## Preface

The requirements for the assessment of real property for the purposes of property taxation are found in Nebraska law. The Constitution of Nebraska requires that "taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all real property and franchises as defined by the Legislature except as otherwise provided in or permitted by this Constitution." Neb. Const. art. VIII, sec. 1 (1) (1998). The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as "the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade." Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (R.R.S., 2003). The assessment level for all real property, except agricultural land and horticultural land, is one hundred percent of actual value. The assessment level for agricultural land and horticultural land, hereinafter referred to as agricultural land, is seventy-five percent of actual value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201(1) and (2)(R.S. Supp., 2007). More importantly, for purposes of equalization, similar properties must be assessed at the same proportion of actual value when compared to each other. Achieving the constitutional requirement of proportionality ultimately ensures the balance equity in the imposition of the property tax by local units of government on each parcel of real property.

The assessment process, implemented under the authority of the county assessor, seeks to value similarly classed properties at the same proportion to actual value. This is not a precise mathematical process, but instead depends on the judgment of the county assessor, based on his or her analysis of relevant factors that affect the actual value of real property. Nebraska law provides ranges of acceptable levels of value that must be met to achieve the uniform and proportionate valuation of classes and subclasses of real property in each county. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023 (R.S. Supp., 2007) requires that all classes of real property, except agricultural land, be assessed within the range of ninety-two and one hundred percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land be assessed within the range of sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation be assessed within the range sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of its special value; and, when the land is disqualified for special value the recapture value be assessed at actual value.

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

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

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

The Division is required by Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2007) to develop and maintain a state-wide sales file of all arm's length transactions. From this sales file the Division prepares an assessment sales ratio study in compliance with acceptable mass appraisal standards. The assessment sales ratio study is the primary mass appraisal performance evaluation tool. From the sales file, the Division prepares statistical analysis from a non-randomly selected set of observations, known as sales, from which inferences about the population, known as a class or subclass of real property, may be drawn. The statistical reports contained in the R\&O are developed in compliance with standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers, hereinafter referred to as the IAAO.

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

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

Finally, after reviewing all of the information available to the Property Tax Administrator regarding the level and quality of assessment for classes and subclasses of real property in each county, the Property Tax Administrator, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027(4) (R.S. Supp., 2005), may make recommendations for adjustments to value for classes and subclasses of property. All of the factors relating to the Property Tax Administrator's determination of level of value and quality of assessment shall be taken into account in the making of such recommendations. Such recommendations are not binding on the Commission.
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## 2008 Commission Summary

## Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 115 | COD | 11.89 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 25,755,772$ | PRD | 103.53 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 25,260,772$ | COV | 23.52 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 23,777,275$ | STD | 22.92 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 219,659$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 11.48 |
| Av. Assessed Value | $\$ 206,759$ | Min | 28.05 |
| Median | 96.55 | Max | 247.00 |
| Wgt. Mean | 94.13 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 95.56 to 98.11 |
| Mean | 97.45 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 90.89 to 97.36 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 19.78 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 7.81 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 4.96 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 325,417 |


| Commercial Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 115 | 96.55 | 11.89 | 103.53 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 119 | 96.55 | 14.36 | 99.48 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 110 | 96.50 | 16.51 | 99.34 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 100 | 94.93 | 19.17 | 98.97 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 103 | 96.30 | 15.27 | 99.76 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 132 | 98 | 13.08 | 99.57 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 146 | 100 | 16.13 | 100.32 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 169 | 95 | 22.26 | 97.02 |

## 2008 Commission Summary

| 71 Platte |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultural Land - Current |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Sales | 67 | COD |  | 22.35 |
| Total Sales Price | \$15,322,832 | PRD |  | 103.56 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | ice $\quad \$ 15,027,352$ | COV |  | 32.65 |
| Total Assessed Value | e \$10,044,265 | STD |  | 22.60 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | - \$224,289 | Avg. |  | 15.53 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | e $\$ 149,914$ | Min |  | 29.81 |
| Median | 69.50 | Max |  | 173.22 |
| Wgt. Mean | 66.84 | 95\% |  | 63.24 to 74.12 |
| Mean | 69.22 | 95\% |  | 62.98 to 70.70 |
|  |  | 95\% Mean C.I. |  | 63.81 to 74.63 |
| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County |  |  |  | 36.6 |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  | 1.34 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period |  |  |  | 1.69 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base |  |  |  | 176,677 |
| Agricultural Land - History |  |  |  |  |
| Year N | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| 2008 | 67 | 69.50 | 22.35 | 103.56 |
| 2007 | 88 | 71.89 | 21.01 | 103.04 |
| 2006 | 88 | 74.06 | 19.49 | 107.56 |
| 2005 | 108 | 74.02 | 19.31 | 104.86 |
| 2004 | 91 | 74.71 | 15.87 | 102.40 |
| 2003 | 91 | 74 | 18.05 | 103.42 |
| 2002 | 78 | 74 | 19.39 | 100.89 |
| 2001 | 95 | 74 | 16.73 | 103.5 |

Opinions

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Platte County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me about the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While I rely primarily on the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property, my opinion of level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained in the RO. Although my primary resource regarding quality of assessment are the performance standards issued by the IAAO, my opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

## Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Platte County is $93 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Platte County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Commercial Real Property

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

## Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land in Platte County is $69 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Platte County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 



## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified



## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 01/2005 to 06/30/2 | 7 Posted | fore: 01/1 | 008 |  | (! AVTot=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | f Sale |  | 904 | MEDIAN: | 91 |  |  | 17.94 | 95\% | dian C.I.: 90.36 | to 92.11 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | s Pric |  | 381 | WGT. MEAN: | 90 |  | STD: | 16.26 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 88. | to 90.67 |  |
|  | L Adj. S | s Pric |  | 381 | MEAN : | 91 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 10.87 |  | Mean C.I.: 89 | 1 to 91.73 |  |
|  | AL Asse | d Valu |  | 835 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | s Pric |  |  | COD : | 11.93 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 191.26 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | 825 | PRD : | 100.99 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 3.05 |  |  | Printed: 02/09 | 12:55:29 |
| YEAR BUILT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 0 OR Blan |  | 82 | 81.24 | 77.30 | 75.19 | 24.71 |  | 102.80 | 3.05 | 134.38 | 75.31 to 89.52 | 30,050 | 22,594 |
| Prior TO 1860 |  | 1 | 50.43 | 50.43 | 50.43 |  |  |  | 50.43 | 50.43 | N/A | 135,000 | 68,085 |
| 1860 тO 1899 |  | 22 | 90.69 | 96.77 | 91.33 | 17.06 |  | 105.96 | 57.03 | 191.26 | 84.20 to 99.23 | 57,209 | 52,247 |
| 1900 TO 1919 |  | 107 | 90.72 | 93.63 | 89.77 | 14.58 |  | 104.30 | 51.90 | 180.86 | 87.44 to 95.29 | 70,157 | 62,981 |
| 1920 TO 1939 |  | 61 | 88.73 | 90.76 | 88.66 | 13.10 |  | 102.37 | 54.91 | 143.61 | 86.65 to 94.99 | 83,654 | 74,166 |
| 1940 TO 1949 |  | 47 | 92.26 | 93.43 | 92.86 | 11.46 |  | 100.61 | 63.24 | 127.86 | 88.59 to 95.20 | 81,512 | 75,690 |
| 1950 TO 1959 |  | 130 | 91.07 | 90.73 | 90.03 | 9.27 |  | 100.78 | 56.67 | 128.92 | 89.15 to 93.03 | 91,490 | 82,367 |
| 1960 TO 1969 |  | 123 | 89.73 | 89.92 | 88.42 | 10.36 |  | 101.70 | 62.01 | 139.94 | 87.72 to 92.47 | 109,305 | 96,643 |
| 1970 TO 1979 |  | 126 | 91.63 | 93.14 | 91.05 | 11.04 |  | 102.30 | 56.34 | 155.78 | 88.86 to 94.47 | 120,466 | 109,686 |
| 1980 TO 1989 |  | 82 | 93.55 | 93.52 | 92.85 | 8.39 |  | 100.73 | 69.67 | 124.26 | 90.90 to 96.99 | 138,726 | 128,805 |
| 1990 TO 1994 |  | 32 | 92.02 | 92.55 | 91.19 | 7.17 |  | 101.48 | 77.12 | 114.88 | 88.50 to 94.84 | 181,023 | 165,081 |
| 1995 TO 1999 |  | 38 | 89.74 | 88.85 | 87.08 | 8.01 |  | 102.02 | 67.95 | 108.92 | 85.33 to 92.49 | 182,628 | 159,041 |
| 2000 TO Pres | nt | 53 | 92.80 | 92.49 | 90.20 | 7.26 |  | 102.54 | 53.54 | 142.33 | 91.06 to 95.02 | 199,291 | 179,760 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 904 | 91.12 | 90.67 | 89.77 | 11.93 |  | 100.99 | 3.05 | 191.26 | 90.36 to 92.11 | 105,626 | 94,825 |
| SALE PRICE RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| _ Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 4 | 83.44 | 83.75 | 79.67 | 24.63 |  | 105.12 | 62.50 | 105.60 | N/A | 2,250 | 1,792 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 5 | 85.71 | 104.01 | 105.80 | 52.19 |  | 98.31 | 40.63 | 180.86 | N/A | 7,540 | 7,977 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 9 | 85.71 | 95.00 | 100.76 | 39.65 |  | 94.29 | 40.63 | 180.86 | 62.50 to 148.14 | 5,188 | 5,228 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 53 | 89.38 | 87.14 | 85.61 | 26.59 |  | 101.79 | 6.55 | 191.26 | 76.52 to 98.63 | 19,539 | 16,727 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 131 | 94.02 | 94.23 | 93.65 | 17.22 |  | 100.62 | 3.05 | 178.91 | 90.11 to 97.49 | 46,371 | 43,426 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 308 | 92.72 | 92.70 | 92.52 | 9.29 |  | 100.20 | 45.67 | 132.08 | 91.41 to 94.15 | 80,933 | 74,876 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 232 | 87.25 | 87.01 | 86.83 | 9.91 |  | 100.21 | 50.43 | 121.50 | 84.89 to 88.91 | 120,110 | 104,285 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 143 | 92.21 | 90.45 | 90.22 | 7.92 |  | 100.26 | 51.90 | 109.81 | 90.83 to 93.23 | 187,881 | 169,504 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 28 | 89.29 | 88.37 | 87.71 | 9.29 |  | 100.75 | 53.54 | 113.89 | 84.31 to 93.04 | 309,614 | 271,570 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 904 | 91.12 | 90.67 | 89.77 | 11.93 |  | 100.99 | 3.05 | 191.26 | 90.36 to 92.11 | 105,626 | 94,825 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Ra | e: $07 /$ | 005 to 06/3 | 07 Posted | fore: 01/18 | 008 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | of Sales: |  | 904 | MEDIAN: | 91 |  | COV: | 17.94 |  | dian C.I.: 90.36 | to 92.11 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | es Price: |  | 381 | WGT. MEAN: | 90 |  | STD: | 16.26 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 88.8 | to 90.67 |  |
|  | L Adj. S | es Price: |  | 381 | MEAN : | 91 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 10.87 |  | Mean C.I.: 89 | 1 to 91.73 |  |
|  | AL Asse | d Value: |  | 835 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | es Price: |  | 626 | COD: | 11.93 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 191.26 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | ed Value: |  | 825 | PRD : | 100.99 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 3.05 |  |  | Printed: 02/09 | 12:55:29 |
| ASSESSED VA | UE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 11 | 40.63 | 44.76 | 16.67 | 77.78 |  | 268.55 | 3.05 | 105.60 | 6.55 to 103.00 | 14,886 | 2,481 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 7 | 79.65 | 73.64 | 69.02 | 23.62 |  | 106.69 | 46.33 | 99.05 | 46.33 to 99.05 | 11,357 | 7,838 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 18 | 60.25 | 55.99 | 33.78 | 47.80 |  | 165.76 | 3.05 | 105.60 | 17.70 to 85.71 | 13,513 | 4,564 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 60 | 85.51 | 88.43 | 81.29 | 23.59 |  | 108.78 | 41.82 | 180.86 | 75.76 to 96.00 | 24,701 | 20,080 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 143 | 90.08 | 91.75 | 88.75 | 14.01 |  | 103.38 | 45.67 | 191.26 | 87.72 to 92.39 | 52,544 | 46,632 |
| 60000 тO | 99999 | 391 | 91.38 | 91.62 | 89.51 | 10.77 |  | 102.35 | 50.43 | 178.91 | 89.84 to 92.51 | 90,582 | 81,084 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 156 | 90.77 | 90.40 | 89.32 | 8.75 |  | 101.21 | 56.34 | 132.08 | 88.91 to 92.31 | 135,676 | 121,186 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 122 | 93.27 | 92.81 | 91.72 | 7.17 |  | 101.19 | 53.54 | 113.62 | 92.09 to 94.90 | 203,762 | 186,889 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 14 | 91.64 | 91.37 | 90.67 | 9.61 |  | 100.77 | 67.95 | 113.89 | 84.96 to 99.41 | 343,207 | 311,192 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 904 | 91.12 | 90.67 | 89.77 | 11.93 |  | 100.99 | 3.05 | 191.26 | 90.36 to 92.11 | 105,626 | 94,825 |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 82 | 81.24 | 77.30 | 75.19 | 24.71 |  | 102.80 | 3.05 | 134.38 | 75.31 to 89.52 | 30,050 | 22,594 |
| 10 |  | 2 | 81.13 | 81.13 | 58.40 | 30.15 |  | 138.92 | 56.67 | 105.60 | N/A | 35,250 | 20,587 |
| 20 |  | 36 | 93.30 | 95.81 | 93.60 | 16.94 |  | 102.36 | 61.43 | 148.14 | 84.71 to 101.71 | 51,977 | 48,651 |
| 25 |  | 44 | 91.05 | 97.09 | 93.20 | 16.55 |  | 104.17 | 67.53 | 191.26 | 86.46 to 97.87 | 59,391 | 55,353 |
| 30 |  | 542 | 90.54 | 91.05 | 88.82 | 10.88 |  | 102.51 | 50.43 | 178.91 | 89.29 to 91.74 | 93,653 | 83,178 |
| 35 |  | 121 | 92.58 | 93.22 | 92.18 | 6.82 |  | 101.12 | 71.23 | 122.27 | 92.02 to 93.92 | 163,539 | 150,753 |
| 40 |  | 55 | 93.31 | 91.28 | 89.44 | 8.94 |  | 102.05 | 53.54 | 109.01 | 89.33 to 98.41 | 212,470 | 190,036 |
| 45 |  | 11 | 94.50 | 93.98 | 92.27 | 6.92 |  | 101.85 | 73.04 | 108.16 | 86.90 to 102.49 | 247,545 | 228,418 |
| 50 |  | 9 | 94.15 | 94.87 | 93.83 | 7.02 |  | 101.10 | 84.96 | 109.81 | 86.58 to 101.27 | 315,000 | 295,575 |
| 55 |  | 1 | 91.94 | 91.94 | 91.94 |  |  |  | 91.94 | 91.94 | N/A | 350,000 | 321,785 |
| 60 |  | 1 | 113.89 | 113.89 | 113.89 |  |  |  | 113.89 | 113.89 | N/A | 325,000 | 370,150 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 904 | 91.12 | 90.67 | 89.77 | 11.93 |  | 100.99 | 3.05 | 191.26 | 90.36 to 92.11 | 105,626 | 94,825 |



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

## Residential

For 2008, the county conducted a market study of the residential class of real property. Market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the level of value for the residential class was at 91 percent of market value. The statistics showed that the towns of Columbus and Platte Center were below the statutory range. In addition, the Rural and Subdivision subclasses were below the acceptable range.

To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis and to complete the cyclical valuation process, Platte County completed the following assessment actions:
$>$ A review was conducted of the lake properties in the Subdivision and Columbus assessor locations. This was completed as part of the review cycle and resulted in the creation of new depreciation schedules and the implementation of 2006 cost updates.
$>$ Properties along golf courses in the city of Columbus Subdivision assessor locations were reviewed as part of the county's review cycle. Costing was updated and new depreciation schedules were developed.
> Rural Residential townships of Walker, Woodville, St. Bernard, Bismarck, and Columbus East were reviewed as part of the cycle and because of market indication. Physical inspections were completed of all parcels, and the county took new photos of all properties. Cost updates and the development of new depreciation tables resulted in new values for this subclass.

After completing the assessment actions for 2008 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level and were equalized throughout the county.

Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new and omitted construction.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Platte County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Appraiser and Assistant |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor, Appraiser |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Appraiser and Assistant |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | 2005 for residential and 2006 for mobile homes |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | Depreciation studies are done with subclass reviews, so 2008 is the most recent year that depreciation studies were conducted in subclasses within Platte County. |
| 6. | What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | N/A |
| 7. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: |
|  | Approximately 25 |
| 8. | How are these defined? |
|  | The neighborhoods are defined by similar property characteristics |
| 9. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | Yes |
| 10. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural residential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | Around the city of Columbus, yes. |


| 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.) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | The market significance only exists around the city of Columbus. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 109 |  |  | 109 |

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


PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj Sales Price TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
866
$94,019,331$
$94,016,331$
$88,045,280$
108,563
101,668

101, 668

| LOCATIONS: URBAN, | SUBURBAN <br> COUNT | MEDIAN |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | 735 | 92.55 |
| 1 | 64 | 96.96 |
| 2 | 67 | 92.50 |
| 3 |  |  |

MEAN
95.50
93.65
91.74
-

| MIN Sales Ratio: | 820.98 |
| :--- | ---: |
|  |  |

$\qquad$

| STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPRO |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| RANGE |  |
| 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |


|  | 866 | 92.91 | 95.07 | 93.65 | 12.45 | 101.52 | 40.63 | 820.98 | 92.23 to 93.81 | 108,563 | 101,668 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROPERTY TYPE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 01 | 850 | 92.98 | 94.94 | 93.65 | 12.32 | 101.37 | 40.63 | 820.98 | 92.23 to 93.92 | 109,977 | 102,996 |
| 06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07 | 16 | 91.90 | 102.13 | 92.97 | 18.85 | 109.85 | 74.67 | 248.00 | 82.96 to 102.14 | 33,471 | 31,117 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 866 | 92.91 | 95.07 | 93.65 | 12.45 | 101.52 | 40.63 | 820.98 | 92.23 to 93.81 | 108,563 | 101,668 |
| SCHOOL DISTRICT * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |

(blank)
06-0017

| 12-0056 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19-0039 | 4 | 88.93 | 89.35 | 88.85 | 8.56 | 100.57 | 77.99 | 101.56 | N/A | 101,750 | 90,402 |
| 19-0058 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 59-0001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 59-0013 | 3 | 80.76 | 84.20 | 81.99 | 6.93 | 102.69 | 77.53 | 94.31 | N/A | 23,316 | 19,118 |
| 63-0030 | 16 | 94.21 | 102.69 | 91.71 | 21.81 | 111.97 | 54.91 | 248.00 | 86.11 to 109.01 | 72,637 | 66,615 |
| 71-0001 | 682 | 92.54 | 95.16 | 93.81 | 12.48 | 101.44 | 40.63 | 820.98 | 92.02 to 93.43 | 108,276 | 101,577 |
| 71-0005 | 108 | 94.97 | 92.86 | 93.14 | 10.01 | 99.70 | 46.67 | 128.92 | 92.36 to 96.99 | 132,992 | 123,864 |
| 71-0067 | 53 | 96.08 | 97.11 | 93.71 | 13.42 | 103.62 | 62.50 | 180.86 | 89.93 to 99.57 | 78,663 | 73,717 |
| NonValid School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 866 | 92.91 | 95.07 | 93.65 | 12.45 | 101.52 | 40.63 | 820.98 | 92.23 to 93.81 | 108,563 | 101,668 |
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PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
866
$94,019,331$
$94,016,331$
$88,045,280$
108,563
101,668

95\% Median C.I.: 92.23 to 93.8
(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)
$\begin{array}{rrrrrr}\text { WGT. MEAN: } & 94 & \text { STD: } & 37.29 & 95 \% \text { Wgt. Mean C.I.: } & 92.11 \text { to } 95.19 \\ \text { MEAN: } & 95 & \text { AVG.ABS.DEV: } & 11.57 & 95 \% \text { Mean C.I.: } & 92.59 \text { to } 97.55\end{array}$

Printed: 04/01/2008 18:44:14

| YEAR BUILT * |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| 0 OR Blank | 52 |
| Prior TO 1860 | 1 |
| 1860 TO 1899 | 22 |
| 1900 TO 1919 | 107 |
| 1920 TO 1939 | 59 |
| 1940 TO 1949 | 46 |
| 1950 TO 1959 | 130 |
| 1960 TO 1969 | 121 |
| 1970 TO 1979 | 123 |
| 1980 TO 1989 | 82 |
| 1990 TO 1994 | 32 |
| 1995 TO 1999 | 38 |
| 2000 TO Present | 53 |
| ALL_ |  |

MEDIAN
90.63
94.21
91.97
92.81
89.62
92.69
92.16
92.13
94.02
95.96
94.16
92.36
95.02

| 1,668 | PRD: |
| ---: | ---: |
| MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| 112.56 | 137.99 |
| 94.21 | 94.21 |
| 98.60 | 93.21 |
| 95.96 | 92.74 |
| 90.79 | 89.52 |
| 94.67 | 93.99 |
| 91.99 | 91.42 |
| 90.89 | 90.21 |
| 95.33 | 93.68 |
| 95.78 | 95.50 |
| 95.16 | 94.73 |
| 92.81 | 92.59 |
| 96.72 | 94.51 |
| 95.07 | 93.65 |


|  |  | 866 | 92.91 | 95.07 | 93.65 | 12.45 | 101.52 | 40.63 | 820.98 | 92.23 to 93.81 | 108,563 | 101,668 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SALE PRICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 3 | 63.89 | 124.80 | 121.25 | 96.78 | 102.93 | 62.50 | 248.00 | N/A | 2,666 | 3,233 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 4 | 87.14 | 98.94 | 101.58 | 41.05 | 97.40 | 40.63 | 180.86 | N/A | 7,675 | 7,796 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 7 | 85.71 | 110.02 | 105.65 | 58.40 | 104.14 | 40.63 | 248.00 | 40.63 to 248.00 | 5,528 | 5,840 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 38 | 96.78 | 95.50 | 95.30 | 17.47 | 100.20 | 46.33 | 191.26 | 88.89 to 100.00 | 19,193 | 18,291 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 112 | 96.81 | 103.73 | 102.66 | 22.10 | 101.04 | 46.67 | 784.43 | 91.15 to 99.23 | 46,806 | 48,052 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 308 | 93.63 | 96.24 | 95.85 | 11.13 | 100.41 | 63.32 | 820.98 | 92.39 to 95.20 | 80,933 | 77,576 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 231 | 89.65 | 89.40 | 89.27 | 9.36 | 100.14 | 65.39 | 121.50 | 87.69 to 91.13 | 120,108 | 107,224 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 142 | 94.18 | 93.98 | 93.88 | 7.76 | 100.11 | 54.91 | 129.19 | 92.49 to 95.77 | 187,774 | 176,282 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 28 | 97.15 | 95.55 | 94.97 | 8.34 | 100.61 | 69.76 | 119.48 | 92.00 to 99.41 | 309,614 | 294,038 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 866 | 92.91 | 95.07 | 93.65 | 12.45 | 101.52 | 40.63 | 820.98 | 92.23 to 93.81 | 108,563 | 101,668 |



PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified

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


Exhibit 71 - Page 22

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: In correlating the analyses displayed in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales, and because the County applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population.

The County made valuation changes to the several residential subclasses for 2008 because of the results of sales analyses and as part of their reappraisal cycle. The assessment actions determined by the County were applied to the class of properties and the statistics indicate that all subclasses are now valued within the statutory range.

Platte County's assessment practices are considered by the Division to be in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal practices because of the County's systematic and necessary assessment efforts. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential calculated in this property class confirm this determination.

## 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 | 1339 | $\mathbf{8 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 . 6 8}$ |
| 2007 | 1288 | 970 | $\mathbf{7 5 . 3 1}$ |
| 2006 | 1278 | 965 | $\mathbf{7 5 . 5 1}$ |
| 2005 | 1285 | 988 | $\mathbf{7 6 . 8 9}$ |
| 2004 | 1228 | 977 | $\mathbf{7 9 . 5 6}$ |
| 2003 | 1253 | 1062 | $\mathbf{8 4 . 7 6}$ |
| 2002 | 1313 | 1076 | $\mathbf{8 1 . 9 5}$ |
| 2001 | 1300 | 1053 | $\mathbf{8 1}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The lower percentage of sales used by the County in 2008 is primarily because of the removal of the substantially changed sales from the qualified sales file as directed by the Division. It is considered that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales.

## 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 | 91.12 | 2.93 | 93.79 |  |
| 2007 | 94.63 | 0.2 | 94.82 | 94.91 |
| 2006 | 95.89 | 1.98 | 97.79 | 97.43 |
| 2005 | 94.87 | 3.73 | 98.4 | 97.13 |
| 2004 | 95.82 | 1.42 | 97.18 | 96.95 |
| 2003 | 91 | 6.41 | 96.83 | 97 |
| 2002 | 93.69 | 6.34 | 99.63 | 94 |
| 2001 | 92 | -0.46 | 91.58 | 92 |

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

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

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

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

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

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5.83 | 2008 | 2.93 |
| 0.66 | 2007 | 0.2 |
| 2.64 | 2006 | 1.98 |
| 5.24 | 2005 | 3.73 |
| 1.66 | 2004 | 1.42 |
| 7 | 2003 | 6 |
| 6.94 | 2002 | 6.34 |
| 0.01 | 2001 | -0.46 |

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

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the 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 | $\mathbf{9 2 . 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 . 0 7}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

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

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. 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 | 12.45 | 101.52 |
| Difference | 0 | 0 |

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

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 904 | $\mathbf{8 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 8}$ |
| Median | 91.12 | 92.91 | $\mathbf{1 . 7 9}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | 89.77 | 93.65 | 3.88 |
| Mean | 90.67 | 95.07 | 4.4 |
| COD | 11.93 | 12.45 | 0.52 |
| PRD | 100.99 | $\mathbf{1 0 1 . 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 3}$ |
| Min Sales Ratio | 3.05 | 40.63 | $\mathbf{3 7 . 5 8}$ |
| Max Sales Ratio | 191.26 | $\mathbf{8 2 0 . 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 9 . 7 2}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property by the County. The change in the number of sales is attributable to the removal of those sales that experienced significant physical or economic changes after the sale occurred. The removal was a combined effort of the Division and the county assessor.

## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified

|  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 01/2004 to 06/30/2 | 7 Posted | re: 01 | 08 |  | (!: AVTot=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER of | f Sales: |  | 124 | MEDIAN: | 96 |  | COV: | 27.03 | 95\% | dian C.I.: 93.9 | to 96.55 | (!: Derived) |
| TOTAL Sales | s Price: |  |  | WGT. MEAN: | 94 |  | STD: | 25.81 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 90. | to 96.96 |  |
| TOTAL Adj. Sales | s Price: |  | , 272 | MEAN : | 95 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 14.23 |  | Mean C.I.: 90. | to 100.03 |  |
| TOTAL Assessed | d Value: |  | , 480 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Adj. Sales | s Price: |  |  | COD: | 14.90 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 247.00 |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Assessed | d Value: |  | , 229 | PRD : | 101.85 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 28.05 |  |  | Printed: 02/09/ | 12:55:42 |
| DATE OF SALE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 TO 09/30/04 | 18 | 95.33 | 87.29 | 95.45 | 13.80 |  | 91.45 | 33.25 | 116.67 | 83.33 to 98.78 | 171,863 | 164,044 |
| 10/01/04 тO 12/31/04 | 8 | 98.00 | 94.67 | 96.30 | 4.46 |  | 98.30 | 72.96 | 100.53 | 72.96 to 100.53 | 109,503 | 105,456 |
| 01/01/05 тO 03/31/05 | 13 | 100.00 | 117.50 | 98.68 | 25.93 |  | 119.07 | 84.27 | 247.00 | 90.00 to 136.00 | 226,094 | 223,121 |
| 04/01/05 то 06/30/05 | 11 | 94.62 | 87.88 | 93.21 | 10.60 |  | 94.29 | 64.29 | 104.17 | 67.91 to 97.96 | 181,051 | 168,750 |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 | 9 | 99.05 | 95.40 | 94.89 | 4.59 |  | 100.53 | 73.60 | 100.82 | 94.13 to 100.00 | 138,292 | 131,231 |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 9 | 96.15 | 95.32 | 96.43 | 8.62 |  | 98.85 | 77.63 | 123.81 | 83.33 to 98.99 | 204,722 | 197,412 |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 7 | 96.83 | 98.95 | 101.10 | 9.15 |  | 97.87 | 80.11 | 133.33 | 80.11 to 133.33 | 81,985 | 82,888 |
| 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 | 5 | 94.67 | 104.98 | 112.15 | 23.63 |  | 93.61 | 76.67 | 171.88 | N/A | 75,600 | 84,789 |
| 07/01/06 то 09/30/06 | 14 | 90.88 | 88.56 | 98.30 | 19.95 |  | 90.09 | 28.05 | 137.75 | 66.16 to 101.62 | 386,580 | 380,012 |
| 10/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 9 | 89.29 | 83.08 | 88.80 | 14.54 |  | 93.56 | 55.56 | 104.55 | 57.66 to 95.24 | 482,715 | 428,664 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 12 | 94.47 | 98.61 | 85.46 | 18.94 |  | 115.38 | 67.71 | 190.22 | 76.50 to 104.60 | 444,416 | 379,809 |
| 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 | 9 | 92.31 | 101.40 | 94.84 | 15.33 |  | 106.91 | 74.16 | 134.52 | 90.00 to 120.00 | 269,144 | 255,262 |
| _ Study Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 TO 06/30/05 | 50 | 96.43 | 96.46 | 96.10 | 15.20 |  | 100.37 | 33.25 | 247.00 | 92.90 to 98.11 | 178,007 | 171,065 |
| 07/01/05 то 06/30/06 | 30 | 96.35 | 97.80 | 98.09 | 10.18 |  | 99.70 | 73.60 | 171.88 | 94.64 to 98.99 | 134,634 | 132,065 |
| 07/01/06 TO 06/30/07 | 44 | 93.02 | 92.80 | 91.56 | 17.57 |  | 101.36 | 28.05 | 190.22 | 85.85 to 96.27 | 397,997 | 364,391 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01/01/05 TO 12/31/05 | 42 | 96.29 | 100.26 | 96.22 | 14.17 |  | 104.20 | 64.29 | 247.00 | 94.62 to 98.99 | 190,902 | 183,681 |
| 01/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 35 | 94.12 | 91.57 | 95.09 | 16.83 |  | 96.30 | 28.05 | 171.88 | 84.00 to 96.83 | 305,956 | 290,923 |
|  | 124 | 95.50 | 95.49 | 93.75 | 14.90 |  | 101.85 | 28.05 | 247.00 | 93.94 to 96.55 | 245,574 | 230,229 |
| ASSESSOR LOCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| COLUMBUS | 76 | 95.55 | 93.90 | 92.90 | 11.62 |  | 101.08 | 55.56 | 175.00 | 93.76 to 97.89 | 307,507 | 285,677 |
| CORNLEA | 1 | 92.15 | 92.15 | 92.15 |  |  |  | 92.15 | 92.15 | N/A | 60,000 | 55,290 |
| CRESTON | 5 | 92.90 | 106.91 | 97.24 | 55.94 |  | 109.95 | 33.25 | 247.00 | N/A | 47,200 | 45,896 |
| DUNCAN | 1 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |  |  |  | 100.00 | 100.00 | N/A | 68,400 | 68,400 |
| HUMPHREY | 9 | 92.23 | 92.38 | 92.00 | 13.54 |  | 100.42 | 66.16 | 136.00 | 76.67 to 98.75 | 100,372 | 92,340 |
| MONROE | 2 | 74.07 | 74.07 | 71.96 | 4.81 |  | 102.92 | 70.50 | 77.63 | N/A | 19,500 | 14,032 |
| PLATTE CENTER | 5 | 95.73 | 92.14 | 92.19 | 24.83 |  | 99.94 | 28.05 | 137.75 | N/A | 22,900 | 21,112 |
| RURAL | 11 | 96.55 | 111.59 | 100.34 | 21.37 |  | 111.21 | 85.71 | 190.22 | 89.22 to 171.88 | 161,954 | 162,500 |
| SUBDIVISION | 14 | 95.75 | 93.51 | 96.23 | 10.52 |  | 97.18 | 36.00 | 134.52 | 90.00 to 100.00 | 276,998 | 266,542 |
| $\ldots$ ALL_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 124 | 95.50 | 95.49 | 93.75 | 14.90 |  | 101.85 | 28.05 | 247.00 | 93.94 to 96.55 | 245,574 | 230,229 |

## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

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




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

## Commercial

For the 2008 tax year the county conducted a market study of the commercial class of property. Market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the level of value for the class, and all assessor locations with sufficient market representation were within the statutory range. Those without sufficient market representation were assumed to be at the statutory level. A further inspection into the market analysis indicated that properties in the downtown area of the city of Columbus had assessed values that should be reviewed.

To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis and to complete their cyclical review process, Platte County completed the following assessment actions:
> Commercial properties in the downtown area of the City of Columbus were revalued using updated income, expenses, and capitalization rates. The county updated the cost approach structure using 2006 costing and by developing a new depreciation schedule using market derived information.
> All commercial properties were updated using 2006 costing from Marshall and Swift.

After completing the assessment actions for 2008 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level and were equalized throughout the county.

Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new and omitted construction.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Platte County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Appraiser and Assistant |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor and Appraiser |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Appraiser and Assistant |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | 2005 |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | Depreciation studies are done with subclass reviews, so 2006 was the most recent year of depreciation studies conducted in subclasses within Platte County. |
| 6. | When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | 2006 |
| 7. | When was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | N/A |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? |
|  | 3 |
| 9. | How are these defined? |
|  | Columbus and Humphrey are analyzed separately and all others are analyzed together. |
| 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?) |
|  | No |



Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{1 0 2}$ |

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



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

State Stat Run
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## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Platte County

## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales, and because the County applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population.

The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, but the price related differential is slightly above the acceptable range. Based on the assessment practices demonstrated by the county, this class of property is considered to have been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 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 | 231 | 115 | 49.78 |
| 2007 | 210 | 119 | 56.67 |
| 2006 | 213 | 110 | 51.64 |
| 2005 | 196 | 100 | 51.02 |
| 2004 | 217 | 103 | 47.47 |
| 2003 | 237 | 132 | 55.7 |
| 2002 | 247 | 153 | 61.94 |
| 2001 | 251 | 169 | 67.33 |

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

## 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 $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 95.50 | 0.3 | 95.79 |  |
| 2007 | 96.55 | -0.09 | 96.47 | 96.55 |
| 2006 | 86.79 | 9.26 | 94.83 | 96.50 |
| 2005 | 91.07 | 0.88 | 91.87 | 94.93 |
| 2004 | 96.33 | 0.66 | 96.97 | 96.30 |
| 2003 | 98 | -0.83 | 97.19 | 98 |
| 2002 | 86.18 | 6.54 | 91.82 | 100 |
| 2001 | 92 | 1.17 | 93.08 | 95 |

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

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

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

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

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

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -1.4 | 2008 | 0.3 |
| 5.94 | 2007 | $-\mathbf{0 . 0 9}$ |
| 21.43 | 2006 | 9.26 |
| 5.86 | 2005 | 0.88 |
| 20.15 | 2004 | 0.66 |
| 0 | 2003 | -1 |
| 30.2 | 2002 | 6.54 |
| 9.65 | 2001 | 1.17 |

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

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the 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 | $\mathbf{9 6 . 5 5}$ | 94.13 | 97.45 |

COMMERCIAL: The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

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

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. 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 | 11.89 | 103.53 |
| Difference | 0 | 0.53 |

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, but the price related differential is slightly above the acceptable range. Based on the assessment practices demonstrated by the county, this class of property is considered to have been valued uniformly and proportionately.

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 124 | 115 | -9 |
| Median | 95.50 | 96.55 | 1.05 |
| Wgt. Mean | 93.75 | 94.13 | 0.38 |
| Mean | 95.49 | 97.45 | 1.96 |
| COD | 14.90 | 11.89 | $-\mathbf{3 . 0 1}$ |
| PRD | 101.85 | 103.53 | 1.68 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 28.05 | 28.05 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 247.00 | 247.00 | 0 |

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property by the County. The change in the number of sales is attributable to the removal of those sales that experienced significant physical or economic changes after the sale occurred. The removal was a combined effort of the Division and the county assessor.

# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 
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# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 

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



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

## Agricultural

For the 2008 assessment year the county conducted a market study of the agricultural class of property. Using unimproved agricultural sales, the market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the median ratio for the class to be well below the statutory range at $60.91 \%$. The assessor analyzed the agricultural land based on the market indication for dry crop, irrigated, and grass use in each of the three market areas.

To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis, Platte County completed the following assessment actions:
> Market Areas were changed in the county. The county grouped similar parcels based on factors evidenced in the market such as soil type, topography, location to the Platte and Loup rivers, and by the land use of the parcel.
> In Market Area Three, the irrigated average acre value increased by 10.6 percent, and the average dry per acre value increased 19.8 percent. The 4GI and 4G grass categories increased by 11.11 percent and 12.50 percent respectively.
$>$ In Market Area Five, the irrigated average acre value increased by 11.2 percent, and the average dry per acre value increased 20.1 percent. The $3 G, 4 \mathrm{GI}$, and 4 G capability groupings were the only grass categories to increase.
$>$ In the largest market area, Area Six, the irrigated average acre value increased by 9.2 percent, and the average dry per acre value increased 12.2 percent. No grass values were changed from the previous year.
> The farm homes subclass was reviewed alongside the rural residential subclass. The Townships of Walker, Woodville, St. Bernard, Bismark, and Columbus East were reviewed as part of the review cycle and because of market indication. Physical inspections were completed of all parcels, and the county took new photos of all properties. Cost updates and the development of new depreciation tables resulted in new values for this subclass.

After completing the assessment actions for 2008 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level and were equalized throughout the county.

Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new construction.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Platte County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Assessor and Staff |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Assessor and Staff |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | Yes |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | To qualify for agricultural valuation the land must be used for agricultural production. |
| 5. | When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | N/A |
| 6. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 2000 |
| 7. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | Currently working on implementing with GIS |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | GIS and NRD records |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | Deputy and Staff |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | 60\% |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class: |
|  | 3 |


| 9. | How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Market areas are stratified by topography, similar soil types and according to market <br> indication |
| 10. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special <br> valuation for agricultural land within the county? <br> No |

Agricultural Permit Numbers: N/A

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 90 | 200 | 290 |

71 - PLATTE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED
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71 - PLATTE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

NUMBER of Sales

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

$15,322,832$
$15,027,352$
$10,044,265$
224,288
149,914
70 COV: 32.65

95\% Median C.I.: 63.24 to 74.12
(!: Derived)

| 67 | STD : | 22.60 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 69 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 15.53 |

95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 62.98 to 70.70
(!: land $+N A T=0$ )

AVG Assessed Val
MEAN: 69 AVG.ABS.DEV: 15.53

95\% Mean C.I.: 63.81 to 74.63

| MAJORITY LAND USE > | 95\% |
| :--- | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| DRY | 16 |
| DRY-N/A | 15 |
| GRASS | 4 |
| GRASS-N/A | 5 |
| IRRGTD | 7 |
| IRRGTD-N/A | 20 |

MEDIAN
68.38
75.08
46.94
42.57
61.58
71.57

|  |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| 72.24 | 70.61 |
| 73.96 | 72.02 |
| 53.91 | 56.06 |
| 64.55 | 50.88 |
| 63.68 | 59.55 |
| 69.42 | 68.48 |

103.56

MAX Sales Ratio: 173.22
Printed: 04/01/2008 18:44:31
$\qquad$
MAJORITY LAND USE $>880$
RANGE

| RANGE | COUN |
| :--- | :--- |
| DRY |  |
| DRY-N/A |  |
| GRASS |  |
| GRASS-N/A |  |
| IRRGTD |  |
| IRRGTD-N/A |  |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| 67 | 69.50 | 69.22 | 66.84 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 22.35 |  |  |  |
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Type: Qualified Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


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

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



| ASSESSED RANGE | VALUE * | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10000 TO | - 29999 | 2 | 41.34 | 41.34 | 38.39 | 25.39 | 107.68 | 30.84 | 51.83 | N/A | 59,345 | 22,780 |
| 30000 TO | - 59999 | 8 | 43.79 | 50.83 | 44.06 | 35.33 | 115.37 | 29.81 | 103.06 | 29.81 to 103.06 | 109,732 | 48,345 |
| 60000 TO | - 99999 | 13 | 67.25 | 72.96 | 65.60 | 31.71 | 111.22 | 44.27 | 173.22 | 46.51 to 92.02 | 117,029 | 76,770 |
| 100000 то | - 149999 | 15 | 75.99 | 75.62 | 72.32 | 16.42 | 104.56 | 52.51 | 129.76 | 65.02 to 80.51 | 185,194 | 133,932 |
| 150000 TO | - 249999 | 20 | 71.33 | 72.54 | 70.29 | 13.78 | 103.19 | 51.33 | 108.55 | 63.72 to 77.00 | 262,339 | 184,407 |
| 250000 TO | - 499999 | 9 | 67.17 | 68.32 | 65.04 | 14.46 | 105.04 | 51.90 | 85.85 | 53.04 to 84.52 | 498,301 | 324,088 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 67 | 69.50 | 69.22 | 66.84 | 22.35 | 103.56 | 29.81 | 173.22 | 63.24 to 74.12 | 224,288 | 149,914 |

# 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Platte County 

## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Considering the analyses in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency.

The agricultural market in Platte County has been determined by the assessor to have three distinct market areas. The systematic valuation methodology the County uses to analyze sales and determine a schedule of values assures that the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar manner. Only Market Area Six has a sufficient number of sales to indicate a level of value. The other two market areas, Three and Five, both have an insufficient number of sales, leaving the Division to assume that the statutory level has been met in these market areas as well.

The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range in the agricultural class. A further examination of the sales file indicates that low ratios for predominately grass sales in Market Area Five are contributing to the excessive COD. The PRD calculation is slightly high, but is considered to be acceptable given the methodical application of values. Based on the excessive COD, the County is considered not to be in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal techniques.

## 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 | 219 | 67 | 30.59 |
| 2007 | 253 | 88 | 34.78 |
| 2006 | 251 | 88 | 35.06 |
| 2005 | 288 | 108 | 37.5 |
| 2004 | 277 | 91 | 32.85 |
| 2003 | 265 | 91 | 34.34 |
| 2002 | 223 | 78 | 34.98 |
| 2001 | 220 | 99 | 45 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percentage of sales used chart displays that 30.59 percent of the available sales were used for the development of the qualified unimproved agricultural sales file. This percentage is relatively low compared to most counties in the state, but consistent with counties surrounding Platte County. A majority of the disqualified sales are family transactions and are appropriately coded as non-qualified. It is assumed that the County has used all available arm's length sales and has not excessively trimmed the sample.

## 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 $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

|  | Preliminary Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 60.91 | 13.1 | 68.89 | 69.50 |
| 2007 | 70.56 | 2.59 | 72.38 | 71.89 |
| 2006 | 67.92 | 9.64 | 74.47 | 74.06 |
| 2005 | 71.86 | 2.81 | 73.88 | 74.02 |
| 2004 | 68.64 | 5.22 | 72.22 | 74.71 |
| 2003 | 72 | 3.29 | 74.37 | 74 |
| 2002 | 72.62 | 0.4 | 72.91 | 74 |
| 2001 | 73 | 0.72 | 73.53 | 74 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The relationship between the trended preliminary median ratio and the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio is similar especially for the large percentage increase in assessed value. Table III is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county, and suggests that sold parcels and unsold parcels are addressed in the same manner.

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.65 | 2008 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 1}$ |
| 2.46 | 2007 | 2.59 |
| 15.29 | 2006 | 9.64 |
| 3.9 | 2005 | 2.81 |
| 7.84 | 2004 | 5.22 |
| 5 | 2003 | 3 |
| 1.94 | 2002 | 0.4 |
| 1.92 | 2001 | 0.72 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the percent change in the sales file and in the base is 5.45 percentage points. This large of an amount is generally considered to suggest disparate treatment between the sold parcels and the unsold parcels. Further analysis however confirmed that Platte County values agricultural land using a common methodology of establishing per acre value schedules based on the sales, and applying the schedules of values uniformly to the population. The difference displayed in the table may have been a result of a slightly under-representative sales file. Information such as the trended preliminary median ratio, historical results displayed in this table, and the methodology used by Platte County, indicates that the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar fashion for assessment purposes.

## 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 | 69.50 | 66.84 | 69.22 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Of the three measures of central tendency, the median and mean are within the acceptable parameters and the weighted mean is slightly below the acceptable parameters.

## 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 | 22.35 | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 5 6}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{2 . 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 6}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. A further examination of the sales file indicates that low ratios for predominately grass sales are in Market Area Five contributing to the excessive COD. The PRD calculation is slightly high, but is considered to be acceptable given the methodical application of values.

## 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 | 69 | 67 | -2 |
| Median | 60.91 | 69.50 | $\mathbf{8 . 5 9}$ |
| Sgt. Mean | 59.99 | 66.84 | $\mathbf{6 . 8 5}$ |
| Mean | 61.38 | 69.22 | 7.84 |
| COD | 22.03 | 22.35 | 0.32 |
| PRD | 102.31 | 103.56 | 1.25 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 21.91 | 29.81 | 7.9 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 155.99 | 173.22 | 17.23 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property.

## County 71 - Platte

| Total Real Property Value <br> (Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 30) |  | Records |  | 17,739 | Value 2,421,749,095 |  | Total Growth(Sum 17, 25, $\underset{\&}{ } 41$ ) $56,996,184$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule I:Non-Agricultural Records (Res and Rec) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records Urban Value |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
|  |  |  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1. Res } \\ & \text { UnImp Land } \end{aligned}$ | 588 | 8,204,465 | 179 | 3,256,745 | 198 | 2,815,165 | 965 | 14,276,375 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2. Res } \\ & \text { Improv Land } \end{aligned}$ | 8,195 | 110,094,345 | 603 | 12,141,695 | 952 | 15,223,250 | 9,750 | 137,459,290 |  |
| 3. Res Improvements | 8,426 | 705,556,945 | 834 | 94,005,210 | 999 | 103,810,160 | 10,259 | 903,372,315 |  |
| 4. Res Total \% of Total | 9,014 | 823,855,755 | 1,013 | 109,403,650 | 1,197 | 121,848,575 | 11,224 | 1,055,107,980 | 23,104,069 |
|  | 80.31 | 78.08 | 9.02 | 10.36 | 10.66 | 11.54 | 63.27 | 43.56 | 40.53 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5. Rec } \\ & \text { UnImp Land } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 262,890 | 7 | 201,230 | 4 | 301,740 | 15 | 765,860 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6. Rec } \\ & \text { Improv Land } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 66,725 | 11 | 66,725 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7. Rec } \\ & \text { Improvements } \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 404,865 | 11 | 404,865 |  |
| 8. Rec Total \% of Total | 4 | 262,890 | 7 | 201,230 | 15 | 773,330 | 26 | 1,237,450 | 0 |
|  | 15.38 | 21.24 | 26.92 | 16.26 | 57.69 | 62.49 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.00 |
| Res+Rec Total \% of Total | 9,018 | 824,118,645 | 1,020 | 109,604,880 | 1,212 | 122,621,905 | 11,250 | 1,056,345,430 | 23,104,069 |
|  | 80.16 | 78.01 | 9.06 | 10.37 | 10.77 | 11.60 | 63.41 | 43.61 | 40.53 |
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## County 71 - Platte <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 | 243.451 | 572,110 | 1,101.870 | 2,589,395 | 1,345.321 | 3,161,505 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 113.032 | 237,365 | 2,795.263 | 5,870,030 | 2,908.295 | 6,107,395 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 80.810 | 157,575 | 2,335.629 | 4,554,480 | 2,416.439 | 4,712,055 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,324.804 | 6,250,625 | 3,324.804 | 6,250,625 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 108.589 | 189,490 | 2,158.766 | 3,767,045 | 2,267.355 | 3,956,535 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.540 | 5,135 | 2,854.638 | 4,139,245 | 2,858.178 | 4,144,380 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 692.539 | 685,610 | 692.539 | 685,610 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 549.422 | 1,161,675 | 15,263.509 | 27,856,430 | 15,812.931 | 29,018,105 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.217 | 22,885 | 78.706 | 160,565 | 89.923 | 183,450 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.111 | 14,440 | 220.659 | 392,765 | 228.770 | 407,205 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.707 | 1,200 | 167.250 | 284,340 | 167.957 | 285,540 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 304.391 | 494,635 | 304.391 | 494,635 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 54.318 | 82,845 | 380.304 | 579,970 | 434.622 | 662,815 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.460 | 9,510 | 760.871 | 970,110 | 768.331 | 979,620 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 353.299 | 314,435 | 353.299 | 314,435 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 81.813 | 130,880 | 2,265.480 | 3,196,820 | 2,347.293 | 3,327,700 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.291 | 905 | 36.471 | 32,895 | 37.762 | 33,800 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.318 | 175 | 89.426 | 58,835 | 89.744 | 59,010 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 12.406 | 6,200 | 246.669 | 136,175 | 259.075 | 142,375 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 890.653 | 477,765 | 890.653 | 477,765 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 239.582 | 119,795 | 2,203.831 | 1,153,745 | 2,443.413 | 1,273,540 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 120.698 | 54,315 | 2,715.706 | 1,343,185 | 2,836.404 | 1,397,500 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,886.506 | 1,713,875 | 3,886.506 | 1,713,875 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 374.295 | 181,390 | 10,069.262 | 4,916,475 | 10,443.557 | 5,097,865 |


| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 22.291 | 1,675 | 22.291 | 1,675 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 5.513 | 415 | 241.840 | 18,145 | 247.353 | 18,560 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,011.043 | 1,474,360 | 27,862.382 | 35,989,545 | 28,873.425 | 37,463,905 |



## County 71 - Platte <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,773.444 | 7,088,400 | 28,792.367 | 71,829,020 | 31,565.811 | 78,917,420 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 1,351.641 | 3,243,950 | 30,437.225 | 73,047,545 | 31,788.866 | 76,291,495 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 401.407 | 932,280 | 16,973.825 | 37,245,955 | 17,375.232 | 38,178,235 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 971.010 | 2,111,940 | 3,939.419 | 8,131,420 | 4,910.429 | 10,243,360 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 397.039 | 804,000 | 20,430.738 | 41,371,915 | 20,827.777 | 42,175,915 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 380.088 | 731,680 | 43,923.471 | 84,552,300 | 44,303.559 | 85,283,980 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 977.632 | 1,614,125 | 18,228.776 | 29,165,990 | 19,206.408 | 30,780,115 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 13.294 | 14,620 | 978.025 | 1,066,435 | 991.319 | 1,081,055 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 7,265.555 | 16,540,995 | 163,703.846 | 346,410,580 | 170,969.401 | 362,951,575 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 429.222 | 1,079,510 | 16,604.206 | 38,970,690 | 17,033.428 | 40,050,200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 432.499 | 973,130 | 24,426.903 | 54,958,000 | 24,859.402 | 55,931,130 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 159.430 | 334,805 | 11,499.202 | 22,610,660 | 11,658.632 | 22,945,465 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 297.043 | 579,250 | 2,474.168 | 4,422,630 | 2,771.211 | 5,001,880 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 94.251 | 177,200 | 16,508.302 | 31,018,355 | 16,602.553 | 31,195,555 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 127.105 | 221,795 | 43,813.581 | 76,427,475 | 43,940.686 | 76,649,270 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 308.244 | 431,545 | 13,436.064 | 18,792,475 | 13,744.308 | 19,224,020 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 4.125 | 4,085 | 1,638.643 | 1,590,185 | 1,642.768 | 1,594,270 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,851.919 | 3,801,320 | 130,401.069 | 248,790,470 | 132,252.988 | 252,591,790 |


| 63. 1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 63.203 | 50,570 | 798.920 | 657,505 | 862.123 | 708,075 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 52.349 | 41,880 | 2,044.600 | 1,698,495 | 2,096.949 | 1,740,375 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 28.535 | 22,830 | 3,316.254 | 2,719,585 | 3,344.789 | 2,742,415 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 133.578 | 103,415 | 2,344.689 | 1,819,840 | 2,478.267 | 1,923,255 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 4.162 | 3,120 | 2,198.211 | 1,752,785 | 2,202.373 | 1,755,905 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 180.856 | 127,290 | 5,690.008 | 4,141,675 | 5,870.864 | 4,268,965 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 460.150 | 302,535 | 5,026.300 | 3,431,165 | 5,486.450 | 3,733,700 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 53.182 | 31,910 | 4,587.239 | 2,778,205 | 4,640.421 | 2,810,115 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 976.015 | 683,550 | 26,006.221 | 18,999,255 | 26,982.236 | 19,682,805 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 41.293 | 3,100 | 2,337.029 | 175,330 | 2,378.322 | 178,430 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 16.271 | 2,985 | 1,175.410 | 302,550 | 1,191.681 | 305,535 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 10,151.053 | 21,031,950 | 323,623.575 | 614,678,185 | 333,774.628 | 635,710,135 |
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## County 71 - Platte

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

| AgLand | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 9,874.422 | 21,776,765 | 188,990.482 | 393,825,645 | 198,864.904 | 415,602,410 |
| 77.Dry Land | 0.000 | 0 | 2,328.206 | 4,583,430 | 134,824.717 | 255,547,025 | 137,152.923 | 260,130,455 |
| 78.Grass | 0.000 | 0 | 3,130.640 | 2,462,580 | 44,788.929 | 31,757,220 | 47,919.569 | 34,219,800 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 919.853 | 68,995 | 3,929.207 | 294,770 | 4,849.060 | 363,765 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 68.011 | 6,460 | 1,511.807 | 327,785 | 1,579.818 | 334,245 |
| 81.Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 0.000 | 0 | 16,321.132 | 28,898,230 | 374,045.142 | 681,752,445 | 390,366.274 | 710,650,675 |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 71 - Platte
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 1,345.321 | 8.51\% | 3,161,505 | 10.89\% | 2,350.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 2,908.295 | 18.39\% | 6,107,395 | 21.05\% | 2,099.991 |
| 2A | 2,416.439 | 15.28\% | 4,712,055 | 16.24\% | 1,949.999 |
| 3A1 | 3,324.804 | 21.03\% | 6,250,625 | 21.54\% | 1,879.998 |
| 3A | 2,267.355 | 14.34\% | 3,956,535 | 13.63\% | 1,745.000 |
| 4A1 | 2,858.178 | 18.07\% | 4,144,380 | 14.28\% | 1,450.007 |
| 4A | 692.539 | 4.38\% | 685,610 | 2.36\% | 989.994 |
| Irrigated Total | 15,812.931 | 100.00\% | 29,018,105 | 100.00\% | 1,835.087 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 89.923 | 3.83\% | 183,450 | 5.51\% | 2,040.078 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 228.770 | 9.75\% | 407,205 | 12.24\% | 1,779.975 |
| 2D | 167.957 | 7.16\% | 285,540 | 8.58\% | 1,700.078 |
| 3D1 | 304.391 | 12.97\% | 494,635 | 14.86\% | 1,624.998 |
| 3D | 434.622 | 18.52\% | 662,815 | 19.92\% | 1,525.037 |
| 4D1 | 768.331 | 32.73\% | 979,620 | 29.44\% | 1,274.997 |
| 4D | 353.299 | 15.05\% | 314,435 | 9.45\% | 889.996 |
| Dry Total | 2,347.293 | 100.00\% | 3,327,700 | 100.00\% | 1,417.675 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 37.762 | $0.36 \%$ | 33,800 | $0.66 \%$ | 895.079 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 89.744 | $0.86 \%$ | 59,010 | $1.16 \%$ | 657.536 |
| 2G | 259.075 | $2.48 \%$ | 142,375 | $2.79 \%$ | 549.551 |
| 3G1 | 890.653 | $8.53 \%$ | 477,765 | $9.37 \%$ | 536.421 |
| 3G | $2,443.413$ | $23.40 \%$ | $1,273,540$ | $24.98 \%$ | 521.213 |
| 4G1 | $2,836.404$ | $27.16 \%$ | $1,397,500$ | $27.41 \%$ | 492.701 |
| 4G | $3,886.506$ | $37.21 \%$ | $1,713,875$ | $33.62 \%$ | 440.980 |
| Grass Total | $10,443.557$ | $100.00 \%$ | $5,097,865$ | $100.00 \%$ | 488.134 |
|  | $15,812.931$ | $54.77 \%$ |  | $1,835.087$ |  |
| Irrigated Total | $2,347.293$ | $8.13 \%$ | $29,018,105$ | $77.46 \%$ | $1,417.675$ |
| Dry Total | $10,443.557$ | $36.17 \%$ | $3,327,700$ | $8.88 \%$ | 488.134 |
| Grass Total | 22.291 | $0.08 \%$ | $5,097,865$ | $13.61 \%$ | 75.142 |
| Waste | 247.353 | $0.86 \%$ | 1,675 | $0.00 \%$ | 75.034 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 18,560 | $0.05 \%$ |  |
| Exempt | $28,873.425$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  | 10 |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  |  |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $15,812.931$ | $7.95 \%$ | $29,018,105$ | $6.98 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,347.293$ | $1.71 \%$ | $3,327,700$ | $1.28 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $10,443.557$ | $21.79 \%$ | $5,097,865$ | $14.90 \%$ |
| Waste | 22.291 | $0.46 \%$ | 1,675 | $0.46 \%$ |
| Other | 247.353 | $15.66 \%$ | 18,560 | $5.55 \%$ |
|  | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Exempt | $28,873.425$ | $7.40 \%$ | $37,463,905$ | $5.27 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 71 - Platte
Market Area: $\quad 5$

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 2,426.676 | 20.08\% | 5,702,680 | 24.13\% | 2,349.996 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 954.418 | 7.90\% | 2,004,280 | 8.48\% | 2,100.002 |
| 2A | 3,797.302 | 31.43\% | 7,499,675 | 31.73\% | 1,975.000 |
| 3A1 | 438.025 | 3.63\% | 827,870 | 3.50\% | 1,890.006 |
| 3A | 3,828.454 | 31.69\% | 6,699,800 | 28.35\% | 1,750.001 |
| 4A1 | 534.195 | 4.42\% | 795,950 | 3.37\% | 1,489.998 |
| 4A | 103.502 | 0.86\% | 102,475 | 0.43\% | 990.077 |
| Irrigated Total | 12,082.572 | 100.00\% | 23,632,730 | 100.00\% | 1,955.935 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 439.979 | 17.24\% | 897,550 | 21.31\% | 2,039.983 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 144.871 | 5.68\% | 257,870 | 6.12\% | 1,779.997 |
| 2D | 533.953 | 20.92\% | 907,715 | 21.56\% | 1,699.990 |
| 3D1 | 95.577 | 3.74\% | 155,315 | 3.69\% | 1,625.024 |
| 3D | 1,174.026 | 45.99\% | 1,790,380 | 42.52\% | 1,524.991 |
| 4D1 | 143.768 | 5.63\% | 183,310 | 4.35\% | 1,275.040 |
| 4D | 20.468 | 0.80\% | 18,825 | 0.45\% | 919.728 |
| Dry Total | 2,552.642 | 100.00\% | 4,210,965 | 100.00\% | 1,649.649 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 121.616 | $1.16 \%$ | 99,855 | $1.06 \%$ | 821.067 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 49.984 | $0.48 \%$ | 47,665 | $0.50 \%$ | 953.605 |
| 2G | 559.172 | $5.33 \%$ | 425,120 | $4.50 \%$ | 760.266 |
| 3G1 | 85.137 | $0.81 \%$ | 64,450 | $0.68 \%$ | 757.015 |
| 3G | $5,771.133$ | $55.00 \%$ | $5,272,890$ | $55.86 \%$ | 913.666 |
| 4G1 | 952.580 | $9.08 \%$ | 870,260 | $9.22 \%$ | 913.582 |
| 4G | $2,954.154$ | $28.15 \%$ | $2,658,890$ | $28.17 \%$ | 900.051 |
| Grass Total | $10,493.776$ | $100.00 \%$ | $9,439,130$ | $100.00 \%$ | 899.497 |
| Irrigated Total | $12,082.572$ | $43.59 \%$ | $23,632,730$ | $63.06 \%$ | $1,955.935$ |
| Dry Total | $2,552.642$ | $9.21 \%$ | $4,210,965$ | $11.24 \%$ | $1,649.649$ |
| Grass Total | $10,493.776$ | $37.86 \%$ | $9,439,130$ | $25.19 \%$ | 899.497 |
| Waste | $2,448.447$ | $8.83 \%$ | 183,660 | $0.49 \%$ | 75.010 |
| Other | 140.784 | $0.51 \%$ | 10,150 | $0.03 \%$ | 72.096 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 1, |
| Market Area Total | $27,718.221$ | $100.00 \%$ | $37,476,635$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $12,082.572$ | $6.08 \%$ | $23,632,730$ | $5.69 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,552.642$ | $1.86 \%$ | $4,210,965$ | $1.62 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $10,493.776$ | $21.90 \%$ | $9,439,130$ | $27.58 \%$ |
| Waste | $2,448.447$ | $50.49 \%$ | 183,660 | $50.49 \%$ |
| Other | 140.784 | $8.91 \%$ | 10,150 | $3.04 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $27,718.221$ | $7.10 \%$ |  | $5.27 \%$ |

[^1]
## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 71 - Platte
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 31,565.811 | 18.46\% | 78,917,420 | 21.74\% | 2,500.091 |
| 1A | 31,788.866 | 18.59\% | 76,291,495 | 21.02\% | 2,399.943 |
| 2 A 1 | 17,375.232 | 10.16\% | 38,178,235 | 10.52\% | 2,197.279 |
| 2A | 4,910.429 | 2.87\% | 10,243,360 | 2.82\% | 2,086.041 |
| 3A1 | 20,827.777 | 12.18\% | 42,175,915 | 11.62\% | 2,024.983 |
| 3A | 44,303.559 | 25.91\% | 85,283,980 | 23.50\% | 1,924.991 |
| 4A1 | 19,206.408 | 11.23\% | 30,780,115 | 8.48\% | 1,602.596 |
| 4 A | 991.319 | 0.58\% | 1,081,055 | 0.30\% | 1,090.521 |
| Irrigated Total | 170,969.401 | 100.00\% | 362,951,575 | 100.00\% | 2,122.903 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 17,033.428 | 12.88\% | 40,050,200 | 15.86\% | 2,351.270 |
| 1D | 24,859.402 | 18.80\% | 55,931,130 | 22.14\% | 2,249.898 |
| 2D1 | 11,658.632 | 8.82\% | 22,945,465 | 9.08\% | 1,968.109 |
| 2D | 2,771.211 | 2.10\% | 5,001,880 | 1.98\% | 1,804.943 |
| 3D1 | 16,602.553 | 12.55\% | 31,195,555 | 12.35\% | 1,878.961 |
| 3D | 43,940.686 | 33.22\% | 76,649,270 | 30.35\% | 1,744.380 |
| 4D1 | 13,744.308 | 10.39\% | 19,224,020 | 7.61\% | 1,398.689 |
| 4D | 1,642.768 | 1.24\% | 1,594,270 | 0.63\% | 970.477 |
| Dry Total | 132,252.988 | 100.00\% | 252,591,790 | 100.00\% | 1,909.913 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 862.123 | $3.20 \%$ | 708,075 | $3.60 \%$ | 821.315 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 G | $2,096.949$ | $7.77 \%$ | $1,740,375$ | $8.84 \%$ | 829.955 |
| 2G1 | $3,344.789$ | $12.40 \%$ | $2,742,415$ | $13.93 \%$ | 819.906 |
| 2G | $2,478.267$ | $9.18 \%$ | $1,923,255$ | $9.77 \%$ | 776.048 |
| 3G1 | $2,202.373$ | $8.16 \%$ | $1,755,905$ | $8.92 \%$ | 797.278 |
| 3G | $5,870.864$ | $21.76 \%$ | $4,268,965$ | $21.69 \%$ | 727.144 |
| 4G1 | $5,486.450$ | $20.33 \%$ | $3,733,700$ | $18.97 \%$ | 680.531 |
| 4G | $4,640.421$ | $17.20 \%$ | $2,810,115$ | $14.28 \%$ | 605.573 |
| Grass Total | $26,982.236$ | $100.00 \%$ | $19,682,805$ | $100.00 \%$ | 729.472 |
| Irrigated Total | $170,969.401$ | $51.22 \%$ | $362,951,575$ | $57.09 \%$ | $2,122.903$ |
| Dry Total | $132,252.988$ | $39.62 \%$ | $252,591,790$ | $39.73 \%$ | $1,909.913$ |
| Grass Total | $26,982.236$ | $8.08 \%$ | $19,682,805$ | $3.10 \%$ | 729.472 |
| Waste | $2,378.322$ | $0.71 \%$ | 178,430 | $0.03 \%$ | 75.023 |
| Other | $1,191.681$ | $0.36 \%$ | 305,535 | $0.05 \%$ | 256.389 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $333,774.628$ | $100.00 \%$ | $635,710,135$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,904.608$ |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $170,969.401$ | $85.97 \%$ | $362,951,575$ | $87.33 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $132,252.988$ | $96.43 \%$ | $252,591,790$ | $97.10 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $26,982.236$ | $56.31 \%$ | $19,682,805$ | $57.52 \%$ |
| Waste | $2,378.322$ | $49.05 \%$ | 178,430 | $49.05 \%$ |
| Other | $1,191.681$ | $75.43 \%$ | 305,535 | $91.41 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $333,774.628$ | $85.50 \%$ | $635,710,135$ | $89.45 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 71 - Platte

| AgLand | Urban |  | SubUrban <br> Acres <br> Value |  | Rural <br> Acres | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 9,874.422 | 21,776,765 188 | 188,990.482 | 393,825,645 |
| Dry | 0.000 | 0 | 2,328.206 | 4,583,430 134 | 134,824.717 | 255,547,025 |
| Grass | 0.000 | 0 | 3,130.640 | 2,462,580 | 44,788.929 | 31,757,220 |
| Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 919.853 | 68,995 | 3,929.207 | 294,770 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0 | 68.011 | 6,460 | 1,511.807 | 327,785 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Total | 0.000 | 0 | 16,321.132 | 28,898,230 37 | 374,045.142 | 681,752,445 |
| AgLand | Total <br> Acres | Value | Acres \% | ** Value | \% of Value* | Average <br> Assessed Value* |
| Irrigated | 198,864.904 | 415,602,410 | 198,864.904 | \% 415,602,410 | O 58.48\% | 2,089.873 |
| Dry | 137,152.923 | 260,130,455 | 137,152.923 | \% 260,130,455 | $536.60 \%$ | 1,896.645 |
| Grass | 47,919.569 | 34,219,800 | 47,919.569 | \% 34,219,800 | - 4.82\% | 714.109 |
| Waste | 4,849.060 | 363,765 | 4,849.060 | \% 363,765 | 5 0.05\% | 75.017 |
| Other | 1,579.818 | 334,245 | 1,579.818 | \% 334,245 | 5 0.05\% | 211.571 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | \% 0 | 0 0.00\% | 0.000 |


| Total | $\mathbf{3 9 0 , 3 6 6 . 2 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 0 , 6 5 0 , 6 7 5}$ | $390,366.274$ | $100.00 \%$ | $710,650,675$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,820.471$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* 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)

71 Platte

|  | 2007 CTL <br> County Total | 2008 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2007 Form 45-2006 CTL) | Percent <br> Change | 2008 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 1,002,739,390 | 1,055,107,980 | 52,368,590 | 5.22 | 23,104,069 | 2.92 |
| 2. Recreational | 1,129,095 | 1,237,450 | 108,355 | 9.6 | 0 | 9.6 |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 95,035,085 | 100,709,075 | 5,673,990 | 5.97 | *--------- | 5.97 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 1,098,903,570 | 1,157,054,505 | 58,150,935 | 5.29 | 23,104,069 | 3.19 |
| 5. Commercial | 291,350,870 | 301,927,515 | 10,576,645 | 3.63 | 30,167,350 | -6.72 |
| 6. Industrial | 156,137,535 | 177,086,340 | 20,948,805 | 13.42 | 0 | 13.42 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 72,287,970 | 75,030,060 | 2,742,090 | 3.79 | 3,724,765 | -1.36 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 519,776,375 | 554,043,915 | 34,267,540 | 6.59 | 32,258,425 | 0.39 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 1,618,679,945 | 1,711,098,420 | 92,418,475 | 5.71 | 56,996,184 | 2.19 |
| 11. Irrigated | 349,556,210 | 415,602,410 | 66,046,200 | 18.89 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 246,232,950 | 260,130,455 | 13,897,505 | 5.64 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 31,951,895 | 34,219,800 | 2,267,905 | 7.1 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 400,995 | 363,765 | -37,230 | -9.28 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 187,620 | 187,620 | 146,625 | 78.15 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 628,329,670 | 710,650,675 | 82,321,005 | 13.1 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 2,247,009,615 | 2,421,749,095 | 174,739,480 | 7.78 | 56,996,184 | 5.24 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^2]
# PLATTE COUNTY <br> PLAN OF ASSESSMENT 

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

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

## County Description of Real Property in Platte County:

Per the 2007 County Abstract, Platte County consists of the following real property types:

|  | Parcels | \%of Total Parcels | \% of Taxable | Value Base |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Residential | 11172 | $63 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $1,003,393,770$ |
| Commercial | 1396 | $8 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $293,507,025$ |
| Industrial | 66 | $.004 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $154,698,600$ |
| Recreational | 26 | $.002 \%$ | $1 \%$ | 921,995 |
| Agricultural | 5017 | $29 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $796,140,185$ |
| Special Value | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ |
|  | 17,677 | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $2,248,661,575$ |

Agricultural land-taxable acres 409,353.608
New Property: For assessment year 2008, an estimated 368 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

## Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

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

## Assessor, Deputy Assessor and 3.5 Clerks work on Personal Property\& Homestead Exemptions, answers the phone.

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

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

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

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

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2007:

| Property Class | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 95 | 9.56 | 100.93 |
| Commercial | 97 | 14.36 | 99.48 |
| Agricultural Land | 72 | 21.01 | 103.04 |

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2008:

## Residential

Sales Review of neighborhoods. Plan to review Rural residential, Lake Areas and Golf Course Areas. Approx (411) parcels.

## Commercial

Sales review checking the statistics. Commercial reappraisal Columbus downtown area planned for 2008.

## Agricultural

Rural improvement review including acreages and farmsteads. Review ag land sales. Review market areas. Review Columbus, Woodville, Walker, \& Bismark Townships.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

## Residential

Review some neighborhoods in Columbus. Sales review. Duncan, Monroe, Platte Center.

## Commercial

Review sales and sales statistics.

## Agricultural

Review ag land sales. Continue GIS. Review Butler, Saint Bernard, Grandville, Humphrey, Creston Townships.

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010

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

Commercial- Sales review of Commercial and Industrial. Pick-up work
Agricultural- Sales review on all land classes in each area. Review Joliet, Burrows, Grand Prairie, Sherman Townships.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Platte County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
|  | 1 |
| 3. | Other full-time employees |
|  | 3 |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 1 |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
|  | \$294,780 |
| 7. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
|  | \$29,125 <br> 8. |
|  | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
|  | N/A |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | \$1,000 |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | N/A |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | None |


| 13. | Total budget |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | $\$ 284,780$ |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
|  | Yes, a minimal amount |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

## C. Zoning Information

1. Does the county have zoning?

Yes
2. If so, is the zoning countywide?

No
3. What municipalities in the county are zoned?

Columbus
4. When was zoning implemented?

Zoning has been implemented for several years

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Large commercial is contracted as needed |
| 2. | Other services |
|  | None |

## Certification

This is to certify that the 2008 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:
-Five copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

- One copy to the Platte County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70062760000063875937.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.


[^0]:    Exhibit 71 - Page 86

[^1]:    Exhibit 71 - Page 89

[^2]:     outbuildings is shown in line 7.

