## Preface

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 1467 | COD | 17.88 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 144,078,469$ | PRD | 105.10 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 144,078,469$ | COV | 43.58 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 134,470,966$ | STD | 42.75 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 98,213$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 16.99 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 91,664$ | Min | 26.15 |
| Median | 95.04 | Max | 972.00 |
| Wgt. Mean | 93.33 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 94.32 to 95.66 |
| Mean | 98.09 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 92.32 to 94.34 |
|  |  | $95 \%$ Mean C.I. | 95.90 to 100.28 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 58.46 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 10.22 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 13.19 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 71,041 |


| Residential Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 1467 | 95.04 | 17.88 | 105.10 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 1543 | 94.27 | 18.75 | 105.94 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 1520 | 97.08 | 21.22 | 108.23 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 1,400 | 95.84 | 17.76 | 105.19 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 1460 | 94.57 | 16.71 | 104.21 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 1,417 | 96 | 19.98 | 106.91 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 1,456 | 96 | 26.61 | 111.97 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 1,431 | 96 | 25.81 | 110.84 |

## 2008 Commission Summary

Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 231 | COD | 28.71 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 59,911,784$ | PRD | 107.42 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 59,896,784$ | COV | 45.48 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 53,927,013$ | STD | 43.99 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 259,293$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 27.34 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 233,450$ | Min | 8.93 |
| Median | 95.21 | Max | 420.86 |
| Wgt. Mean | 90.03 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 90.99 to 98.78 |
| Mean | 96.71 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 82.55 to 97.51 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 22.83 |
| :--- | ---: |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period | 9.84 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 13.54 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 169,612 |


| Commercial Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 231 | 95.21 | 28.71 | 107.42 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 305 | 97.19 | 33.79 | 110.67 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 311 | 95.88 | 33.74 | 119.21 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 262 | 96.21 | 31.80 | 118.68 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 247 | 95.66 | 32.06 | 120.06 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 243 | 95 | 33.4 | 111.54 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 248 | 92 | 39.48 | 107.03 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 241 | 96 | 32.6 | 109.27 |

Opinions

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Scott Bluff 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 Scotts Bluff County is $95 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Scotts Bluff County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. In order to move the level of value of Assessor Location of Morrill with-in the acceptable range, I have recommended an adjustment of $5.49 \%$.

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Scotts Bluff County is $95 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Scotts Bluff County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. In order to move the level of value of Assessor Location of Gering with-in the acceptable range, I have recommended an adjustment of $5.02 \%$.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 




# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 





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

## Residential

The city of Gering has been data collected, land values have been updated and all Gering improvements have been revalued for assessment year 2008. Two Scottsbluff neighborhoods (1200 and 1600) were revalued for 2008. Also, Minatare residential received a $4 \%$ decrease to land and improvements. Morrill residential received a $2 \%$ increase to land and improvements. Improvements on leased land (IOLL's) received a $2 \%$ decrease.

Also data collection and revaluation has been completed for the rural residential subclass. Rural site values were raised to reflect the market and provide equalization for the first two acres of both rural and ag residential properties.

# 2008 Assessment Survey for Scotts Bluff County 

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | The Appraiser and four staff data collectors. |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | The Assessor and Appraiser. |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | The Appraiser and four staff data collectors. |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | The RCN data for the residential property class is dated June, 2006. |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | The last market-derived depreciation schedule was developed in 2005. |
| 6. | What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | Typically, the Market or Sales Comparison Approach is used during individual taxpayer protests, and not as an approach for the mass appraisal of residential property. |
| 7. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: |
|  | There are sixty-nine residential neighborhoods. |
| 8. | How are these defined? |
|  | Primarily by location and similar property characteristics. |
| 9. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | No, since the County uses sixty-nine residential neighborhoods when it values the residential property class. The "Assessor Location" is too broad to be used as a valuation identity in Scotts Bluff County. |
| 10. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural residential? (That is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | No, "suburban" does not have its own market at this time. |
| 11. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.) |
|  | At this time, the County does not use the suburban designation as defined in Reg 10. |

12. Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified and valued in the same manner?
Yes, ag and rural residential improvements are both classified and valued in the same manner (with the same RCN and depreciation schedule).
Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 5}$ |







## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The following tables and narrative comments will show that all three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range, and any could be used to describe the overall level of value for the residential property class. For purposes of direct equalization, and since it falls within the very narrow range of the $95 \%$ Median Confidence Interval of 94.32 to 95.66 (at 95.04), the overall median will be used as the point estimate for the residential level of value.

Regarding the overall quality of assessment (uniformity), Table VI reveals that neither qualitative statistic appears to be within compliance. However, the removal of outliers would bring both the coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential within their respective acceptable parameters (at 12.75 and 102.02, respectively).

For overall level of value and assessment uniformity, Scotts Bluff County is in compliance.
A further review of the statistical profile indicates that under the heading "Assessor Location," Morrill has 42 sales, with a median of 91.00, a mean of 110.36, a weighted mean of 90.33 , a COD of 40.08 and a PRD of 122.19 . The removal of the three most extreme outlying sales would produce a median of 90.07 , a mean of 95.22 , a weighted mean of 89.30 , a COD of 25.10 and a PRD of 106.64. To move the median of this subclass to the mid-point of acceptable range, an adjustment of $5.49 \%$ to both land and improvements would be offered as a non-binding recommendation.

Under the heading "School District," district 79-0011 contains eighty sales with a median of 90.40 , a mean of 102.72 , a weighted mean of 88.98 , a COD of 33.34 and a PRD of 115.45 . It should be noted that this is the "Morrill" school district, and the aforementioned non-binding recommended adjustment would result in the following statistics for this district: a median of 92.34, a mean of 105.90 , a weighted mean of 91.51 , a COD of 34.04 , and a PRD of 115.72.

## 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 | 1795 | 1467 | $\mathbf{8 1 . 7 3}$ |
| 2007 | 1883 | 1543 | $\mathbf{8 1 . 9 4}$ |
| 2006 | 1792 | 1520 | $\mathbf{8 4 . 8 2}$ |
| 2005 | 1700 | 1400 | 82.35 |
| 2004 | 1776 | 1460 | 82.21 |
| 2003 | 1790 | 1417 | $\mathbf{7 9 . 1 6}$ |
| 2002 | 1774 | 1456 | 82.07 |
| 2001 | 1794 | 1431 | 79.77 |

RESIDENTIAL: As Table II shows, the percentage of sales used for assessment year 2008 is commensurate with last year, and by rounding, fits well within the percentage used for all of the previous years.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Scotts Bluff County

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | $\mathbf{8 9 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 . 2}$ |  |
| 2007 | 92.54 | 0.66 | 93.15 | 94.27 |
| 2006 | 93.49 | 5.47 | 98.61 | 97.08 |
| 2005 | 91.52 | -4.39 | 87.5 | 95.84 |
| 2004 | 90.85 | 4.96 | 95.35 | 94.57 |
| 2003 | 91 | 3.9 | 94.55 | 96 |
| 2002 | 91 | 1.72 | 92.57 | 96 |
| 2001 | 87 | 10.9 | 96.48 | 96 |

RESIDENTIAL: The difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R\&O Median is less than three points (2.84), and indicates only moderate support for each statistic.

## 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) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8.95 | 2008 | $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ |
| 1.77 | 2007 | 0.66 |
| 7.38 | 2006 | 5.47 |
| 9.09 | 2005 | -4.39 |
| 11.31 | 2004 | 4.96 |
| 10.71 | 2003 | 3.9 |
| 7.82 | 2002 | 1.72 |
| 11.22 | 2001 | 10.9 |

RESIDENTIAL: As shown by Table IV, the difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the residential property base is 5.45 points. Assessment actions taken to address the residential property class included: The city of Gering has been data collected, land values have been updated and all Gering improvements have been revalued for assessment year 2008. Two Scottsbluff neighborhoods (1200 and 1600) were revalued for 2008. Minatare residential received a $4 \%$ decrease to land and improvements. Morrill residential received a $2 \%$ increase to land and improvements. Improvements on leased land (IOLL's) received a $2 \%$ decrease.

Also data collection and revaluation has been completed for the rural residential subclass. Rural site values were raised to reflect the market and provide equalization for the first two acres of both rural and ag residential properties.

To consider only the Gering and Rural subclasses, these constitute approximately $54 \%$ of the total assessed value of the sales sample ( $53.69 \%$ ), compared to $7.17 \%$ of the residential base. Thus, it is not surprising the 2008 assessment actions taken to address the residential property class affected the sales base more profoundly than it did the entire residential property class as a whole.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 95.04 | 93.33 | 98.09 |

RESIDENTIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range, and any could be used to describe the overall level of value for the residential property class.

## 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 | 17.88 | $\mathbf{1 0 5 . 1 0}$ |
| Difference | 2.88 | 2.1 |

RESIDENTIAL: Table VI reveals that neither qualitative statistic appears to be within compliance. However, the removal of outliers would bring both the coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential within their respective acceptable parameters (at 12.75 and 102.02, respectively).

## 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 | 1466 | 1467 | 1 |
| Median | $\mathbf{8 9 . 0 8}$ | 95.04 | $\mathbf{5 . 9 6}$ |
| Wgt. Mean | $\mathbf{8 7 . 5 8}$ | 93.33 | $\mathbf{5 . 7 5}$ |
| Mean | 93.67 | 98.09 | 4.42 |
| COD | 22.25 | 17.88 | -4.37 |
| PRD | 106.96 | 105.10 | -1.86 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 1.36 | 26.15 | 24.79 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 972.00 | 972.00 | 0 |

RESIDENTIAL: The one-sale difference between the Preliminary and the R\&O statistics is due to the reclassification of one sale into the qualified sales file (from ag improved to rural residential). Assessment actions taken to address the residential property class for 2008 included: "The city of Gering has been data collected, land values have been updated and all Gering improvements have been revalued for assessment year 2008. Two Scottsbluff neighborhoods (1200 and 1600) were revalued for 2008. Minatare residential received a $4 \%$ decrease to land and improvements. Morrill residential received a $2 \%$ increase to land and improvements. Improvements on leased land (IOLL's) received a $2 \%$ decrease.

Also data collection and revaluation has been completed for the rural residential subclass. Rural site values were raised to reflect the market and

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE
Query: 6373
What If ID: 5351
Desc: New Whatif for Query ID: 6373

| Strata Hdg. | Strata | Chg.Value | Chg.Type | Pct.Chg. | Group | Priority |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessor Location | Morrill | Total | Increase | 5.490 | A | 1 |

## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified

TOTAL Sales Price TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
1467
$144,078,469$
$144,078,469$
$134,562,922$
98,213
91,726

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

## MEDIAN:

WGT. MEAN: MEAN : MEAN: 93 95
93 93
98

COV:
STD:
43.78

01/18/2008
95\% Median C.I.: 94.45 to 95.74
(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 92.38 to 94.41
AVG.ABS.DEV: 17.06
COD: 17.92 MAX Sales Ratio: 972.00
PRD: 105.20 MIN Sales Ratio: 26.15

| DATE |
| :--- |
| RANGE |


| RANGE |
| :--- |
| Qrtrs |
| $07 / 01 / 05$ |
| TO |

$\qquad$ Study Years study Years $\qquad$ 07/01/06 тO 06/30/07
$\qquad$ Calendar
01/01/06 тO 12/31/06
$\ldots \mathrm{ALL}$

|  | 1467 | 95.17 | 98.25 | 93.40 | 17.92 | 105.20 | 26.15 | 972.00 | 94.45 to 95.74 | 98,213 | 91,726 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ASSESSOR LOCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| GERING | 367 | 97.02 | 100.46 | 98.03 | 11.02 | 102.48 | 60.93 | 831.12 | 96.48 to 97.67 | 104,944 | 102,873 |
| MINATARE | 25 | 98.77 | 101.63 | 92.20 | 21.88 | 110.23 | 56.03 | 213.91 | 82.40 to 108.40 | 40,785 | 37,602 |
| MITCHELL | 80 | 97.51 | 99.28 | 90.55 | 23.55 | 109.64 | 37.03 | 230.98 | 87.95 to 100.00 | 67,702 | 61,302 |
| MORRILL | 42 | 96.00 | 116.43 | 95.28 | 40.08 | 122.19 | 63.49 | 533.17 | 85.38 to 109.84 | 59,476 | 56,671 |
| RURAL | 296 | 92.17 | 95.34 | 90.35 | 22.29 | 105.52 | 26.38 | 511.87 | 88.80 to 94.95 | 125,559 | 113,442 |
| SCOTTSBLUFF | 603 | 92.83 | 96.96 | 92.70 | 16.96 | 104.59 | 35.61 | 972.00 | 91.72 to 94.50 | 94,328 | 87,445 |
| SMTWNS | 34 | 93.92 | 96.81 | 81.53 | 32.95 | 118.73 | 26.15 | 176.17 | 69.58 to 110.55 | 31,635 | 25,792 |
| TERRYTOWN | 20 | 96.84 | 95.78 | 92.69 | 10.43 | 103.33 | 68.47 | 161.11 | 88.36 to 99.55 | 75,435 | 69,924 |
| _ALL | 1467 | 95.17 | 98.25 | 93.40 | 17.92 | 105.20 | 26.15 | 972.00 | 94.45 to 95.74 | 98,213 | 91,726 |
| LOCATIONS: URBAN, | URBAN | \& RURAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1 | 1171 | 95.44 | 98.99 | 94.45 | 16.88 | 104.80 | 26.15 | 972.00 | 94.85 to 96.22 | 91,300 | 86,237 |
| 3 | 296 | 92.17 | 95.34 | 90.35 | 22.29 | 105.52 | 26.38 | 511.87 | 88.80 to 94.95 | 125,559 | 113,442 |
| _ ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1467 | 95.17 | 98.25 | 93.40 | 17.92 | 105.20 | 26.15 | 972.00 | 94.45 to 95.74 | 98,213 | 91,726 |




## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:
1467
$144,078,469$
$144,078,469$
$134,562,922$
98,213
91,726

## MEDIAN:

WGT. MEAN:
MEAN: 98

COV:
STD:
AVG.ABS.DEV: 17.06
17.06

95\% Median C.I.: 94.45 to 95.74
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 92.38 to 94.41 95\% Mean C.I.: 96.05 to 100.45

Printed: 04/03/2008 12:54:51
20 MIN Sales Ratio: $\quad 26.15$
ASSESSED VALUE *

| RANGE |  | COUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low \$ |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 26 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 23 |
| Total \$ |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 49 |
| 10000 то | 29999 | 141 |
| 30000 тO | 59999 | 338 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 441 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 257 |
| 150000 то | 249999 | 205 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 34 |
| 500000 + |  | 2 |

_ALL_ $\quad$| 1467 |
| :--- |

| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| 88.69 | 93.05 | 71.87 |
| 114.27 | 132.19 | 89.68 |
|  |  |  |
| 92.40 | 111.42 | 83.11 |
| 93.47 | 93.44 | 79.69 |
| 94.20 | 99.49 | 90.70 |
| 94.62 | 95.70 | 92.47 |
| 94.55 | 97.74 | 93.36 |
| 98.56 | 103.61 | 97.70 |
| 91.60 | 91.29 | 89.02 |
| 101.72 | 101.72 | 101.80 |
|  |  |  |


|  | 1467 | 95.17 | 98.25 | 93.40 | 17.92 | 105.20 | 26.15 | 972.00 | 94.45 to 95.74 | 98,213 | 91,726 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 125 | 92.10 | 103.38 | 81.87 | 37.94 | 126.27 | 27.48 | 533.17 | 86.80 to 96.51 | 39,204 | 32,097 |
| 0 | 2 | 51.02 | 51.02 | 54.40 | 12.93 | 93.78 | 44.42 | 57.61 | N/A | 105,100 | 57,170 |
| 10 | 3 | 96.37 | 105.43 | 106.91 | 9.65 | 98.62 | 96.00 | 123.91 | N/A | 46,733 | 49,961 |
| 15 | 3 | 136.79 | 126.13 | 116.24 | 19.71 | 108.51 | 80.35 | 161.25 | N/A | 16,633 | 19,335 |
| 20 | 44 | 99.56 | 125.21 | 101.01 | 45.01 | 123.97 | 37.03 | 972.00 | 91.78 to 109.84 | 66,275 | 66,943 |
| 25 | 32 | 92.21 | 93.27 | 92.56 | 21.01 | 100.76 | 26.15 | 160.74 | 82.25 to 103.03 | 62,731 | 58,063 |
| 30 | 892 | 94.47 | 96.08 | 92.33 | 16.09 | 104.07 | 26.38 | 511.87 | 93.15 to 95.33 | 82,083 | 75,786 |
| 35 | 160 | 96.98 | 98.22 | 95.91 | 10.86 | 102.41 | 64.79 | 225.61 | 95.05 to 98.29 | 127,193 | 121,991 |
| 40 | 178 | 95.72 | 100.09 | 94.85 | 13.32 | 105.52 | 61.63 | 831.12 | 94.49 to 97.31 | 181,450 | 172,104 |
| 45 | 11 | 97.54 | 91.33 | 90.63 | 8.70 | 100.77 | 63.49 | 105.55 | 80.85 to 100.96 | 272,286 | 246,781 |
| 50 | 17 | 98.95 | 98.73 | 99.28 | 5.92 | 99.45 | 87.73 | 124.59 | 90.40 to 102.04 | 293,602 | 291,491 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1467 | 95.17 | 98.25 | 93.40 | 17.92 | 105.20 | 26.15 | 972.00 | 94.45 to 95.74 | 98,213 | 91,726 |

## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

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


# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 

## Type: Qualified

(!: Derived)

TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price
AVG. Assessed Value:
239
$59,544,044$
$59,529,044$
$52,532,858$
249,075
219,802

## MEDIAN: <br> MEAN :

94
COV:
67.36

MEAN :
COD :
PRD: 32.75 MAX Sales Ratio:
PRD: 111.05 MIN Sales Ratio: 8.93

95\% Median C.I.: 88.31 to 98.64
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 80.50 to 96.00
95\% Mean C.I.: 89.63 to 106.37
249,075
219, 802
DATE OF SALE *
RANGE
$\quad$ Qrtrs__

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

ASSESSOR LOCATION

## GERING

 MINATARE MITCHELL MORRILL RURAL SCOTTSBLUFF SMTWNS TERRYTOWN$\qquad$ ALL
COUNT

MEDIAN
MEAN WGT. MEAN

| 24 | 95.85 | 121.30 | 82.52 | 57.11 | 146.99 | 20.91 | 800.00 | 70.73 to 114.52 | 114,154 | 94,202 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | 92.54 | 104.73 | 91.51 | 37.67 | 114.45 | 18.07 | 236.67 | 70.35 to 123.16 | 96,078 | 87,919 |
| 14 | 97.83 | 90.97 | 81.74 | 23.27 | 111.29 | 37.80 | 177.12 | 56.81 to 106.79 | 524,048 | 428,362 |
| 25 | 89.24 | 94.14 | 76.95 | 25.12 | 122.35 | 45.45 | 204.40 | 80.91 to 106.02 | 186,960 | 143,858 |
| 23 | 98.64 | 93.65 | 97.39 | 26.34 | 96.16 | 25.99 | 157.13 | 72.33 to 111.37 | 164,708 | 160,405 |
| 18 | 98.91 | 113.57 | 98.67 | 43.26 | 115.10 | 21.53 | 479.93 | 82.55 to 107.92 | 97,925 | 96,625 |
| 21 | 97.06 | 101.36 | 100.61 | 30.99 | 100.74 | 23.80 | 198.39 | 74.68 to 116.57 | 431,948 | 434,601 |
| 24 | 95.32 | 101.60 | 94.89 | 36.48 | 107.07 | 29.09 | 420.86 | 65.88 to 100.31 | 604,868 | 573,943 |
| 20 | 96.54 | 98.04 | 91.51 | 16.04 | 107.13 | 54.10 | 136.31 | 84.36 to 107.50 | 97,911 | 89,597 |
| 20 | 80.61 | 80.77 | 69.83 | 27.85 | 115.67 | 34.86 | 137.64 | 59.95 to 100.17 | 225,200 | 157,263 |
| 12 | 78.00 | 75.92 | 78.22 | 19.33 | 97.06 | 19.39 | 113.40 | 72.78 to 91.52 | 388,530 | 303,898 |
| 16 | 93.32 | 82.95 | 76.22 | 30.35 | 108.84 | 8.93 | 141.23 | 50.75 to 114.87 | 150,100 | 114,400 |
| 85 | 94.16 | 104.03 | 81.76 | 37.15 | 127.23 | 18.07 | 800.00 | 87.86 to 100.00 | 198,401 | 162,219 |
| 86 | 97.87 | 101.92 | 97.22 | 33.71 | 104.83 | 21.53 | 479.93 | 88.02 to 100.00 | 338,822 | 329,416 |
| 68 | 87.55 | 85.51 | 76.99 | 25.07 | 111.06 | 8.93 | 141.23 | 79.19 to 97.27 | 198,914 | 153,153 |
| 80 | 97.60 | 97.82 | 85.54 | 28.97 | 114.35 | 21.53 | 479.93 | 88.79 to 100.00 | 219,520 | 187,776 |
| 85 | 94.93 | 95.80 | 92.64 | 28.23 | 103.41 | 23.80 | 420.86 | 82.52 to 100.00 | 353,529 | 327,511 |
| 239 | 93.92 | 98.00 | 88.25 | 32.75 | 111.05 | 8.93 | 800.00 | 88.31 to 98.64 | 249,075 | 219,802 |
| COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg. Adj. } \\ & \text { Sale Price } \end{aligned}$ | Avg. Assd Val |
| 59 | 91.52 | 93.26 | 84.01 | 31.87 | 111.01 | 8.93 | 236.67 | 82.43 to 100.00 | 114,963 | 96,584 |
| 3 | 56.81 | 67.76 | 77.30 | 55.44 | 87.66 | 25.99 | 120.48 | N/A | 39,166 | 30,277 |
| 19 | 93.92 | 89.93 | 80.44 | 23.37 | 111.80 | 23.80 | 131.39 | 74.06 to 113.40 | 47,236 | 37,995 |
| 7 | 100.17 | 150.06 | 88.82 | 73.63 | 168.95 | 61.91 | 420.86 | 61.91 to 420.86 | 53,521 | 47,537 |
| 16 | 107.08 | 137.51 | 92.35 | 59.60 | 148.89 | 41.77 | 800.00 | 69.77 to 114.87 | 129,250 | 119,367 |
| 125 | 95.49 | 95.59 | 88.82 | 27.62 | 107.63 | 21.53 | 479.93 | 88.85 to 98.78 | 392,236 | 348,377 |
| 8 | 76.95 | 76.20 | 74.61 | 23.95 | 102.13 | 45.31 | 114.70 | 45.31 to 114.70 | 12,754 | 9,516 |
| 2 | 99.09 | 99.09 | 99.09 | 0.88 | 100.00 | 98.22 | 99.96 | N/A | 78,500 | 77,788 |
| 239 | 93.92 | 98.00 | 88.25 | 32.75 | 111.05 | 8.93 | 800.00 | 88.31 to 98.64 | 249,075 | 219,802 |


| 24 | 95.85 | 121.30 | 82.52 | 57.11 | 146.99 | 20.91 | 800.00 | 70.73 to 114.52 | 114,154 | 94,202 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | 92.54 | 104.73 | 91.51 | 37.67 | 114.45 | 18.07 | 236.67 | 70.35 to 123.16 | 96,078 | 87,919 |
| 14 | 97.83 | 90.97 | 81.74 | 23.27 | 111.29 | 37.80 | 177.12 | 56.81 to 106.79 | 524,048 | 428,362 |
| 25 | 89.24 | 94.14 | 76.95 | 25.12 | 122.35 | 45.45 | 204.40 | 80.91 to 106.02 | 186,960 | 143,858 |
| 23 | 98.64 | 93.65 | 97.39 | 26.34 | 96.16 | 25.99 | 157.13 | 72.33 to 111.37 | 164,708 | 160,405 |
| 18 | 98.91 | 113.57 | 98.67 | 43.26 | 115.10 | 21.53 | 479.93 | 82.55 to 107.92 | 97,925 | 96,625 |
| 21 | 97.06 | 101.36 | 100.61 | 30.99 | 100.74 | 23.80 | 198.39 | 74.68 to 116.57 | 431,948 | 434,601 |
| 24 | 95.32 | 101.60 | 94.89 | 36.48 | 107.07 | 29.09 | 420.86 | 65.88 to 100.31 | 604,868 | 573,943 |
| 20 | 96.54 | 98.04 | 91.51 | 16.04 | 107.13 | 54.10 | 136.31 | 84.36 to 107.50 | 97,911 | 89,597 |
| 20 | 80.61 | 80.77 | 69.83 | 27.85 | 115.67 | 34.86 | 137.64 | 59.95 to 100.17 | 225,200 | 157,263 |
| 12 | 78.00 | 75.92 | 78.22 | 19.33 | 97.06 | 19.39 | 113.40 | 72.78 to 91.52 | 388,530 | 303,898 |
| 16 | 93.32 | 82.95 | 76.22 | 30.35 | 108.84 | 8.93 | 141.23 | 50.75 to 114.87 | 150,100 | 114,400 |
| 85 | 94.16 | 104.03 | 81.76 | 37.15 | 127.23 | 18.07 | 800.00 | 87.86 to 100.00 | 198,401 | 162,219 |
| 86 | 97.87 | 101.92 | 97.22 | 33.71 | 104.83 | 21.53 | 479.93 | 88.02 to 100.00 | 338,822 | 329,416 |
| 68 | 87.55 | 85.51 | 76.99 | 25.07 | 111.06 | 8.93 | 141.23 | 79.19 to 97.27 | 198,914 | 153,153 |
| 80 | 97.60 | 97.82 | 85.54 | 28.97 | 114.35 | 21.53 | 479.93 | 88.79 to 100.00 | 219,520 | 187,776 |
| 85 | 94.93 | 95.80 | 92.64 | 28.23 | 103.41 | 23.80 | 420.86 | 82.52 to 100.00 | 353,529 | 327,511 |
| 239 | 93.92 | 98.00 | 88.25 | 32.75 | 111.05 | 8.93 | 800.00 | 88.31 to 98.64 | 249,075 | 219,802 |
| COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg. Adj. } \\ & \text { Sale Price } \end{aligned}$ | Avg. Assd Val |
| 59 | 91.52 | 93.26 | 84.01 | 31.87 | 111.01 | 8.93 | 236.67 | 82.43 to 100.00 | 114,963 | 96,584 |
| 3 | 56.81 | 67.76 | 77.30 | 55.44 | 87.66 | 25.99 | 120.48 | N/A | 39,166 | 30,277 |
| 19 | 93.92 | 89.93 | 80.44 | 23.37 | 111.80 | 23.80 | 131.39 | 74.06 to 113.40 | 47,236 | 37,995 |
| 7 | 100.17 | 150.06 | 88.82 | 73.63 | 168.95 | 61.91 | 420.86 | 61.91 to 420.86 | 53,521 | 47,537 |
| 16 | 107.08 | 137.51 | 92.35 | 59.60 | 148.89 | 41.77 | 800.00 | 69.77 to 114.87 | 129,250 | 119,367 |
| 125 | 95.49 | 95.59 | 88.82 | 27.62 | 107.63 | 21.53 | 479.93 | 88.85 to 98.78 | 392,236 | 348,377 |
| 8 | 76.95 | 76.20 | 74.61 | 23.95 | 102.13 | 45.31 | 114.70 | 45.31 to 114.70 | 12,754 | 9,516 |
| 2 | 99.09 | 99.09 | 99.09 | 0.88 | 100.00 | 98.22 | 99.96 | N/A | 78,500 | 77,788 |
| 239 | 93.92 | 98.00 | 88.25 | 32.75 | 111.05 | 8.93 | 800.00 | 88.31 to 98.64 | 249,075 | 219,802 |

Avg. Adj.
Avg.
.

## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified



## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified





## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

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

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


| 239 | MEDIAN |
| ---: | ---: |
| 59,544,044 | WGT. MEAN |
| $59,529,044$ | MEAN |
| $52,532,858$ |  |
| 249,075 | COD |
| 219,802 | PRD |
|  |  |
| 98 | 98.00 |

,
D $\quad 32$.
32.7
COV
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { OV: } & 67.36\end{array}$ 95

ALI $\qquad$
95\% Median C.I.: 88.31 to 98.64 (!: Derived)
t. Mean C.I.: 80.50 to 96.00 95\% Mean C.I.: 89.63 to 106.37

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:03:42
8.93
800.00
88.31 to 98.64

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

## Commercial

For assessment year 2008, Minatare commercial property received a $25 \%$ increase to land only. Small Town commercial (Henry, Lyman, Melbeta and McGrew) received a 5\% increase to land and improvements. Rural commercial parcels had their improvements decreased by $5 \%$.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Scotts Bluff County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | The Appraiser and four staff data collectors. |
|  | Valuation done by: |
| 3. | Phe Assessor and the Appraiser. |
| Pickup work done by whom: |  |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are <br> used to value this property class? |
| 5. | The RCN that is used to value this property class is dated 2006. <br> What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was <br> developed using market-derived information? |
|  | The last market-derived depreciation schedule was developed for commercial <br> property in 2005. |
| 6. | When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or <br> establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | The last time the Income Approach was used to estimate market value was for the <br> subclass of storage units in 2006 during taxpayer protests. |
| 7. | When 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? |
|  | As noted in the residential section of this survey, the Market or Sales Comparison <br> Approach is used primarily during taxpayer protests, and is not used as an approach <br> for the mass appraisal of commercial/industrial property within Scotts Bluff County. |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? |
| There are forty commercial neighborhoods in Scotts Bluff County. |  |
| 10. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | No, "Assessor Location" is too broad to be a usable valuation identity. The County <br> values lists and values commercial properties by the forty neighborhoods that were <br> developed to aid in the appraisal process. |
| Primarily by location. |  |


| 11. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural <br> commercial? (That is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | At this time, the assessor location "suburban" does not have its own market. |

12. What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
The County does not designate any of the commercial property as "suburban" defined in Reg 10.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{8 1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{8 1}$ |
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NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price AVG. Assessed Value:

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
231
$59,911,784$
$59,896,784$
$53,926,903$
259,293
233,449


## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: As the following tables and their accompanying narratives will show, two of the three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range-the median and the mean. Only the weighted mean falls approximately two points below the bottom limit of compliance. The removal of extreme outliers would fail to bring the weighted mean within acceptable range.

A review of the qualitative statistics shows both qualitative statistics outside of compliance. The removal of outliers would fail to bring either measure within compliance.

Further review of the statistical profile under the heading "Assessor Location," shows the city of Gering with fifty-four sales and the following statistics: a median of 91.41 , a mean of 98.59 , a weighted mean of 87.06 , a COD of 35.44 , and a PRD of 113.24. Removal of extreme outliers (six) would still leave the median at 91.41, would lower the mean to 95.08, and raise the weighted mean to 90.64 . The COD would become 24.79 and the PRD would fall to 104.91 . In order to move the median to the mid-point of acceptable range, an adjustment to both land and improvements by $5.02 \%$ is offered as a non-binding recommendation.

2008 Correlation Section<br>for Scotts Bluff County

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | $\mathbf{3 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 9 6}$ |
| 2007 | 380 | 305 | $\mathbf{8 0 . 2 6}$ |
| 2006 | 379 | 311 | $\mathbf{8 2 . 0 6}$ |
| 2005 | 350 | 262 | $\mathbf{7 4 . 8 6}$ |
| 2004 | 346 | 247 | $\mathbf{7 1 . 3 9}$ |
| 2003 | 345 | 243 | $\mathbf{7 0 . 4 3}$ |
| 2002 | 339 | 248 | $\mathbf{7 3 . 1 6}$ |
| 2001 | 331 | 241 | $\mathbf{7 2 . 8 1}$ |

COMMERCIAL: Table II appears to indicate a lower percentage of sales used for assessment year 2008 compared to previous years. However, further review of the total commercial file reveals that thirty-nine of the total sales were in reality family transfers, part-interests, foreclosures, name changes, satisfaction of old contracts, etc. This would actually leave 306 total available commercial sales, and the County's determination that 231 are qualified, would actually produce a $74.76 \%$ percentage of commercial sales used, and although less than the last two years, still fits within the historical range.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Scotts Bluff County

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.
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 | 93.92 | -0.23 | 93.71 |  |
| 2007 | 92.20 | 3.11 | 95.06 | 97.19 |
| 2006 | 92.36 | 6.13 | 98.02 | 95.88 |
| 2005 | 91.30 | 11.16 | 101.49 | 96.21 |
| 2004 | 90.64 | 6.82 | 96.82 | 95.66 |
| 2003 | 88 | 6.1 | 93.37 | 95 |
| 2002 | 92 | -2.95 | 89.29 | 92 |
| 2001 | 95 | 4.76 | 99.52 | 96 |

COMMERCIAL: As indicated by Table III, the difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R\&O Median is less than two points (1.50), and reveals that each figure provides relatively strong support for the other.

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

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

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.

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

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11.51 | 2008 | $-\mathbf{0 . 2 3}$ |
| -0.48 | 2007 | 3.11 |
| 5.56 | 2006 | 6.13 |
| 12.75 | 2005 | 11.16 |
| 9.03 | 2004 | 6.82 |
| 16.25 | 2003 | 6.1 |
| 23.46 | 2002 | -2.95 |
| 6.91 | 2001 | 4.76 |

COMMERCIAL: As shown by Table IV, the absolute difference between the percent change to the sales file compared to the percent change to the commercial base is 11.74 points. This appears to be significant. The assessment practices taken to address the commercial property class for 2008 included, Minatare commercial property received a $25 \%$ increase to land only. Small Town commercial (Henry, Lyman, Melbeta and McGrew) received a 5\% increase to land and improvements. Rural commercial parcels had their improvements decreased by $5 \%$.

Further review of the sales sample reveals that the assessment actions taken to address commercial property would have affected twenty-two sales (six of the rural are unimproved, and would be unaffected by a decrease to improvements), with a total assessed value of $\$ 1,639,214$. This amount, when compared to the total assessed value of the commercial sample ( $\$ 53,927,013$ ), is approximately $3 \%$ of the sales file ( $3.04 \%$ ). However, when comparing the total assessed value of the affected sample $\$ 1,639,214$ with the commercial total value as reported on the abstract ( $\$ 372,479,278$ minus growth of $\$ 16,916,686=\$ 355,562,592)$, this is only $0.46 \%$ of the commercial base. In consideration of the above, it is quite possible to see how the sales file would receive a greater effect from the assessment actions than would the commercial base as a whole.

Also, the formula for the percent change to the sale file is derived by taking the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ weighted mean for the latest study year period under the heading of "Date of Sale," (in this case, 7.01.06 to 6.30 .07 ) minus the same study period weighted mean for the Preliminary statistical profile, and this figure is then divided by the weighted mean for the last study year for the Preliminary profile. It should be noted that comparing the number of sales used to calculate this figure changed by two sales (the Preliminary had 68 sales with a weighted mean of 76.99 , and the R\&O has 68 sales with a weighted mean of 85.85). This two-sale difference could affect the percent change to the sales file number.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 95.21 | 90.03 | 96.71 |

COMMERCIAL: Two of the three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range-the median and the mean. Only the weighted mean falls approximately two points below the bottom limit of compliance. The removal of extreme outliers would fail to bring the weighted mean within acceptable range.

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 28.71 | 107.42 |
| Difference | $\mathbf{8 . 7 1}$ | 4.42 |

COMMERCIAL: Table VI indicates that both qualitative statistics are outside of compliance. The removal of outliers would fail to bring either measure within compliance.

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 239 | 231 | -8 |
| Median | 93.92 | 95.21 | 1.29 |
| Wgt. Mean | 88.25 | 90.03 | 1.78 |
| Mean | 98.00 | 96.71 | -1.29 |
| COD | 32.75 | 28.71 | -4.04 |
| PRD | 111.05 | 107.42 | -3.63 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 8.93 | 8.93 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 800.00 | 420.86 | -379.14 |

COMMERCIAL: The eight sale difference between the Preliminary and the R\&O statistics is due to these found to be substantially changed (due to additions, remodeling, etc.) For assessment year 2008, Minatare commercial property received a $25 \%$ increase to land only. Small Town commercial (Henry, Lyman, Melbeta and McGrew) received a 5\% increase to land and improvements. Rural commercial parcels had their improvements decreased by $5 \%$.

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE
Query: 6536
What If ID: 5355
Desc: New Whatif for Query ID: 6536

| Strata Hdg. | Strata | Chg.Value | Chg.Type | Pct.Chg. | Group | Priority |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assessor Location | Gering | Total | Increase | 5.020 | A | 1 |

## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

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


## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified
$\begin{array}{cccc}\text { Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 } & \text { Posted Before: } \mathbf{0 1 / 1 8 / 2 0 0 8} \\ 96 & \text { COV : } & 45.73 & 95 \% \text { Median }\end{array}$
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:
231
$59,911,784$
$59,896,784$
$54,211,683$
259,293
234,682
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:

| LOCATIONS: UR |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| RANGE |  |
| 1 |  |
| 3 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | $A L L \_$ |



## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 01/2004 to 06/30/2 | Posted | fore: 01/1 | 2008 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | f Sale |  | 231 | MEDIAN: | $96$ |  | COV: | 45.73 | 95\% | Median C.I.: 91.6 | to 99.49 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | s Pric |  | , 784 | WGT. MEAN: | 91 |  | STD: | 44.75 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 83. | to 97.92 |  |
| TOTA | L Adj. Sal | s Pric |  | , 784 | MEAN : | 98 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 27.67 |  | Mean C.I.: 92.0 | to 103.63 |  |
| TOT | AL Asse | d Valu |  | , 683 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. | Adj. S | es Pric |  | , 293 | COD : | 28.86 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 420.86 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | , 682 | PRD : | 108.12 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 9.38 |  |  | Printed: 04/03/ | 12:55:40 |
| YEAR BUILT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 0 OR Blank |  | 35 | 92.20 | 92.86 | 98.64 | 42.41 |  | 94.13 | 9.38 | 266.56 | 61.82 to 105.00 | 100,773 | 99,406 |
| Prior TO 1860 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1860 TO 1899 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1900 TO 1919 |  | 21 | 100.00 | 104.31 | 102.65 | 22.62 |  | 101.62 | 27.24 | 199.70 | 89.47 to 118.18 | 58,490 | 60,037 |
| 1920 тO 1939 |  | 31 | 93.06 | 91.95 | 88.73 | 22.52 |  | 103.63 | 47.58 | 170.43 | 78.61 to 105.86 | 93,563 | 83,020 |
| 1940 TO 1949 |  | 20 | 99.09 | 132.20 | 108.87 | 61.71 |  | 121.43 | 50.75 | 420.86 | 79.43 to 153.22 | 70,175 | 76,397 |
| 1950 тO 1959 |  | 16 | 80.56 | 94.22 | 71.18 | 35.27 |  | 132.37 | 40.29 | 194.27 | 69.22 to 114.52 | 136,628 | 97,249 |
| 1960 TO 1969 |  | 26 | 93.40 | 96.66 | 105.41 | 27.95 |  | 91.71 | 26.61 | 248.55 | 79.19 to 105.69 | 271,057 | 285,710 |
| 1970 то 1979 |  | 32 | 99.90 | 101.71 | 87.12 | 14.95 |  | 116.75 | 58.88 | 136.31 | 95.54 to 113.27 | 254,148 | 221,403 |
| 1980 TO 1989 |  | 28 | 88.50 | 85.66 | 90.21 | 19.56 |  | 94.95 | 20.36 | 119.73 | 78.79 to 100.00 | 789,269 | 712,015 |
| 1990 то 1994 |  | 3 | 107.40 | 97.74 | 99.13 | 22.17 |  | 98.59 | 57.19 | 128.63 | N/A | 503,666 | 499,308 |
| 1995 TO 1999 |  | 7 | 104.61 | 98.48 | 97.43 | 13.46 |  | 101.07 | 64.13 | 128.52 | 64.13 to 128.52 | 548,952 | 534,861 |
| 2000 TO Pres | nt | 12 | 100.57 | 84.45 | 68.50 | 21.77 |  | 123.29 | 34.86 | 116.57 | 59.79 to 105.32 | 501,492 | 343,527 |
| _ALL_ |  | 231 | 95.89 | 97.86 | 90.51 | 28.86 |  | 108.12 | 9.38 | 420.86 | 91.67 to 99.49 | 259,293 | 234,682 |
| SALE PRICE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| _Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 6 | 92.10 | 105.06 | 111.31 | 36.41 |  | 94.39 | 55.35 | 231.06 | 55.35 to 231.06 | 2,424 | 2,698 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 6 | 102.50 | 163.36 | 156.30 | 74.53 |  | 104.52 | 61.47 | 420.86 | 61.47 to 420.86 | 6,425 | 10,043 |
| Total \$ |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 12 | 95.97 | 134.21 | 143.98 | 59.83 |  | 93.22 | 55.35 | 420.86 | 67.24 to 193.42 | 4,424 | 6,370 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 28 | 112.56 | 121.11 | 121.11 | 32.70 |  | 100.00 | 26.61 | 308.40 | 101.92 to 123.16 | 20,784 | 25,172 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 41 | 88.08 | 85.50 | 84.72 | 30.49 |  | 100.92 | 9.38 | 194.27 | 70.75 to 104.17 | 41,615 | 35,257 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 39 | 98.64 | 107.08 | 107.78 | 27.33 |  | 99.35 | 23.92 | 266.56 | 92.73 to 107.92 | 76,107 | 82,031 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 32 | 96.44 | 89.69 | 90.35 | 18.50 |  | 99.27 | 29.09 | 129.50 | 81.28 to 101.85 | 124,221 | 112,228 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 33 | 97.61 | 97.72 | 98.04 | 22.94 |  | 99.67 | 45.61 | 177.12 | 84.98 to 106.02 | 190,057 | 186,327 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 25 | 80.82 | 78.59 | 76.70 | 24.38 |  | 102.47 | 20.36 | 136.14 | 65.88 to 91.67 | 335,191 | 257,084 |
| $500000+$ |  | 21 | 94.16 | 88.68 | 90.71 | 21.66 |  | 97.76 | 34.86 | 129.97 | 74.68 to 101.86 | 1,712,404 | 1,553,256 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 231 | 95.89 | 97.86 | 90.51 | 28.86 |  | 108.12 | 9.38 | 420.86 | 91.67 to 99.49 | 259,293 | 234,682 |

## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
Query: 6536
(!: AVTot=0) (?: Derived)
95\% Median C.I.: 91.67 to 99.49
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 83.09 to 97.92
95\% Mean C.I.: 92.09 to 103.63

Printed: 04/03/2008 12:55:40

| MEAN : |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| MEAN : |  |
|  |  |
| COD : | 28.86 |
| PRD : | 108.12 |

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

|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 259,293 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 234,682 |
|  |  |  |

231
$59,911,784$
$59,896,784$
$54,211,683$
259,293
234,682

| RANGE | COUNT |
| :--- | :--- |
| Low \$_ |  |


| 1 TO | 4999 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 8 |
| Total \$ |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 15 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 32 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 44 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 31 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 41 |
| 150000 тO | 249999 | 32 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 19 |
| 500000 + |  | 17 |


| ALL |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 231 |


| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| 67.24 | 67.16 | 25.64 |
| 73.51 | 81.65 | 42.09 |
|  |  |  |
| 67.24 | 74.89 | 36.89 |
| 86.60 | 95.48 | 72.31 |
| 102.17 | 107.72 | 95.90 |
| 93.55 | 92.55 | 74.77 |
| 96.98 | 100.21 | 90.31 |
| 100.69 | 99.88 | 89.59 |
| 96.95 | 99.67 | 90.85 |
| 100.00 | 95.21 | 92.65 |

Avg. Adj.
Avg.
.

|  | 231 | 95.89 | 97.86 | 90.51 | 28.86 | 108.12 | 9.38 | 420.86 | 91.67 to 99.49 | 259,293 | 234,682 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COST RANK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 39 | 92.20 | 93.93 | 102.29 | 40.77 | 91.83 | 9.38 | 266.56 | 69.77 to 106.77 | 110,950 | 113,488 |
| 10 | 23 | 104.65 | 108.08 | 99.98 | 22.14 | 108.10 | 51.82 | 248.55 | 90.19 to 106.79 | 94,177 | 94,158 |
| 15 | 14 | 99.47 | 97.73 | 87.76 | 20.66 | 111.36 | 54.10 | 142.45 | 75.08 to 119.73 | 133,407 | 117,078 |
| 20 | 121 | 94.16 | 98.78 | 87.84 | 28.88 | 112.45 | 20.36 | 420.86 | 86.97 to 98.22 | 331,836 | 291,483 |
| 25 | 10 | 90.01 | 84.71 | 68.12 | 26.38 | 124.35 | 37.80 | 135.28 | 54.25 to 107.02 | 373,477 | 254,425 |
| 30 | 21 | 99.43 | 92.99 | 107.03 | 21.88 | 86.88 | 26.61 | 129.97 | 70.73 to 116.15 | 343,231 | 367,352 |
| 35 | 1 | 119.51 | 119.51 | 119.51 |  |  | 119.51 | 119.51 | N/A | 100,000 | 119,513 |
| 40 | 2 | 108.11 | 108.11 | 97.70 | 10.32 | 110.65 | 96.95 | 119.27 | N/A | 170,538 | 166,616 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 231 | 95.89 | 97.86 | 90.51 | 28.86 | 108.12 | 9.38 | 420.86 | 91.67 to 99.49 | 259,293 | 234,682 |

## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | : 07/0 | 01/2004 to 06/3 | Pos | fore: 01/1 | 2008 |  |  | (!: AVTot=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBER of | f Sales: |  | 231 | MEDIAN: | 96 |  | Cov: | 45.73 | 95\% | edian | C.I.: 91.67 | to 99.49 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL Sales | Price: |  | 59,911,784 | WGT. MEAN: | 91 |  | STD: | 44.75 | 95\% Wgt | Mean | C.I.: 83.09 | to 97.92 |  |
|  | TOTAL Adj. Sales | Price: |  | 59,896,784 | MEAN : | 98 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 27.67 |  | Mean | C.I.: 92. | to 103.63 |  |
|  | total Assessed | d Value: |  | 54,211,683 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales | Price: |  | 259,293 | COD : | 28.86 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 420.86 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Assessed | d Value: |  | 234,682 | PRD : | 108.12 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 9.38 |  |  |  | Printed: 04/03/ | 08 12:55:40 |
| OCCUPANC | CY CODE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | N MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 35 | 92.51 | 195.58 | 100.00 | 40.98 |  | 95.58 | 9.38 | 266.56 | 73.64 | to 106.77 | 99,388 | 99,388 |
| 304 |  | 1 | 96.95 | 596.95 | 96.95 |  |  |  | 96.95 | 96.95 |  | N/A | 329,576 | 319,516 |
| 309 |  | 4 | 183.11 | 1 167.31 | 143.56 | 15.85 |  | 116.55 | 104.65 | 198.39 |  | N/A | 38,750 | 55,628 |
| 319 |  | 1 | 94.16 | 694.16 | 94.16 |  |  |  | 94.16 | 94.16 |  | N/A | 4,200,000 | 3,954,534 |
| 326 |  | 4 | 97.52 | 294.85 | 97.39 | 4.01 |  | 97.39 | 84.36 | 100.00 |  | N/A | 144,823 | 141,045 |
| 343 |  | 1 | 92.21 | 192.21 | 92.21 |  |  |  | 92.21 | 92.21 |  | N/A | 2,289,221 | 2,110,813 |
| 344 |  | 25 | 95.54 | $4 \quad 91.31$ | 89.50 | 17.76 |  | 102.02 | 45.83 | 126.78 | 82.87 | to 105.32 | 166,754 | 149,248 |
| 349 |  | 3 | 81.67 | 787.69 | 96.24 | 8.38 |  | 91.12 | 80.44 | 100.97 |  | N/A | 329,553 | 317,172 |
| 350 |  | 5 | 80.33 | 395.70 | 54.41 | 52.60 |  | 175.87 | 37.80 | 199.70 |  | N/A | 523,455 | 284,834 |
| 351 |  | 25 | 93.55 | 593.62 | 81.37 | 28.43 |  | 115.06 | 27.24 | 170.43 | 72.78 | to 106.72 | 108,576 | 88,346 |
| 352 |  | 31 | 97.61 | 196.06 | 87.89 | 15.68 |  | 109.29 | 58.88 | 153.22 | 86.97 | to 100.25 | 223,211 | 196,189 |
| 353 |  | 19 | 98.64 | 496.33 | 72.43 | 20.51 |  | 132.98 | 34.86 | 135.28 | 78.61 | to 115.42 | 175,237 | 126,930 |
| 386 |  | 5 | 86.76 | 683.16 | 72.28 | 21.80 |  | 115.06 | 57.19 | 106.79 |  | N/A | 238,626 | 172,470 |
| 395 |  | 2 | 164.07 | 7 164.07 | 130.27 | 51.49 |  | 125.94 | 79.58 | 248.55 |  | N/A | 25,000 | 32,567 |
| 406 |  | 4 | 128.02 | 2115.85 | 125.98 | 16.50 |  | 91.96 | 69.72 | 137.64 |  | N/A | 131,000 | 165,028 |
| 407 |  | 1 | 95.21 | $1 \quad 95.21$ | 95.21 |  |  |  | 95.21 | 95.21 |  | N/A | 151,200 | 143,957 |
| 412 |  | 1 | 74.68 | $8 \quad 74.68$ | 74.68 |  |  |  | 74.68 | 74.68 |  | N/A | 2,245,000 | 1,676,473 |
| 413 |  | 1 | 100.00 | 00100.00 | 100.00 |  |  |  | 100.00 | 100.00 |  | N/A | 10,500,000 | 10,500,000 |
| 423 |  | 2 | 72.71 | $1 \quad 72.71$ | 70.40 | 11.79 |  | 103.27 | 64.13 | 81.28 |  | N/A | 169,500 | 119,332 |
| 426 |  | 1 | 107.40 | 107.40 | 107.40 |  |  |  | 107.40 | 107.40 |  | N/A | 70,000 | 75,179 |
| 442 |  | 1 | 93.06 | 693.06 | 93.06 |  |  |  | 93.06 | 93.06 |  | N/A | 28,000 | 26,056 |
| 444 |  | 3 | 78.17 | 790.58 | 98.63 | 19.38 |  | 91.84 | 74.06 | 119.51 |  | N/A | 64,166 | 63,289 |
| 455 |  | 2 | 96.46 | $6 \quad 96.46$ | 92.96 | 9.57 |  | 103.76 | 87.23 | 105.69 |  | N/A | 1,087,500 | 1,010,951 |
| 458 |  | 1 | 308.40 | 0308.40 | 308.40 |  |  |  | 308.40 | 308.40 |  | N/A | 22,500 | 69,391 |
| 470 |  | 1 | 54.10 | $0 \quad 54.10$ | 54.10 |  |  |  | 54.10 | 54.10 |  | N/A | 350,000 | 189,356 |
| 471 |  | 20 | 74.97 | $7 \quad 98.24$ | 68.51 | 57.95 |  | 143.39 | 20.36 | 420.86 | 64.56 | to 113.40 | 90,617 | 62,084 |
| 493 |  | 1 | 105.12 | 2105.12 | 105.12 |  |  |  | 105.12 | 105.12 |  | N/A | 47,500 | 49,933 |
| 494 |  | 1 | 59.92 | 29.92 | 59.92 |  |  |  | 59.92 | 59.92 |  | N/A | 50,000 | 29,961 |
| 497 |  | 1 | 91.67 | $7 \quad 91.67$ | 91.67 |  |  |  | 91.67 | 91.67 |  | N/A | 250,000 | 229,183 |
| 528 |  | 14 | 98.21 | 193.68 | 85.74 | 18.46 |  | 109.26 | 54.25 | 132.64 | 69.77 | 7 to 112.63 | 163,187 | 139,921 |
| 531 |  | 4 | 86.37 | $7 \quad 84.58$ | 82.94 | 10.04 |  | 101.97 | 65.88 | 99.69 |  | N/A | 318,750 | 264,378 |
| 534 |  | 2 | 105.47 | $7 \quad 105.47$ | 105.46 | 0.82 |  | 100.01 | 104.61 | 106.33 |  | N/A | 225,658 | 237,982 |
| 543 |  | 1 | 190.14 | 4190.14 | 190.14 |  |  |  | 190.14 | 190.14 |  | N/A | 69,000 | 131,199 |
| 544 |  | 2 | 126.15 | 5126.15 | 109.58 | 35.04 |  | 115.12 | 81.95 | 170.35 |  | N/A | 360,000 | 394,481 |
| 554 |  | 2 | 87.75 | $5 \quad 87.75$ | 72.65 | 20.64 |  | 120.78 | 69.64 | 105.86 |  | N/A | 163,625 | 118,881 |
| 555 |  | 2 | 125.28 | $8 \quad 125.28$ | 124.77 | 1.69 |  | 100.41 | 123.16 | 127.40 |  | N/A | 19,750 | 24,642 |
| 699 |  | 1 | 23.92 | 23.92 | 23.92 |  |  |  | 23.92 | 23.92 |  | N/A | 60,000 | 14,349 |
| 710 |  | 1 | 129.97 | $7 \quad 129.97$ | 129.97 |  |  |  | 129.97 | 129.97 |  | N/A | 2,900,000 | 3,769,254 |

79 - SCOTTSBLUFF COUNTY COMMERCIAL

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

## PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics

## Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
96 COV: 45.73 95\% Median C.I.: 91.67 to $99.49 \quad$ (!: AVTot=0)


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

## Agricultural

Minor percentage changes were made to particular Land Capability Groups to reflect $75 \%$ of market value, for the agricultural and Special Value land within the County. Irrigated land from 2A1 to 4A1 was raised (4A remained unchanged). Dryland remained unchanged, and Grassland values were all raised to closer match $75 \%$ of the market.

Regarding recapture, no changes were made to Area 1 recapture values. Area 2 experienced changes to recapture value as follows: 4A was increased; 2G and 2G1 recapture value was decreased; 3G1, 4G1 and 4G values were all increased.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Scotts Bluff County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | The Appraiser and four staff data collectors. |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | The Assessor and the Appraiser. |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | The Appraiser and four staff data collectors. |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | Yes. |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | Agland is defined pursuant to Section 35 of LB 808 <br> 1) Agricultural land and horticultural land means a parcel of land which is primarily used for agricultural or horticultural purposes, including wasteland lying in or adjacent to and in common ownership or nanagement with other agricultural land and horticultural land. Agricultural land and horticultural land does not include any land directly associated with any building or enclosed structure. <br> 2) Agricultural or horticultural purposes means used for the commercial production of any plant or animal product in a raw or unprocessed state that is derived from the science and art of agriculture, aquaculture, or horticulture. Agricultural or horticultural purposes includes the following uses of land: <br> a) Land retained or protected for future agricultural or horticultural purposes under a conservation easement as provided in the Conservation and Preservation Easements Act except when the parcel or a portion thereof is being used for purposes other than agricultural or horticultural purposes; and <br> b) Land enrolled in a federal or state program in which payments are received for removing such land from agricultural or horticultural production. <br> Land not falling into either category listed above will be considered Rural Residential. |
| 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? |
|  | The Income Approach has only been used to establish the special value of agricultural land within the County. |
| 6. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |


|  | 1967 |
| ---: | :--- |
| 7. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | The last countywide land use study was completed in 1998. It is currently done as <br> land use change is discovered on an ongoing basis. |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | Primarily by discovery and FSA maps provided by taxpayers. |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | The Appraiser and the data collectors. |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | There is no planned cyclical program for updating land use, except by discovery of <br> land use change. |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class: |
|  | Three |


| 9. | How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | By geographical and topographical characteristics, as well as similarity of land and <br> soils. |
| 10. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special <br> valuation for agricultural land within the county? |
|  | Yes, the County has implemented special valuation in Market Areas 1 and 2. |

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4 4}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{4 4}$ |

Amy Ramos
SCOTTS BLUFF COUNTY ASSESSOR
Gering, Ne. 69361
308-436-6630
aramos@scottsbluffcounty.org

Ruth A. Sorensen
March 1, 2008
Dept of Revenue, Property Assessment Division
1033 O St. Ste 600
Lincoln, Ne. 68508
Dear Ms Sorensen:
Below is the information regarding special valuation in Scotts Bluff County as per PAT Regulation-11-005.04

Market area I for 2008 is located around the cities of Scotts Bluff and Gering. This area is unique in that the cities are growing outside of their corporate boundaries and many rural subdivisions are being created. Land values are becoming affected by buyers purchasing the land at site value instead of ag land value.

Market area II for 2008 is located north and south diagonally through the county. This area is unique in that it encompasses the river and the accretion land, but it also consists of any growth from the small towns. Land values are becoming affected by buyers purchasing the land at site value instead of ag land value. Land is also affected by buyers purchasing accretion land for recreational use.

Market area III for 2008 is located north and south of market areas I and II. It is the remainder of Scotts Bluff County not included in market areas I or II.

Statistics were run in market area III to determine the value. Once the values were set they were compared to neighboring counties and Scotts Bluff County was found to be comparable to the surrounding counties, therefore it was determined that market area III did not qualify for special valuation for 2008.

Using the information and statistics from PAT it was determined that market area I and II did qualify for special value for 2008. It was evident that the sales of recreational use or growth outside of a city were corrupting the ag values. Once the recapture value was set for these areas, market area III values were used as the special value.

Special value has been implemented in this county since 2001. A large part of the county has signed up for and received special value. These are property owners who own land within Market area I or II that are actively using their land for agricultural use. With the definition of an ag parcel in 2006, we are actively trying to correctly classify a parcel as ag or rural residential. We are also going through each Ag parcel individually to correct any inconsistencies and clean up problems for the future.

Sincerely,
Amy Ramos
Scotts Bluff County Assessor

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Counties that have Implemented Special Value for Scotts Bluff 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.

## Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land in Scotts Bluff County is $73 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Scotts Bluff County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in Scotts Bluff County is $73 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in Scotts Bluff County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Recapture Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in Scotts Bluff County is $75 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in Scotts Bluff County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.


# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION for Scotts Bluff County 

## I. Agricultural Land Value Correlation

According to the Special Value Methodology document provided by the Scotts Bluff County assessor, agricultural Market Area I, "located around the cities of Scottsbluff and Gering," is influenced by "buyers purchasing the land at site value instead of ag land value." Market Area II, running north to south diagonally through the County, "encompasses the river and the accretion land, but it also consists of any growth from the small towns." Land values in this Market Area is also being purchased as site value rather than ag value, but also includes the effect of accretion land along the North Platte River being purchased for recreational use.

Agricultural Market Area III constitutes the remainder of agricultural land within the County that is not subject to the influences found in Market Areas I and II. During the three-year timeframe of the sales study, 133 unimproved sales were designated qualified by the County. Of these, 115 were classified as falling within Market Area III. It is these uninfluenced land sales that will be used to estimate the level of value for agricultural land within Scotts Bluff County.

The statistical profile of the 115 sales indicates an overall median of $72.69 \%$, a mean of $75.51 \%$ and a weighted mean of $72.53 \%$. Thus, both the median and weighted mean are within acceptable range. The hypothetical removal of extreme outliers would bring the mean within acceptable range (at 74.99). For purposes of direct equalization, the median will be used as the point estimate of overall level of value for agricultural land within the County.

Review of the qualitative statistics shows that the coefficient of dispersion is at 26.25 and the price-related differential is at 104.12 . Both are outside of compliance, and the same removal of extreme outliers would fail to bring either the COD or the PRD into compliance. Therefore, it is believed that the County has met the standards for level of value for agricultural land, but is not in compliance with the standards for uniform and proportionate assessment.

Further review of the statistical profile reveals under the heading, "Majority Land Use $>95 \%$," ten "Grass" sales with a median of 64.79, a mean of 57.89 , a weighted mean of 69.53 , a COD of 26.25 and a PRD of 104.12. Inspection of the sales file shows that these ten sales have a total of 2,767.06 acres of grass. Comparing this figure to the reported total grass acres found in Market Area 3 ( $166,904.140$ as reported in Section IX-c of the abstract), provides a ratio of less than two percent of all grass acres in Market Area 3 (1.67\%). Therefore, no non-binding recommendation will be made for this subclass.






# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION CORRELATION for Scotts Bluff County 

## II. Special Value Correlation

The Special Value Methodology document provided for assessment year 2008 by the Scotts Bluff County assessor, reveals that both agricultural Market Areas I and II are influenced by nonagricultural use-Area I is located around the cities of Scottsbluff and Gering, and Area II "encompasses the river and the accretion land, but it also consists of any growth from the small towns." Agricultural Market Area III is comprised of the remainder of agricultural land within Scotts Bluff County that is not subject to the influence found in Market Areas I and II. Of the 133 qualified unimproved land sales that occurred during the three-year timeframe of the sales study, 115 of the se were classified as falling within the boundaries of agricultural Market Area III. According to the assessor's Special Value Methodology document, "statistics were run in market area III to determine the value." These uninfluenced land sales will be used to estimate the level of value for special value within Scotts Bluff County.

The statistical profile of the 115 sales indicates an overall median of $72.69 \%$, a mean of $75.51 \%$ and a weighted mean of $72.53 \%$. Thus, both the median and weighted mean are within acceptable range. The hypothetical removal of extreme outliers would bring the mean within acceptable range (at 74.99). For purposes of direct equalization, the median will be used as the point estimate of overall level of value for special value within the County.

Review of the qualitative statistics shows that the coefficient of dispersion is at 26.25 and the price-related differential is at 104.12 . Both are outside of compliance, and the same removal of extreme outliers would fail to bring either the COD or the PRD into compliance. Therefore, it is believed that the County has met the standards for level of special value, but is not in compliance with the standards for uniform and proportionate assessment.

Examination of the statistical profile under the heading, "Majority Land Use $>95 \%$," indicates ten "Grass" sales with a median of 64.79 , a mean of 57.89 , a weighted mean of 69.53 , a COD of 26.25 and a PRD of 104.12. Inspection of the sales file shows that these ten sales have a total of 2,767.06 acres of grass. Comparing this figure to the reported total grass acres found in Market Area 3 ( $166,904.140$ as reported in Section IX-c of the abstract), provides a ratio of less than two percent of all grass acres in Market Area 3 (1.67\%). Therefore, no non-binding recommendation will be made for this subclass.



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


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


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


# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION for <br> Scotts Bluff County 

## III. Recapture Value Correlation

One hundred thirty-three qualified agricultural unimproved sales occurred during the three-year period of the sales study. Of these, the sales determined to fall within the regions of Market Areas I and II are influenced by the non-agricultural market. Area I is located around the cities of Scottsbluff and Gering, and Area II "encompasses the river and the accretion land, but it also consists of any growth from the small towns." The measurement of recapture value will be based on the eighteen unimproved sales (four in Market Area I and fourteen in Area II) occurring during the period of the sales study that show a recapture value.

The statistical profile indicates an overall median of 71.99 , a mean of 94.19 and a weighted mean of 70.87. Both the median and weighted mean are within acceptable range, and the removal of the two extreme outliers would fail to bring the mean within compliance (it would fall to 89.31). With only eighteen sales to measure recapture value within the County, and a high COD, it is difficult to have confidence in any of the measures of central tendency. Further, because of the limited sample and the broad range of ratios within the sample (a minimum $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ of $33.56 \%$ and a maximum A/S of $233 \%$ ), it is only possible to state that the liaison presumes that the County has met the required level of value for recapture, because there is no convincing data to prove otherwise.

Both qualitative statistics are quite outside of compliance, with a COD of 59.21 and a PRD of 132.91. The removal of the two extreme outliers would fail to bring these into compliance-the coefficient of dispersion would become 49.30 , and the price-related differential would drop to 124.72. Therefore, it is believed that the county has not met the standards for uniform and proportionate assessment for recapture value.


## AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

|  | NUMBER of Sales: | 18 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $2,777,080$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $2,777,080$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $1,968,187$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 154,282 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 109,343 |

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



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



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


## County 79 - Scotts Bluff
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## County 79 - Scotts Bluff

| Schedule II:Tax Increment Financing (TIF) |  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value Base | Value Excess | Records | Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 38 | 100,260 | 4,364,917 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 50 | 1,434,721 | 18,240,222 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural <br> Value Base | Value Excess | Records | Total <br> Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 100,260 | 4,364,917 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 1,434,721 | 18,240,222 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  | 88 | 1,534,981 | 22,605,139 |


| Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records | Urban |  | SubUrban |  |  | Rural |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records |  | Value | Records | Value |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 1 | 16,008 |  | 0 | 0 | 46 | 2,620,756 |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4,060 |


|  | Total |  | Growth |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 47 | $2,636,764$ | 0 |  |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 4 | 4,060 | 0 |  |
| 25. Mineral Interest Total | 51 | $\mathbf{2 , 6 4 0 , 8 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |


$\left.$| Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural |
| :--- |
| Urban <br> Records | | SubUrban |
| :---: |
| Records |$\quad$| Rural |
| :---: |
| Records |$\quad$| Total |
| :---: |
| Records | \right\rvert\, | 26. Exempt | 700 | 0 | 698 | $\mathbf{1 , 3 9 8}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Schedule V: Agricultural Records | Urban | SubUrban |  |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Records |  | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land | 6 | 166,054 | 0 | 0 | 2,140 | 110,891,443 | 2,146 | 111,057,497 |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 2 | 26,928 | 0 | 0 | 1,386 | 118,481,556 | 1,388 | 118,508,484 |
| 29. Ag-Improvements | 2 | 98,365 | 0 | 0 | 1,398 | 93,996,997 | 1,400 | 94,095,362 |
| 30. Ag-Total Taxable |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,546 | 323,661,343 |

County 79 - Scotts Bluff
Schedule VI: Agricultural Records:
Non-Agricultural Detail
31. HomeSite UnImp Land
32. HomeSite Improv Land
33. HomeSite Improvements
34. HomeSite Total

| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 1 | 1.000 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 1 |  | 20,672 | 0 | 0 |

38. FarmSite Total

| 38. FarmSite Total |
| :--- |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| Records |


| 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 | 15 | 4,390.370 | 998,323 | 15 | 4,390.370 | 998,323 |
| Schedule VIII: Agricultural Records: Special Value | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 3 | 62.630 | 21,043 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 93,467 | Total |  |  |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 2,109 | 270,280.640 | 119,859,757 | 2,112 | 270,343.270 | 119,880,800 |
| 44. Recapture Val |  |  | 148,598,854 |  |  | 148,692,321 |
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## County 79 - Scotts Bluff <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUr <br> Acres | Value | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 | 69.030 | 144,403 | 0.000 | 0 | 6,353.220 | 7,857,275 | 6,422.250 | 8,001,678 |
| 48. 2A | 4.000 | 3,800 | 0.000 | 0 | 2,572.070 | 2,869,576 | 2,576.070 | 2,873,376 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,575.620 | 1,449,000 | 1,575.620 | 1,449,000 |
| 50. 3A | 2.620 | 5,240 | 0.000 | 0 | 625.320 | 484,806 | 627.940 | 490,046 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.820 | 1,230 | 0.000 | 0 | 821.030 | 564,911 | 821.850 | 566,141 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 421.380 | 320,328 | 421.380 | 320,328 |
| 53. Total | 76.470 | 154,673 | 0.000 | 0 | 12,368.640 | 13,545,896 | 12,445.110 | 13,700,569 |


| Dryland: |
| :--- |
| 54. 1D1 |
| 55. 1D |

Grass:
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## County 79 - Scotts Bluff <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

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

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 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 | 3,567.080 | 3,794,110 | 3,567.080 | 3,794,110 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7,628.320 | 7,673,774 | 7,628.320 | 7,673,774 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 236.420 | 190,709 | 236.420 | 190,709 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,390.800 | 2,287,811 | 3,390.800 | 2,287,811 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,629.680 | 2,265,248 | 3,629.680 | 2,265,248 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,880.020 | 1,134,659 | 1,880.020 | 1,134,659 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 20,332.320 | 17,346,311 | 20,332.320 | 17,346,311 |


| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 29.730 | 8,325 | 29.730 | 8,325 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 43.530 | 10,012 | 43.530 | 10,012 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 85.000 | 19,550 | 85.000 | 19,550 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 48.940 | 10,278 | 48.940 | 10,278 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 207.200 | 48,165 | 207.200 | 48,165 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 185.810 | 57,740 | 185.810 | 57,740 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 910.700 | 269,228 | 910.700 | 269,228 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 151.730 | 43,955 | 151.730 | 43,955 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,442.250 | 372,514 | 1,442.250 | 372,514 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4,294.120 | 1,001,619 | 4,294.120 | 1,001,619 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 15,161.040 | 3,310,655 | 15,161.040 | 3,310,655 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 22,145.650 | 5,055,711 | 22,145.650 | 5,055,711 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,009.900 | 75,748 | 1,009.900 | 75,748 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 43,695.070 | 22,525,935 | 43,695.070 | 22,525,935 |
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## County 79 - Scotts Bluff

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
3

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated: | Acres 0 | Value 0 | Acres | Value 0 | Acres | Value 0 | Acres | Value |
| 46. |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0 |
|  | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 44,593.610 | 46,816,620 | 44,593.610 | 46,816,620 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 35,328.690 | 33,578,078 | 35,328.690 | 33,578,078 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 26,239.960 | 21,254,491 | 26,239.960 | 21,254,491 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 15,674.210 | 10,195,234 | 15,674.210 | 10,195,234 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13,537.870 | 8,260,161 | 13,537.870 | 8,260,161 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7,003.070 | 4,201,992 | 7,003.070 | 4,201,992 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 142,377.410 | 124,306,576 | 142,377.410 | 124,306,576 |


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

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,578.450 | 894,634 | 3,578.450 | 894,634 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 20,928.670 | 4,814,393 | 20,928.670 | 4,814,393 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 9,813.740 | 2,159,023 | 9,813.740 | 2,159,023 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 16,004.230 | 3,362,813 | 16,004.230 | 3,362,813 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 34,634.720 | 6,927,294 | 34,634.720 | 6,927,294 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 81,944.330 | 15,979,245 | 81,944.330 | 15,979,245 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 166,904.140 | 34,137,402 | 166,904.140 | 34,137,402 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11,276.460 | 845,917 | 11,276.460 | 845,917 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 354,635.720 | 168,293,958 | 354,635.720 | 168,293,958 |
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## County 79 - Scotts Bluff

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

| Urban |  |  | U | Rural |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 76.470 | 154,673 | 0.000 | 0 | 175,078.370 | 155,198,783 | 175,154.840 | 155,353,456 |
| 77.Dry Land | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 34,405.470 | 9,083,970 | 34,405.470 | 9,083,970 |
| 78.Grass | 60.570 | 21,809 | 0.000 | 0 | 191,321.510 | 40,096,609 | 191,382.080 | 40,118,418 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 12,998.740 | 975,097 | 12,998.740 | 975,097 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 81.Exempt | 229.940 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 4,100.630 | 0 | 4,330.570 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 137.040 | 176,482 | 0.000 | 0 | 413,804.090 | 205,354,459 | 413,941.130 | 205,530,941 |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 79 - Scotts Bluff
Market Area:
Average Assessed Value*

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

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 68.140 | 2.92\% | 21,266 | 2.30\% | 312.092 |
| 2G | 264.260 | 11.33\% | 110,031 | 11.89\% | 416.374 |
| 3G1 | 97.480 | 4.18\% | 30,231 | 3.27\% | 310.125 |
| 3G | 262.120 | 11.24\% | 75,972 | 8.21\% | 289.836 |
| 4G1 | 335.400 | 14.38\% | 103,880 | 11.23\% | 309.719 |
| 4G | 1,304.890 | 55.95\% | 583,925 | 63.11\% | 447.489 |
| Grass Total | 2,332.290 | 100.00\% | 925,305 | 100.00\% | 396.736 |
| Irrigated Total | 12,445.110 | 79.72\% | 13,700,569 | 93.13\% | 1,100.879 |
| Dry Total | 120.560 | 0.77\% | 31,742 | 0.22\% | 263.287 |
| Grass Total | 2,332.290 | 14.94\% | 925,305 | 6.29\% | 396.736 |
| Waste | 712.380 | 4.56\% | 53,432 | 0.36\% | 75.004 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 4,330.570 | 27.74\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 15,610.340 | 100.00\% | 14,711,048 | 100.00\% | 942.391 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $12,445.110$ | $7.11 \%$ | $13,700,569$ | $8.82 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 120.560 | $0.35 \%$ | 31,742 | $0.35 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $2,332.290$ | $1.22 \%$ | 925,305 | $2.31 \%$ |
| Waste | 712.380 | $5.48 \%$ | 53,432 | $5.48 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | $4,330.570$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $15,610.340$ | $3.77 \%$ | $14,711,048$ | $7.16 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 79 - Scotts Bluff
Market Area: 2

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 3,567.080 | 17.54\% | 3,794,110 | 21.87\% | 1,063.645 |
| 2A | 7,628.320 | 37.52\% | 7,673,774 | 44.24\% | 1,005.958 |
| 3A1 | 236.420 | 1.16\% | 190,709 | 1.10\% | 806.653 |
| 3A | 3,390.800 | 16.68\% | 2,287,811 | 13.19\% | 674.711 |
| 4A1 | 3,629.680 | 17.85\% | 2,265,248 | 13.06\% | 624.090 |
| 4A | 1,880.020 | 9.25\% | 1,134,659 | 6.54\% | 603.535 |
| Irrigated Total | 20,332.320 | 100.00\% | 17,346,311 | 100.00\% | 853.139 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D | 29.730 | 14.35\% | 8,325 | 17.28\% | 280.020 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3D | 43.530 | 21.01\% | 10,012 | 20.79\% | 230.002 |
| 4D1 | 85.000 | 41.02\% | 19,550 | 40.59\% | 230.000 |
| 4D | 48.940 | 23.62\% | 10,278 | 21.34\% | 210.012 |
| Dry Total | 207.200 | 100.00\% | 48,165 | 100.00\% | 232.456 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| 2G1 | 185.810 | $0.84 \%$ | 57,740 | $1.14 \%$ |
| 2G | 910.700 | $4.11 \%$ | 269,228 | $5.33 \%$ |
| 3G1 | 151.730 | $0.69 \%$ | 43,955 | $0.87 \%$ |
| 3G | $1,442.250$ | $6.51 \%$ | 372,514 | $7.37 \%$ |
| 4G1 | $4,294.120$ | $19.39 \%$ | $1,001,619$ | $19.81 \%$ |
| 4G | $15,161.040$ | $68.46 \%$ | $3,310,655$ | $65.48 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $22,145.650$ | $100.00 \%$ | $5,055,711$ | $100.00 \%$ |
| Irrigated Total | $20,332.320$ | $46.53 \%$ |  | 295.627 |
| Dry Total | 207.200 | $0.47 \%$ | $17,346,311$ | $77.01 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $22,145.650$ | $50.68 \%$ | 48,165 | $0.21 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,009.900$ | $2.31 \%$ | $5,055,711$ | $22.44 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 75,748 | $0.34 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 |
| Market Area Total | $43,695.070$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | 233.286 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $20,332.320$ | $11.61 \%$ | $17,346,311$ | $11.17 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 207.200 | $0.60 \%$ | 48,165 | $0.53 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $22,145.650$ | $11.57 \%$ | $5,055,711$ | $12.60 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,009.900$ | $7.77 \%$ | 75,748 | $7.77 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $43,695.070$ | $10.56 \%$ | $22,525,935$ | $10.96 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 79 - Scotts Bluff
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 44,593.610 | 31.32\% | 46,816,620 | 37.66\% | 1,049.850 |
| 2A | 35,328.690 | 24.81\% | 33,578,078 | 27.01\% | 950.447 |
| 3A1 | 26,239.960 | 18.43\% | 21,254,491 | 17.10\% | 810.004 |
| 3A | 15,674.210 | 11.01\% | 10,195,234 | 8.20\% | 650.446 |
| 4A1 | 13,537.870 | 9.51\% | 8,260,161 | 6.64\% | 610.152 |
| 4A | 7,003.070 | 4.92\% | 4,201,992 | 3.38\% | 600.021 |
| Irrigated Total | 142,377.410 | 100.00\% | 124,306,576 | 100.00\% | 873.077 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2D1 | 3,314.550 | 9.73\% | 1,093,814 | 12.15\% | 330.003 |
| 2D | 12,457.280 | 36.56\% | 3,488,038 | 38.74\% | 279.999 |
| 3D1 | 8,576.560 | 25.17\% | 2,229,904 | 24.77\% | 259.999 |
| 3D | 808.480 | 2.37\% | 185,956 | 2.07\% | 230.006 |
| 4D1 | 6,647.170 | 19.51\% | 1,528,870 | 16.98\% | 230.003 |
| 4D | 2,273.670 | 6.67\% | 477,481 | 5.30\% | 210.004 |
| Dry Total | 34,077.710 | 100.00\% | 9,004,063 | 100.00\% | 264.221 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | $3,578.450$ | $2.14 \%$ | 894,634 | $2.62 \%$ | 250.006 |
| 2G | $20,928.670$ | $12.54 \%$ | $4,814,393$ | $14.10 \%$ | 230.038 |
| 3G1 | $9,813.740$ | $5.88 \%$ | $2,159,023$ | $6.32 \%$ | 220.000 |
| 3G | $16,004.230$ | $9.59 \%$ | $3,362,813$ | $9.85 \%$ | 210.120 |
| 4G1 | $34,634.720$ | $20.75 \%$ | $6,927,294$ | $20.29 \%$ | 200.010 |
| 4G | $81,944.330$ | $49.10 \%$ | $15,979,245$ | $46.81 \%$ | 195.001 |
| Grass Total | $166,904.140$ | $100.00 \%$ | $34,137,402$ | $100.00 \%$ | 204.532 |
| Irrigated Total | $142,377.410$ | $40.15 \%$ | $124,306,576$ | $73.86 \%$ | 873.077 |
| Dry Total | $34,077.710$ | $9.61 \%$ | $9,004,063$ | $5.35 \%$ | 264.221 |
| Grass Total | $166,904.140$ | $47.06 \%$ | $34,137,402$ | $20.28 \%$ | 204.532 |
| Waste | $11,276.460$ | $3.18 \%$ | 845,917 | $0.50 \%$ | 75.016 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 474.5 |
| Market Area Total | $354,635.720$ | $100.00 \%$ | $168,293,958$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $142,377.410$ | $81.29 \%$ | $124,306,576$ | $80.02 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $34,077.710$ | $99.05 \%$ | $9,004,063$ | $99.12 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $166,904.140$ | $87.21 \%$ | $34,137,402$ | $85.09 \%$ |
| Waste | $11,276.460$ | $86.75 \%$ | 845,917 | $86.75 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Exempt | Market Area Total | $354,635.720$ | $85.67 \%$ | $168,293,958$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 79 - Scotts Bluff

| AgLand | Urban |  | SubUrban Acres |  | Value | Rural | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | 76.470 | 154,673 |  | O00 | $0 \quad 17$ | 5,078.370 | 155,198,783 |
| Dry | 0.000 | 0 |  | . 000 | 0 | 4,405.470 | 9,083,970 |
| Grass | 60.570 | 21,809 |  | 000 | 0 | 1,321.510 | 40,096,609 |
| Waste | 0.000 | 0 |  | 000 | 0 | 2,998.740 | 975,097 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0 |  | O00 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Exempt | 229.940 | 0 |  | 000 | 0 | 4,100.630 | 0 |
| Total | 137.040 | 176,482 |  | 000 | 0 | ,804.090 | 205,354,459 |
| AgLand | Total <br> Acres | Value | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| Irrigated | 175,154.840 | 155,353,456 | 175,154.840 | 42.31\% | 155,353,456 | 75.59\% | 886.949 |
| Dry | 34,405.470 | 9,083,970 | 34,405.470 | 8.31\% | 9,083,970 | 4.42\% | 264.026 |
| Grass | 191,382.080 | 40,118,418 | 191,382.080 | 46.23\% | 40,118,418 | 19.52\% | 209.624 |
| Waste | 12,998.740 | 975,097 | 12,998.740 | 3.14\% | 975,097 | 0.47\% | 75.014 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 4,330.570 | 0 | 4,330.570 | 1.05\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |


| Total | $\mathbf{4 1 3 , 9 4 1 . 1 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5 , 5 3 0 , 9 4 1}$ | $413,941.130$ | $100.00 \%$ | $205,530,941$ | $100.00 \%$ | 496.522 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

* 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)

79 Scotts Bluff

|  | 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 | 972,357,373 | 1,019,860,866 | 47,503,493 | 4.89 | 13,496,652 | 3.5 |
| 2. Recreational | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 90,738,848 | 97,742,407 | 7,003,559 | 7.72 | *---------- | 7.72 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 1,063,096,221 | 1,117,603,273 | 54,507,052 | 5.13 | 13,496,652 | 3.86 |
| 5. Commercial | 356,775,466 | 372,479,278 | 15,703,812 | 4.4 | 16,916,686 | -0.34 |
| 6. Industrial | 24,972,545 | 25,768,945 | 796,400 | 3.19 | 443,597 | 1.41 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 24,785,846 | 20,387,695 | -4,398,151 | -17.74 | 2,176,035 | -26.52 |
| 8. Minerals | 2,518,601 | 2,640,824 | 122,223 | 4.85 | 0 | 4.85 |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 409,052,458 | 421,276,742 | 12,224,284 | 2.99 | 17,360,283 | -1.26 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 1,472,148,679 | 1,538,880,315 | 66,731,636 | 4.53 | 33,032,970 | 2.29 |
| 11. Irrigated | 147,241,878 | 155,353,456 | 8,111,578 | 5.51 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 9,048,845 | 9,083,970 | 35,125 | 0.39 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 36,385,483 | 40,118,418 | 3,732,935 | 10.26 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 962,550 | 975,097 | 12,547 | 1.3 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 300 | 300 | -300 | -100 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 193,639,056 | 205,530,941 | 11,891,885 | 6.14 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 1,665,787,735 | 1,744,411,256 | 78,623,521 | 4.72 | 33,032,970 | 2.74 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
# 2007 STATISTICS 

|  | Median | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential | $94 \%$ | 18.75 | 105.94 |
| Commercial | $97 \%$ | 33.79 | 110.67 |
| Agriculture | $75 \%$ | 29.06 | 110.90 |

## ASSESSMENT ACTIONS PLANNED

2007-2008 we will rework all 4500 (rural residential) properties and all small (40 acres or less) 4000 properties in response to the change in agriculture use definition. Two data collectors are currently working on this. We will data collect commercial property: mini storage, apartments and multi-family dwellings within the county, warehouse storage will also be addressed, but not sure that it will be completed by December 2007. We are working through Scottsbluff residential neighborhoods that have not been seen in several years (since 1999) starting with neighborhood 1200. Next we will data collect the small towns that have not been updated since the late 1990's. All information that is completed (the entire neighborhood data collected) will be updated for the 2008 tax year. All building permits will be visited quarterly in 2007 and we will continue this process in the future. Agricultural parcels will be updated with the current sales information to set 2008 values.

2008-2009 we will rework all agricultural properties to collect current data not only on land use, but for buildings, etc., and ensure consistency within the farm properties. All farm properties will be updated for the 2009 tax year with the new data collected. We will continue to work through the commercial property within the county: office buildings, downtown row buildings, and industrial properties. Residential properties will be worked using the properties that have not been visited for the longest period of time first. If a neighborhood is pointed out by sales, as out of balance with the values in the working files we will do that neighborhood to collect accurate data and correct any problems. It has become important to go through each neighborhood to do a land study before allowing the working files to be rolled into the taxable value.

2009-2010 we will finish up on commercial properties and continue to review residential properties. The Ag land will be reviewed and rolled based on the current sales information. As with all years, we will check all building permits, partial assessments, and mobile homes.

We have opted to have the current cost tables updated in our files every year. By doing this, we hope that the amount of change each year will not be as drastic as waiting every few years to update them.

I hope to improve my statistics in the next few years by utilizing spreadsheets, my Terra Scan system, and experience from other Assessors and Appraisers.

## OFFICE STAFF

I have a total of 11 employees including myself.
I have 4 data collectors. Two data collectors go out as a group and review the rural property. The other 2 data collectors go out individually to review commercial and residential. They continuously review the county. We are looking into online training to cut down on mileage and hotel costs.

I have 1 data entry person that enters all of the building permits, does the file maintenance, helps with creating and maintaining spreadsheets, and helps with whatever project we have for that year.

I have 3 office clerks who do the personal property, mobile homes, permissive exemptions, LB 271 letters, homestead exemptions, and 521's. When time allows, they also help with projects we have for that year.

I have an appraiser who is responsible for the sales studies and sets values in conjunction with the assessor for Scotts Bluff County. She is responsible for preparing for TERC cases and working on income statements for the rent restricted housing. She is also responsible for quality control and performance evaluations for the appraisal staff.

My Deputy specializes in personal property but assists me in my work including splits, reports, and personnel issues.

I do all plats that come in. I complete required reports such as the abstracts, the school district report, and CTL. I handle the Centrally Assessed Property and the Oil and Gas Interest. I also handle all personnel issues and payroll.

## BUDGET

My 2007 budget has been approved in the amount of \$481,348.86
I budgeted for an additional vehicle for 2007. This will allow each data collector to have their own vehicle for review and allow the appraiser to visually verify the sales.

I was able to keep my continuing education amount up and plan to send my data collectors and office clerks to more classes. We have sent some employees to Ag Land training and others to 101 classes. The appraiser and I have taken some appraisal courses to help when setting values.

## VALUATION

After setting the values and going through the protest hearings, we ended up with an ending county valuation of $\$ 1,875,452,685$.

## COMPUTER RECORDS

We are currently using Terra Scan as our vendor. We also have Taxsifter. Taxsifter allows the public to access our Terra Scan records.

We are using cadastral maps and soil survey books but we are beginning to utilize the computer version of both along with the online FSA records.

We have purchased deed plotter for difficult legal descriptions and are relying more and more on the GIS system maintained by our mapping department. One employee is currently working with the mapping department to gain knowledge of the system so that we can utilize it more in this office.

## COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

The 2007 protest year went very smooth. I attribute this to keeping communication open with my office, keeping the Board up to date with what our office is doing and with our office review each protest before it went to the board. This is something I intend to continue.

I have kept the County Board informed on changing laws, and invite interested board members to meetings that discuss future changes in our office. By doing this I believe the board will better understand my office and will benefit me at protest time when trying to explain procedures.

## CONCLUSION

In my opinion, there are many areas in this office that need to be restructured, from Personnel to Statistics. This will not be corrected in one year but I hope to complete this during my term as Assessor.

Respectfully submitted:

Amy Ramos
Scotts Bluff County Assessor
October $30^{\text {th }}, 2007$

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Scotts Bluff County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | One |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
| 3. | One |
|  | Eight |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
| 5. | None |
|  | Number of shared employees |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
|  | \$481,348.86 |
| 7. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
|  | \$38,514.11 |
| 8. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
|  | N/A |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
|  | \$161,507.82 |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | \$7,000 |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | N/A |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | N/A |
|  | Total budget |
|  |  |
|  |  |

a. Was any of last year's budget not used:
No

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Terra Scan |
|  | CAMA software |
| 3. | Terra Scan |
|  | Yes |
| 4. | Who maintains the Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
|  | A member of the Assessor's staff, in conjunction with the County Surveyor. |
| 5. | Does the county have GIS software? |
|  | Yes |
| 6. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
|  | The County Surveyor. |
| 7. | Personal Property software: |
|  | Terra Scan |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Yes |
|  | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
| 3. | Yes |
|  | What municipalities in the county are zoned? <br> Gering, Henry, Lyman, McGrew, Melbeta, Minatare, Mitchell, Morrill, Scottsbluff <br> and Terrytown. |
| 4. | When was zoning implemented? |

## D. Contracted Services

## 1. Appraisal Services

All real property appraisal is done "in-house" by the County. The firm of Pritchard and Abbott is contracted for all oil, gas, and mineral valuation.
2. Other services

Terra Scan for CAMA, administrative and personal property software.

## Certification

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

- One copy to the Scotts Bluff County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70062760000063875081.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.


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

