## 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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Richardson

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 332 |  | COD |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |$r 44.38$


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 21.89 |
| :--- | ---: |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period | 7.81 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 8.48 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 31,002 |


| Residential Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 332 | 97.23 | 44.38 | 133.51 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 360 | 96.65 | 39.01 | 123.97 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 283 | 98.38 | 32.08 | 119.08 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 308 | 98.82 | 28.02 | 115.58 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 336 | 98.06 | 29.75 | 115.45 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 322 | 98 | 33.05 | 118.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 369 | 97 | 32.19 | 118.01 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 392 | 97 | 25.2 | 111.7 |

## 2008 Commission Summary

Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 42 | COD | 29.02 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 2,631,214$ | PRD | 96.69 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 2,631,214$ | COV | 40.65 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 2,736,178$ | STD | 40.87 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 62,648$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 28.41 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 65,147$ | Min | 10.53 |
| Median | 97.91 | Max | 202.72 |
| Wgt. Mean | 103.99 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 90.63 to 104.29 |
| Mean | 100.54 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 90.92 to 117.06 |
|  |  | $95 \%$ Mean C.I. | 88.18 to 112.90 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 4.15 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 7.45 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 10.95 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 44,293 |


| Commercial Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 42 | 97.91 | 29.02 | 96.69 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 46 | 98.91 | 29.51 | 106.41 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 46 | 96.81 | 44.03 | 144.71 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 58 | 95.30 | 44.99 | 138.21 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 53 | 93.25 | 55.17 | 160.25 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 55 | 92 | 42.96 | 149.73 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 60 | 95 | 36.37 | 158.62 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 71 | 96 | 32.62 | 128.63 |

## 2008 Commission Summary

| 74 Richardson |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | ---: |

Opinions

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Richardson 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 Richardson County is $97 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Richardson County is not 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 Richardson County is $98 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Richardson County is not 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 Richardson County is $72 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Richardson County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator
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# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 

## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

State Stat Run


## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics <br> \section*{Type: Qualified}

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


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

Residential: Richardson County adjustments and reappraisal areas are as follows; Dawson residential was revalued with new cost table and new depreciation rates. All Rural residential was increased by factoring based on sales study analysis. Residential Salem was decreased by factoring based on sales study analysis. Residential Verdon was increased by factoring based on sales analysis. The county also did their annual pick-up work and permit review.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Richardson County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Vapraiser |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Appraiser |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are <br> used to value this property class? |
|  | June 2007 |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was <br> developed using market-derived information? |
|  | June 2007 |
| 6. | What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was <br> used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | June 2007 |
| 7. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: |
|  | O <br> 8. |
|  | How are these defined? <br> N/A <br> 9. |
| Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |  |
| 10. | Do- these assessor locations are too diverse to use for valuation purposes. <br> Desidential? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | No |


| 11. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> $\mathbf{0 0 1 . 0 7 B}$ ? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the <br> limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | There is no market significance |
| 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 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 395 |  |  | 395 |



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 <br> <br> Type: Qualified <br> <br> Type: Qualified <br> <br> Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008 

 <br> <br> Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008}

| NUMBER of Sales: | 332 |
| ---: | ---: |
| TOTAL Sales Price: | $13,125,356$ |
| TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $13,125,356$ |
| TOTAL Assessed Value: | $11,182,342$ |
| AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 39,534 |
| AVG. Assessed Value: | 33,681 |


| ASSESSED VA RANGE | UE * | 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 | 42 | 95.56 | 123.03 | 65.84 | 74.50 | 186.86 | 8.08 | 730.83 | 64.96 to 111.36 | 3,875 | 2,551 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 30 | 109.21 | 148.77 | 100.54 | 63.83 | 147.97 | 35.25 | 545.60 | 92.32 to 137.48 | 7,335 | 7,374 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 72 | 98.31 | 133.76 | 85.78 | 72.60 | 155.92 | 8.08 | 730.83 | 92.31 to 113.20 | 5,317 | 4,561 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 119 | 100.42 | 121.37 | 91.78 | 46.91 | 132.24 | 23.81 | 399.36 | 96.07 to 112.83 | 20,153 | 18,496 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 87 | 90.97 | 100.36 | 85.38 | 30.91 | 117.54 | 35.56 | 350.84 | 83.70 to 98.24 | 48,966 | 41,809 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 39 | 91.54 | 94.84 | 86.19 | 21.61 | 110.03 | 40.42 | 259.85 | 82.56 to 100.21 | 84,978 | 73,245 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 8 | 82.53 | 82.19 | 76.40 | 22.90 | 107.58 | 54.80 | 115.75 | 54.80 to 115.75 | 147,000 | 112,303 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 7 | 99.51 | 86.02 | 79.07 | 15.65 | 108.79 | 51.09 | 103.82 | 51.09 to 103.82 | 227,714 | 180,059 |
| ALL |  | 332 | 97.23 | 113.74 | 85.20 | 44.38 | 133.51 | 8.08 | 730.83 | 93.89 to 99.53 | 39,534 | 33,681 |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 43 | 95.50 | 103.99 | 63.66 | 54.29 | 163.36 | 8.08 | 730.83 | 63.00 to 100.00 | 21,888 | 13,933 |
| 10 |  | 6 | 110.81 | 202.87 | 100.07 | 101.40 | 202.73 | 73.59 | 545.60 | 73.59 to 545.60 | 15,725 | 15,735 |
| 20 |  | 100 | 101.59 | 123.64 | 98.37 | 44.63 | 125.68 | 16.87 | 323.84 | 95.23 to 115.22 | 20,957 | 20,616 |
| 30 |  | 173 | 94.05 | 108.72 | 83.76 | 41.12 | 129.81 | 23.81 | 399.36 | 89.25 to 98.30 | 49,881 | 41,778 |
| 40 |  | 10 | 96.56 | 90.13 | 87.90 | 14.03 | 102.53 | 64.50 | 115.75 | 67.67 to 103.82 | 136,450 | 119,945 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 332 | 97.23 | 113.74 | 85.20 | 44.38 | 133.51 | 8.08 | 730.83 | 93.89 to 99.53 | 39,534 | 33,681 |
| STYLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 43 | 95.50 | 103.99 | 63.66 | 54.29 | 163.36 | 8.08 | 730.83 | 63.00 to 100.00 | 21,888 | 13,933 |
| 100 |  | 17 | 97.21 | 137.30 | 84.46 | 62.08 | 162.57 | 54.08 | 392.70 | 73.59 to 177.10 | 25,337 | 21,399 |
| 101 |  | 165 | 97.65 | 113.90 | 88.06 | 39.60 | 129.34 | 16.87 | 545.60 | 93.14 to 100.07 | 42,954 | 37,825 |
| 102 |  | 30 | 98.97 | 99.54 | 82.45 | 29.87 | 120.73 | 23.81 | 350.84 | 81.27 to 103.82 | 63,652 | 52,480 |
| 103 |  | 1 | 91.54 | 91.54 | 91.54 |  |  | 91.54 | 91.54 | N/A | 75,000 | 68,657 |
| 104 |  | 73 | 99.53 | 120.62 | 86.45 | 51.80 | 139.52 | 23.81 | 399.36 | 88.28 to 115.34 | 33,800 | 29,221 |
| 106 |  | 1 | 98.37 | 98.37 | 98.37 |  |  | 98.37 | 98.37 | N/A | 102,000 | 100,334 |
| 111 |  | 1 | 88.49 | 88.49 | 88.49 |  |  | 88.49 | 88.49 | N/A | 67,000 | 59,286 |
| 304 |  | 1 | 94.05 | 94.05 | 94.05 |  |  | 94.05 | 94.05 | N/A | 45,000 | 42,321 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 332 | 97.23 | 113.74 | 85.20 | 44.38 | 133.51 | 8.08 | 730.83 | 93.89 to 99.53 | 39,534 | 33,681 |



## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. These quality statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity. The substantial difference, between the mean and weighted mean, suggest a problem with the quality of assessment actions. The county may need to review their assessment practices. The level of value is best represented by the median measure of central tendency.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | $\mathbf{4 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 3 2}$ |
| 2007 | 457 | 360 | $\mathbf{7 8 . 7 7}$ |
| 2006 | 403 | 283 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 2 2}$ |
| 2005 | 393 | 308 | $\mathbf{7 8 . 3 7}$ |
| 2004 | 424 | 336 | $\mathbf{7 9 . 2 5}$ |
| 2003 | 404 | $\mathbf{3 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 . 7}$ |
| 2002 | 425 | 369 | $\mathbf{8 6 . 8 2}$ |
| 2001 | 488 | 392 | $\mathbf{8 0 . 3 3}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized a high 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.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Richardson County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& O$ median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ 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 | 96.68 | 0.77 | 97.43 |  |
| 2007 | 95.96 | 1.24 | 97.15 | 96.65 |
| 2006 | 98.45 | 1.09 | 99.53 | 98.38 |
| 2005 | 99.48 | 0.1 | 99.58 | 98.82 |
| 2004 | 99.70 | 1.89 | 101.58 | 98.06 |
| 2003 | 99 | -0.32 | 98.68 | 98 |
| 2002 | 97 | 0.04 | 97.04 | 97 |
| 2001 | 90 | 14.21 | 102.79 | 97 |

RESIDENTIAL: After review of the trended preliminary ratio and the R\&O median, it is apparent that the two statistics are very similar and support a level of value with the acceptable range. This has been the consistent pattern for Richardson County.

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

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

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

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

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.66 | 2008 | 0.77 |
| 3.29 | 2007 | 1.24 |
| 1.76 | 2006 | 1.09 |
| 2.92 | 2005 | 0.1 |
| 1.57 | 2004 | 1.89 |
| 0 | 2003 | 0 |
| 0.07 | 2002 | 0.04 |
| 14.08 | 2001 | 14.21 |

RESIDENTIAL: After review of the percent change report, it appears that Richardson County has appraised sold parcels similarly to unsold parcels. The percent change in sales base value and the percent change in assessed base value is consistent with the reported assessment action.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 7 . 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 . 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3 . 7 4}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The median measure is within the acceptable range. The weighted mean and mean are outside of the acceptable range.

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 44.38 | $\mathbf{1 3 3 . 5 1}$ |
| Difference | 29.38 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 5 1}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are outside of the acceptable range. These statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity.

## 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 | 355 | 332 | $\mathbf{- 2 3}$ |
| Median | $\mathbf{9 6 . 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 . 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 5}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | $\mathbf{8 4 . 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 . 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 4}$ |
| Mean | 112.87 | $\mathbf{1 1 3 . 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 7}$ |
| COD | 44.66 | $\mathbf{4 4 . 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 2 8}$ |
| PRD | 133.01 | $\mathbf{1 3 3 . 5 1}$ | 0.5 |
| Min Sales Ratio | $\mathbf{5 . 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 1 3}$ |
| Max Sales Ratio | $\mathbf{8 4 3 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 0 . 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 1 2 . 1 7}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The difference in the number of qualified sales is a result of sales sustaining substantial physical changes for 2008 and being removed from the qualified sales roster.

# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 

## Type: Qualified



## Type: Qualified



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



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


## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

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


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

Commercial: No specific changes, the commercial level of value does not indicate a further review of this class. The county did their annual pick-up work and permit review.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Richardson County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Appraiser |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Appraiser |
| 4. | What is the date of Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | June 2007 |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | June 2007 |
| 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? |
|  | June 2007 |
| 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? |
|  | June 2007 |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? |
|  | 0 |
| 9. | How are these defined? |
|  | N/A |
| 10. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | No- these assessor locations are too diverse to use for valuation purposes. |
| 11. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | N/A |


| 12. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> $\mathbf{0 0 1 . 0 7 B}$ ? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the <br> limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | No |

Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 38 |  |  | 38 |



# PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics 



# Type: Qualified <br> 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


## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range that is best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. These quality statistics do not support assessment uniformity or proportionality. The counties use of a high proportion of the commercial sales could be the cause of the quality statistics being outside the acceptable range. The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R\&O ratio suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

## 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 | 59 | 42 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 1 9}$ |
| 2007 | 66 | 46 | 69.7 |
| 2006 | 63 | 46 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 0 2}$ |
| 2005 | 68 | 58 | $\mathbf{8 5 . 2 9}$ |
| 2004 | 61 | 53 | $\mathbf{8 6 . 8 9}$ |
| 2003 | 65 | 55 | $\mathbf{8 4 . 6 2}$ |
| 2002 | 71 | 60 | 84.51 |
| 2001 | $\mathbf{8 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 1}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 . 5 2}$ |

COMMERCIAL: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized a high 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.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Richardson County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& O$ median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ 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 | 99.65 | -0.01 | $\mathbf{9 9 . 6 4}$ |  |
| 2007 | 98.96 | -0.11 | 98.85 | 98.91 |
| 2006 | 95.98 | 1.43 | 97.35 | 96.81 |
| 2005 | 93.52 | -0.67 | 92.9 | 95.30 |
| 2004 | 81.55 | 4.58 | 85.29 | 93.25 |
| 2003 | 92 | -2.79 | 89.43 | 92 |
| 2002 | 95 | -0.05 | 94.95 | 95 |
| 2001 | 96 | 0.13 | 96.12 | 96 |

COMMERCIAL: A review of the trended preliminary ratio and the R\&O median, it is apparent that the two statistics are very similar and support a level of value within the acceptable range.

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -5.9 | 2008 | $-\mathbf{0 . 0 1}$ |
| 2.12 | 2007 | $-\mathbf{0 . 1 1}$ |
| 13.23 | 2006 | $\mathbf{1 . 4 3}$ |
| 13.93 | 2005 | $-\mathbf{- 0 . 6 7}$ |
| 4.91 | 2004 | 4.58 |
| -35 | 2003 | -3 |
| 0 | 2002 | $-\mathbf{0 . 0 5}$ |
| 0 | 2001 | $-\mathbf{0 . 1 3}$ |

COMMERCIAL: A review of the table shows over a 5 point difference between the percent of change in the sales file when compared to the assessed base. The county did not report any assessment actions for the commercial class of property.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 97.91 | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 5 4}$ |

COMMERCIAL: The median measure is within the acceptable range. The weighted mean and mean are both outside of the acceptable range.

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 29.02 | $\mathbf{9 6 . 6 9}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{9 . 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 3 1}$ |

COMMERCIAL: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are outside of the acceptable range. These statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity.

## 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 | 42 | 42 | 0 |
| Median | 99.65 | 97.91 | -1.74 |
| Wgt. Mean | 104.77 | 103.99 | -0.78 |
| Mean | 116.78 | 100.54 | -16.24 |
| COD | 41.47 | 29.02 | -12.45 |
| PRD | 111.46 | 96.69 | -14.77 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 10.53 | 10.53 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 433.60 | 202.72 | -230.88 |

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

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


# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 




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


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

Agricultural: Market area 50 was increased by 29\%. Market area 44 was increased by $29 \%$. Market area 41 was increased by $24 \%$.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Richardson County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Appraiser |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Appraiser |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | Within the office's general written policy, there is a statement that reads, "The Nebraska Agricultural Land Valuation Manual will be used as the manual in assisting with the valuation of agricultural land, using the most recent one made available by the property assessment and taxation of the state of Nebraska. Values of land will be developed through sales in Richardson County with the aid of the Richardson County contracted appraisal service" There is no specific mention of how rural residential acreages are defined. |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | Agricultural land is defined by highest and best use. |
| 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? |
|  | 2006 |
| 6. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 1974 |
| 7. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | 1997 |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | FSA Maps |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | Appraiser |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |


|  | 100\% complete. |
| ---: | :--- |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class: |
|  | Three market areas. |
|  |  |


| 9. | How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | The market areas are defined by location. More specifically, they are defined by <br> section lines and soil type. |
| 10. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special <br> valuation for agricultural land within the county? <br> There is currently no special valuation for agricultural land. |

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 151 |  |  | 151 |

## RICHARDSON COUNTY

 AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVEDPAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified


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




## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are outside the acceptable range. These statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity. The mean and the weighted mean are in the range while the mean is substantially above the range. The trended analysis shows that the county is treating the sold properties similarly to the assessed base. The level of value is best represented by the median level of value.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 144 | 93 | 64.58 |
| 2007 | 139 | 97 | 69.78 |
| 2006 | 127 | 93 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 2 3}$ |
| 2005 | 105 | 67 | 63.81 |
| 2004 | 108 | 66 | 61.11 |
| 2003 | 120 | 80 | 66.67 |
| 2002 | 142 | 99 | 69.72 |
| 2001 | 229 | 144 | 62.88 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized a high 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.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Richardson County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& O$ median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ 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 | 56.79 | 25.66 | 71.36 | 72.40 |
| 2007 | 66.78 | 8.1 | 72.19 | 71.92 |
| 2006 | 67.97 | 8.92 | 74.03 | 75.39 |
| 2005 | 75.91 | 2.05 | 77.47 | 75.49 |
| 2004 | 69.59 | 8.08 | 75.21 | 75.23 |
| 2003 | 75 | 0 | 75 | 75 |
| 2002 | 69 | 11.84 | 77.17 | 75 |
| 2001 | 74 | 0.04 | 74.03 | 74 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: After review of the trended preliminary ratio and the R\&O median, it is apparent that the two statistics are similar and support a level of value with the acceptable range.

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25.4 | 2008 | 25.66 |
| 9.21 | 2007 | $\mathbf{8 . 1}$ |
| 9.77 | 2006 | $\mathbf{8 . 9 2}$ |
| -2.76 | 2005 | 2.05 |
| 8.51 | 2004 | $\mathbf{8 . 0 8}$ |
| 0 | 2003 | 0 |
| 13.72 | 2002 | 11.84 |
| -2.8 | 2001 | 0.04 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in sales base value and the percent change in assessed base value is consistent with the reported assessment actions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{7 2 . 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 . 4 2}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median and the weighted mean are within the acceptable range. The mean is above the acceptable range.

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{4 2 . 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 3 . 1 9}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{2 2 . 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 . 1 9}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are well outside of the acceptable range. These statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity.

## 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 | 95 | 93 | -2 |
| Median | 56.79 | 72.40 | 15.61 |
| Wgt. Mean | 55.21 | 73.40 | 18.19 |
| Mean | 64.62 | 90.42 | 25.8 |
| COD | 30.64 | 42.45 | 11.81 |
| PRD | 117.05 | 123.19 | 6.14 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 19.42 | 23.67 | 4.25 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 225.80 | 950.26 | 724.46 |

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

## County 74-Richardson
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## County 74 - Richardson



| Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  | Rural |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records |  | Value | Records | Value |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 19 | 884,526 |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 74 | 960,820 |


|  | Total |  | Growth |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 19 | 884,526 | 0 |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 79 | 960,820 | 0 |
| 25. Mineral Interest Total | $\mathbf{9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 4 5 , 3 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |


|  | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26. Exempt | 364 | 75 | 298 | 737 |



## County 74 -Richardson

Schedule VI: Agricultural Records: Non-Agricultural Detail

| Non-Agricultural Detail | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 80 | 90.590 | 186,170 |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 |  | 0 | 79 |  | 1,864,636 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11 | 22.810 | 23,309 |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 118 | 283.100 | 169,860 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 5 |  | 30,608 | 134 |  | 856,785 |

38. FarmSite Total

| 39. Road \& Ditches | 0.000 |  |  | 512.270 |  |  | Growth Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0.000 | 0 |  |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |  |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 12 | 13.000 | 26,000 | 12 | 13.000 | 26,000 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 730 | 737.610 | 1,510,650 | 810 | 828.200 | 1,696,820 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 726 |  | 15,758,556 | 805 |  | 17,623,192 | 1,001,434 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 817 | 841.200 | 19,346,012 |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 87 | 173.440 | 109,470 | 98 | 196.250 | 132,779 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 945 | 2,207.190 | 1,438,549 | 1,063 | 2,490.290 | 1,608,409 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 1,077 |  | 8,494,944 | 1,216 |  | 9,382,337 | 0 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 1,314 | 2,686.540 | 11,123,525 |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |  | 5,345.280 |  |  | 5,857.550 |  |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0.000 | 0 |  |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 2,131 | 9,385.290 | 30,469,537 | 1,001,434 |


| Schedule VII: Agricultural Records: Ag Land Detail-Game \& Parks | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 14 | 691.480 | 278,337 | 14 | 691.480 | 278,337 |
| Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records: Special Value | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
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## County 74 - Richardson <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 61.030 | 115,342 | 61.030 | 115,342 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 207.020 | 417,150 | 207.020 | 417,150 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.500 | 918 | 0.500 | 918 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 40.000 | 68,400 | 40.000 | 68,400 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 468.610 | 412,726 | 468.610 | 412,726 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 84.620 | 86,312 | 84.620 | 86,312 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 234.000 | 183,694 | 234.000 | 183,694 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,095.780 | 1,284,542 | 1,095.780 | 1,284,542 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,123.930 | 2,133,410 | 4,209.770 | 8,050,073 | 5,333.700 | 10,183,483 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 937.200 | 1,681,681 | 8,584.330 | 13,325,908 | 9,521.530 | 15,007,589 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 201.540 | 480,829 | 1,242.920 | 2,983,286 | 1,444.460 | 3,464,115 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 467.140 | 757,056 | 3,839.060 | 6,049,230 | 4,306.200 | 6,806,286 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,797.470 | 1,970,766 | 21,850.280 | 24,380,533 | 23,647.750 | 26,351,299 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 1,418.980 | 2,088,757 | 4,815.600 | 6,877,256 | 6,234.580 | 8,966,013 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,555.170 | 1,889,337 | 9,606.460 | 9,704,515 | 11,161.630 | 11,593,852 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 56.800 | 33,998 | 231.770 | 141,459 | 288.570 | 175,457 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 7,558.230 | 11,035,834 | 54,380.190 | 71,512,260 | 61,938.420 | 82,548,094 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 243.190 | 220,009 | 1,508.890 | 1,334,560 | 1,752.080 | 1,554,569 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 258.300 | 266,292 | 1,485.930 | 1,527,694 | 1,744.230 | 1,793,986 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 15.500 | 11,780 | 359.770 | 204,539 | 375.270 | 216,319 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 24.830 | 16,398 | 821.680 | 596,307 | 846.510 | 612,705 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 753.770 | 598,111 | 5,014.900 | 3,993,237 | 5,768.670 | 4,591,348 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 253.410 | 189,381 | 818.410 | 626,919 | 1,071.820 | 816,300 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 675.930 | 426,116 | 4,960.280 | 3,014,445 | 5,636.210 | 3,440,561 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 555.920 | 316,500 | 2,597.840 | 1,457,569 | 3,153.760 | 1,774,069 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,780.850 | 2,044,587 | 17,567.700 | 12,755,270 | 20,348.550 | 14,799,857 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 485.400 | 19,416 | 1,947.830 | 76,870 | 2,433.230 | 96,286 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 508.830 |  | 508.830 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 10,824.480 | 13,099,837 | 74,991.500 | 85,628,942 | 85,815.980 | 98,728,779 |
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## County 74 - Richardson 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value |  | Value |  | Value |  | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,354.540 | 2,361,553 | 7,442.570 | 13,127,995 | 8,797.110 | 15,489,548 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 1,286.700 | 2,544,164 | 7,356.180 | 11,017,638 | 8,642.880 | 13,561,802 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,085.210 | 2,369,033 | 7,106.360 | 14,911,364 | 8,191.570 | 17,280,397 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 1,360.750 | 2,095,948 | 6,344.670 | 9,550,804 | 7,705.420 | 11,646,752 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,180.310 | 2,154,906 | 29,266.350 | 29,088,097 | 31,446.660 | 31,243,003 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 1,857.040 | 2,538,220 | 9,587.710 | 11,947,999 | 11,444.750 | 14,486,219 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 768.190 | 728,881 | 6,282.780 | 5,047,078 | 7,050.970 | 5,775,959 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 86.270 | 49,016 | 1,168.760 | 632,294 | 1,255.030 | 681,310 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 9,979.010 | 14,841,721 | 74,555.380 | 95,323,269 | 84,534.390 | 110,164,990 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 136.950 | 123,535 | 1,419.170 | 1,126,783 | 1,556.120 | 1,250,318 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 402.290 | 392,554 | 2,127.370 | 1,951,038 | 2,529.660 | 2,343,592 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 129.170 | 71,277 | 1,834.120 | 815,649 | 1,963.290 | 886,926 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 193.290 | 134,534 | 2,027.200 | 1,355,869 | 2,220.490 | 1,490,403 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 691.840 | 518,593 | 9,064.370 | 6,618,419 | 9,756.210 | 7,137,012 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 438.170 | 315,920 | 1,854.430 | 1,299,437 | 2,292.600 | 1,615,357 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 627.970 | 371,015 | 4,119.260 | 2,406,250 | 4,747.230 | 2,777,265 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 1,068.260 | 547,343 | 12,621.530 | 6,309,044 | 13,689.790 | 6,856,387 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 3,687.940 | 2,474,771 | 35,067.450 | 21,882,489 | 38,755.390 | 24,357,260 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 587.770 | 23,430 | 4,113.090 | 161,038 | 4,700.860 | 184,468 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 43.620 |  | 270.460 |  | 314.080 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 14,254.720 | 17,339,922 | 113,735.920 | 117,366,796 | 127,990.640 | 134,706,718 |

## County 74 - Richardson 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 72.500 | 186,325 | 72.500 | 186,325 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 29.500 | 74,488 | 29.500 | 74,488 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 152.500 | 352,275 | 152.500 | 352,275 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.000 | 151,940 | 71.000 | 151,940 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 79.500 | 129,585 | 79.500 | 129,585 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 45.500 | 44,363 | 45.500 | 44,363 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 450.500 | 938,976 | 450.500 | 938,976 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 82.000 | 188,192 | 3,116.120 | 6,704,432 | 3,198.120 | 6,892,624 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 979.390 | 2,141,746 | 17,932.810 | 39,810,177 | 18,912.200 | 41,951,923 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 181.680 | 430,382 | 9,880.270 | 18,840,023 | 10,061.950 | 19,270,405 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 85.500 | 166,299 | 3,326.780 | 6,392,198 | 3,412.280 | 6,558,497 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 675.280 | 1,430,866 | 13,517.850 | 24,873,408 | 14,193.130 | 26,304,274 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 844.520 | 1,692,481 | 19,973.930 | 38,847,638 | 20,818.450 | 40,540,119 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,054.970 | 1,586,557 | 13,084.160 | 20,278,856 | 14,139.130 | 21,865,413 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 52.750 | 60,365 | 2,144.150 | 2,472,174 | 2,196.900 | 2,532,539 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 3,956.090 | 7,696,888 | 82,976.070 | 158,218,906 | 86,932.160 | 165,915,794 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.500 | 4,020 | 822.850 | 888,262 | 831.350 | 892,282 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 136.520 | 123,390 | 2,234.950 | 2,513,282 | 2,371.470 | 2,636,672 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.500 | 2,258 | 884.740 | 566,308 | 890.240 | 568,566 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,490 | 171.800 | 138,216 | 174.800 | 140,706 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 103.300 | 90,439 | 1,850.520 | 1,496,637 | 1,953.820 | 1,587,076 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 94.500 | 74,123 | 1,813.890 | 1,473,655 | 1,908.390 | 1,547,778 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 214.780 | 142,750 | 3,540.290 | 2,379,909 | 3,755.070 | 2,522,659 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 99.000 | 42,131 | 5,261.350 | 2,436,074 | 5,360.350 | 2,478,205 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 665.100 | 481,601 | 16,580.390 | 11,892,343 | 17,245.490 | 12,373,944 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 293.590 | 11,744 | 9,310.900 | 386,435 | 9,604.490 | 398,179 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 138.000 | 5,520 | 138.000 | 5,520 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 1,264.230 |  | 1,264.230 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 4,914.780 | 8,190,233 | 109,455.860 | 171,442,180 | 114,370.640 | 179,632,413 |

## County 74 - Richardson

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

| Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,546.280 | 2,223,518 | 1,546.280 | 2,223,518 |
| 77.Dry Land | 0.000 | 0 | 21,493.330 | 33,574,443 | 211,911.640 | 325,054,435 | 233,404.970 | 358,628,878 |
| 78.Grass | 0.000 | 0 | 7,133.890 | 5,000,959 | 69,215.540 | 46,530,102 | 76,349.430 | 51,531,061 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 1,366.760 | 54,590 | 15,371.820 | 624,343 | 16,738.580 | 678,933 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 138.000 | 5,520 | 138.000 | 5,520 |
| 81.Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 43.620 | 0 | 2,043.520 | 0 | 2,087.140 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 0.000 | 0 | 29,993.980 | 38,629,992 | 298,183.280 | 374,437,918 | 328,177.260 | 413,067,910 |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 74-Richardson
Market Area:

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

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 74-Richardson
Market Area:
44

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | $\%$ of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 A 1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 8,797.110 | 10.41\% | 15,489,548 | 14.06\% | 1,760.754 |
| 1D | 8,642.880 | 10.22\% | 13,561,802 | 12.31\% | 1,569.129 |
| 2D1 | 8,191.570 | 9.69\% | 17,280,397 | 15.69\% | 2,109.534 |
| 2D | 7,705.420 | 9.12\% | 11,646,752 | 10.57\% | 1,511.501 |
| 3D1 | 31,446.660 | 37.20\% | 31,243,003 | 28.36\% | 993.523 |
| 3D | 11,444.750 | 13.54\% | 14,486,219 | 13.15\% | 1,265.752 |
| 4D1 | 7,050.970 | 8.34\% | 5,775,959 | 5.24\% | 819.172 |
| 4D | 1,255.030 | 1.48\% | 681,310 | 0.62\% | 542.863 |
| Dry Total | 84,534.390 | 100.00\% | 110,164,990 | 100.00\% | 1,303.197 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | $1,556.120$ | $4.02 \%$ | $1,250,318$ | $5.13 \%$ | 803.484 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 G | $2,529.660$ | $6.53 \%$ | $2,343,592$ | $9.62 \%$ | 926.445 |
| 2G1 | $1,963.290$ | $5.07 \%$ | 886,926 | $3.64 \%$ | 451.754 |
| 2G | $2,220.490$ | $5.73 \%$ | $1,490,403$ | $6.12 \%$ | 671.204 |
| 3G1 | $9,756.210$ | $25.17 \%$ | $7,137,012$ | $29.30 \%$ | 731.535 |
| 3G | $2,292.600$ | $5.92 \%$ | $1,615,357$ | $6.63 \%$ | 704.596 |
| 4G1 | $4,747.230$ | $12.25 \%$ | $2,777,265$ | $11.40 \%$ | 585.028 |
| 4G | $13,689.790$ | $35.32 \%$ | $6,856,387$ | $28.15 \%$ | 500.839 |
| Grass Total | $38,755.390$ | $100.00 \%$ | $24,357,260$ | $100.00 \%$ | 628.487 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | $84,534.390$ | $66.05 \%$ | $110,164,990$ | $81.78 \%$ | $1,303.197$ |
| Grass Total | $38,755.390$ | $30.28 \%$ | $24,357,260$ | $18.08 \%$ | 628.487 |
| Waste | $4,700.860$ | $3.67 \%$ | 184,468 | $0.14 \%$ | 39.241 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 314.080 | $0.25 \%$ |  |  | $1,0.052 .473$ |
| Market Area Total | $127,990.640$ | $100.00 \%$ | $134,706,718$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $84,534.390$ | $36.22 \%$ | $110,164,990$ | $30.72 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $38,755.390$ | $50.76 \%$ | $24,357,260$ | $47.27 \%$ |
| Waste | $4,700.860$ | $28.08 \%$ | 184,468 | $27.17 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 314.080 | $15.05 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $127,990.640$ | $39.00 \%$ | $134,706,718$ | $32.61 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 74 - Richardson
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 72.500 | 16.09\% | 186,325 | 19.84\% | 2,570.000 |
| 1A | 29.500 | 6.55\% | 74,488 | 7.93\% | 2,525.016 |
| 2A1 | 152.500 | 33.85\% | 352,275 | 37.52\% | 2,310.000 |
| 2A | 71.000 | 15.76\% | 151,940 | 16.18\% | 2,140.000 |
| 3A1 | 79.500 | 17.65\% | 129,585 | 13.80\% | 1,630.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 45.500 | 10.10\% | 44,363 | 4.72\% | 975.010 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 450.500 | 100.00\% | 938,976 | 100.00\% | 2,084.297 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 3,198.120 | 3.68\% | 6,892,624 | 4.15\% | 2,155.211 |
| 1D | 18,912.200 | 21.76\% | 41,951,923 | 25.29\% | 2,218.246 |
| 2D1 | 10,061.950 | 11.57\% | 19,270,405 | 11.61\% | 1,915.175 |
| 2D | 3,412.280 | 3.93\% | 6,558,497 | 3.95\% | 1,922.027 |
| 3D1 | 14,193.130 | 16.33\% | 26,304,274 | 15.85\% | 1,853.310 |
| 3D | 20,818.450 | 23.95\% | 40,540,119 | 24.43\% | 1,947.316 |
| 4D1 | 14,139.130 | 16.26\% | 21,865,413 | 13.18\% | 1,546.446 |
| 4D | 2,196.900 | 2.53\% | 2,532,539 | 1.53\% | 1,152.778 |
| Dry Total | 86,932.160 | 100.00\% | 165,915,794 | 100.00\% | 1,908.566 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 831.350 | 4.82\% | 892,282 | 7.21\% | 1,073.292 |
| 1G | 2,371.470 | 13.75\% | 2,636,672 | 21.31\% | 1,111.830 |
| 2G1 | 890.240 | 5.16\% | 568,566 | 4.59\% | 638.665 |
| 2G | 174.800 | 1.01\% | 140,706 | 1.14\% | 804.954 |
| 3G1 | 1,953.820 | 11.33\% | 1,587,076 | 12.83\% | 812.293 |
| 3G | 1,908.390 | 11.07\% | 1,547,778 | 12.51\% | 811.038 |
| 4G1 | 3,755.070 | 21.77\% | 2,522,659 | 20.39\% | 671.800 |
| 4G | 5,360.350 | 31.08\% | 2,478,205 | 20.03\% | 462.321 |
| Grass Total | 17,245.490 | 100.00\% | 12,373,944 | 100.00\% | 717.517 |
| Irrigated Total | 450.500 | 0.39\% | 938,976 | 0.52\% | 2,084.297 |
| Dry Total | 86,932.160 | 76.01\% | 165,915,794 | 92.36\% | 1,908.566 |
| Grass Total | 17,245.490 | 15.08\% | 12,373,944 | 6.89\% | 717.517 |
| Waste | 9,604.490 | 8.40\% | 398,179 | 0.22\% | 41.457 |
| Other | 138.000 | 0.12\% | 5,520 | 0.00\% | 40.000 |
| Exempt | 1,264.230 | 1.11\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 114,370.640 | 100.00\% | 179,632,413 | 100.00\% | 1,570.616 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 450.500 | $29.13 \%$ | 938,976 | $42.23 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $86,932.160$ | $37.25 \%$ | $165,915,794$ | $46.26 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $17,245.490$ | $22.59 \%$ | $12,373,944$ | $24.01 \%$ |
| Waste | $9,604.490$ | $57.38 \%$ | 398,179 | $58.65 \%$ |
| Other | 138.000 | $100.00 \%$ | 5,520 | $100.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | $1,264.230$ | $60.57 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $114,370.640$ | $34.85 \%$ | $179,632,413$ | $43.49 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 74 - Richardson


| Total | $328,177.260$ | $413,067,910$ | $328,177.260$ | $100.00 \%$ | $413,067,910$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,258.673$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Calculates


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

|  | 2007 CTL <br> County Total | 2008 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2007 Form 45-2006 CTL) | Percent Change | 2008 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 128,994,356 | 131,181,876 | 2,187,520 | 1.7 | 1,208,650 | 0.76 |
| 2. Recreational | 648,769 | 668,944 | 20,175 | 3.11 | 0 | 3.11 |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 18,529,104 | 19,346,012 | 816,908 | 4.41 | *---------- | 4.41 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 148,172,229 | 151,196,832 | 3,024,603 | 2.04 | 1,208,650 | 1.23 |
| 5. Commercial | 22,246,131 | 22,397,321 | 151,190 | 0.68 | 153,257 | -0.01 |
| 6. Industrial | 2,511,081 | 2,583,981 | 72,900 | 2.9 | 72,900 | 0 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 10,869,849 | 11,123,525 | 253,676 | 2.33 | 1,001,434 | -6.88 |
| 8. Minerals | 1,845,346 | 1,845,346 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 37,472,407 | 37,950,173 | 477,766 | 1.27 | 226,157 | 0.67 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 185,644,636 | 189,147,005 | 3,502,369 | 1.89 | 2,436,241 | 0.57 |
| 11. Irrigated | 2,173,829 | 2,223,518 | 49,689 | 2.29 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 289,017,023 | 358,628,878 | 69,611,855 | 24.09 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 36,934,267 | 51,531,061 | 14,596,794 | 39.52 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 577,285 | 678,933 | 101,648 | 17.61 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 4,140 | 4,140 | 1,380 | 33.33 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 328,706,544 | 413,067,910 | 84,361,366 | 25.66 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 514,351,180 | 602,214,915 | 87,863,735 | 17.08 | 2,436,241 | 16.61 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
## COUNTY DESCRIPTION

RICHARDSON COUNTY HAS APPROXIMATELY 9621 PARCELS. WHICH INCLUDES APPROXIMATELY 330,547 ACRES OF AGLAND. ACCORDING TO THE 2004 ABSTRACT RICHARDSON COUNTY HAS 4196 RESIDENTIAL PARCELS, 560 COMMERCIAL PARCELS, 11 INDUSTRIAL PARCELS AND 38 RECREATIONAL PARCELS. THE COUNTY WAS DIVIDED INTO 3 AGRICULTURAL MARKET AREAS FOR 2004.

BUDGET, STAFFING \& TRAINING
BUDGET
2007-08 BUDGET $=157,734.04$
APPRAISAL BUDGET $=28,700$
PRITCHARD \& ABBOTT COSTS FOR OIL \& GAS PROPERTIES $=1,500$

STAFF
1 ASSESSOR
1 DEPUTY
2 FULL-TIME CLERKS

CONTRACT APPRAISER
10 DAYS/MONTH

TRAINING
THE ASSESSOR'S AND THE DEPUTY'S TRAINING EXPENSES ARE PAID FROM THE COUNTY GENERAL FUND. THEREFORE WE HAVEN'T HAD ANY PROBLEMS DOING WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE FOR CREDIT HOURS.

2007 R\&O STATISTICS

| PROPERTY CLASS | MEDIAN | COD | PRD |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RESIDENTIAL | $97 \%$ |  | 39.01 |  | 123.97 |
| COMMERCIAL | $99 \%$ |  | 29.51 |  | 106.41 |
| AGRICULTURAL UNIMP |  | $67 \%$ |  | 24.86 |  |

RESIDENTIAL
THERE WILL ONLY BE APPRAISAL MAINTENANCE FOR THE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES IN 2006. SINCE WE ARE CONDUCTING A COUNTY-WIDE COMMERCIAL REAPPRAISAL. APPRAISAL MAINTENANCE INCLUDES SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK. SALES REVIEW INCLUDES A PHYSICAL INSPECTION OF PROPERTY, QUESTIONAIRE SENT TO THE BUYERS \& SELLERS, AND AN INTERVIEW WITH THE BUYER (IF AVAILABLE) AT THE TIME OF INSPECTION. PICK-UP WORK INCLUDES A PHYSICAL INSPECTION OF ALL BUILDING PERMITS AND INFORMATION STATEMENTS.

COMMERCIAL
A COMPLETE COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL REAPPRAISAL IS PLANNED FOR 2005. THIS REAPPRAISAL WILL BE COMPLETED BY THE CONTRACT APPRAISER. ALL PROPERTIES WILL BE PHYSICALLY INSPECTED BY THE CONTRACT APPRAISER TO VERIFY THE CURRENT LISTING AND NEW DIGITAL PICTURES WILL BE TAKEN. THE PHYSICAL INSPECTION WILL ALSO INCLUDE INTERIOR INSPECTIONS WHENEVER POSSIBLE. ALL THREE APPROACHES TO VALUE WILL BE USED WHENEVER APPLICABLE TO THE PROPERTY. (INCLUDE ANY OTHER INFORMATION AS IT IS RELATED TO THE COMMERCIAL REAPPRAISAL) THE DATA COLLECTION PROCESS WILL ALSO INCLUDE GATHERING INCOME INFORMATION AND ANALYZING CURRENT SALES. WE WILL ALSO IMPLEMENT NEW REPLACEMENT COST WITH A CORRELATION REPORT INDICATING THE FINAL VALUE.

AGRICULTURAL
A MARKET ANALYSIS OF AGRICULTURAL SALES BY LAND CLASSIFICIATION GROUP WILL BE CONDUCTED TO DETERMINE ANY POSSIBLE ADJUSTMENTS TO COMPLY WITH STATISTICAL MEASURES. SALES WILL ALSO BE PLOTTED ON A MAP TO DETERMINE IF THE CURRENT MARKET AREAS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE CURRENT SALES. HOMESITE VALUES MAY ALSO NEED TO BE ADJUSTED ACCORDING TO THE MARKET ANALYSIS. THE MARKET ANALYSIS IS CONDUCTED IN-HOUSE BY THE CONTRACT APPRAISER BY UTILIZING THE COUNTY'S CURRENT CAMA SYSTEM.

WE HAVE STARTED TO PHYSICALLY REVIEW ALL OUT BLDGS, AND RURAL RESIDENTIAL HOMES. AS TIME \& MONEY PERMITS \& IF NOT COMPLETED, THIS WILL BE CARRIED OVER TO THE NEXT YEAR.

RESIDENTIAL
THE COUNTY HAS REVIEWED DAWSON, SALEM, RULO, BARADA, PRESTON, HUMBOLDT \& RURAL RES. THIS WILL INCLUDE A PHYSICAL INSPECTION OF ALL PROPERTIES WITHIN THESE TOWNS. THE PHYSICAL INSPECTION WILL INCLUDE VERIFYING ALL INFORMATION LOCATED ON THE PROPERTY RECORD CARD ALONG WITH TAKING NEW DIGITAL PICTURES. INTERIOR INSPECTIONS WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED WHENEVER POSSIBLE. THESE PROPERTIES WILL BE VALUED USING THE COST APPROACH USING MARKET DERIVED DEPRECIATION. IF TIME PERMITS, THIS SAME PROCESS WILL BE DONE FOR SHUBERT \& STELLA. SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

COMMERCIAL
THERE WILL ONLY BE APPRAISAL MAINTENANCE FOR THE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES IN 2007, SINCE ALL COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES WERE REAPPRAISED IN 2005. HOWEVER, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENTS MAY BE NEEDED IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH STATISTICAL MEASURES REQUIRED BY LAW. AN APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT WOULD BE A PERCENTAGE INCREASE OR DECREASE APPLIED TO ALL PROPERTIES WITHIN A SUBCLASS OF THE COMMERICAL CLASS. SALES REVIEW AND PICKUP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR THE COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES.

AGRICULTURAL
A MARKET ANALYSIS OF AGRICULTURAL SALES BY LAND CLASSIFICATION GROUP WILL BE CONDUCTED TO DETERMINE ANY POSSIBLE ADJUSTMENTS TO COMPLY WITH STATISTICAL MEASURES. SALES WILL ALSO BE PLOTTED ON A MAP TO DETERMINE IF THE CURRENT MARKET AREAS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE CURRENT SALES. THE MARKET ANALYSIS IS CONDUCTED IN-HOUSE BY THE CONTRACT APPRAISER BY UTILIZING THE COUNTY'S CURRENT CAMA SYSTEM. SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR AGRICULTURAL PROPERTIES. PHYSICALLY REVIEW ALL OUT BLDGS AND RURAL RESIDENTIAL HOMES. AS TIME PERMITS AND WILL CONTINUE EACH YEAR.

2008
RESIDENTIAL
FOR 06-07-08, THE COUNTY PLANS TO REVIEW ALL FALLS CITY \& RURAL RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.THIS WILL INCLUDE A PHYSICAL INSPECTION OF ALL HOMES LOCATED IN THE FALLS CITY \& RURAL AREAS. THIS WILL INCLUDE ACREAGES AND FARMS ALONG WITH ANY OUTBLDGS. THE PHYSICAL INSPECTION WILL INCLUDE VERIFYING ALL INFORMATION LOCATED ON THE PROPERTY RECORD CARD ALONG WITH TAKING NEW DIGITAL PICTURES. INTERIOR INSPECTIONS WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED WHENEVER POSSIBLE. THESE PROPERTIES WILL BE VALUED USING THE COST APPROACH USING MARKET DERIVED DEPRECIATION. SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

COMMERICAL
THERE WILL ONLY BE APPRAISAL MAINTENANCE FOR THE RURAL \& SMALL TOWN COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES IN 2008, SINCE ALL COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES WERE REAPPRAISED IN 2005. HOWEVER, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENTS MAY BE NEEDED IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH STATISTICAL MEASURES REQUIRED BY LAW. AN APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT WOULD BE A PERCENTAGE INCREASE OR DECREASE APPLIED TO ALL PROPERTIES WITHIN A SUBCLASS OF THE COMMERICAL CLASS. SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES.

AGRICULTURAL
AS STATED IN THE RESIDENTIAL PORTION OF THE 2007 APPRAISAL PLANS, ALL AGRICULTURAL HOMES WILL BE REAPPRAISED. WE WILL ALSO CONDUCT A LAND USE STUDY IN CONJUCTION WITH THE RURAL REAPPRAISAL. IN ADDITION TO THIS, WE WILL ALSO BE COMPLETING OUR ANNUAL SALES ANALYSIS BY LAND CLASSIFICATION GROUP OF ALL AGRICULTURAL LAND SALES TO DETERMINE ANY POSSIBLE ADJUSTMENTS TO COMPLY WITH STATISTICAL MEASURES. SALES WILL ALSO BE PLOTTED ON A MAP TO DETERMINE IF THE CURRENT MARKET AREAS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE CURRENT SALES. THE MARKET ANALYSIS IS CONDUCTED IN-HOUSE BY THE CONTRACT APPRAISER BY UTILIZING THE COUNTY'S CURRENT CAMA SYSTEM. SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR AGRICULTURAL PROPERTIES.

RESIDENTIAL
FOR 2008-09, THE COUNTY PLANS TO REVIEW ALL RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES IN FALLS CITY, SHUBERT, STELLA \& VERDON. THIS WILL INCLUDE A PHYSICAL INSPECTION OF ALL HOMES LOCATED IN THESE AREAS. THE PHYSICAL INSPECTION WILL INCLUDE VERIFYING
ALL INFORMATION LOCATED ON THE PROPERTY RECORD CARD ALONG WITH TAKING NEW DIGITAL PICTURES. INTERIOR INSPECTIONS WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED WHENEVER POSSIBLE. THESE PROPERTIES WILL BE VALUED USING THE COST APPROACH USING MARKET DERIVED DEPRECIATION. SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

COMMERICAL
FALLS CITY COMMERCIALS WILL PHYSICALLY REVIEWED IN 2009. HOWEVER, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENTS MAY BE NEEDED IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH STATISTICAL MEASURES REQUIRED BY LAW. AN APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT WOULD BE A PERCENTAGE INCREASE OR DECREASE APPLIED TO ALL PROPERITES WITHIN A SUBCLASS OF THE COMMERCIAL CLASS. SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES.

## AGRICULTURAL

FINISH RURAL IMPROVED \& AGLAND USE STUDY. A MARKET ANALYSIS OF AGRICULTURAL SALES BY LAND CLASSIFICATION GROUP WILL BE CONDUCTED TO DETERMINE ANY POSSIBLE ADJUSTMENTS TO COMPLY WITH STATISTICAL MEASURES. SALES WILL ALSO BE PLOTTED ON A MAP TO DETERMINE IF THE CURRENT MARKET AREAS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE CURRENT SALES. THE MARKET ANALYSIS IS CONDUCTED IN-HOUSE BY THE CONTRACT APPRIASER BY UTILIZING THE COUNTY'S CURRENT CAMA SYSTEM. SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR AGRICULTURAL PROPERTIES.

2010
RESIDENTIAL
PHYSICALLY REVIEW RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES IN HUMBOLDT, RULO \& SALEM, AND RECREATIONAL PROPERTIES THOUGHOUT THE COUNTY. INCLUDING REGULAR MAINTENANCE WORK.

COMMERICAL
PHYSICALLY REVIEW GRAIN ELEVATORS \& MANUFACTURING THOUGHOUT THE COUNTY. ALONG WITH REGULAR MAINTENANCE.

AGRICULTURAL
CONDU̇CT SALES STUDY ANALYSIS ALONG WITH REGULAR MAINTENANCE WORK.

RICHARDSON COUNTY ASSESSOR

## REGINA D CUMMINGS

DATE

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Richardson County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
| 3. | Other full-time employees |
|  | 2 |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 0 |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
|  | $158,649.04$ |
| 7. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
|  | $14,000$. Which is entirely from the Assessor's budget. |
| 8. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
|  | Same as requested budget. |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
|  | $28,700.00$ |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | None |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | None |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | None |
|  |  |


| 13. | Total budget |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | $157,734.04$ |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
|  | No all was used. |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Terra Scan |
| 2. | CAMA software |
| 3. | Terra Scan |
|  | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
| 4. | Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
|  | Assessor and Staff |
| 5. | Does the county have GIS software? |
|  | No |
| 6. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
|  | N/A |
| 7. | Personal Property software: |
|  | Terra Scan |
|  |  |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Yes |
|  | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
| 3. | What municipalities in the county are zoned? |
|  | Falls City and Humboldt |

4. When was zoning implemented?

The County is unsure about when the zoning was implemented.

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Ron Elliot <br> Prichard \& Abbott |
| 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 Richardson County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70062760000063875968.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.
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[^0]:     outbuildings is shown in line 7.

