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## 2009 Commission Summary

Gosper

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 59 | COD | 6.47 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 5,007,991$ | PRD | 103.07 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 5,042,991$ | COV | 10.38 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 4,751,741$ | STD | 10.09 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 85,474$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 6.17 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 80,538$ | Average Assessed Value <br> of the Base | $\$ 72,977$ |
| Median | 95 | Wgt. Mean | 94 |
| Mean | 97 | Max | 9 |
| Min | 72.65 |  | 138 |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 93.96 to 97.80 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 94.55 to 99.70 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 91.93 to 96.52 |

$\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 28.46
\% of Records Sold in the Study Period
\% of Value Sold in the Study Period

## Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 70 | 93 | 8.92 | 102.32 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 67 | 95 | 9.83 | 104.13 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 79 | 93 | 12.65 | 105 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 102 | 93 | 6.76 | 101.31 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

## 37 Gosper

## Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 5 | COD | 6.61 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 239,500$ | PRD | 98.21 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 223,500$ | COV | 10.85 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 231,604$ | STD | 11.04 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 44,700$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 6.47 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 46,321$ | Average Assessed Value <br> of the Base | $\$ 76,156$ |
| Median | 98 | Wgt. Mean | 104 |
| Mean | 102 | Max | 121 |
| Min | 92 |  |  |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | N/A |
| :--- | ---: |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 88.07 to 115.48 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | N/A |


| $\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 2.68 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 4.85 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 2.95 |

## Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 5 | 94 | 20.11 | 97.97 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 3 | 94 | 9.76 | 100.6 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 4 | 97 | 11.08 | 103.39 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 6 | 94 | 5.86 | 100.99 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

37 Gosper

Agricultural Land - Current

| Number of Sales | 58 | COD | 14.02 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 11,262,440$ | PRD | 100.66 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 11,262,440$ | COV | 18.94 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 7,980,398$ | STD | 13.51 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 194,180$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 10.05 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 137,593$ | Average Assessed Value |  |
| of the Base | $\$ 123,611$ |  |  |
| Median | 72 | Wgt. Mean |  |
| Mean | 71 | Max | 71 |
| Min | 30.34 |  | 104.13 |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 67.90 to 75.33 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 67.85 to 74.80 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 67.30 to 74.42 |

\% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 68.86
$\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period 3.56
\% of Value Sold in the Study Period

| Agricultural Land - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 55 | 69 | 11.75 | 102 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 40 | 70 | 10.09 | 102.22 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 35 | 75 | 14.76 | 101.07 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 55 | 77 | 16.16 | 99.91 |

Opinions

# 2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Gosper 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 Gosper County is $95.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Gosper 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 Gosper County is $100.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Gosper 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 Gosper County is $72.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Gosper 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 

|  |  |  |  |  | Date Range: | 07/0 | 01/2006 to 06/30 | Posted | ore: 01/ | 09 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER of | f Sales: |  | 59 | MEDIAN: | 93 |  | COV: | 27.83 |  | dian C.I.: 89.7 | to 94.42 | (!: Derived) |
| TOTAL Sales | s Price: |  | 5,007,991 | WGT. MEAN: | 89 |  | STD: | 26.81 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 85 | to 92.33 |  |
| total Adj. Sales | s Price: |  | 5,042,991 | MEAN : | 96 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 13.91 |  | Mean C.I.: 89 | to 103.19 |  |
| TOTAL Assessed | d Value: |  | 4,480,644 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Adj. Sales | s Price: |  | 85,474 | COD : | 15.01 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 234.05 |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Assessed | d Value: |  | 75,943 | PRD : | 108.44 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 63.06 |  |  | Printed: 01/2 | 22:15:47 |
| DATE OF SALE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/06 то 09/30/06 | 12 | 93.73 | 94.34 | 92.31 | 3.66 |  | 102.20 | 88.23 | 105.57 | 89.77 to 96.67 | 88,241 | 81,458 |
| 10/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 7 | 92.77 | 90.11 | 91.43 | 6.73 |  | 98.55 | 64.43 | 100.45 | 64.43 to 100.45 | 71,421 | 65,302 |
| 01/01/07 TO 03/31/07 | 4 | 91.63 | 90.55 | 85.65 | 7.17 |  | 105.72 | 76.55 | 102.38 | N/A | 93,925 | 80,445 |
| 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 | 4 | 76.62 | 84.22 | 74.69 | 15.26 |  | 112.77 | 71.17 | 112.50 | N/A | 66,750 | 49,854 |
| 07/01/07 TO 09/30/07 | 10 | 88.97 | 97.39 | 90.23 | 19.70 |  | 107.94 | 74.61 | 186.93 | 75.08 to 102.70 | 90,300 | 81,475 |
| 10/01/07 TO 12/31/07 | 9 | 107.09 | 103.81 | 90.66 | 21.48 |  | 114.50 | 63.06 | 158.41 | 78.95 to 136.97 | 71,604 | 64,919 |
| 01/01/08 TO 03/31/08 | 5 | 91.55 | 91.12 | 88.78 | 6.87 |  | 102.64 | 82.26 | 103.34 | N/A | 103,200 | 91,621 |
| 04/01/08 TO 06/30/08 | 8 | 92.66 | 107.34 | 85.82 | 27.32 |  | 125.07 | 67.67 | 234.05 | 67.67 to 234.05 | 97,250 | 83,461 |
| ___Study Years__ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/06 TO 06/30/07 | 27 | 92.77 | 91.18 | 88.84 | 7.53 |  | 102.64 | 64.43 | 112.50 | 89.77 to 94.96 | 81,538 | 72,437 |
| 07/01/07 то 06/30/08 | 32 | 92.66 | 100.70 | 88.86 | 21.31 |  | 113.33 | 63.06 | 234.05 | 82.83 to 102.70 | 88,795 | 78,900 |
| __Calendar Yrs__ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01/01/07 TO 12/31/07 | 27 | 91.40 | 96.57 | 87.68 | 20.07 |  | 110.14 | 63.06 | 186.93 | 79.33 to 102.70 | 81,116 | 71,119 |
| __ALL_ | 59 | 92.67 | 96.35 | 88.85 | 15.01 |  | 108.44 | 63.06 | 234.05 | 89.77 to 94.42 | 85,474 | 75,943 |
| ASSESSOR LOCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| ACREAGE | 10 | 90.59 | 87.40 | 87.13 | 11.60 |  | 100.31 | 63.06 | 109.05 | 64.43 to 103.34 | 116,950 | 101,899 |
| ELWOOD | 26 | 93.73 | 99.00 | 89.31 | 16.09 |  | 110.86 | 73.90 | 234.05 | 88.38 to 96.67 | 66,368 | 59,272 |
| JOHNSON LAKE | 20 | 92.71 | 96.04 | 89.35 | 14.31 |  | 107.49 | 67.67 | 186.93 | 84.04 to 101.62 | 100,945 | 90,191 |
| SMITHFIELD | 3 | 93.03 | 105.19 | 90.48 | 18.41 |  | 116.27 | 85.58 | 136.97 | N/A | 43,000 | 38,905 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 59 | 92.67 | 96.35 | 88.85 | 15.01 |  | 108.44 | 63.06 | 234.05 | 89.77 to 94.42 | 85,474 | 75,943 |
| LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURE | URBAN | \& RURAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1 | 28 | 93.73 | 100.56 | 90.39 | 16.17 |  | 111.25 | 74.61 | 234.05 | 91.14 to 96.67 | 62,199 | 56,225 |
| 3 | 31 | 91.55 | 92.54 | 88.03 | 13.76 |  | 105.12 | 63.06 | 186.93 | 84.04 to 94.06 | 106,496 | 93,753 |
| $\ldots$ ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 59 | 92.67 | 96.35 | 88.85 | 15.01 |  | 108.44 | 63.06 | 234.05 | 89.77 to 94.42 | 85,474 | 75,943 |
| STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIM | MPROVED | D \& IOL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1 | 36 | 92.21 | 95.94 | 88.46 | 15.76 |  | 108.46 | 63.06 | 234.05 | 85.58 to 94.42 | 83,663 | 74,005 |
| 2 | 3 | 102.38 | 103.29 | 103.28 | 5.70 |  | 100.01 | 95.00 | 112.50 | N/A | 4,066 | 4,200 |
| 3 | 20 | 92.71 | 96.04 | 89.35 | 14.31 |  | 107.49 | 67.67 | 186.93 | 84.04 to 101.62 | 100,945 | 90,191 |
| $\ldots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 59 | 92.67 | 96.35 | 88.85 | 15.01 |  | 108.44 | 63.06 | 234.05 | 89.77 to 94.42 | 85,474 | 75,943 |
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## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics
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Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009


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

## Residential

As proposed in the three year plan, the Marshall and Swift costing tables were updated to the June, 2008 table for the entire residential class. A new depreciation table was developed based on a sales study. Pickup work was completed in a timely manner.

As a result of the assessment actions the subclasses of Bullhead point at Johnson's Lake and Clearview Estates in Elwood were decreased about 3\%. The remainder of Elwood remained stable, while Johnson Lake area 1 increased $7 \%$ and Johnson Lake area 2 increased 5\%. Values in the Village of Smithfield increased $12 \%$, while rural residential properties increased $9 \%$.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Gosper County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Contract appraiser and the clerk |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor and the clerk |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Contract appraiser and the clerk |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | June, 2008 |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2009 |
| 6. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties? |
|  | The cost approach is used. |
| 7. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
|  | There are four assessor locations with subclasses within at Johnson Lake. |
| 8. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |
|  | The four assessor locations are defined by the political boundaries of Elwood and Smithfield, the Johnson Lake area, and the rest is rural. There are three subclasses at Johnson Lake they are Bullhead point, Johnson Lake 1, and Johnson Lake 2. These subclasses were developed by their proximity and view of the lake. |
| 9. | Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/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.) |
|  | The assessor location suburban is not used. |
| 11. | Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain? |
|  | Yes, they are both valued at the same statutory level. |

## Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50 | 44 | 0 | 94 |

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


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

|  | NUMBER of Sales: |  | 59 | MEDIAN: | 95 |  | COV: | 10.38 | 95\% Median C.I.: 93.96 to 97.80 (!: Derived) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL Sales Price: |  | 5,007,991 | WGT. MEAN: | 94 |  | STD: | 10.09 | 95\% Wg |  | Mean | C.I.: | : 91. | to 96.52 |  |
|  | TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: |  | 5,042,991 | MEAN : | 97 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 6.17 |  |  | Mean | C.I.: |  | 5 to 99.70 |  |
|  | TOTAL Assessed Value: |  | 4,751,741 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: |  | 85,474 | COD : | 6.47 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 138.06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: |  | 80,537 | PRD : | 103.07 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 72.65 | Printed: 03/09/2009 13:30:04 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STYLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX |  | 95\% M | Median | C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 5 | 95.00 | 97.43 | 85.40 | 7.92 |  | 114.09 | 83.61 | 112.50 |  |  | N/A |  | 33,640 | 28,727 |
| 100 | 1 | 97.63 | 97.63 | 97.63 |  |  |  | 97.63 | 97.63 |  |  | N/A |  | 6,950 | 6,785 |
| 101 | 45 | 95.39 | 96.26 | 93.54 | 6.16 |  | 102.90 | 72.65 | 138.06 |  | 92.48 | 48 to | 97.51 | 90,518 | 84,671 |
| 102 | 5 | 99.59 | 100.18 | 97.15 | 5.78 |  | 103.12 | 91.80 | 110.18 |  |  | N/A |  | 108,000 | 104,920 |
| 104 | 1 | 109.42 | 109.42 | 109.42 |  |  |  | 109.42 | 109.42 |  |  | N/A |  | 112,500 | 123,096 |
| 301 | 2 | 101.77 | 101.77 | 100.97 | 5.06 |  | 100.79 | 96.62 | 106.92 |  |  | N/A |  | 71,000 | 71,691 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 59 | 95.44 | 97.12 | 94.22 | 6.47 |  | 103.07 | 72.65 | 138.06 |  | 93.96 | 96 to 97 | 97.80 | 85,474 | 80,537 |
| CONDITI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX |  | 95\% M | Median | C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 5 | 95.00 | 97.43 | 85.40 | 7.92 |  | 114.09 | 83.61 | 112.50 |  |  | N/A |  | 33,640 | 28,727 |
| 10 | 1 | 94.40 | 94.40 | 94.40 |  |  |  | 94.40 | 94.40 |  |  | N/A |  | 62,000 | 58,526 |
| 20 | 5 | 97.63 | 104.93 | 99.19 | 10.98 |  | 105.79 | 91.26 | 134.93 |  |  | N/A |  | 16,490 | 16,356 |
| 30 | 38 | 95.66 | 96.80 | 94.92 | 6.11 |  | 101.98 | 72.65 | 138.06 |  | 93.08 | 08 to 98 | 98.28 | 86,207 | 81,824 |
| 40 | 9 | 96.42 | 94.81 | 93.49 | 5.01 |  | 101.41 | 85.77 | 106.92 |  | 89.9 | 99 to 9 | 98.72 | 147,160 | 137,581 |
| 45 | 1 | 92.48 | 92.48 | 92.48 |  |  |  | 92.48 | 92.48 |  |  | N/A |  | 130,000 | 120,229 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 59 | 95.44 | 97.12 | 94.22 | 6.47 |  | 103.07 | 72.65 | 138.06 |  | 93.9 | 96 to 97 | 97.80 | 85,474 | 80,537 |

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL:All three measures of central tendency are within the required range and are supportive of one another. An attempt has been made to use all possible sales for the measurement of the residential class. The trended statistics and the reports and opinions statistics reasonably correlate, and indicate that the sample is representative of the population. The trended preliminary ratio and the similarity between the change in the sample compared to the change in the base suggest that sold and unsold properties are treated uniformly. Because all of the statistical measures mentioned are reasonably comparable, the median is considered an accurate and reliable measure, and has been used to represent the level of value in the residential class.

The qualitative statistics are both within the acceptable range, indicating that assessment uniformity has been achieved. There will be no recommended adjustment for the residential class.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 101 | 59 | 58.42 |
| 2008 | 106 | 70 | 66.04 |
| 2007 | 104 | 67 | 64.42 |
| 2006 | 124 | 79 | 63.71 |
| 2005 | 141 | 102 | 72.34 |

RESIDENTIAL:While the percent of sales used still remains relatively high, the percentage of sales used has decreased from $66.04 \%$ to $58.42 \%$. Of the 42 sales that were disqualified 15 were substantially improved, were these sales hypothetically added back into the sample the percent of sales used would be $73.3 \%$. The county assessor has established business relationships with many of the realtors, appraisers, bankers, and attorneys in the area. The assessor uses her own extensive knowledge of the county as well as knowledge obtained from these professionals and tax payers that she comes in contact with to verify sales. The sample has not been excessively trimmed.

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

## 2009 Correlation Section

for Gosper 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 | 93 | 4.32 | 97 | 95 |
| 2008 | 92.93 | -0.54 | 92 | 92.93 |
| 2007 | 87 | 10.72 | 97 | 95 |
| 2006 | 93 | 0.55 | 93 | 93 |
| 2005 | 91 | 3.80 | 94 | 93 |

RESIDENTIAL:There is only two percentage points difference between the trended preliminary ratio and the reports and opinions ratio. The similarity supports the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ ratio as the accurate level of value and suggests that assessment actions have been applied to the sample and the population uniformly.

## 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 Gosper 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)

| 5.62 | 2009 | 4.32 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -0.69 | 2008 | -0.54 |
| 18.23 | 2007 | 10.72 |
| 1.62 | 2006 | 0.55 |
| 10.66 | 2005 | 3.80 |

RESIDENTIAL:The movement in the sample and the base are similar with very little difference between the percent changes in each. This would suggest that assessment actions have been applied to the sample and the base uniformly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 95 | $\mathbf{9 4}$ | 97 |

RESIDENTIAL:All three measures of central tendency are within the required range. The median and weighted mean are very close at 95 and 94 respectively. The mean, which is more susceptible to outliers, is slightly higher at 97 . All three measures support the statistical level of value, the trended preliminary ratio is also supportive of the three measures of central tendency. For equalization purposes the median will be used to describe the level of value.

## 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 | $\mathbf{6 . 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 0 7}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ | 0.07 |

RESIDENTIAL:Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are within the acceptable standards. The fact that the calculated PRD is 0.07 points above the acceptable range is statistically insignificant. Assessment uniformity has been achieved in the residential class for the 2009 assessment year.

## 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 | 59 | 59 | 0 |
| Median | 93 | 95 | 2 |
| Wgt. Mean | 89 | 94 | 5 |
| Mean | 96 | 97 | 1 |
| COD | 15.01 | 6.47 | -8.54 |
| PRD | 108.44 | 103.07 | -5.37 |
| Minimum | 63.06 | 72.65 | 9.59 |
| Maximum | 234.05 | 138.06 | -95.99 |

RESIDENTIAL:The change in the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ statistics is a result of the reported assessment actions. The costing tables were updated for 2009 and new depreciation was developed. All three measures of central tendency were brought into the acceptable range and the qualitative statistics improved.

## 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 | 59 | 57 | 2 |
| Median | 95 | 95 | 0 |
| Wgt. Mean | 94 | 93 | 1 |
| Mean | 97 | 110 | -13 |
| COD | 6.47 | 28.28 | -21.81 |
| PRD | 103.07 | 117.93 | -14.86 |
| Minimum | 72.65 | 67.67 | 4.98 |
| Maximum | 138.06 | 349.13 | -211.07 |

The table above is a comparison of the reports and opinions statistic to a set of statistics produced by trended values. The trended values have been calculated by taking the assessed value one year prior to the sale date and trending the value forward by each year's percentage change in the base.

The median and weighted mean measures of central tendency are reasonably similar to the trended ratios. The trended mean is above the acceptable range and is not similar. The median and weighted mean suggest that the sample is representative of the population; it also suggests that sold and unsold properties are treated uniformly. Because representation has been established the reports and opinions statistics can be relied upon as accurate measures of the level of value and quality of assessment for the residential class.

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified
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## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



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

## Commercial

The Marshall and Swift costing tables were updated to the June, 2008 version for the entire commercial class. Occupancy codes were reviewed and corrected when needed. A sales study was completed and a new depreciation schedule was developed. Pickup work was completed in a timely manner.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Gosper County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Contract appraiser and the clerk. |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor and the clerk. |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Contract appraiser and the clerk. |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | June, 2008 |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2009 |
| 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? |
|  | The income approach is not used to establish market value. |
| 7. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties? |
|  | The cost approach is used to estimate market value. |
| 8. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
|  | 4 |
| 9. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations 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? |
|  | An attempt is made by the assessor to recognize common value characteristics within subclasses, however, with so few commercial sales in the county, adjustments to value should not be made based on occupancy code alone. |
| 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 incorporated city or village.) |
|  | The assessor location suburban is not used. |

Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009 
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# Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2005 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:
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## PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics

Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009


## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:The sample used to measure the commercial class is too small to be representative of the population. For 2009 the costing tables were updated to the Marshall and Swift June, 2008 tables and new depreciation was developed. As a result the calculated statistics indicate that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value and quality of assessment. However, because the sample is so small the statistical calculations are not a reliable measurement of the class.

Historically, the costing and depreciation tables have been updated on a biannual basis and were updated this year as part of that cycle. This process shows a commitment by the assessor to maintaining current values in a class that generally cannot be measured adequately. There is no information to suggest that Gosper County has not achieved an acceptable level of value and quality of assessment. There will be no recommended adjustments for the commercial class.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 11 | 5 | 45.45 |
| 2008 | 12 | 5 | 41.67 |
| 2007 | 9 | 3 | 33.33 |
| 2006 | 17 | 4 | 23.53 |
| 2005 | 20 | 6 | 30.00 |

COMMERCIAL:While table II reflects an increasing percentage of sales used, the number is low. Gosper County has few commercial sales, only 11 overall. Of the six sales that were disqualified, three were substantially improved, the rest included a family sale, legal action, and a sale involving an exempt entity. An attempt was made to use as many sales as possible; however, the sample is too small to be representative of the commercial class.

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

| Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended <br> Preliminary Ratio | R\&O <br> Median |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 87 | 2.32 | 89 | 98 |
| 2008 | 94.26 | 1.45 | 96 | 94.26 |
| 2007 | 100 | -1.10 | 99 | 94 |
| 2006 | 97 | -0.01 | 97 | 97 |
| 2005 | 92 | 0.94 | 93 | 94 |

COMMERCIAL:There is no similarity between the trended preliminary ratio and the reports and opinions ratio. With only five sales in the sample, the reports and opinions ratio is not an accurate measure of the level of value in the class. The trended preliminary ratio is more representative of the assessment actions completed for 2009.

## 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 Gosper 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)

| 11.49 | 2009 | 2.32 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.00 | 2008 | 1.45 |
| -18.99 | 2007 | -1.10 |
| 0.00 | 2006 | -0.01 |
| 2.01 | 2005 | 0.94 |

COMMERCIAL:The percent change in the sales file and the percent change in the base are not similar. The percent change in the sales file only represents the percent change of one sale. The sample is too small to be representative of the commercial class. There is no information available to suggest that sold and unsold properties are not treated uniformly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 98 | 104 | 102 |

COMMERCIAL:While all three measures of central tendency are supportive of each other, only the median is within the required range. The sample in the commercial class is too small, with only five sales, to be representative of the population. There is no information available to show that Gosper County has not met an acceptable level of value for the 2009 assessment year in the commercial class.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 6.61 | 98.21 |
| Difference | 0.00 | 0.00 |

COMMERCIAL:While the qualitative measures are both in the acceptable range, indicating assessment uniformity, the sample is too small to place any reliance on these measures. There is no information to suggest that assessments are not uniform and proportionate.

## 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 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Median | 87 | 98 | 11 |
| Wgt. Mean | 93 | 104 | 11 |
| Mean | 91 | 102 | 11 |
| COD | 20.85 | 6.61 | -14.24 |
| PRD | 97.19 | 98.21 | 1.02 |
| Minimum | 68.44 | 91.89 | 23.45 |
| Maximum | 134.46 | 120.63 | -13.83 |

COMMERCIAL:The changes from the preliminary to the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ statistics represent the assessment actions completed for 2009. The costing tables were updated to the Marshall and Swift June, 2008 tables and a new depreciation table was developed.

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009


## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

## AGRTCULTURAL UNTMPROVED

Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009


## AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009


## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009


## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009


## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

| NUMBER of | f Sales: |  | 58 | MEDIAN: |  |  | COV: | 18.77 | 95\% Median C.I.: 61.79 to 69.74 |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { (!: Derived) } \\ \text { (!: land+NAT=0) } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL Sales | s Price: | 11,262,440 |  | WGT. MEAN: | 65 |  | STD: | 12.41 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 61.9 | 61.95 to 68.58 |  |
| TOTAL Adj. Sales | s Price: | 11,262,440 |  | MEAN : | 66 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 9.59 |  | Mean C.I.: 62 | 62.90 to 69.29 |  |
| TOTAL Assessed | d Value: | 7,350,341 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95 |  |  |  |
| AVG. Adj. Sales | s Price: | 194,180 |  | COD : | 14.10 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 95.14 |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Assessed | d Value: | 126,730 |  | PRD : | 101.27 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 32.20 | Printed: 01/22/2009 22:16:24 |  |  |  |
| DATE OF SALE * <br> RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 1 | 75.66 | 75.66 | 75.66 |  |  |  | 75.66 | 75.66 | N/A | 150,205 | 113,648 |
| 01/01/06 TO 03/31/06 | 8 | 69.29 | 70.10 | 66.84 | 6.97 |  | 104.87 | 61.59 | 83.41 | 61.59 to 83.41 | 246,437 | 164,720 |
| 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 | 5 | 69.29 | 71.30 | 70.29 | 8.83 |  | 101.43 | 59.75 | 80.91 | N/A | 142,300 | 100,027 |
| 07/01/06 TO 09/30/06 | 6 | 72.01 | 74.29 | 74.50 | 10.28 |  | 99.71 | 64.37 | 94.89 | 64.37 to 94.89 | 69,198 | 51,554 |
| 10/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 8 | 70.09 | 68.95 | 68.24 | 8.96 |  | 101.04 | 59.07 | 81.78 | 59.07 to 81.78 | 222,259 | 151,665 |
| 01/01/07 TO 03/31/07 | 9 | 69.18 | 66.86 | 63.96 | 15.20 |  | 104.53 | 51.74 | 83.34 | 53.14 to 79.18 | 220,804 | 141,224 |
| 04/01/07 то 06/30/07 | 5 | 57.54 | 61.56 | 67.09 | 25.37 |  | 91.77 | 37.95 | 95.14 | N/A | 155,322 | 104,197 |
| 07/01/07 TO 09/30/07 | 4 | 50.66 | 48.27 | 50.36 | 16.42 |  | 95.84 | 32.20 | 59.55 | N/A | 100,017 | 50,370 |
| 10/01/07 то 12/31/07 | 2 | 68.71 | 68.71 | 70.84 | 3.16 |  | 96.99 | 66.54 | 70.88 | N/A | 237,183 | 168,024 |
| 01/01/08 TO 03/31/08 | 7 | 66.09 | 64.91 | 65.24 | 11.10 |  | 99.50 | 52.08 | 77.44 | 52.08 to 77.44 | 238,388 | 155,519 |
| 04/01/08 то 06/30/08 | 3 | 53.26 | 49.60 | 51.45 | 7.18 |  | 96.39 | 42.03 | 53.50 | N/A | 309,654 | 159,322 |
| Study Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06 | 14 | 69.52 | 70.92 | 68.18 | 7.77 |  | 104.03 | 59.75 | 83.41 | 61.79 to 77.98 | 202,371 | 137,967 |
| 07/01/06 TO 06/30/07 | 28 | 68.87 | 68.10 | 66.87 | 14.49 |  | 101.85 | 37.95 | 95.14 | 59.52 to 74.94 | 177,039 | 118,380 |
| 07/01/07 то 06/30/08 | 16 | 58.20 | 58.35 | 60.60 | 16.18 |  | 96.29 | 32.20 | 77.44 | 52.08 to 67.46 | 217,007 | 131,508 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 27 | 69.29 | 70.91 | 68.51 | 8.76 |  | 103.51 | 59.07 | 94.89 | 67.02 to 74.74 | 180,602 | 123,724 |
| 01/01/07 TO 12/31/07 | 20 | 58.55 | 62.00 | 64.03 | 20.73 |  | 96.83 | 32.20 | 95.14 | 53.14 to 70.88 | 181,914 | 116,477 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 58 | 68.01 | 66.09 | 65.26 | 14.10 |  | 101.27 | 32.20 | 95.14 | 61.79 to 69.74 | 194,180 | 126,730 |
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## Gosper County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

## Agricultural

The costing data on all agricultural improvements was updated to the Marshall and Swift June, 2008 version. A ratio study was completed, and new depreciation was developed. The county also completed pickup work in a timely manner.

In the past, the Gosper County Assessor's office has reviewed land use yearly. They purchase aerial images from the FSA to accomplish this; due to budget issues the FSA will now only be providing new images every three years. Because land use was reviewed in 2007, and new irrigation has not been allowed in the county since 2004, it was determined that land use in Gosper County was accurate for the 2009 assessment year.

A policy was established by the Assessor to determine how to define rural residential parcels and agricultural land.

A sales review was completed for unimproved and minimally improved agricultural land in all three market areas. The following adjustments to value were made as a result.

Market area 1: Irrigated values increased 7-9\%, grassland decreased 1-7\%, and dry land remained the same. The following values reflect these changes.

Irrigated

|  | $\underline{2008}$ | $\underline{2009}$ |  | $\underline{2008}$ | $\underline{2009}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1A1 | 1495 | 1625 |  | 1G1 | 520 |
| 1A | 1485 | 1625 |  | 1G | 520 |
| 2A1 | 1030 | 1115 |  | 2G1 | 435 |
| 2A | 760 | 825 | $2 G$ | 390 | 485 |
| 3A1 | 680 | 745 | $3 G 1$ | 360 | 385 |
| 3A | 605 | 655 | $3 G$ | 360 | 350 |
| 4A1 | 480 | 515 | $4 G 1$ | 360 | 350 |
| 4A | 435 | 470 | $4 G$ | 360 | 340 |

Market area 3: Irrigated and dry land remained the same; grass values increased 9-10\%.

## Grass

|  | $\underline{2008}$ |  | $\underline{2009}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1G1 | 530 |  | 580 |
| 1G | 530 |  | 580 |
| 2G1 | 435 |  | 475 |
| 2G | 410 |  | 450 |
| 3G1 | 410 |  | 450 |
| 3G | 275 |  | 300 |
| 4G1 | 275 | 300 |  |
| 4G | 275 |  | 300 |

Market area 4: Irrigated vales increased 1-8\% while dry land values increased 14-18\%, grass land remained the same. You will notice a decrease in 1A1 of $\$ 100$ per acre; this was done because the recent soil conversion indicated that there are not any 1A1 soils in this market area of Gosper County.

|  | Irrigated |  |  | Dry |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\underline{2008}$ | $\underline{2009}$ |  | $\underline{2008}$ | $\underline{2009}$ |
| 1A1 | 1235 | 1135 | 1D1 | 440 | 515 |
| 1A | 1050 | 1135 | 1D | 440 | 515 |
| 2A1 | 895 | 955 | 2D1 | 360 | 420 |
| 2A | 755 | 760 | 2D | 350 | 400 |
| 3A1 | 680 | 685 | 3D1 | 350 | 400 |
| 3A | 605 | 605 | 3D | 255 | 290 |
| 4A1 | 480 | 500 | 4D1 | 255 | 290 |
| 4A | 435 | 465 | 4D | 255 | 290 |

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Gosper County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information



| 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 is not used to establish market value. |
| 6. | If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used? |
|  | Not applicable |
| 7. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 1979; the assessor and staff are in the process of completing the soil conversion. The symbols have been converted from the old alpha to the new numeric symbols and they are currently recounting acres, the conversion will be complete for 2010. |
| 8. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | December, 2007 |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | The county purchases a CD from the FSA office of the crop year and uses the ArcView program to review the maps for land use. |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | This was done by the current and former assessor. |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | The study is complete, and is typically done on a yearly basis. The study was not redone for 2008 as the FSA did not have new images available for purchase. |
| 9. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class: |
|  | 3 |
| 10. | How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed? |
|  | Market areas are developed by predominate soil types. |
| 11. | In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation? <br> Yes or No |
|  | No |
| a. | If yes, list. |
|  | Not applicable |
| 12. | In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings? |
|  | Not applicable |
| 13. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county? |
|  | No |

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
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## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The median has been used to represent the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class. An acceptable number of sales have been used for the measurement of the class. There are not any qualified minimally improved sales in Gosper County. All three measures of central tendency and the trended preliminary ratio are similar, all within one percentage point, and are supportive of each other. The trended preliminary ratio and the similarity between the movement in the sample and the movement in the base suggest that assessment actions have been applied uniformly. The qualitative measures are also within the acceptable range, indicating that assessment uniformity has been achieved. There will be no recommended adjustment in the agricultural unimproved class.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | $\mathbf{1 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 2 4}$ |
| 2008 | 100 | 55 | $\mathbf{5 5 . 0 0}$ |
| 2007 | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 4 4}$ |
| 2006 | $\mathbf{8 1}$ | 35 | $\mathbf{4 3 . 2 1}$ |
| 2005 | $\mathbf{9 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 . 4 4}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The percentage of sales used increased very slightly from last year. A review of the disqualified sales indicates that of the 47 that were disqualified, $47 \%$ were family sales or sales involving partial interests and $19 \%$ were substantially improved. The assessor has worked in the office for thirty years, and uses her knowledge of the county and their tax payers as well as her familiarity with area realtors, bankers, attorneys, and appraisers to gather information regarding sales to determine whether a sale is an arm's length transaction. Because of the Assessor's knowledge of the county and the reasons given for the exclusion of sales, it is believed that the sample has not been excessively trimmed.

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended <br> Preliminary Ratio | R\&O <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 68 | 6.60 | 72 | 72 |
| 2008 | 66.69 | 3.44 | 69 | 69.28 |
| 2007 | 69 | 1.78 | 71 | 70 |
| 2006 | 71 | 6.78 | 76 | 75 |
| 2005 | 74 | 3.36 | 77 | 77 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The trended preliminary ratio is very similar to the reports and opinions ratio. The similarity suggests that the reports and opinions ratio is a reliable measure of the level of value in the agricultural unimproved class. The similarity of the two measures also suggests that assessment actions have been applied to the base and the sample proportionately.

## 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 Gosper 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)

| 8.2 | 2009 | 6.60 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 6.91 | 2008 | 3.44 |
| -0.01 | 2007 | 1.78 |
| 7.77 | 2006 | 6.78 |
| 2.36 | 2005 | 3.36 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:There is little difference between the change in the sales file and the change in the base, suggesting that assessment actions were applied to the sample and the base uniformly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 72 | 71 | 71 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:All three measures of central tendency are within the required range, and are very close with the median being 72 and the weighted mean and mean both coming in at 71 . The trended preliminary ratio, which is 72 , is also supportive of the measures. The similarity of all four of these statistical measures, suggests that any of the measures could be used to represent the level of value. For equalization purposes the median has been used to describe the level of value.

## 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 | 14.02 | 100.66 |
| Difference | 0.00 | 0.00 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both within the acceptable range. Assessment uniformity has been achieved in the residential class for the 2009 assessment year.

## 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 | 58 | 58 | 0 |
| Median | 68 | 72 | 4 |
| Wgt. Mean | 65 | 71 | 6 |
| Mean | 66 | 71 | 5 |
| COD | 14.10 | 14.02 | -0.08 |
| PRD | 101.27 | 100.66 | -0.61 |
| Minimum | 32.20 | 30.34 | -1.86 |
| Maximum | 95.14 | 104.13 | 8.99 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The difference between the preliminary statistics and the R\&O statistics is a reflection of the sales study completed by the assessor. Values in all market areas and land classification groups were adjusted where changes were needed.

| Total Real Property <br> Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 30 | Records : 2,875 | Value : 292,597,981 | Growth 1,423,668 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 01. Res UnImp Land | 64 | 167,590 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 853,196 | 118 | 1,020,786 |  |
| 02. Res Improve Land | 312 | 1,263,336 | 0 | 0 | 588 | 14,096,477 | 900 | 15,359,813 |  |
| 03. Res Improvements | 327 | 19,785,108 | 0 | 0 | 658 | 46,998,655 | 985 | 66,783,763 |  |
| 04. Res Total | 391 | 21,216,034 | 0 | 0 | 712 | 61,948,328 | 1,103 | 83,164,362 | 935,730 |
| \% of Res Total | 35.45 | 25.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 64.55 | 74.49 | 38.37 | 28.42 | 65.73 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05. Com UnImp Land | 4 | 17,732 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18,200 | 7 | 35,932 |  |
| 06. Com Improve Land | 51 | 257,835 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 440,393 | 80 | 698,228 |  |
| 07. Com Improvements | 53 | 3,450,639 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 2,680,404 | 93 | 6,131,043 |  |
| 08. Com Total | 57 | 3,726,206 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 3,138,997 | 100 | 6,865,203 | 0 |
| \% of Com Total | 57.00 | 54.28 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 43.00 | 45.72 | 3.48 | 2.35 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. Ind UnImp Land | 1 | 6,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6,200 |  |
| 10. Ind Improve Land | 1 | 9,035 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9,035 |  |
| 11. Ind Improvements | 2 | 963,595 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 963,595 |  |
| 12. Ind Total | 3 | 978,830 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 978,830 | 0 |
| \% of Ind Total | 100.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.33 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Rec UnImp Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 14. Rec Improve Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 27,000 | 36 | 27,000 |  |
| 15. Rec Improvements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 75,705 | 38 | 75,705 |  |
| 16. Rec Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 102,705 | 38 | 102,705 | 0 |
| \% of Rec Total | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 1.32 | 0.04 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Res \& Rec Total\% of Res \& Rec Total | 391 | 21,216,034 | 0 | 0 | 750 | 62,051,033 | 1,141 | 83,267,067 | 935,730 |
|  | 34.27 | 25.48 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 65.73 | 74.52 | 39.69 | 28.46 | 65.73 |
| Com \& Ind Total | 60 | 4,705,036 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 3,138,997 | 103 | 7,844,033 | 0 |
| \% of Com \& Ind Total | 58.25 | 59.98 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 41.75 | 40.02 | 3.58 | 2.68 | 0.00 |
| 17. Taxable Total | 451 | 25,921,070 | 0 | 0 | 793 | 65,190,030 | 1,244 | 91,111,100 | 935,730 |
| \% of Taxable Total | 36.25 | 28.45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 63.75 | 71.55 | 43.27 | 31.14 | 65.73 |
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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 | 2 | 4,300 | 218,878 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 2 | 4,300 | 218,878 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  | 2 | 4,300 | 218,878 |

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 | 1 |  | 1,413 | 1 |  | 1,413 | 0 |
| 25. Total | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1,413 | 1 |  | 1,413 | 0 |


| Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| 26. Producing | 33 | 0 | 225 | 258 |


| Schedule V : Agricultural Records |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land | 2 | 30,683 | 0 | 0 | 1,300 | 134,342,855 | 1,302 | 134,373,538 |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 313 | 50,271,303 | 313 | 50,271,303 |
| 29. Ag Improvements | 1 | 84,093 | 0 | 0 | 327 | 16,756,534 | 328 | 16,840,627 |
| 30. Ag Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,630 | 201,485,468 |
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| Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |  |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 1 | 0.00 | 84,093 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches | 0 | 0.45 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | 0 Records | $0.00$ <br> Rural <br> Acres | 0 <br> Value | $0$ <br> Records | $0.00$ <br> Total <br> Acres | 0 <br> Value | Growth |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 7 | 7.00 | 38,990 | 7 | 7.00 | 38,990 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 233 | 238.00 | 1,316,080 | 233 | 238.00 | 1,316,080 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 203 | 207.00 | 10,619,688 | 203 | 207.00 | 10,619,688 | 487,938 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 210 | 245.00 | 11,974,758 |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 12 | 36.77 | 23,714 | 12 | 36.77 | 23,714 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 268 | 878.06 | 446,016 | 268 | 878.06 | 446,016 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 309 | 0.00 | 6,136,846 | 310 | 0.00 | 6,220,939 | 0 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 322 | 914.83 | 6,690,669 |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches | 0 | 4,484.03 | 0 | 0 | 4,484.48 | 0 |  |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 532 | 5,644.31 | 18,665,427 | 487,938 |
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|  | Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
|  | Records | ${ }_{\text {Acres }} \quad \text { Rural }$ | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubU <br> Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Value N/A |  |  | Value | 0 Records |  | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 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 1

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 46. 1A | 44,181.92 | 88.13\% | 71,788,787 | 93.86\% | 1,624.85 |
| 47. 2A1 | 1,749.69 | 3.49\% | 1,950,907 | 2.55\% | 1,115.00 |
| 48. 2A | 484.09 | 0.97\% | 399,374 | 0.52\% | 825.00 |
| 49.3A1 | 1,993.58 | 3.98\% | 1,485,220 | 1.94\% | 745.00 |
| 50.3A | 162.33 | 0.32\% | 106,327 | 0.14\% | 655.01 |
| 51.4A1 | 485.55 | 0.97\% | 250,060 | 0.33\% | 515.00 |
| 52. 4A | 1,073.79 | 2.14\% | 504,681 | 0.66\% | 470.00 |
| 53. Total | 50,130.95 | 100.00\% | 76,485,356 | 100.00\% | 1,525.71 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 55. 1D | 5,123.41 | 70.53\% | 2,536,097 | 77.04\% | 495.00 |
| 56. 2D1 | 326.23 | 4.49\% | 143,540 | 4.36\% | 440.00 |
| 57. 2D | 186.31 | 2.56\% | 73,593 | 2.24\% | 395.00 |
| 58.3D1 | 829.80 | 11.42\% | 323,623 | 9.83\% | 390.00 |
| 59.3D | 52.94 | 0.73\% | 15,353 | 0.47\% | 290.01 |
| 60.4D1 | 375.09 | 5.16\% | 108,778 | 3.30\% | 290.01 |
| 61. 4D | 370.31 | 5.10\% | 90,730 | 2.76\% | 245.01 |
| 62. Total | 7,264.09 | 100.00\% | 3,291,714 | 100.00\% | 453.15 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 64. 1G | 3,719.33 | 8.93\% | 1,818,000 | 12.28\% | 488.80 |
| 65. 2G1 | 364.80 | 0.88\% | 158,124 | 1.07\% | 433.45 |
| 66. 2G | 811.87 | 1.95\% | 313,196 | 2.11\% | 385.77 |
| 67.3G1 | 1,154.95 | 2.77\% | 409,901 | 2.77\% | 354.91 |
| 68.3G | 129.09 | 0.31\% | 50,212 | 0.34\% | 388.97 |
| 69.4G1 | 1,135.19 | 2.73\% | 389,594 | 2.63\% | 343.20 |
| 70.4G | 34,320.93 | 82.43\% | 11,669,998 | 78.80\% | 340.03 |
| 71. Total | 41,636.16 | 100.00\% | 14,809,025 | 100.00\% | 355.68 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated Total | 50,130.95 | 50.44\% | 76,485,356 | 80.85\% | 1,525.71 |
| Dry Total | 7,264.09 | 7.31\% | 3,291,714 | 3.48\% | 453.15 |
| Grass Total | 41,636.16 | 41.89\% | 14,809,025 | 15.65\% | 355.68 |
| Waste | 328.40 | 0.33\% | 9,853 | 0.01\% | 30.00 |
| Other | 35.57 | 0.04\% | 4,268 | 0.00\% | 119.99 |
| Exempt | 5,980.22 | 6.02\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 99,395.17 | 100.00\% | 94,600,216 | 100.00\% | 951.76 |
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Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 3

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 46. 1A | 3,002.15 | 84.35\% | 3,407,441 | 90.69\% | 1,135.00 |
| 47. 2A1 | 79.00 | 2.22\% | 76,630 | 2.04\% | 970.00 |
| 48. 2A | 3.00 | 0.08\% | 1,935 | 0.05\% | 645.00 |
| 49.3A1 | 387.16 | 10.88\% | 234,232 | 6.23\% | 605.00 |
| 50.3A | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 51.4A1 | 61.90 | 1.74\% | 27,236 | 0.72\% | 440.00 |
| 52. 4A | 26.00 | 0.73\% | 9,620 | 0.26\% | 370.00 |
| 53. Total | 3,559.21 | 100.00\% | 3,757,094 | 100.00\% | 1,055.60 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 55. 1D | 907.66 | 65.91\% | 412,985 | 71.69\% | 455.00 |
| 56. 2D1 | 42.00 | 3.05\% | 16,170 | 2.81\% | 385.00 |
| 57. 2D | 24.00 | 1.74\% | 8,880 | 1.54\% | 370.00 |
| 58.3D1 | 278.04 | 20.19\% | 102,875 | 17.86\% | 370.00 |
| 59.3D | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 60.4D1 | 73.95 | 5.37\% | 20,706 | 3.59\% | 280.00 |
| 61. 4D | 51.54 | 3.74\% | 14,431 | 2.51\% | 280.00 |
| 62. Total | 1,377.19 | 100.00\% | 576,047 | 100.00\% | 418.28 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 64. 1G | 704.93 | 4.93\% | 417,348 | 8.96\% | 592.04 |
| 65.2G1 | 269.00 | 1.88\% | 127,775 | 2.74\% | 475.00 |
| 66. 2G | 248.00 | 1.73\% | 111,600 | 2.40\% | 450.00 |
| 67.3G1 | 524.33 | 3.67\% | 235,951 | 5.06\% | 450.00 |
| 68.3G | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 69.4G1 | 467.72 | 3.27\% | 140,316 | 3.01\% | 300.00 |
| 70.4G | 12,080.56 | 84.51\% | 3,625,711 | 77.83\% | 300.13 |
| 71. Total | 14,294.54 | 100.00\% | 4,658,701 | 100.00\% | 325.91 |
| Irrigated Total | 3,559.21 | 18.51\% | 3,757,094 | 41.78\% | 1,055.60 |
| Dry Total | 1,377.19 | 7.16\% | 576,047 | 6.41\% | 418.28 |
| Grass Total | 14,294.54 | 74.33\% | 4,658,701 | 51.81\% | 325.91 |
| Waste | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Other | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Exempt | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 19,230.94 | 100.00\% | 8,991,842 | 100.00\% | 467.57 |
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Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 4

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 46. 1A | 24,055.74 | 60.85\% | 27,303,277 | 75.22\% | 1,135.00 |
| 47. 2A1 | 311.20 | 0.79\% | 297,196 | 0.82\% | 955.00 |
| 48. 2A | 311.91 | 0.79\% | 237,052 | 0.65\% | 760.00 |
| 49.3A1 | 6,826.74 | 17.27\% | 4,676,317 | 12.88\% | 685.00 |
| 50.3A | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 51.4A1 | 1,510.93 | 3.82\% | 755,465 | 2.08\% | 500.00 |
| 52. 4A | 6,515.02 | 16.48\% | 3,029,493 | 8.35\% | 465.00 |
| 53. Total | 39,531.54 | 100.00\% | 36,298,800 | 100.00\% | 918.22 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 55. 1D | 30,612.39 | 69.98\% | 15,765,400 | 76.62\% | 515.00 |
| 56. 2D1 | 744.99 | 1.70\% | 312,897 | 1.52\% | 420.00 |
| 57. 2D | 321.57 | 0.74\% | 128,628 | 0.63\% | 400.00 |
| 58.3D1 | 7,918.63 | 18.10\% | 3,167,452 | 15.39\% | 400.00 |
| 59.3D | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 60.4D1 | 2,465.67 | 5.64\% | 715,049 | 3.48\% | 290.00 |
| 61. 4D | 1,679.56 | 3.84\% | 487,075 | 2.37\% | 290.00 |
| 62. Total | 43,742.81 | 100.00\% | 20,576,501 | 100.00\% | 470.40 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 64. 1G | 5,390.56 | 6.86\% | 2,400,489 | 10.74\% | 445.31 |
| 65. 2G1 | 723.92 | 0.92\% | 311,279 | 1.39\% | 429.99 |
| 66. 2G | 564.19 | 0.72\% | 203,108 | 0.91\% | 360.00 |
| 67.3G1 | 4,176.32 | 5.32\% | 1,484,591 | 6.64\% | 355.48 |
| 68.3G | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 69.4G1 | 4,969.51 | 6.33\% | 1,318,226 | 5.90\% | 265.26 |
| 70.4G | 62,719.43 | 79.85\% | 16,623,853 | 74.41\% | 265.05 |
| 71. Total | 78,543.93 | 100.00\% | 22,341,546 | 100.00\% | 284.45 |
| Irrigated Total | 39,531.54 | 24.40\% | 36,298,800 | 45.82\% | 918.22 |
| Dry Total | 43,742.81 | 26.99\% | 20,576,501 | 25.97\% | 470.40 |
| Grass Total | 78,543.93 | 48.47\% | 22,341,546 | 28.20\% | 284.45 |
| Waste | 181.20 | 0.11\% | 5,436 | 0.01\% | 30.00 |
| Other | 47.50 | 0.03\% | 5,700 | 0.01\% | 120.00 |
| Exempt | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 162,046.98 | 100.00\% | 79,227,983 | 100.00\% | 488.92 |
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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 | 13.00 | 21,125 | 0.00 | 0 | 93,208.70 | 116,520,125 | 93,221.70 | 116,541,250 |
| 77. Dry Land | 19.31 | 9,558 | 0.00 | 0 | 52,364.78 | 24,434,704 | 52,384.09 | 24,444,262 |
| 78. Grass | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 134,474.63 | 41,809,272 | 134,474.63 | 41,809,272 |
| 79. Waste | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 509.60 | 15,289 | 509.60 | 15,289 |
| 80. Other | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 83.07 | 9,968 | 83.07 | 9,968 |
| 81. Exempt | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 5,980.22 | 0 | 5,980.22 | 0 |
| 82. Total | 32.31 | 30,683 | 0.00 | 0 | 280,640.78 | 182,789,358 | 280,673.09 | 182,820,041 |


|  | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | 93,221.70 | 33.21\% | 116,541,250 | 63.75\% | 1,250.15 |
| Dry Land | 52,384.09 | 18.66\% | 24,444,262 | 13.37\% | 466.64 |
| Grass | 134,474.63 | 47.91\% | 41,809,272 | 22.87\% | 310.91 |
| Waste | 509.60 | 0.18\% | 15,289 | 0.01\% | 30.00 |
| Other | 83.07 | 0.03\% | 9,968 | 0.01\% | 120.00 |
| Exempt | 5,980.22 | 2.13\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Total | 280,673.09 | 100.00\% | 182,820,041 | 100.00\% | 651.36 |
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## 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

| 2008 CTL |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| County Total |

# THREE-YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN <br> GOSPER COUNTY <br> June 04, 2008 <br> Introduction 

Amended July 30, 2008
Amended October 30, 2008

Pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2005 Nebraska Legislature, the Assessor shall prepare a Plan of Assessment by June 15 and submit this plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year. On or before October 31 the Assessor shall mail the plan and any amendments to the Department of Revenue, Property Tax Division.

|  | 2008 Assessment Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Level of Value, Quality, Uniformity |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | MEDIAN |  |  |  | COD | PRD |
| PROPERTY CLASS | 93 | 8.92 | 102.32 |  |  |  |
| Residential | 94 | 20.11 | 97.97 |  |  |  |
| Commercial | 69 | 11.75 | 102.00 |  |  |  |

# *Since I plan to retire on December 31, 2008, the remaining year for this Three-Year Plan will only be an estimate of what I would have planned. 

## 2009 Assessment Year

## Residential

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2009, using $\mathbf{0 6 / 0 8}$ pricing.
2. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value.

## Commercial

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2009, using $\mathbf{0 6 / 0 8}$ pricing.
2. Complete sales ratio study to determine level of values.

## Agricultural

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2009, using $\mathbf{0 6 / 0 8}$ pricing.
2. Ratio studies and market area study completed by March 1, 2009 to determine if level of value is correct and whether market areas should be changed.
3. We have checked with the FSA office, and there will not be an aerial land use CD for the 2008 crop year due to their budget constraints. They plan to have one flown for the 2009 crop year, then a new one every 3 years.
4. Since we had completed a land use from the CD on the 2007 crop year, we feel our land use is up to date, especially, since our NRD has allowed no new irrigation since 2004.

## Other

1. TerraScan loaded the $06 / 08$ pricing costs on $7 / 23 / 2008$, and we have begun work on repricing all of our residential, commercial and rural properties.
2. Our ratio studies have been run and they show that we need to reprice with new depreciation.
3. Our new ratio study for agland also indicates that land values will have to be changed.
4. As of October 30, 2008, we have completed repricing and final depreciation for 2009 values on our rural buildings, rural houses, acreages, Smithfield Village, Elwood Village and commercials. All that is left is Johnson Lake residential. This should be completed within the next two weeks. Using the "What If" program, we have already established new land values for 2009.
5. We have also received a CD with the new soil survey. Upon completion of the new values, we will begin working on recounting acres, if needed. We have viewed a website that has the new survey, and spot checked it against our current survey and have found no changes.
6. The County Board has granted us funds to start a county wide relisting project over 2 budget years. We have hired HawkEye Appraisal, Inc. to do our relisting and should start sometime before the end of the year.
7. I submitted my resignation, effective December 31, 2008 on October 8, 2008. The County Board appointed Cheryl Taft, Deputy, as the next Gosper County Assessor on October 29, 2008, effective January 1, 2009.
8. The new County Assessor will try to hire an office clerk by December 1, 2008, with hopes that he/she will be able to pass the certification test within six months to become deputy.

## 2010 Assessment Year

## Residential

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1,2010 , using $\mathbf{0 6} / \mathbf{0 8}$ pricing.
2. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value and new depreciation applied if needed.

## Commercial

1. Pickup work to be complete by March 1, 2010, using 06/08 pricing.
2. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value and new depreciation applied if needed.

## Agricultural

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2010, using $\mathbf{0 6 / 0 8}$ pricing.
2. Ratio studies and market area study completed by March 1, 2010 to determine if level of value is correct and whether market areas should be changed and correct if needed.
3. Aerial CD from FSA office will be reviewed for any land use changes in the 2009 crop year.

Other
We will have finished the county wide listing project for the 2010 Assessment year.

## 2011 Assessment Year

## Residential

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2011, using $\mathbf{0 6} / \mathbf{1 0}$ pricing.
2. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value.

## Commercial

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1,2011 , using $\mathbf{0 6} / \mathbf{1 0}$ pricing.
2. Complete sales ratio study to determine level of value.

## Agricultural

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1,2011 , using $\mathbf{0 6} / 10$ pricing.
2. Ratio studies and market area study to be completed by March 1, 2011 to determine if level of value is correct and whether market areas should be changed. Correct if needed.
3. No FSA CD will be available for the 2010 crop year.

## Summary/Conclusion

Gosper County presently uses the TerraScan CAMA system contracted with the Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation. At present, we have no plans to switch to any other system. There are a few problems with this system, but TerraScan seems open to suggestions for improvement and changes.

All of our personal property schedules and real estate records are in both hardcopy and in the computer. We continue to enter all sales into the computer and we use the sales reports generated to compare to our own ratio reports developed on our PC and to sales reports and rosters provided by Property Tax. We also utilize the "what if" program for ag sales.

We acquired a new server from TerraScan in October, 2005 and at this time do not foresee the need to update computers.

All other functions and duties required by the Assessor's office are performed in a timely fashion.

## 2008/09 Budget Request

| Salaries | $56,970.00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Telephone | 520.00 |
| PTAS/CAMA | $3,985.76$ |
| Repair | 200.00 |
| Mileage | 468.00 |
| Dues, Registration | 160.00 |
| Reappraisal | $12,510.00$ |
| Schooling | 350.00 |
| Office Supplies | 300.24 |
| Equipment | 300.00 |
|  |  |
| Total Request | $\mathbf{7 5 , 7 6 4 . 0 0}$ |

Our above budget request was approved by the County Board.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Gosper County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 0 |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
| 3. | 0 |
|  | Other full-time employees |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 0 |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
| 6. | 0 |
| 7. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
| Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |  |
| 8. | \$3,985.76 |
| 9. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
|  | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | \$300.24 |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | Not applicable |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | Not applicable |
| 13. | Total budget |
| \$75,764 |  |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
|  | Yes, \$69.28 |
|  |  |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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


| 3. | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4. | Yes |
| 5. | The maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
| 5 | Does the county have GIS software? |
| 6. | No |
|  | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
| 7. | Not applicable |
|  | Personal Property software: |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Yes |
| 3. | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
| 3. | Yes, and since 2006 the zoning is handled through the assessor's office. |
| 4. | All municipalities in ine county county are zoned? |
|  | When was zoning implemented? |
|  | 1991 |

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Gene Witte, Hawk Eye, Inc., is hired to assist the clerk in completing the pickup <br> work. He will not participate in the valuation process. |
| 2. | Other services |
|  | None |

## 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 Gosper County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



