014 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | 967.080 | $6.98 \%$ | 681,805 | $7.93 \%$ | 705.014 |
| 3G1 | 29.950 | $0.22 \%$ | 20,665 | $0.24 \%$ | 689.983 |
| 3G | $1,184.840$ | $8.55 \%$ | 817,545 | $9.51 \%$ | 690.004 |
| 4G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G | $11,398.270$ | $82.21 \%$ | $6,838,945$ | $79.57 \%$ | 599.998 |
| Grass Total | $13,864.840$ | $100.00 \%$ | $8,595,265$ | $100.00 \%$ | 619.932 |
| Irrigated Total | 184.500 | $0.86 \%$ | 127,275 | $0.83 \%$ | 689.837 |
| Dry Total | $6,263.200$ | $29.17 \%$ | $6,523,410$ | $42.63 \%$ | $1,041.545$ |
| Grass Total | $13,864.840$ | $64.58 \%$ | $8,595,265$ | $56.16 \%$ | 619.932 |
| Waste | $1,156.520$ | $5.39 \%$ | 57,830 | $0.38 \%$ | 50.003 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | $1,666.650$ | $7.76 \%$ |  |  | 712.829 |
| Market Area Total | $21,469.060$ | $100.00 \%$ | $15,303,780$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 184.500 | $0.32 \%$ | 127,275 | $0.17 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $6,263.200$ | $2.95 \%$ | $6,523,410$ | $3.55 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $13,864.840$ | $3.89 \%$ | $8,595,265$ | $3.94 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,156.520$ | $4.46 \%$ | 57,830 | $4.45 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | $1,666.650$ | $7.10 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $21,469.060$ | $3.28 \%$ | $15,303,780$ | $3.18 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 54 - Knox

Market Area: 5

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

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 209.610 | $0.72 \%$ | 154,065 | $0.95 \%$ | 735.007 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | 240.160 | $0.82 \%$ | 142,895 | $0.88 \%$ | 594.999 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | $5,121.470$ | $17.54 \%$ | $2,944,955$ | $18.14 \%$ | 575.021 |
| 4G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4G | $23,631.040$ | $80.92 \%$ | $12,997,135$ | $80.04 \%$ | 550.002 |
| Grass Total | $29,202.280$ | $100.00 \%$ | $16,239,050$ | $100.00 \%$ | 556.088 |
| Irrigated Total | $5,006.500$ | $11.27 \%$ | $5,171,600$ | $19.87 \%$ | $1,032.977$ |
| Dry Total | $8,158.970$ | $18.37 \%$ | $4,503,585$ | $17.30 \%$ | 551.979 |
| Grass Total | $29,202.280$ | $65.75 \%$ | $16,239,050$ | $62.39 \%$ | 556.088 |
| Waste | $2,034.770$ | $4.58 \%$ | 101,755 | $0.39 \%$ | 50.008 |
| Other | 10.000 | $0.02 \%$ | 11,550 | $0.04 \%$ | $1,155.000$ |
| Exempt | 102.880 | $0.23 \%$ |  |  | 50 |
| Market Area Total | $44,412.520$ | $100.00 \%$ | $26,027,540$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $5,006.500$ | $8.64 \%$ | $5,171,600$ | $6.72 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $8,158.970$ | $3.84 \%$ | $4,503,585$ | $2.45 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $29,202.280$ | $8.20 \%$ | $16,239,050$ | $7.45 \%$ |
| Waste | $2,034.770$ | $7.84 \%$ | 101,755 | $7.82 \%$ |
| Other | 10.000 | $0.41 \%$ | 11,550 | $2.26 \%$ |
|  | 102.880 | $0.44 \%$ |  |  |
| Exempt | $44,412.520$ | $6.78 \%$ | $26,027,540$ | $5.42 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 54 - Knox


| Total | $655,067.770$ | $480,553,555$ | $655,067.770$ | $100.00 \%$ | $480,553,555$ | $100.00 \%$ | 733.593 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* 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 | 101,580,530 | 105,363,985 | 3,783,455 | 3.72 | 969,377 | 2.77 |
| 2. Recreational | 57,484,940 | 60,532,625 | 3,047,685 | 5.3 | 1,013,855 | 3.54 |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 40,382,420 | 41,106,460 | 724,040 | 1.79 | *---------- | 1.79 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 199,447,890 | 207,003,070 | 7,555,180 | 3.79 | 1,983,232 | 2.79 |
| 5. Commercial | 27,698,615 | 27,747,260 | 48,645 | 0.18 | 240,065 | -0.69 |
| 6. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 18,891,025 | 19,899,150 | 1,008,125 | 5.34 | 1,574,810 | -3 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 46,589,640 | 47,646,410 | 1,056,770 | 2.27 | 240,065 | 1.75 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 246,037,530 | 254,649,480 | 8,611,950 | 3.5 | 3,798,107 | 1.96 |
| 11. Irrigated | 62,652,420 | 77,010,105 | 14,357,685 | 22.92 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 167,841,820 | 183,683,780 | 15,841,960 | 9.44 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 189,106,520 | 218,047,285 | 28,940,765 | 15.3 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 1,304,415 | 1,300,420 | -3,995 | -0.31 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 0 | 0 | 511,965 |  |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 420,905,175 | 480,553,555 | 59,648,380 | 14.17 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 666,942,705 | 735,203,035 | 68,260,330 | 10.23 | 3,798,107 | 9.67 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
# 2007 Knox County 3 year Plan of Assessment 

| County Description |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Residential/Recreational | 4817 | $24 \%$ | $158,799,965$ |
| Commercial | 582 | $4 \%$ | $28,107,420$ |
| Agricultural | $\underline{5354}$ | $\underline{72 \%}$ | $\underline{480,892,015}$ |
| Totals | 10753 | $100 \%$ | $667,799,400$ |

Budget, Staffing and Training
2007 Budget-\$ 138,804
Appraisal Budget-\$ 61,275
Staff
1 Assessor
1 Deputy Assessor
3 Full Time Clerks/Appraisers
All staff functions are performed by everyone in the office. This makes all help accessible at all times to any customer. The Assessor does all of the reports.

## Contract Appraiser-none

## Training

As the Assessor, I have attended all workshops and completed my educational hours needed to maintain my Assessor Certificate. The Deputy Assessor and the office clerks all attend school on a regular basis-several have been cancelled over the past couple years.

2007 R \& O Statistics

| Property Class | Median | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | $96.00 \%$ | 10.30 | 106.50 |
| Commercial | $98.00 \%$ | 12.07 | 96.20 |
| Agricultural | $72.00 \%$ | 18.89 | 105.39 |

## 3 Year Appraisal Plan

## $\underline{2008}$

## Residential

For 2008, I plan to continue the field work of reviewing the cities. My staff has begun the review of the cities and villages including Bloomfield, Crofton, Creighton, Niobrara, Verdigre, Wausa, Winnetoon, Verdel, Bazile Mills and Lindy. This includes a physical inspection of all homes located within the cities. The physical inspection will include verifying all information located on the property record card along with all new digital photos. Interior inspections will also be completed whenever possible. These properties will be valued using the cost approach using market derived depreciation. The lake areas, just having completed their physical review and inspection in 2006-2007, will have appraisal maintenance. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed for all residential properties.

## Commercial

If all continues well, the Commercial review and data entry will be completed and finalized for the 2008 assessment and if not all complete, 2009 will be the target date. Staff began data collection in late summer of 2007, with all properties physically inspected and digital photos taken. All market studies shall be used to determine a value for the newly appraised properties.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. A review of the market area boundaries will also be addressed. As in the past, all sales will again be plotted on a county map showing the market area and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house by the Assessor using all information collected and with the help of the state liaison. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed for agricultural properties. With the help of FSA, we plan on getting farmer/owner permission slips mailed and returned to us in order that we can verify their information with the FSA, if necessary. If GIS is not already implemented, the goal would be to have it switched over to the TerraScan program and activated.

## Other

Personnel will continue reviewing and entering land use into the GIS system. I shall possibly order property record cards and transfer all information, gather personal
property, file homestead exemptions, work within the sale rosters and set the yearly values, file abstract, implement 521's sale transfers, change property names, handle the splits, maintain property record cards, generate yearly records, review all sales, keep mapping up to date, generate the valuation change notices, prepare omitted and undervalued notices, hear protests, review and visit each protest sight, figure growth, prepare centrally assessed values, generate valuations and distribute, certify school values, correct sales file roster, prepare charitable exemptions, generate trust land reports, prepare values and report to Nebraska Commission of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, combine and balance levies, prepare Certified Tax List, prepare school aid reports, generate tax roles, tax list corrections, prepare update with FSA records and update CRP records and prepare for TERC.

## 2009

## Residential

City property review should be completed and implemented for 2009 tax year. There will be appraisal maintenance for the lake area properties in 2009. Appraisal maintenance includes review and pickup work. Sale review includes a physical inspection of the property. We shall talk to either the buyer or the seller. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

## Commercial

Commercial maintenance will be the agenda for 2009. Knox County generally has a smaller number of sales in commercial property. A market analysis will continue to be done as in the past. Sales review and pickup work will continue as before

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map showing market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house, by me, using all the information collected and with the advice of the state liaison. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed for agricultural properties. We shall continue reviewing the ag land for land use updates.

## Other

Personnel will continue with entering land use into the GIS system. I shall possibly order property record cards and transfer all information, gather personal property, file homestead exemptions, work within the sales rosters and set the yearly values, file abstract, implement 521's sale transfers, change property names, handle the splits, maintain property record cards, generate yearly records, review all sales, keep mapping up to date, generate the valuation change notices, prepare omitted and undervalued
notices, hear protests, review and visit each protest sight, figure growth, prepare centrally assessed values, generate valuations and distribute, certify school values, correct sales file roster, prepare charitable exemptions, generate trust land reports, prepare values and report to Nebraska Commission of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, combine and balance levies, prepare Certified Tax List, prepare school aid reports, generate tax roles, tax list corrections, prepare update with FSA records and update CRP records and prepare for TERC.

## $\underline{2010}$

## Residential

There will be appraisal maintenance for the city and lake areas for 2010. Appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pickup work. Sale review includes a physical inspection of the property. We shall try to contact either the buyer or the seller. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits.

## Commercial

Commercial maintenance will be conducted for 2010. Knox County normally does not have a large number of sales in commercial property. A market analysis will continue to be done as in the past. Sales review and pickup work will continue as before

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map showing market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house, by me, using all the information collected and with the advice of the state liaison. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed for agricultural properties. Personnel will continue to update ag land properties

## Other

Personnel will continue with entering land use into the GIS system. I shall possibly order property record cards and transfer all information, gather personal property, file homestead exemptions, work within the sales rosters and set the yearly values, file abstract, implement 521's sale transfers, change property names, handle the splits, maintain property record cards, generate yearly records, review all sales, keep mapping up to date, generate the valuation change notices, prepare omitted and undervalued notices, hear protests, review and visit each protest sight, figure growth, prepare centrally assessed values, generate valuations and distribute, certify school values, correct sales file roster, prepare charitable exemptions, generate trust land reports, prepare values and report to Nebraska Commission of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, combine and
balance levies, prepare Certified Tax List, prepare school aid reports, generate tax roles, tax list corrections, prepare update with FSA records and update CRP records and prepare for TERC.

Class

| Residential | Continue City <br> Review | Implement City <br> Review |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Commercial | Implement Commercial | Market |
|  | Review | Analysis |
| Agricultural | Market | Market |
|  | Analysis | Analysis |
|  | Possible GIS | Begin Farm Site |
|  | Implementation | Review |
|  |  | Continue Upgrading |
|  |  | Ag Land Use |

## 2010

Market
Analysis
Market
Analysis
Market
Analysis
Continue Farm
Site Review
Continue Upgrading
Ag Land Use

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Knox 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 |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 0 |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
|  | $\$ 111,004.90$ |
| 7. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
|  | $\$ 22,000.00$ |
| 8. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
|  | $\$ 111,004.90$ |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
|  | Separate budget |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | $\$ 2,000$ |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | $\$ 44,074.00$ |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | $\$ 0$ |
|  |  |


| 13. | Total budget |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | $\$ 155,078.00$ (General and Appraisal) |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
|  | $\$ 10,000+$ |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Terra Scan |
|  | Terra Scan |
| 3. | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
| 4. | Yes |
|  | Staff maintains the Cadastral Maps? <br> 5.Does the county have GIS software?Yes - GIS Workshop <br> 6.Who maintains the GIS software and maps?Staff <br> 7.Personal Property software:Terra Scan |

## 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?

Bazile Mills, Bloomfield, Center, Creighton, Crofton, Niobrara, Santee, Verdel, Wausa, and Winnetoon
4. When was zoning implemented? 7/1995

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
| In House |  |
| 2. | Other services |
|  | N/A |

## 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 Knox County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70062760000063875760.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.


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

