## Table of Contents

## 2009 Commission Summary

## 2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

## Residential Reports

Preliminary Statistics
Residential Assessment Actions
Residential Assessment Survey
R\&O Statistics

## Residential Correlation

Residential Real Property
I. Correlation
II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R\&O Median Ratio
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD
VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions
VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

## Commercial Reports

Preliminary Statistics
Commercial Assessment Actions
Commercial Assessment Survey
R\&O Statistics

## Commercial Correlation

Commercial Real Property
I. Correlation
II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R\&O Median Ratio
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD
VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

## Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

Preliminary Statistics
Agricultural Assessment Actions
Agricultural Assessment Survey
R\&O Statistics
2009 Special Valuation Methodology

## Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

Agricultural or Special Valuation Land
I. Correlation
II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R\&O Median Ratio
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD
VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

## County Reports

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
2009 County Agricultural Land Detail
2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2008
Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
Assessment Survey - General Information

## Certification

Maps
Market Areas
Registered Wells > 500 GPM
Geo Codes
Soil Classes
Valuation History Charts

## 2009 Commission Summary

Gage

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 654 | COD | 22.88 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 55,677,037$ | PRD | 113.61 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 55,859,437$ | COV | 85.53 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 53,797,660$ | STD | 93.58 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 85,412$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 22.17 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 82,259$ | Average Assessed Value <br> of the Base | $\$ 73,278$ |
| Median | 97 | Wgt. Mean | 96 |
| Mean | 109 | Max | 1,500 |
| Min | 19.47 |  |  |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 96.32 to 97.35 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 102.24 to 116.59 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 94.86 to 97.76 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 40.34 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 6.92 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 7.77 |

## Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 709 | 97 | 14.4 | 107.07 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 827 | 97 | 22.94 | 112.8 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 888 | 98 | 19.78 | 108.82 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 818 | 97 | 21.54 | 107.94 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

## 34 Gage

## Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 69 | COD | 29.43 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 10,497,743$ | PRD | 103.76 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 10,185,568$ | COV | 80.72 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 10,840,450$ | STD | 89.14 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 147,617$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 29.43 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 157,108$ | Average Assessed Value |  |
|  |  | of the Base | $\$ 143,081$ |
| Median | 100 | Wgt. Mean | 106 |
| Mean | 110 | Max | 802 |
| Min | 33 |  |  |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 94.74 to 103.82 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 89.40 to 131.47 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 91.44 to 121.42 |


| $\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 10.21 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 5.63 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 6.18 |

## Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 83 | 96 | 30.96 | 109.84 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 84 | 97 | 18.69 | 99.76 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 96 | 97 | 19.01 | 100.86 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 99 | 98 | 16.79 | 100.55 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

34 Gage

Agricultural Land - Current

| Number of Sales | 128 | COD | 23.61 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 24,747,268$ | PRD | 104.53 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 24,747,268$ | COV | 33.91 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 17,974,850$ | STD | 25.75 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 193,338$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 17.20 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 140,429$ | Average Assessed Value |  |
| of the Base | $\$ 150,828$ |  |  |
| Median | 73 | Wgt. Mean |  |
| Mean | 76 | Max | 73 |
| Min | 10.23 |  | 237.71 |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 68.96 to 77.81 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 71.46 to 80.39 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 69.02 to 76.25 |

\% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 49.44
$\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period 2.28
\% of Value Sold in the Study Period

| Agricultural Land - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 135 | 72 | 22.5 | 105.81 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 131 | 71 | 24.81 | 108.12 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 127 | 75 | 21.1 | 108.33 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 116 | 75 | 18.38 | 104.74 |

Opinions

# 2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Gage County 

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within this Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. The resource used regarding the quality of assessment for each class of real property in this county are the performance standards issued by the International Association of Assessing Officers (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 Gage County is $97.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Gage County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Gage County is $100.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Gage County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Gage County is $72.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Gage County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.


Ruth A. Sorensen<br>Property Tax Administrato

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

## ype: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
687
$57,307,152$
$57,489,552$
$53,423,375$
83,682
77,763
MEDIAN:
WGT. MEAN :
MEAN :
COD :
PRD :

| $\mathbf{9 6}$ | COV: | 104.81 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 93 | STD: | 117.44 |
| 112 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 29.08 |
|  |  |  |
| 30.15 | MAX Sales Ratio: | 1944.17 |
| 20.57 | MIN Sales Ratio: | 7.34 |


| COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16.71 | 108.61 | 40.00 | 500.00 | 93.85 to 96.12 | 86,078 | 80,148 |
| 17.80 | 114.24 | 36.87 | 500.00 | 94.10 to 96.95 | 76,576 | 69,519 |
| 13.28 | 104.63 | 40.05 | 414.24 | 94.39 to 97.62 | 82,041 | 78,671 |
| 28.33 | 117.31 | 28.14 | 865.31 | 95.44 to 97.28 | 91,567 | 88,874 |
| 65.41 | 160.04 | 9.01 | 1944.17 | 96.64 to 99.00 | 90,261 | 81,322 |
| 20.59 | 111.51 | 7.34 | 308.26 | 95.87 to 98.67 | 79,876 | 75,095 |
| 50.14 | 130.95 | 34.88 | 903.05 | 94.45 to 102.19 | 61,921 | 62,622 |
| 23.17 | 109.50 | 9.83 | 226.12 | 86.03 to 97.23 | 88,786 | 75,657 |
| 20.22 | 111.85 | 28.14 | 865.31 | 95.27 to 96.56 | 85,096 | 80,490 |
| 39.36 | 129.41 | 7.34 | 1944.17 | 96.41 to 98.43 | 82,311 | 75,122 |
| 33.98 | 124.62 | 7.34 | 1944.17 | 96.56 to 97.77 | 86,456 | 81,399 |
| 30.15 | 120.57 | 7.34 | 1944.17 | 95.85 to 96.95 | 83,682 | 77,763 |

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics 

|  |  |  |  |  | Date Range | e: 07/0 | 01/2006 to 06/30/2 | 008 Posted | Before: 01/2 | 2009 |  | (!: AVTot=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUM | of Sales |  | 687 | MEDIAN: | 96 |  | COV: | 104.81 |  | dian C.I.: 95.8 | to 96.95 | (!: Derived) |
| TOTAL | es Price |  | 152 | WGT. MEAN: | 93 |  | STD: | 117.44 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 90. | to 95.43 |  |
| TOTAL Adj | es Price |  |  | MEAN : | 112 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 29.08 |  | Mean C.I.: 103 | 6 to 120.83 |  |
| total As | ed Value |  | 375 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Adj. | es Price |  | 682 | COD : | 30.15 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 1944.17 |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. As | ed Value |  | 763 | PRD : | 120.57 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 7.34 |  |  | Printed: 01/22 | 22:13:15 |
| PROPERTY TYPE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 01 | 674 | 96.41 | 111.48 | 92.93 | 29.35 |  | 119.96 | 7.34 | 1944.17 | 95.83 to 96.94 | 84,806 | 78,811 |
| 06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07 | 13 | 100.00 | 141.64 | 92.39 | 69.07 |  | 153.31 | 28.14 | 500.00 | 74.13 to 142.59 | 25,373 | 23,442 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 687 | 96.46 | 112.05 | 92.93 | 30.15 |  | 120.57 | 7.34 | 1944.17 | 95.85 to 96.95 | 83,682 | 77,763 |
| SCHOOL DISTRICT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 1 | 226.12 | 226.12 | 226.12 |  |  |  | 226.12 | 226.12 | N/A | 13,000 | 29,395 |
| 34-0001 | 88 | 99.78 | 167.33 | 106.25 | 84.20 |  | 157.48 | 40.00 | 1944.17 | 96.95 to 101.26 | 29,426 | 31,266 |
| 34-0015 | 474 | 96.26 | 104.49 | 93.02 | 19.63 |  | 112.34 | 7.34 | 1500.00 | 95.61 to 96.80 | 91,331 | 84,952 |
| 34-0034 | 49 | 95.82 | 98.85 | 85.16 | 29.54 |  | 116.08 | 28.14 | 391.67 | 81.79 to 98.24 | 108,866 | 92,713 |
| 34-0100 | 19 | 87.41 | 91.37 | 89.25 | 22.62 |  | 102.38 | 49.96 | 196.53 | 73.92 to 99.32 | 54,000 | 48,197 |
| 48-0300 | 3 | 99.93 | 114.31 | 103.84 | 16.56 |  | 110.08 | 96.67 | 146.33 | N/A | 81,833 | 84,975 |
| 55-0160 | 30 | 93.63 | 113.50 | 93.56 | 42.97 |  | 121.31 | 38.10 | 865.31 | 81.54 to 98.51 | 120,893 | 113,111 |
| 67-0069 | 12 | 90.19 | 93.31 | 90.36 | 31.93 |  | 103.27 | 42.82 | 152.40 | 65.50 to 126.33 | 42,758 | 38,636 |
| 76-0002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 76-0082 | 11 | 97.42 | 95.34 | 94.65 | 4.90 |  | 100.73 | 81.79 | 104.94 | 86.64 to 100.95 | 77,272 | 73,135 |
| NonValid School | 1 | 226.12 | 226.12 | 226.12 |  |  |  | 226.12 | 226.12 | N/A | 13,000 | 29,395 |
|  | 687 | 96.46 | 112.05 | 92.93 | 30.15 |  | 120.57 | 7.34 | 1944.17 | 95.85 to 96.95 | 83,682 | 77,763 |
| 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 | 74 | 92.50 | 187.24 | 97.69 | 141.29 |  | 191.68 | 7.34 | 1944.17 | 80.00 to 100.00 | 29,345 | 28,665 |
| Prior TO 1860 | 1 | 97.28 | 97.28 | 97.28 |  |  |  | 97.28 | 97.28 | N/A | 58,000 | 56,420 |
| 1860 TO 1899 | 12 | 96.38 | 157.16 | 93.29 | 75.46 |  | 168.47 | 63.26 | 500.00 | 88.21 to 127.84 | 48,225 | 44,987 |
| 1900 TO 1919 | 144 | 96.28 | 100.95 | 90.50 | 18.04 |  | 111.55 | 10.28 | 298.70 | 95.20 to 97.14 | 52,589 | 47,593 |
| 1920 TO 1939 | 113 | 96.89 | 111.05 | 92.95 | 25.35 |  | 119.47 | 19.47 | 676.67 | 95.64 to 98.23 | 59,137 | 54,969 |
| 1940 TO 1949 | 36 | 94.50 | 92.30 | 90.04 | 8.17 |  | 102.52 | 52.66 | 126.64 | 92.23 to 97.68 | 70,061 | 63,081 |
| 1950 TO 1959 | 53 | 98.42 | 99.75 | 96.84 | 6.47 |  | 103.00 | 77.25 | 196.53 | 96.08 to 98.87 | 82,674 | 80,063 |
| 1960 TO 1969 | 66 | 95.28 | 97.51 | 87.12 | 12.22 |  | 111.92 | 9.01 | 337.20 | 93.88 to 97.65 | 105,554 | 91,956 |
| 1970 TO 1979 | 79 | 96.61 | 96.48 | 95.27 | 9.81 |  | 101.27 | 28.14 | 233.31 | 95.11 to 98.11 | 106,275 | 101,249 |
| 1980 тО 1989 | 30 | 96.64 | 95.93 | 93.78 | 9.72 |  | 102.29 | 60.59 | 184.38 | 94.94 to 98.54 | 133,110 | 124,834 |
| 1990 TO 1994 | 12 | 97.63 | 97.81 | 98.10 | 4.07 |  | 99.71 | 87.53 | 109.21 | 94.20 to 102.18 | 167,416 | 164,235 |
| 1995 TO 1999 | 16 | 96.65 | 93.29 | 90.61 | 7.11 |  | 102.95 | 72.14 | 104.94 | 86.01 to 100.00 | 150,375 | 136,258 |
| 2000 TO Present | 51 | 96.11 | 114.51 | 93.96 | 30.98 |  | 121.87 | 34.36 | 903.05 | 94.97 to 97.23 | 191,200 | 179,660 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 687 | 96.46 | 112.05 | 92.93 | 30.15 |  | 120.57 | 7.34 | 1944.17 | 95.85 to 96.95 | 83,682 | 77,763 |
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Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009
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NUMBER of Sales
TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price AVG. Assessed Value:
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## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009


# Gage County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses: 

Residential; Gage County followed the 3-year plan for 2009 by doing a statistical analysis by assessor location in the residential class. The county conducted a sales analysis for the various locations and adjusted by a percentage the rural residential. The County also reviewed the towns of Odell and Pickrell.

In the Odell review the appraiser drove by all properties to check for additions or updates and corrected the property record card. If additions were noted the improvement was measured. New photos were taken of the major improvement on the property. The market analysis showed that adjustments were necessary one-story homes built prior to 1951. Also the 1-1/2 and two story homes built prior to 1940 were adjusted.

In Pickrell a drive by review was completed by the appraiser where the property record card was updated to reflect changes in the properties. New photos were taken and properties were measured if there was a change to the improvement. In Pickrell and adjustment was necessary to all 1 story homes. This was accomplished by using the information gather in the sales analysis for the location. Tables were set up for year built, quality and condition.

The county completed their annual pick-up and permit work for 2009.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Gage County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Staff |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Contractor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Urban- Contractor <br> Suburban, Rural and Res. Ag- Staff and contractor |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | 2007 |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2007 |
| 6. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties? |
|  | RCNLD Using a market based depreciation. |
| 7. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
|  | Urban-23 <br> Suburban- 1 <br> Rural-3 <br> Residential Ag-2 |
| 8. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |
|  | The market areas are defined by location and similar property characteristics. |
| 9. | Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods Is /Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping? |
|  | Yes |
| 10. | Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.) |
|  | There is no market significance. |


| 11. | Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels <br> valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? <br> Explain? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | No <br> They are treated as two different subclasses. Rural residential and ag-dwellings are <br> not valued in the same assessment cycle. |

## Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4 6 1}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{4 6 1}$ |

PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009


# PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics 



PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009
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NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:

| SALE PRICE * |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE |  | COUNT |
| Low \$ |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 30 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 13 |
| Total \$ |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 43 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 87 |
| 30000 то | 59999 | 135 |
| 60000 то | 99999 | 172 |
| 100000 то | 149999 | 116 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 89 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 12 |
| _ALL |  |  |

ASSESSED VALUE *

| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 29 | 96.89 | 132.26 | 88.27 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 9 | 97.00 | 141.91 | 98.93 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 38 | 96.89 | 134.55 | 93.97 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 92 | 97.80 | 139.30 | 94.53 |
| 30000 то | 59999 | 153 | 97.28 | 101.75 | 96.17 |
| 60000 то | 99999 | 163 | 97.30 | 100.96 | 97.59 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 121 | 95.42 | 95.26 | 94.10 |
| 150000 то | 249999 | 78 | 96.29 | 117.42 | 96.91 |
| 250000 тO | 499999 | 9 | 99.65 | 102.12 | 101.43 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 654 | 96.90 | 109.42 | 96.31 |

EDIAN
100.57

| 242.37 | 207.42 |
| :--- | :--- |

100.00
$182.82 \quad 178.72$

01/23/200
95\% Median C.I.: 96.32 to 97.35
(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 94.86 to 97.76


Printed: 03/19/2009 14:02:19
$172.82 \quad 116.85$
19.47

| 75.21 | 149.84 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 59.93 | 143.44 |
| 71.61 | 143.18 |
| 57.99 | 147.36 |
| 13.96 | 105.80 |
| 9.51 | 103.45 |
| 6.59 | 101.23 |
| 29.24 | 121.17 |
| 5.64 | 100.69 |
|  |  |
| 22.88 | 113.61 |


| 19.47 | 500.00 | 62.00 to 108.00 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 46.67 | 337.20 | 92.15 to 315.50 |
|  |  |  |
| 19.47 | 500.00 | 80.00 to 100.00 |
| 27.14 | 1500.00 | 96.95 to 99.29 |
| 50.00 | 278.57 | 95.47 to 98.44 |
| 67.55 | 539.10 | 96.36 to 98.23 |
| 57.53 | 161.55 | 94.30 to 96.40 |
| 62.28 | 1007.69 | 94.45 to 97.35 |
| 94.18 | 116.23 | 94.97 to 109.44 |
|  |  |  |
| 19.47 | 1500.00 | 96.32 to 97.35 |


| 2,269 | 2,003 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 8,388 | 8,299 |
| 3,719 | 3,494 |
| 22,451 | 21,224 |
| 47,058 | 45,258 |
| 80,213 | 78,279 |
| 129,664 | 122,016 |
| 192,103 | 186,169 |
| 300,490 | 304,777 |
|  |  |
| 85,411 | 82,259 |
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Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009


PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

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. Assessed Value:
654
$55,677,037$
$55,859,437$
$53,797,660$
85,411
82,259
MEAN WGT. MEAN
COD
67.60
134.14
21.77
1.15
29.67
14.00
12.21
6.02
10.17
0.08
22.88
PRD
142.81
168.31
98.20
100.33
115.08
106.84
105.71
100.73
103.61
99.96
MIN
27.14
40.00
19.47
93.98
28.14
62.79
60.59
67.67
57.53
62.28
94.03

19.47

| MAX | $95 \%$ Median C.I. |
| ---: | :---: |
| 500.00 | 76.52 to 116.23 |
| 1500.00 | 76.92 to 100.00 |
| 225.00 | 92.89 to 100.00 |
| 96.16 | N/A |
| 525.08 | 97.28 to 99.39 |
| 539.10 | 96.08 to 98.30 |
| 903.05 | 96.40 to 97.97 |
| 141.24 | 93.92 to 97.77 |
| 337.20 | 94.45 to 96.89 |
| 62.28 | N/A |
| 94.18 | N/A |
| 1500.00 | 96.32 to 97.35 |


| Printed: 03/19/2009 $14: 02: 19$ |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 109,707 | 101,064 |
| 20,723 | 23,090 |
| 18,521 | 19,442 |
| 107,950 | 102,292 |
| 37,124 | 37,093 |
| 47,979 | 47,240 |
| 90,656 | 88,063 |
| 115,629 | 109,667 |
| 154,349 | 145,306 |
| 350,000 | 217,995 |
| 248,250 | 233,717 |
|  |  |
| 85,411 | 82,259 |

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL:Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. Although these quality statistics improved since the preliminary statistics, they do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity. In analyzing the measures of central tendency only the mean is outside the range. It is the opinion of the Division that the R\&O statistics along with each of these analyses demonstrates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value that is best represented by the median measure of central tendency.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | $\mathbf{1 , 0 4 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 5 2}$ |
| 2008 | $\mathbf{1 , 1 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 3 6}$ |
| 2007 | $\mathbf{1 , 2 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 . 4 6}$ |
| 2006 | $\mathbf{1 , 1 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 1 2}$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 0 9}$ |

RESIDENTIAL:A review of the utilization grid indicates the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available residential sales for the development of the qualified statistics.

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

## 2009 Correlation Section

for Gage County

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

 Continued|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended <br> Preliminary Ratio | R\&O <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 96 | 2.89 | 99 | 97 |
| 2008 | 92.14 | 6.65 | 98 | 96.6 |
| 2007 | 96 | 0.70 | 97 | 97 |
| 2006 | 93 | 9.64 | 102 | 98 |
| 2005 | 92 | 6.88 | 99 | 97 |

RESIDENTIAL:The difference between the preliminary ratio and the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ ratio is approximately two points. The relationship suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and the assessed base in a similar manner.

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 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 2008 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.

# 2009 Correlation Section 

for Gage County

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

\% Change in Total
Assessed Value in the Sales File
\% Change in Total Assessed
Value (excl. growth)

| 7.69 | 2009 | 2.89 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 12.54 | 2008 | 6.65 |
| 3.64 | 2007 | 0.70 |
| 9.73 | 2006 | 9.64 |
| 2.88 | 2005 | 6.88 |

RESIDENTIAL:A review of the percent change report reveals an approximate 5 point difference between the assessed base and the sales base. The difference may imply that the assessment actions had more of a pronounced affect on the sales sample when compared to the assessed base. This raises the concern of the representativeness of the sales file.

## 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.

## 2009 Correlation Section
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## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 97 | 96 | 109 |

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

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

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

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

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{2 2 . 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3 . 6 1}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{7 . 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 6 1}$ |

RESIDENTIAL:Both quality of assessment measurements are outside the acceptable range.

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | $\mathbf{6 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 4}$ | -33 |
| Median | 96 | 97 | 1 |
| Wgt. Mean | 93 | 96 | 3 |
| Mean | 112 | 109 | -3 |
| COD | 30.15 | 22.88 | -7.27 |
| PRD | 120.57 | 113.61 | -6.96 |
| Minimum | 7.34 | 19.47 | 12.13 |
| Maximum | $1,944.17$ | $1,500.00$ | -444.17 |

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

## VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

In order to be meaningful, statistical inferences must be based on a representative and proportionate sample of the population. If the sales are representative of the population and the sales have been appraised in a similar manner to the unsold properties, statistical inferences should be substantially the same as statistics developed from actual assessed value. This comparison is to provide additional information to the analyst in determining the reliability of the statistical inference.

|  | R\&O Statistics | Trended Ratio | Difference |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | $\mathbf{6 5 4}$ | 247 | 407 |
| Median | 97 | 85 | 12 |
| Wgt. Mean | 96 | 93 | 3 |
| Mean | 109 | 112 | -3 |
| COD | 22.88 | 49.31 | -26.43 |
| PRD | 113.61 | 121.26 | -7.65 |
| Minimum | 19.47 | 28.45 | -8.98 |
| Maximum | $1,500.00$ | 459.78 | $1,040.22$ |

The table above is a direct comparison of the statistics generated using the 2009 assessed values reported by the assessor to the statistics generated using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population.

In Gage County the sales file was randomly trimmed to 260 parcels from which parcels where previous years values were not available were removed from the analysis leaving the 247 sales. From the county, parcel counts for each assessor location were gathered to determine the percentage of parcels that were sold out of the total residential parcels in the location and in the county. The goal was to achieve a similar sample from the sales file to aid in replicating the movement in the assessed base.

In Gage County the trended median and R\&O median are dissimilar suggesting the sales file may not be representative of the population. The mean came in 3 points higher and the weighted mean is 3 points lower.

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified
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## Gage County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

## Commercial:

No changes were reported to the commercial and industrial class of property for 2009. A market analysis was conducted of this class of property and determined that no valuation groupings had a representative number of sales to indicate an adjustment was necessary.

The county also did their annual pick-up work based on permits filed. The county is in the process of updating photos for this class as well as reviewing property record cards for additions or deletions of improvements. Office staff has been updating the photos and doing the drive-by review.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Gage County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Contractor and staff |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Contractor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Contractor |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | 2002 |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2004 |
| 6. | When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | 2004 |
| 7. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties? |
|  | RCNLD based on market depreciation. |
| 8. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
|  | Commercial-7 <br> Industrial-2 |
| 9. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |
|  | The market areas are defined by location. |
| 10. | Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping? |
|  | Yes |
| 11. | Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics? |
|  | No |
| 12. | Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (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 <br> incorporated city or village.) <br> There is no market significance. Suburban as defined is used for classification only. |
| :--- | :--- |

Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{8 1}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{8 1}$ |

NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
69
$10,497,743$
$10,185,568$
$10,840,450$
147,616
157,107

TOTAL Sales Price OTAL Adj.Sales Price: AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:

COUNT
MEDIAN
100.00
$\square$
28
21
100
106 COV:
80.72
89.14
$\begin{array}{llrl}\text { MEAN : } & 110 & \text { STD: } & 89.14 \\ & & \text { AVG.ABS.DEV: } & 29.43\end{array}$
5\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 91
95\% Mean C.I.: 89.40 to 131.47
COD: 29.43 MAX Sales Ratio: 801.97
PRD: 103.76 MIN Sales Ratio: 32.50


| ALL_ | $\left.\begin{array}{c}25 \\ \end{array}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- |

07/01/05 TO 09/30/0 10/01/05 $1012 / 31 / 05$ 04/01/06 TO 06/30 07/01/06 TO 09/30/06 10/01/06 TO 12/31/06 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 07/01/07 то 09/30/07 10/01/07 то 12/31/07 1/01/08
$\qquad$ study Years 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06 07/01/07 то 06/30/08

|  |
| :--- |
| ASSESSOR LOCATION |
| RANGE | ADAMS BEATRICE BEATRICE SUBDIVISION BLUE SPRINGS

CLATONIA
CORTLAND
ODELL
PICKRELI
ROCKFORD
RURAL
WYMORE
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| 99.30 | 99.71 | 95.17 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 84.71 | 97.47 | 81.80 |
| 100.08 | 103.13 | 99.90 |
| 96.01 | 103.96 | 96.67 |
| 96.06 | 230.92 | 158.72 |
| 100.00 | 103.67 | 97.86 |
| 103.69 | 104.04 | 107.51 |
| 56.00 | 65.05 | 70.38 |
| 133.06 | 125.46 | 108.70 |
| 102.76 | 98.35 | 103.50 |
| 105.66 | 105.66 | 105.64 |
| 109.29 | 109.29 | 114.96 |
|  |  |  |
| 96.46 | 101.15 | 95.36 |
| 91.51 | 124.84 | 124.52 |
| 105.66 | 108.30 | 104.77 |
|  |  |  |
| 96.48 | 128.07 | 113.15 |
| 102.14 | 99.10 | 103.49 |


| COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 41.67 | 41.67 | 41.67 |
| 40 | 100.00 | 119.12 | 112.11 |
| 1 | 96.90 | 96.90 | 96.90 |
| 1 | 192.31 | 192.31 | 192.31 |
| 1 | 62.40 | 62.40 | 62.40 |
| 3 | 84.64 | 76.26 | 74.95 |
| 8 | 117.82 | 120.02 | 119.60 |
| 1 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| 1 | 76.00 | 76.00 | 76.00 |
| 2 | 66.29 | 66.29 | 97.39 |
| 10 | 99.72 | 96.44 | 98.52 |
|  |  |  |  |

- COD

| COD | PRD |
| ---: | ---: |
| 17.25 | 104.77 |

95\% Median C.I. Sal
(!: Derived)

Assd Val

| 41.67 | 140.00 | 41.67 to 140.00 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59.12 | 192.31 | 59.12 to 192.31 |
| 92.98 | 119.98 | 92.98 to 119.98 |
| 80.00 | 171.94 | 80.00 to 171.94 |
| 76.00 | 801.97 | N/A |
| 84.64 | 148.00 | 84.64 to 148.00 |
| 90.51 | 118.26 | N/A |
| 32.50 | 100.00 | N/A |
| 47.32 | 167.25 | 47.32 to 167.25 |
| 62.50 | 121.85 | 66.15 to 120.38 |
| 105.60 | 105.71 | N/A |
| 95.85 | 122.72 | N/A |
| 41.67 | 192.31 | 93.09 to 101.56 |
| 32.50 | 801.97 | 84.64 to 105.82 |
| 47.32 | 167.25 | 100.00 to 121.85 |
|  |  |  |
| 76.00 | 801.97 | 92.98 to 105.00 |
| 32.50 | 167.25 | 90.51 to 118.26 |


| 160,250 | 152,513 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 47,675 | 38,996 |
| 26,660 | 26,635 |
| 355,563 | 343,728 |
| 248,280 | 394,069 |
| 122,225 | 119,610 |
| 152,818 | 164,293 |
| 34,200 | 24,070 |
| 102,200 | 111,087 |
| 222,700 | 230,501 |
| 100,000 | 105,640 |
| 11,250 | 12,932 |
|  |  |
| 151,557 | 144,522 |
| 137,107 | 170,720 |
| 153,135 | 160,434 |
|  |  |
| 183,559 | 207,698 |
| 144,898 | 149,962 |


| 29.43 | 103.76 | 32.50 | 801.97 | 94.74 to 103.82 | 147,616 | 157,107 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | edian C.I. <br> N/A | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |
|  |  | 41.67 | 41.67 | N/A | 66,000 | 27,500 |
| 34.52 | 106.25 | 56.00 | 801.97 | 92.98 to 105.93 | 173,680 | 194,712 |
|  |  | 96.90 | 96.90 | N/A | 2,185,944 | 2,118,180 |
|  |  | 192.31 | 192.31 | N/A | 1,300 | 2,500 |
|  |  | 62.40 | 62.40 | N/A | 6,250 | 3,900 |
| 19.49 | 101.74 | 47.32 | 96.82 | N/A | 153,441 | 115,010 |
| 17.23 | 100.35 | 86.00 | 167.25 | 86.00 to 167.25 | 26,675 | 31,904 |
|  |  | 100.00 | 100.00 | N/A | 27,000 | 27,000 |
|  |  | 76.00 | 76.00 | N/A | 5,000 | 3,800 |
| 50.97 | 68.06 | 32.50 | 100.08 | N/A | 12,562 | 12,235 |
| 9.69 | 97.90 | 47.83 | 118.26 | 94.74 to 105.71 | 24,800 | 24,432 |
| 29.43 | 103.76 | 32.50 | 801.97 | 94.74 to 103.82 | 147,616 | 157,107 |
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## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a median level of value within the acceptable range. While the percent change in assessed value for sold and unsold properties are dissimilar the removal of sales as required by the substantially changed directive may have impacted the change in the weighted mean which is used in the calculation. A review of the trended preliminary ratio and the R\&O ratio shows the two statistics are similar and it appears that the assessment practices in the County treat both the sold and the assessed base in a similar fashion. Based on the tables and the assessment actions of the County this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 162 | 69 | 42.59 |
| 2008 | 162 | 83 | 51.23 |
| 2007 | 166 | 84 | 50.60 |
| 2006 | 184 | 96 | 52.17 |
| 2005 | 186 | 99 | 53.23 |

COMMERCIAL:A review of the utilization grid indicates the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available commercial sales for the development of the qualified statistics. The decrease in percent used can be attributed to land use changes and being coded out as substantially changed.

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

 Continued|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended <br> Preliminary Ratio | R\&O <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 97 | 0.08 | 97 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| 2008 | 96.06 | -0.27 | 96 | 96.17 |
| 2007 | 98 | -0.13 | 97 | 97 |
| 2006 | 97 | -0.09 | 97 | 97 |
| 2005 | 98 | 0.26 | 98 | 98 |

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

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 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 2008 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.

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

\% Change in Total \% Change in Total Assessed
Value (excl. growth)

| 9.38 | 2009 | 0.08 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.04 | 2008 | -0.27 |
| -1.72 | 2007 | -0.13 |
| 0.13 | 2006 | -0.09 |
| 3.06 | 2005 | 0.26 |

COMMERCIAL: A review of the table shows an approximate 9 point difference between the percent change of the sold and the unsold properties. There were six sales that were removed from the sales file between the time of preliminary and the final R\&O statistical reports. The removal of those sales because of the substantially changed directive may have impacted the weighted mean comparison used in this table.

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 100 | 106 | 110 |

COMMERCIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency only the median is in the range. The weighted mean is 6 points above the range and the mean is 10 points above the range.

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

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

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

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 29.43 | 103.76 |
| Difference | 9.43 | 0.76 |
|  |  |  |

COMMERCIAL:The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. The price related differential is outside the range by less than one point.

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 75 | 69 | -6 |
| Median | 97 | 100 | 3 |
| Wgt. Mean | 102 | 106 | 4 |
| Mean | 106 | 110 | 4 |
| COD | 30.96 | 29.43 | -1.53 |
| PRD | 103.86 | 103.76 | -0.10 |
| Minimum | 26.00 | 32.50 | $\mathbf{6 . 5 0}$ |
| Maximum | 801.97 | 801.97 | 0.00 |

COMMERCIAL:The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The difference in the number of qualified sales is a result of sales sustaining substantial physical changes and being removed from the qualified sales roster as required by the department for use in the statistical analysis.
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## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009



# Gage County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses: 

## Agricultural:

An analysis of agricultural/horticultural sales did not indicate a need for re-alignment of agricultural/horticultural neighborhoods or areas within the county for tax year 2009. Gage County continues to consist of two neighborhood or areas for valuation purposes. In general, Gage County experienced increases in values in both agricultural/horticultural neighborhoods or areas in all land capability groups except for neighborhood or area 2 where a slight decrease in the irrigated classification occurred. Gage County is a special (greenbelt) value county and has developed both recapture and special (greenbelt) values. Our current review, analysis and sales verification has indicated that the non agricultural/horticultural influences that previously existed no longer exists and that recapture values and special (greenbelt) values no longer show any significant difference.

Irrigated 2009 value adjustments - Recapture/Special irrigated values experienced various percentage increases/decreases in the various land capability groups averaging approximately an $18 \%$ increase.

DRYLAND 2009 value adjustments - Recapture/Special dryland values experienced various percentage increases in the various land capability groups averaging an increase of approximately $17.8 \%$

GRASSLAND 2009 value adjustments - Recapture/Special grassland values experienced various percentage increases in the various land capability groups averaging an increase of approximately $32.6 \%$.

WASTE 2009 value adjustments - Waste values in both neighborhoods 1 and 2 were increased from $\$ 45.00$ to $\$ 100.00$.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Gage County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Staff |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Contractor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Staff and contractor |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | There is no written policy at this time to define agricultural land versus residential acreages. The county uses a questionnaire to aid in the classification and use of agricultural and residential parcels in the rural areas. |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | It is defined by statute and predominant use of the parcel. |
| 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 was not used. |
| 6. | If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used? |
|  | NA |
| 7. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 2008 |
| 8. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | 2007 |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | GIS, FSA, and physical inspection |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | Staff |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | $100 \%$ complete with ongoing updates. |
| 9. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class: |
|  | 2 market areas |


| 10. | How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed? |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | The market areas are defined by location and soil makeup and market. |
| 11. | In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other <br> than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation? <br> Yes or No |
|  | No |
| a. | If yes, list. |
|  | In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings? |
|  | NA |
| 13. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special <br> valuation for agricultural land within the county? |
|  | The entire county has been implemented with special value. The recapture and <br> special value are the same for 2009. |

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 8 5}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{2 8 5}$ |

34 - GAGE COUNTY
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|  |  | 128 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (AgLand) | NUMBER of Sales: | 10 SAL Sales Price: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $24,747,268$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $17,974,850$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 193,338 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 140,428 |
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## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Gage County concluded in 2009 that non-agricultural or horticultural influences on sales no longer exist and that sales of agricultural/horticultural land in Gage are as if the lands only available use is for agricultural/horticultural purposes. The County analyzed sales in adjoining Counties using the same methodology that they used in Gage County and developed a range of values for each land capability grouping. Base on these values and comparing with the market values in Gage County the indication was that there was no significant difference between the market values and the special values for Gage County.

In the analysis more weight was given to the statistical reports for the minimally improved agricultural sales. The additional 18 sales in the minimal statistics support a level of value that more closely resembles the values in the adjoining counties. In an examination of market area two the sample includes two additional sales. Both sales have very minimal improvements $(1325,335)$ which in the opinion the County have no contributory value to the sale amount. With the inclusion of those two sales the median for market area 2 comes in at 72.19 whereas for just the unimproved sales in area 2 the median is 77.02 . The division will not recommend an adjustment where the result would cause a larger discrepancy when looking across the County line into Pawnee County. In the 2009 R\&O statistics for the minimal improved non-ag all three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range.

Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. Both quality statistics improved since the preliminary statistics, but they do not support quality vertical assessment uniformity. It is the opinion of the Property Tax Administrator that the R\&O statistics along with each of these analyses demonstrates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value that is best represented by the median measure of central tendency and that the minimally improved agricultural statistics better define the overall level of value.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | $\mathbf{3 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 . 0 0}$ |
| 2008 | 310 | 135 | $\mathbf{4 3 . 5 5}$ |
| 2007 | 278 | 131 | 47.12 |
| 2006 | 267 | 127 | 47.57 |
| 2005 | 264 | 116 | 43.94 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:A review of the utilization grid indicates the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available agricultural sales for the development of the qualified statistics.

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

 Continued$\left.$|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended <br> Preliminary Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | R\&O |
| :---: |
| Median | \right\rvert\, | 2009 | 64 | 26.47 | 81 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2008 |  |  |  |
| 2007 |  |  |  |
| 2006 |  |  |  |
| 2005 |  |  |  |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The relationship between the trended prelim ratio and the R\&O ratio show a disparity of almost 8 points and show little support for each other. The omissions in the table for years 2005-2008 reflect that in those years the County was measured using the 994 analysis.

## 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 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 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 2008 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.
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## IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

\% Change in Total \% Change in Total Assessed
Value (excl. growth)

| 27.45 | 2009 | 26.47 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23.41 | 2008 | 10.98 |
| 6.81 | 2007 | 5.27 |
|  | 2006 |  |
|  | 2005 |  |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Table IV shows that the percentage change in the sales file closely follow that of the change in the assessed base. This lends support to the theory that the county has shown no bias to the sold property compared to the assessed base.

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 73 | 73 | 76 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The median and weighted mean are within the acceptable range, while the mean is outside the acceptable range. The range for the three measures is only 3 points.

## 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 | 23.61 | 104.53 |
| Difference | 3.61 | 1.53 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both slightly outside the acceptable range. In the recent changes in the rapidly increasing agricultural market the higher COD causes little concern in analyzing the agricultural unimproved land.

## 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 | 130 | 128 | -2 |
| Median | 64 | 73 | 9 |
| Wgt. Mean | 63 | 73 | 10 |
| Mean | 65 | 76 | 11 |
| COD | 25.70 | 23.61 | -2.09 |
| PRD | 103.70 | 104.53 | 0.83 |
| Minimum | 15.44 | 10.23 | $\mathbf{- 5 . 2 1}$ |
| Maximum | 203.36 | 237.71 | 34.35 |

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

| Total Real Property <br> Sum Lines 17, $25, \& 30$ | Records : 16,297 | Value : 1,715,932,610 | Growth 16,168,460 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 01. Res UnImp Land | 1,222 | 7,658,590 | 88 | 879,195 | 119 | 1,814,420 | 1,429 | 10,352,205 |  |
| 02. Res Improve Land | 6,762 | 66,666,405 | 251 | 4,979,120 | 885 | 19,421,900 | 7,898 | 91,067,425 |  |
| 03. Res Improvements | 6,839 | 440,682,490 | 278 | 34,489,935 | 895 | 115,591,150 | 8,012 | 590,763,575 |  |
| 04. Res Total | 8,061 | 515,007,485 | 366 | 40,348,250 | 1,014 | 136,827,470 | 9,441 | 692,183,205 | 9,101,785 |
| \% of Res Total | 85.38 | 74.40 | 3.88 | 5.83 | 10.74 | 19.77 | 57.93 | 40.34 | 56.29 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05. Com UnImp Land | 201 | 2,670,905 | 12 | 125,745 | 3 | 29,775 | 216 | 2,826,425 |  |
| 06. Com Improve Land | 872 | 19,617,250 | 23 | 423,890 | 29 | 531,380 | 924 | 20,572,520 |  |
| 07. Com Improvements | 895 | 104,197,175 | 28 | 4,316,255 | 42 | 11,451,645 | 965 | 119,965,075 |  |
| 08. Com Total | 1,096 | 126,485,330 | 40 | 4,865,890 | 45 | 12,012,800 | 1,181 | 143,364,020 | 2,766,680 |
| \% of Com Total | 92.80 | 88.23 | 3.39 | 3.39 | 3.81 | 8.38 | 7.25 | 8.35 | 17.11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. Ind UnImp Land | 8 | 248,865 | 5 | 32,530 | 1 | 2,110 | 14 | 283,505 |  |
| 10. Ind Improve Land | 14 | 618,065 | 13 | 470,085 | 3 | 224,760 | 30 | 1,312,910 |  |
| 11. Ind Improvements | 14 | 7,477,400 | 13 | 16,881,935 | 3 | 5,954,970 | 30 | 30,314,305 |  |
| 12. Ind Total | 22 | 8,344,330 | 18 | 17,384,550 | 4 | 6,181,840 | 44 | 31,910,720 | 83,990 |
| \% of Ind Total | 50.00 | 26.15 | 40.91 | 54.48 | 9.09 | 19.37 | 0.27 | 1.86 | 0.52 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Rec UnImp Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 640 | 1 | 640 |  |
| 14. Rec Improve Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 40,000 | 1 | 40,000 |  |
| 15. Rec Improvements | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5,205 | 4 | 24,025 | 5 | 29,230 |  |
| 16. Rec Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5,205 | 5 | 64,665 | 6 | 69,870 | 0 |
| \% of Rec Total | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.67 | 7.45 | 83.33 | 92.55 | 0.04 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Res \& Rec Total\% of Res \& Rec Total | 8,061 | 515,007,485 | 367 | 40,353,455 | 1,019 | 136,892,135 | 9,447 | 692,253,075 | 9,101,785 |
|  | 85.33 | 74.40 | 3.88 | 5.83 | 10.79 | 19.77 | 57.97 | 40.34 | 56.29 |
| Com \& Ind Total | 1,118 | 134,829,660 | 58 | 22,250,440 | 49 | 18,194,640 | 1,225 | 175,274,740 | 2,850,670 |
| \% of Com \& Ind Total | 91.27 | 76.92 | 4.73 | 12.69 | 4.00 | 10.38 | 7.52 | 10.21 | 17.63 |
| 17. Taxable Total\% of Taxable Total | 9,179 | 649,837,145 | 425 | 62,603,895 | 1,068 | 155,086,775 | 10,672 | 867,527,815 | 11,952,455 |
|  | 86.01 | 74.91 | 3.98 | 7.22 | 10.01 | 17.88 | 65.48 | 50.56 | 73.92 |
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Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

|  | Records | Urban <br> Value Base | Value Excess | Records | SubUrban <br> Value Base | Value Excess |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18. Residential | 244 | 3,852,050 | 4,293,870 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 77 | 1,815,435 | 17,472,670 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 4 | 233,725 | 62,055,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | Records | 0 <br> Rural <br> Value Base | 0 <br> Value Excess | $0$ <br> Records | 0 <br> Total Value Base | 0 <br> Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 3,852,050 | 4,293,870 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 1,815,435 | 17,472,670 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 233,725 | 62,055,800 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  | 325 | 5,901,210 | 83,822,340 |

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

| Mineral Interest | Records | Urban | Value | Records | SubUrban | Value | Records | Rural | Value | Records | Total | Value | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23. Producing | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 24. Non-Producing | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 25. Total | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |


| Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| 26. Producing | 980 | 137 | 157 | 1,274 |

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land | 5 | 47,540 | 505 | 43,710,365 | 3,398 | 435,996,910 | 3,908 | 479,754,815 |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 1 | 33,645 | 187 | 23,701,645 | 1,393 | 212,318,725 | 1,581 | 236,054,015 |
| 29. Ag Improvements | 1 | 50,525 | 195 | 16,335,870 | 1,521 | 116,209,570 | 1,717 | 132,595,965 |
| 30. Ag Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,625 | 848,404,795 |
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|  | Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 6 | 0.00 | 280,200 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
|  | Records | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 6 | 0.00 | 280,200 |
| Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records | Urban <br> Acres | Value | Records | SubUrb <br> Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 514 | 39,512.22 | 54,704,270 |
| 44. Recapture Value N/A | $0$ <br> Records | $0.00$ <br> Rural <br> Acres | 0 <br> Value | $514$ <br> Records | $39,512.22$ <br> Total Acres | $54,704,270$ <br> Value |
| 43. Special Value | 3,840 | 393,854.66 | 531,976,650 | 4,354 | 433,366.88 | 586,680,920 |
| 44. Recapture Value | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* LB 968 (2006) for tax year 2009 and forward there will be no Recapture value.

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area $\quad 1$

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 5,232.28 | 9.90\% | 13,120,185 | 10.80\% | 2,507.55 |
| 46. 1A | 19,746.11 | 37.37\% | 49,853,075 | 41.02\% | 2,524.70 |
| 47. 2A1 | 4,154.82 | 7.86\% | 9,391,570 | 7.73\% | 2,260.40 |
| 48. 2A | 10,980.82 | 20.78\% | 24,828,265 | 20.43\% | 2,261.06 |
| 49.3A1 | 3,559.37 | 6.74\% | 7,177,585 | 5.91\% | 2,016.53 |
| 50.3A | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 51.4A1 | 7,714.70 | 14.60\% | 14,447,775 | 11.89\% | 1,872.76 |
| 52. 4A | 1,446.49 | 2.74\% | 2,703,975 | 2.23\% | 1,869.34 |
| 53. Total | 52,834.59 | 100.00\% | 121,522,430 | 100.00\% | 2,300.05 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 10,500.09 | 3.62\% | 19,845,210 | 4.50\% | 1,890.00 |
| 55. 1D | 68,800.34 | 23.75\% | 130,032,680 | 29.50\% | 1,890.00 |
| 56. 2D1 | 13,644.94 | 4.71\% | 22,309,560 | 5.06\% | 1,635.01 |
| 57. 2D | 79,646.64 | 27.50\% | 121,461,490 | 27.55\% | 1,525.00 |
| 58.3D1 | 50,837.00 | 17.55\% | 70,663,465 | 16.03\% | 1,390.00 |
| 59.3D | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 60.4D1 | 57,350.70 | 19.80\% | 66,240,340 | 15.03\% | 1,155.00 |
| 61.4D | 8,880.08 | 3.07\% | 10,256,590 | 2.33\% | 1,155.01 |
| 62. Total | 289,659.79 | 100.00\% | 440,809,335 | 100.00\% | 1,521.82 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 999.01 | 0.00\% | 716,915 | 0.99\% | 717.63 |
| 64. 1G | 4,570.92 | 4.99\% | 4,207,690 | 5.82\% | 920.53 |
| 65. 2G1 | 3,264.61 | 3.56\% | 2,625,830 | 3.63\% | 804.33 |
| 66. 2G | 11,657.62 | 12.72\% | 10,062,905 | 13.91\% | 863.20 |
| 67.3G1 | 30,031.43 | 32.77\% | 25,398,715 | 35.12\% | 845.74 |
| 68. 3G | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 69.4G1 | 19,237.30 | 20.99\% | 15,033,835 | 20.79\% | 781.49 |
| 70.4G | 21,870.83 | 23.87\% | 14,283,695 | 19.75\% | 653.09 |
| 71. Total | 91,631.72 | 100.00\% | 72,329,585 | 100.00\% | 789.35 |
| Irrigated Total | 52,834.59 | 11.95\% | 121,522,430 | 19.12\% | 2,300.05 |
| Dry Total | 289,659.79 | 65.51\% | 440,809,335 | 69.37\% | 1,521.82 |
| Grass Total | 91,631.72 | 20.72\% | 72,329,585 | 11.38\% | 789.35 |
| Waste | 8,009.39 | 1.81\% | 800,950 | 0.13\% | 100.00 |
| Other | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Exempt | 668.24 | 0.15\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 442,135.49 | 100.00\% | 635,462,300 | 100.00\% | 1,437.26 |
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| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 73.03 | 9.18\% | 122,690 | 10.58\% | 1,679.99 |
| 46. 1A | 132.39 | 16.64\% | 222,415 | 19.19\% | 1,680.00 |
| 47. 2A1 | 17.00 | 2.14\% | 25,670 | 2.21\% | 1,510.00 |
| 48. 2A | 198.00 | 24.89\% | 298,980 | 25.79\% | 1,510.00 |
| 49.3A1 | 152.00 | 19.10\% | 203,680 | 17.57\% | 1,340.00 |
| 50.3A | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 51.4A1 | 149.00 | 18.73\% | 190,720 | 16.45\% | 1,280.00 |
| 52. 4A | 74.24 | 9.33\% | 95,025 | 8.20\% | 1,279.97 |
| 53. Total | 795.66 | 100.00\% | 1,159,180 | 100.00\% | 1,456.88 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 1,287.38 | 2.91\% | 1,750,830 | 3.47\% | 1,359.99 |
| 55. 1D | 8,204.79 | 18.53\% | 11,158,510 | 22.14\% | 1,360.00 |
| 56. 2D1 | 1,485.60 | 3.35\% | 1,953,565 | 3.88\% | 1,315.00 |
| 57. 2D | 13,289.27 | 30.01\% | 17,475,430 | 34.67\% | 1,315.00 |
| 58.3D1 | 9,781.78 | 22.09\% | 10,075,225 | 19.99\% | 1,030.00 |
| 59.3D | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 60.4D1 | 8,111.58 | 18.32\% | 6,327,035 | 12.55\% | 780.00 |
| 61. 4D | 2,127.28 | 4.80\% | 1,659,270 | 3.29\% | 780.00 |
| 62. Total | 44,287.68 | 100.00\% | 50,399,865 | 100.00\% | 1,138.01 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 64.34 | 0.00\% | 49,005 | 0.41\% | 761.66 |
| 64. 1G | 666.39 | 3.71\% | 525,970 | 4.40\% | 789.28 |
| 65. 2G1 | 792.43 | 4.42\% | 554,525 | 4.64\% | 699.78 |
| 66. 2G | 2,192.08 | 12.21\% | 1,573,860 | 13.16\% | 717.98 |
| 67.3G1 | 7,182.24 | 40.02\% | 4,940,110 | 41.30\% | 687.82 |
| 68.3G | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 69.4G1 | 3,526.67 | 19.65\% | 2,192,310 | 18.33\% | 621.64 |
| 70. 4G | 3,523.78 | 19.63\% | 2,124,340 | 17.76\% | 602.86 |
| 71. Total | 17,947.93 | 100.00\% | 11,960,120 | 100.00\% | 666.38 |
| Irrigated Total | 795.66 | 1.23\% | 1,159,180 | 1.82\% | 1,456.88 |
| Dry Total | 44,287.68 | 68.43\% | 50,399,865 | 79.14\% | 1,138.01 |
| Grass Total | 17,947.93 | 27.73\% | 11,960,120 | 18.78\% | 666.38 |
| Waste | 1,687.96 | 2.61\% | 168,795 | 0.27\% | 100.00 |
| Other | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Exempt | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 64,719.23 | 100.00\% | 63,687,960 | 100.00\% | 984.07 |
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Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76. Irrigated | 0.00 | 0 | 4,783.88 | 10,915,270 | 48,846.37 | 111,766,340 | 53,630.25 | 122,681,610 |
| 77. Dry Land | 33.85 | 54,475 | 31,661.62 | 47,462,705 | 302,252.00 | 443,692,020 | 333,947.47 | 491,209,200 |
| 78. Grass | 24.73 | 16,110 | 9,518.53 | 7,036,715 | 100,036.39 | 77,236,880 | 109,579.65 | 84,289,705 |
| 79. Waste | 6.00 | 600 | 979.55 | 97,965 | 8,711.80 | 871,180 | 9,697.35 | 969,745 |
| 80. Other | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 81. Exempt | 95.13 | 0 | 30.36 | 0 | 542.75 | 0 | 668.24 | 0 |
| 82. Total | 64.58 | 71,185 | 46,943.58 | 65,512,655 | 459,846.56 | 633,566,420 | 506,854.72 | 699,150,260 |


|  | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | 53,630.25 | 10.58\% | 122,681,610 | 17.55\% | 2,287.54 |
| Dry Land | 333,947.47 | 65.89\% | 491,209,200 | 70.26\% | 1,470.92 |
| Grass | 109,579.65 | 21.62\% | 84,289,705 | 12.06\% | 769.21 |
| Waste | 9,697.35 | 1.91\% | 969,745 | 0.14\% | 100.00 |
| Other | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Exempt | 668.24 | 0.13\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Total | 506,854.72 | 100.00\% | 699,150,260 | 100.00\% | 1,379.39 |
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## 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

| 34 Gage | E3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 CTL <br> County Total | 2009 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2009 form 45-2008 CTL) | Percent Change | 2009 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | Percent Change excl. Growth |
| 01. Residential | 663,874,595 | 692,183,205 | 28,308,610 | 4.26\% | 9,101,785 | 2.89\% |
| 02. Recreational | 69,870 | 69,870 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling | 117,002,835 | 118,588,950 | 1,586,115 | 1.36\% | 4,216,005 | -2.25\% |
| 04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 780,947,300 | 810,842,025 | 29,894,725 | 3.83\% | 13,317,790 | 2.12\% |
| 05. Commercial | 140,454,905 | 143,364,020 | 2,909,115 | 2.07\% | 2,766,680 | 0.10\% |
| 06. Industrial | 31,827,230 | 31,910,720 | 83,490 | 0.26\% | 83,990 | 0.00\% |
| 07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 28,848,250 | 30,665,585 | 1,817,335 | 6.30\% | 0 | 6.30\% |
| 08. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 201,130,385 | 205,940,325 | 4,809,940 | 2.39\% | 2,850,670 | 0.97\% |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 982,077,685 | 1,016,782,350 | 34,704,665 | 3.53\% | 16,168,460 | 1.89\% |
| 11. Irrigated | 93,137,430 | 122,681,610 | 29,544,180 | 31.72\% |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 398,531,190 | 491,209,200 | 92,678,010 | 23.25\% |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 60,639,450 | 84,289,705 | 23,650,255 | 39.00\% |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 506,955 | 969,745 | 462,790 | 91.29\% |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 552,815,025 | 699,150,260 | 146,335,235 | 26.47\% |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of all Real Property | 1,534,892,710 | 1,715,932,610 | 181,039,900 | 11.79\% | 16,168,460 | 10.74\% |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Gage County

3-Year Plan
June 2008

## COUNTY DESCRIPTION

|  | Parcel/Acre <br> Count | \% <br> Parcel | Total Value | $\%$ <br> Value | Land Only | Improvement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential/Recreation | 9450 |  | $\$ 665,451,905$ |  | $\$ 100,815,385$ | $\$ 564,636,520$ |
| Commercial/Industrial | 1219 |  | $\$ 173,407,630$ |  | $\$ 24,965,470$ | $\$ 148,442,160$ |
| Agricultural | $5621 /$ <br> $507,063.27$ |  | $\$ 698,759,775$ |  | $\$ 569,548,895$ | $\$ 129,210,880$ |
| Total | 16,290 |  | $\$ 1,537,619,310$ |  | $\$ 695,329,750$ | $\$ 842,289,560$ |

## Budget, Staffing, and Contracts

## Budget

2008 Proposed Budget $=\$ 222,492.56$ (including salaries)
$\$ 10,000$ is allotted for education, lodging, and other travel related expenses.
Appraisal Maintenance $\$ 40,000$ (Contracted)

## Budget Comments

I would like to hire a full time appraiser for Gage County. We have completed our 5 -year plan for reappraising all classes of property. In my estimation an appraiser's salary would run in the range of $\$ 40,000$ to $\$ 45,000$.

## Staff

Assessor: assumes responsibility for all functions within the office and prepares all necessary reports and documents

Deputy Assessor: assists the Assessor with all functions within the office and also helps in the building of the GIS system.

Real Property Appraisal Technician: responsible for all 521's, updating and developing the GIS system. Creates Sales File.

Personal Property Clerk: responsible for all personal property filed in the county, also assists in updating real estate records including sketching, and entering data for the reappraisals. Keeps all records concerning building permits filed. General office duties. Assisting taxpayers.

Clerk: responsible for assisting taxpayer and maintaining homestead exemption records, permissive exemption records, sending out sales review questionnaires. She assists with data entry within the CAMA system, answers phones, and performs other general office duties.

Appraiser Assistant: Performs all appraisal maintenance and pickup work.

## Part-time County Appraiser

Bob Thoma is now a county employee who works for approximately 240 hours. His responsibilities include developing valuation studies, for agricultural properties.

## Contract Appraiser

Darrell Stanard is contracted for 4 days a month. His responsibilities include sales verification, appraisal maintenance and pricing pickup work and developing valuation studies.

## 2008 R \& O Statistics

| Property Class | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 97 | 14.02 | 107.42 |
| Commercial | 96 | 30.96 | 109.84 |
| Agricultural Special Value | 72 | N/A | N/A |
| Agricultural Recapture | 71 | 23.07 | 105.14 |

## Statistical Definitions

Median Ratio: the middle ratio of the arrayed sample data set. If there is an even number of ratios, the median is the average of the two middle ratios.

Coefficient of Dispersion (COD): a measurement of assessment uniformity. It is the average absolute deviation calculated about the median expressed as a percentage of the median.

Average Absolute Deviation (AVG.ABS.DEV.): the arithmetic mean of the total absolute deviations from a measure of central tendency such as the median. It is used in calculating the coefficient of dispersion (COD).

Price Related Differential (PRD): a measure of assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). It measures the relative treatment of properties based upon the selling price of the properties. It is calculated by dividing the mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio.

Mean Ratio: the ratio that is the result of the total of all assessment/sales ratios in the sample data set divided by the number of ratios in the sample data set.

Weighted mean ratio: the ratio that is the result of the total of all assessed values of all properties in the sample data set divided by the total of all sale prices of all properties in the sample data set.

## 3 Year Appraisal Plan

## Appraisal Definitions

50-001.02 Appraisal shall mean a written opinion of value of real property. An appraisal shall set forth an opinion of value of an adequately described property, as of a specified date, and shall be supported by an analysis of relevant data. For the purposes of property taxation, appraisal, reappraisal, and mass appraisal are interchangeable terms; except, reappraisal may mean a subsequent or second appraisal needed to correct an error in an appraisal. For purposes of these regulations the term appraisal shall be used, unless the context requires otherwise. All appraisals shall meet the standards as promulgated by the Appraisal Standards Board of the Appraisal Foundation in the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, effective as currently updated, including Standard 6, Mass Appraisal and Reporting in conjunction with existing "Statements on Appraisal Standards" and "Advisory Opinions". A copy of the Uniform Stanards of Professional Appraisal Practice is on file at the office of the Property Tax Administrator.

Reg 50-001.22 Appraisal or assessed value adjustment shall mean an action taken by the assessor, Tax Equalization and Review Commission, Agricultural and Horticultural Land Valuation Board or other lawful body that changes the valuation of a class or subclass of property by a percentage, and is based primarily on the analysis of an assessment sales ratio study. This contrasts to an appraisal update which is a change or model calibration based on appraisal process and rooted in the analysis of the market.

Reg 50-001.06 Appraisal maintenance, or pick-up work, is the collection of specific data relating to new construction, remodeling, additions, alterations, and removals of existing buildings or structures. Pick-up work may also include: changes in zoning, use or annexation, the addition, deletion or change in characteristics of encumbrances such as leases, easements, or special programs (eg., Conservation Reserve Program); and the addition, deletion or change in characteristics external to the property, including, but not limited to, amenities such as paving, utilities and proximity to favorable or unfavorable influences, such as schools, libraries, city dumps, sewage treatment facilities, or meatpacking plants. The data shall be gathered in a systematic process so that all properties are treated uniformly. The value of property analyzed in an appraisal maintenance project shall be equalized with comparable properties.

Reg 50-001-.03 Appraisal process shall mean a systematic analysis of the factors that affect the value of real property. It is a documented, orderly program by which the problem is defined, the work necessary to solve the problem is planned, and the necessary data gathered, classified, analyzed, and interpreted into a written opinion of value. In the assessment process, it is the function for determining assessed value. For purposes of property taxation, it shall include the
grouping of similar properties so that all properties within a class or subclass are collectively examined and valued.

Reg 50-001-.05 Appraisal update shall mean an appraisal in which all or a part of the data collection process is determined to be unnecessary (a limited appraisal) but there is a need to adjust values on all of the properties within a defined class or subclass. This includes, but is not limited to recalibration of a market model or cost model involving implementation of more current cost data or adjustments to value by a percentage, and applied uniformly to all property within a defined class or subclass of property.

Reg 50-001.19 Market Analysis is a study of general real estate market conditions that affect the competitive supply, demand, and prices for particular types of facilities of properties.

## $\underline{2009}$

## Residential

For 2009 a plan for an appraisal maintenance will be done for all the residential properties. Review in- house preliminary statistical information received from the Nebraska Property Assessment Division and analyze for any possible subclass adjustments needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law. Sales reveiw and pickup work will also be completed.

## Commercial

For 2009 the county will begin a new cycle for a maintenance reappraisal of all commercial properties. New digital photos will be taken, gather current income information, analyze current sales along with continued sales review and pick up work. The office staff will be involved to cut down on the cost of the appraisal.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on a map to determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales. The market analysis is conducted in house by Bob Thoma by utilizing the county's current CAMA system. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed for agricultural properties. Rural residential properties will also be reviewed and analyzed for any adjustments needed to comply with statistical measures required by law.

## $\underline{2010}$

## Residential

For 2010, the county will begin a new cycle for a maintenance reappraisal of the small town residential properties. A new digital photo will be taken and any changes that may have occurred to the property will be updated. All other residential properties may be adjusted after preliminary statistical information is received from the Nebraska Property Assessment Division to comply with statistical measures as required by law. Sale review and pick up work will also be completed.

## Commercial

There will only be an appraisal maintenance for the commercial properties in 2010, since all commercial and industrial properties were reappraised in 2009. However, it is possible that appraisal adjustments may be needed in order to comply with statistical measures required by law. An appraisal adjustment would be a percentage increase or decrease applied to all properties within a subclass of the commercial class. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed for commercial properties.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will also be plotted on a map to determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales. The market analysis is conducted in-house by an appraiser by utilizing the county's current CAMA system. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed for agricultural properties. Rural residential properties will be reviewed and analyzed for any adjustments needed to comply with statistical measures required by law.

## 2011

## Residential

For 2011 a plan for an appraisal maintenance will be done for all residential properties. Review in-house preliminary statistical information received from the Nebraska Department of Assessment Division and analyze for any possible subclass adjustments needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed.

## Commercial

There will be an appraisal maintenance for the commercial properties in 2011. It is possible that appraisal adjustments may be needed in order to comply with statistical measures required by law. An appraisal adjustment would be a percentage increase or decrease applied to all properties within a subclass of the commercial class. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed for commercial properties.

## Agricultural

For 2011 the county will begin a new cycle for an appraisal maintenance of all rural residential properties (homes and outbuildings). A new digital photo will be taken and any changes that may have occurred to the property will be updated. All other residential properties may be adjusted after preliminary statistical information is received from the Nebraska Department of Assessment Division to comply with statistical measures as required by law. A market analysis of agricultural by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will also be plotted on a map to determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales. The market analysis is conducted in-house by an appraiser by utilizing the county's current CAMA system. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed for agricultural properties.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Gage County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
| 3. | 0 |
|  | Other full-time employees |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 0 |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
| 7. | $\$ 231,492$ |
|  | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
| 8. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
| 9. | $\$ 211,992$ |
|  | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
| 10. | 4,000 |
|  | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | $\$ 40,000$ |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  |  |
| 13. | Total budget |
|  | $\$ 251,992$ |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
|  | Yes- a nominal amount was not used. |
|  |  |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Terra Scan |
|  | CAMA software |


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

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Yes |
| 3. | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
|  | Yes |
| 4. | Adams, Beatrice, Clatonia, Cortland, Odell, Pickrell, and Wymore |
|  | When was zoning implemented? |

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Standard Appraisal Services |
|  | Other services <br> Robert Thoma-statistical analysis of Ag <br> Land. |

## Certification

This is to certify that the 2009 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

Four copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.
One copy to the Gage County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



