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## 2009 Commission Summary

45 Holt

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 266 | COD | 22.38 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Sales Price | \$16,948,742 | PRD | 107.25 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$16,883,442 | COV | 39.52 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$16,080,295 | STD | 40.37 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$63,472 | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 21.81 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | \$60,452 | Average Assessed Value of the Base | \$49,610 |
| Median | 97 | Wgt. Mean | 95 |
| Mean | 102 | Max | 544 |
| Min | 28.80 |  |  |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 95.83 to 98.85 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 97.30 to 107.00 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 92.80 to 97.69 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 16.49 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 6.06 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 7.39 |

## Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | PRD

## 2009 Commission Summary

45 Holt

## Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 48 | COD | 27.59 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 3,882,650$ | PRD | 104.59 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 3,702,145$ | COV | 38.52 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 3,302,410$ | STD | 35.94 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 77,128$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 26.20 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 68,800$ | Average Assessed Value |  |
|  |  | of the Base | $\$ 76,857$ |
| Median | 95 | Wgt. Mean | 89 |
| Mean | 93 | Max | 202 |
| Min | 17 |  |  |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 85.34 to 102.10 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 83.13 to 103.47 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 79.07 to 99.33 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 4.36 |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 6.41 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 5.74 |

## Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 52 | 95 | 23.09 | 103.41 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 57 | 100 | 22.72 | 95.05 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 49 | 96 | 25.52 | 108.33 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 48 | 96 | 24.2 | 107.49 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

45 Holt

Agricultural Land - Current

| Number of Sales | 198 | COD | 20.40 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 65,320,832$ | PRD | 107.13 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 60,745,381$ | COV | 28.83 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 41,136,305$ | STD | 20.92 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 306,795$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 14.60 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 207,759$ | Average Assessed Value <br> of the Base | $\$ 149,825$ |
| Median | 72 | Wgt. Mean |  |
| Mean | 73 | Max | 68 |
| Min | 24.70 |  | 215.71 |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 68.26 to 73.91 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 69.64 to 75.46 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 64.75 to 70.69 |

\% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 79.16
\% of Records Sold in the Study Period
\% of Value Sold in the Study Period 1.99

| Agricultural Land - History |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 197 | 72 | 20.63 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 186 | 72 | 23.73 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 194 | 77 | 23.09 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 161 | 78 | 25.87 |

Opinions

# 2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Holt 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 Holt County is $97.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Holt County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Holt County is $95.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Holt County is not 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 Holt County is $72.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Holt 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 

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


## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



NUMBER of Sales TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price
AVG. Assessed Value:
281
$17,915,942$
$17,850,642$
$16,096,755$
63,525
57,283Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:

| ASSESSED VALUE * RANGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 11 | 94.38 | 123.09 | 84.47 | 64.98 | 145.72 | 28.80 | 513.00 | 44.80 to 133.83 | 3,409 | 2,879 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 22 | 109.62 | 129.14 | 93.13 | 47.70 | 138.66 | 36.95 | 515.00 | 72.00 to 155.90 | 8,148 | 7,589 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 33 | 100.56 | 127.12 | 91.63 | 56.09 | 138.73 | 28.80 | 515.00 | 86.22 to 122.74 | 6,568 | 6,019 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 67 | 95.83 | 103.38 | 88.43 | 31.47 | 116.91 | 44.48 | 329.29 | 84.45 to 102.46 | 23,301 | 20,605 |
| 30000 то | 59999 | 68 | 89.86 | 94.98 | 86.65 | 25.56 | 109.61 | 43.77 | 184.93 | 86.59 to 98.83 | 49,877 | 43,220 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 69 | 89.26 | 93.27 | 90.10 | 14.33 | 103.52 | 61.91 | 158.21 | 86.86 to 94.14 | 83,285 | 75,044 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 25 | 90.39 | 91.42 | 89.74 | 12.22 | 101.87 | 68.60 | 130.61 | 81.95 to 96.38 | 129,826 | 116,504 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 18 | 92.75 | 95.37 | 93.99 | 10.94 | 101.47 | 73.89 | 119.41 | 85.78 to 105.24 | 187,144 | 175,901 |
| $\begin{gathered} 250000 \mathrm{TO} \\ \mathrm{ALL} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 499999 | 1 | 100.52 | 100.52 | 100.52 |  |  | 100.52 | 100.52 | N/A | 320,000 | 321,670 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 281 | 91.13 | 100.07 | 90.17 | 26.86 | 110.97 | 28.80 | 515.00 | 89.11 to 94.41 | 63,525 | 57,283 |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 34 | 95.28 | 111.19 | 98.92 | 42.26 | 112.41 | 28.80 | 513.00 | 86.22 to 118.30 | 20,169 | 19,951 |
| 10 |  | 15 | 100.16 | 131.01 | 92.72 | 50.97 | 141.29 | 61.91 | 515.00 | 76.37 to 142.66 | 47,823 | 44,343 |
| 15 |  | 9 | 101.75 | 116.72 | 91.44 | 38.39 | 127.64 | 65.00 | 227.20 | 67.99 to 173.20 | 35,527 | 32,487 |
| 20 |  | 58 | 90.47 | 102.47 | 89.63 | 29.56 | 114.34 | 48.67 | 329.29 | 85.65 to 100.61 | 38,562 | 34,561 |
| 25 |  | 34 | 92.25 | 95.48 | 90.67 | 20.64 | 105.31 | 52.96 | 162.40 | 86.79 to 103.54 | 47,201 | 42,795 |
| 30 |  | 98 | 89.63 | 92.61 | 87.49 | 20.59 | 105.86 | 43.77 | 184.93 | 83.35 to 94.14 | 79,007 | 69,122 |
| 35 |  | 25 | 90.17 | 92.31 | 91.55 | 11.21 | 100.83 | 60.89 | 140.46 | 86.75 to 96.38 | 129,523 | 118,578 |
| 40 |  | 7 | 90.39 | 92.64 | 95.49 | 9.72 | 97.01 | 71.15 | 119.28 | 71.15 to 119.28 | 140,785 | 134,441 |
| 45 ALL |  | 1 | 100.52 | 100.52 | 100.52 |  |  | 100.52 | 100.52 | N/A | 320,000 | 321,670 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 281 | 91.13 | 100.07 | 90.17 | 26.86 | 110.97 | 28.80 | 515.00 | 89.11 to 94.41 | 63,525 | 57,283 |

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:
281
$17,915,942$
$17,850,642$
$16,096,755$
63,525
57,283

## MEDIAN:

91
COV:
47.89

95\% Median C.I.: 89.11 to 94.41
(!: Derived)
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:
-

# MEAN : 

.DEV:
24.47

95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. 8783 to 92.52
95\% Mean C.I.: 94.46 to 105.67

| STYLE |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| (blank) | 35 |
| 100 | 14 |
| 101 | 192 |
| 102 | 11 |
| 103 | 2 |
| 104 | 19 |
| 106 | 2 |
| 111 | 6 |

MEDIAN
94.72
74.42
92.34
78.89
102.17
87.59
118.87
83.94


PRD: $\quad$| 26.8 |
| :--- |

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:22:46

|  | 281 | 91.13 | 100.07 | 90.17 | 26.86 | 110.97 | 28.80 | 515.00 | 89.11 to 94.41 | 63,525 | 57,283 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CONDITION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) | 34 | 95.28 | 111.19 | 98.92 | 42.26 | 112.41 | 28.80 | 513.00 | 86.22 to 118.30 | 20,169 | 19,951 |
| 10 | 1 | 145.40 | 145.40 | 145.40 |  |  | 145.40 | 145.40 | N/A | 5,000 | 7,270 |
| 15 | 3 | 112.60 | 232.47 | 96.20 | 131.79 | 241.64 | 69.80 | 515.00 | N/A | 13,833 | 13,308 |
| 20 | 10 | 88.80 | 94.46 | 91.55 | 21.81 | 103.18 | 62.56 | 169.00 | 65.00 to 111.88 | 22,350 | 20,460 |
| 25 | 18 | 99.16 | 95.94 | 84.22 | 22.85 | 113.91 | 48.67 | 156.60 | 78.16 to 109.79 | 27,600 | 23,245 |
| 30 | 117 | 89.99 | 97.76 | 88.96 | 23.82 | 109.89 | 44.48 | 227.20 | 87.89 to 98.09 | 75,331 | 67,017 |
| 35 | 54 | 89.72 | 95.84 | 90.02 | 20.91 | 106.46 | 43.77 | 170.20 | 85.33 to 97.02 | 76,903 | 69,228 |
| 40 | 42 | 91.59 | 96.17 | 92.76 | 21.19 | 103.67 | 54.73 | 329.29 | 86.79 to 98.17 | 79,099 | 73,376 |
| 50 | 2 | 85.74 | 85.74 | 79.59 | 9.83 | 107.72 | 77.31 | 94.16 | N/A | 54,650 | 43,495 |
| _ ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 281 | 91.13 | 100.07 | 90.17 | 26.86 | 110.97 | 28.80 | 515.00 | 89.11 to 94.41 | 63,525 | 57,283 |
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# Holt County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses: 

## Residential

For assessment year 2009 the Assessor performed a market analysis on the assessor location of O'Neill. Through the analysis it was determined to delete the economic factor on all improvements.

In the assessor location of Atkinson the economic factor was reduced on all improvements based on the market analysis performed. Also, in Atkinson the lot values in one subdivision were increased.

The Chambers assessor location was reviewed and adjustments were made accordingly. Through sales verification it was determined adjustments would need to be made to some sales as errors were found.

The Rural assessor location received a $15 \%$ increase based on a market analysis performed.

The Holt County Assessor reviewed all residential sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

Pickup work was completed and placed on the 2009 assessment roll.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Holt County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Assessor and Deputy |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor, Deputy and staff determine the valuation, with the assessor being responsible for the final value of the property. |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Assessor and Deputy |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | June 2002 Marshall-Swift for all towns, rural residential and Ag Dwellings |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2004 for all towns, rural residential and Ag Dwellings |
| 6. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties? |
|  | The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties. |
| 7. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
|  | 9 Assessor Locations - Atkinson, Chambers, Emmet, Ewing, Inman, O’Neill, Page, Stuart and Rural |
| 8. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |
|  | These assessor locations are defined by location, specifically by town and rural |
| 9. | Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping? |
|  | Yes, Assessor Locations are a unique usable valuation grouping |

10. Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
There is no market significance of the suburban location as this location is only a geographic grouping based on the REGS
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, both dwellings are valued in a manner that provides the same relationship to the market

Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67 | 0 | 30 | 97 |

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

| NUMBER of Sales: | 266 |
| ---: | ---: |
| TOTAL Sales Price: | $16,948,742$ |
| TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $16,883,442$ |
| TOTAL Assessed Value: | $16,080,295$ |
| AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 63,471 |
| AVG. Assessed Value: | 60,452 |

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAI Adj Sal Assessed Value:

AVG. Assessed Value:
97 COV:
(!: AVTot=0)
GT. MEAN: 95 STD: 40.37 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 92.80 to 97.69
MEAN: 102 AVG.ABS.DEV: 21.81 95\% Mean C.I.: 97.30 to 107.00
(!. Derived)

| DATE OF SALE |
| :--- |
| RANGE |

Ortrs

|  | 266 | 97.47 | 102.15 | 95.24 | 22.38 | 107.25 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 95.83 to 98.85 | 63,471 | 60,452 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ASSESSOR LOCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | Count | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| AMELIA | 1 | 62.56 | 62.56 | 62.56 |  |  | 62.56 | 62.56 | N/A | 9,000 | 5,630 |
| AMELIA V | 1 | 100.56 | 100.56 | 100.56 |  |  | 100.56 | 100.56 | N/A | 4,500 | 4,525 |
| ATKINSON | 43 | 97.98 | 106.40 | 96.51 | 26.49 | 110.24 | 46.98 | 243.12 | 90.10 to 102.07 | 59,855 | 57,769 |
| CHAMBERS | 11 | 98.76 | 99.31 | 87.04 | 32.58 | 114.09 | 28.80 | 222.00 | 36.95 to 120.44 | 31,959 | 27,817 |
| EWING | 10 | 100.35 | 100.24 | 92.82 | 27.44 | 108.00 | 44.80 | 159.40 | 54.73 to 155.90 | 10,680 | 9,913 |
| INMAN | 1 | 89.11 | 89.11 | 89.11 |  |  | 89.11 | 89.11 | N/A | 33,000 | 29,405 |
| O'NEILL | 125 | 97.70 | 104.45 | 96.54 | 20.71 | 108.19 | 31.55 | 543.67 | 95.83 to 101.80 | 66,871 | 64,561 |
| PAGE | 5 | 71.21 | 87.97 | 77.63 | 24.36 | 113.33 | 69.80 | 120.33 | N/A | 20,300 | 15,758 |
| RURAL | 44 | 96.13 | 97.38 | 93.30 | 20.38 | 104.37 | 53.61 | 190.30 | 86.59 to 102.42 | 90,520 | 84,458 |
| STUART | 25 | 96.28 | 98.74 | 94.50 | 20.61 | 104.49 | 51.43 | 183.75 | 86.84 to 100.07 | 54,455 | 51,458 |
| _ALL | 266 | 97.47 | 102.15 | 95.24 | 22.38 | 107.25 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 95.83 to 98.85 | 63,471 | 60,452 |
| LOCATIONS: URBAN, | JRBAN | \& RURAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1 | 220 | 97.85 | 103.29 | 95.86 | 22.76 | 107.75 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 95.90 to 100.07 | 58,577 | 56,154 |
| 2 | 24 | 96.13 | 99.56 | 94.07 | 15.84 | 105.84 | 62.67 | 151.22 | 86.70 to 106.18 | 93,039 | 87,518 |
| 3 | 22 | 94.89 | 93.57 | 92.20 | 25.61 | 101.48 | 53.61 | 190.30 | 66.29 to 102.42 | 80,157 | 73,902 |
| $\ldots$ ALL__ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 266 | 97.47 | 102.15 | 95.24 | 22.38 | 107.25 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 95.83 to 98.85 | 63,471 | 60,452 |
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PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

| NUMBER of Sales: | 266 |
| ---: | ---: |
| TOTAL Sales Price: | $16,948,742$ |
| TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $16,883,442$ |
| TOTAL Assessed Value: | $16,080,295$ |
| AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 63,471 |
| AVG. Assessed Value: | 60,452 |


| STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED \& IOLL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. |  |  |
| 1 | 242 | 97.76 | 103.05 | 95.46 | 22.12 | 107.95 | 31.55 | 543.67 | 96.06 to 99.17 | 68,312 | 65,213 |
| 2 | 24 | 91.65 | 93.04 | 84.91 | 25.45 | 109.57 | 28.80 | 151.22 | 78.40 to 114.98 | 14,655 | 12,444 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 266 | 97.47 | 102.15 | 95.24 | 22.38 | 107.25 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 95.83 to 98.85 | 63,471 | 60,452 |
| PROPERTY TYPE *RANGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
|  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 01 | 264 | 97.62 | 102.45 | 95.35 | 22.24 | 107.45 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 95.90 to 98.94 | 63,749 | 60,783 |
| 06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07 | 2 | 62.35 | 62.35 | 62.56 | 40.73 | 99.66 | 36.95 | 87.74 | N/A | 26,775 | 16,750 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 266 | 97.47 | 102.15 | 95.24 | 22.38 | 107.25 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 95.83 to 98.85 | 63,471 | 60,452 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCHOOL DISTRICT * } \\ & \text { RANGE } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
|  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. |  |  |
| (blank) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02-0006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02-0049 | 2 | 139.71 | 139.71 | 100.35 | 36.22 | 139.22 | 89.11 | 190.30 | N/A | 18,562 | 18,627 |
| 08-0036 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08-0050 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36-0100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45-0007 | 154 | 97.56 | 103.45 | 96.02 | 20.70 | 107.74 | 31.55 | 543.67 | 95.33 to 101.80 | 69,834 | 67,052 |
| 45-0029 | 14 | 96.55 | 95.66 | 91.97 | 24.76 | 104.02 | 44.80 | 159.40 | 69.80 to 112.75 | 16,378 | 15,063 |
| 45-0044 | 26 | 97.19 | 98.99 | 95.63 | 19.99 | 103.52 | 51.43 | 183.75 | 86.84 to 102.46 | 58,515 | 55,955 |
| 45-0137 | 12 | 98.66 | 95.61 | 81.74 | 33.59 | 116.97 | 28.80 | 222.00 | 54.94 to 114.30 | 35,087 | 28,680 |
| 45-0239 | 58 | 97.07 | 101.74 | 94.57 | 24.00 | 107.58 | 46.98 | 243.12 | 90.10 to 100.52 | 67,587 | 63,915 |
| 54-0583 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 92-0045 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NonValid School$\qquad$ ALL $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 266 | 97.47 | 102.15 | 95.24 | 22.38 | 107.25 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 95.83 to 98.85 | 63,471 | 60,452 |

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


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang |  | /2006 to 06/30/2 | 08 Posted | re: 01 | 09 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | f Sales |  | 266 | MEDIAN: | $97$ |  | COV: | 39.52 | 95\% | dian C.I.: 95.83 | to 98.85 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | es Price |  | 742 | WGT. MEAN: | 95 |  | STD: | 40.37 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 92. | to 97.69 |  |
| TOT | L Adj. ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | es Price |  | 442 | MEAN : | 102 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 21.81 |  | Mean C.I.: 97 | to 107.00 |  |
|  | Al Asse | d Value |  | 295 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | es Price |  | 471 | COD : | 22.38 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 543.67 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Value |  | 452 | PRD : | 107.25 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 28.80 |  |  | Printed: 03/25/ | 9 15:13:14 |
| ASSESSED VA | UE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 11 | 94.38 | 86.12 | 79.13 | 25.17 |  | 108.83 | 28.80 | 133.83 | 44.80 to 122.00 | 3,409 | 2,697 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 19 | 118.30 | 138.96 | 99.50 | 49.05 |  | 139.66 | 36.95 | 543.67 | 72.00 to 159.40 | 7,461 | 7,424 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 30 | 101.78 | 119.58 | 95.24 | 46.64 |  | 125.56 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 86.22 to 122.74 | 5,975 | 5,691 |
| 10000 тO | 29999 | 57 | 98.94 | 101.03 | 86.03 | 25.56 |  | 117.44 | 31.55 | 243.12 | 89.11 to 106.02 | 22,431 | 19,297 |
| 30000 то | 59999 | 67 | 93.63 | 100.35 | 91.92 | 25.68 |  | 109.16 | 53.61 | 200.13 | 86.59 to 104.52 | 46,951 | 43,159 |
| 60000 тO | 99999 | 65 | 96.41 | 99.99 | 97.03 | 13.06 |  | 103.05 | 61.91 | 176.89 | 94.85 to 98.59 | 79,043 | 76,696 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 28 | 96.20 | 96.18 | 94.48 | 11.18 |  | 101.80 | 73.49 | 141.12 | 87.79 to 98.73 | 125,567 | 118,640 |
| 150000 то | 249999 | 18 | 100.09 | 100.54 | 99.48 | 9.25 |  | 101.06 | 83.68 | 127.14 | 92.48 to 105.85 | 183,672 | 182,725 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 1 | 100.52 | 100.52 | 100.52 |  |  |  | 100.52 | 100.52 | N/A | 320,000 | 321,670 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 266 | 97.47 | 102.15 | 95.24 | 22.38 |  | 107.25 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 95.83 to 98.85 | 63,471 | 60,452 |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 32 | 96.32 | 100.68 | 103.70 | 31.59 |  | 97.09 | 28.80 | 190.30 | 86.22 to 118.30 | 20,101 | 20,845 |
| 10 |  | 15 | 102.07 | 136.04 | 98.24 | 48.99 |  | 138.48 | 61.91 | 543.67 | 93.63 to 134.93 | 47,823 | 46,980 |
| 15 |  | 9 | 101.75 | 116.87 | 92.80 | 33.10 |  | 125.94 | 69.80 | 243.12 | 73.14 to 145.47 | 35,527 | 32,970 |
| 20 |  | 54 | 96.91 | 103.48 | 94.12 | 22.53 |  | 109.95 | 52.33 | 222.00 | 90.63 to 104.52 | 40,298 | 37,927 |
| 25 |  | 34 | 98.66 | 96.61 | 91.78 | 17.73 |  | 105.26 | 31.55 | 170.12 | 89.11 to 106.02 | 47,201 | 43,322 |
| 30 |  | 92 | 96.15 | 98.92 | 94.22 | 19.26 |  | 104.99 | 46.98 | 200.13 | 91.94 to 100.07 | 79,426 | 74,838 |
| 35 |  | 23 | 98.35 | 96.05 | 96.02 | 9.85 |  | 100.03 | 66.07 | 118.05 | 88.95 to 101.09 | 131,819 | 126,573 |
| 40 |  | 6 | 98.11 | 95.79 | 101.29 | 7.78 |  | 94.57 | 71.15 | 113.30 | 71.15 to 113.30 | 127,166 | 128,800 |
| 45 |  | 1 | 100.52 | 100.52 | 100.52 |  |  |  | 100.52 | 100.52 | N/A | 320,000 | 321,670 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 266 | 97.47 | 102.15 | 95.24 | 22.38 |  | 107.25 | 28.80 | 543.67 | 95.83 to 98.85 | 63,471 | 60,452 |



## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

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

The assessment actions for 2009 were applied to the population by the County and the statistics indicate all subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are valued within the statutory range.

## 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 | 438 | 266 | $\mathbf{6 0 . 7 3}$ |
| 2008 | 419 | 256 | $\mathbf{6 1 . 1 0}$ |
| 2007 | 404 | 260 | $\mathbf{6 4 . 3 6}$ |
| 2006 | 419 | 263 | $\mathbf{6 2 . 7 7}$ |
| 2005 | 424 | 222 | $\mathbf{5 2 . 3 6}$ |

RESIDENTIAL:Table II indicates that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and the measurement of the class of property was done will all available arm?s length sales.

The Holt County Assessor reviewed all residential sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

## 2009 Correlation Section

## 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 | 91 | 6.12 | 97 | 97 |
| 2008 | 93.32 | 2.84 | 96 | 94.89 |
| 2007 | 94 | 5.52 | 99 | 100 |
| 2006 | 96 | 0.22 | 97 | 96 |
| 2005 | 98 | 0.64 | 99 | 98 |

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

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 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 Holt County

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

\% Change in Total \% Change in Total Assessed

Assessed Value in the Sales File
Value (excl. growth)

| 5.68 | 2009 | 6.12 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 2.61 | 2008 | 2.84 |
| 11.44 | 2007 | 8.96 |
| 1.24 | 2006 | 0.22 |
| 0.81 | 2005 | 0.64 |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# 2009 Correlation Section 

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 97 | 95 | 102 |

RESIDENTIAL:Both the median and weighted mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. The mean measure is outside the range, but can be attributed to outlier sales.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 22.38 | $\mathbf{1 0 7 . 2 5}$ |
| Difference | 7.38 | 4.25 |

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

## 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 | 281 | 266 | -15 |
| Median | 91 | 97 | 6 |
| Wgt. Mean | 90 | 95 | 5 |
| Mean | 100 | 102 | 2 |
| COD | 26.86 | 22.38 | -4.48 |
| PRD | 110.97 | 107.25 | -3.72 |
| Minimum | 28.80 | 28.80 | 0.00 |
| Maximum | 515.00 | 543.67 | 28.67 |

RESIDENTIAL:The change between the preliminary statistics and the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property by the County. The change in the number of sales is attributable to the removal of those sales that experienced significant physical or economic changes after the sale occurred.

## 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 | 266 | 239 | 27 |
| Median | 97 | 99 | -2 |
| Wgt. Mean | 95 | 95 | 0 |
| Mean | 102 | 109 | -7 |
| COD | 22.38 | 33.64 | -11.26 |
| PRD | 107.25 | 114.56 | -7.31 |
| Minimum | 28.80 | 7.10 | 21.70 |
| Maximum | 543.67 | 562.04 | -18.37 |

In comparing the two sets of statistics in the above table you will notice the Trended Statistics have twenty-seven less sales than the R\&O Statistics. The sales were removed from the analysis as they were split off from the original parcel or substantially changed since the date of sale. The split off sales did not have a prior year value, thus the reason for not figuring them into the Trended Statistics.

It appears the two sets of statistics are fairly similar. There is no reason to believe the sales file is not representative of the population, or the sold properties have been treated differently than the unsold properties.

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

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



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



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

## Commercial

Commercial values were not changed for 2009. Any changes found through pickup work and/or sales verification were updated.

The Holt County Assessor reviewed all commercial sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

Pickup work was completed and placed on the 2009 assessment roll.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Holt County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Assessor and Deputy |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor and Deputy determine the valuation, with the assessor being responsible for the final value of the property |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Assessor and Deputy |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | June 2002 Marshall-Swift |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2004 |
| 6. | When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | The income approach has not been utilized |
| 7. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties? |
|  | The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties. |
| 8. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
|  | 9 Assessor Locations - Atkinson, Chambers, Emmet, Ewing, Inman, O’Neill, Page, Stuart and Rural |
| 9. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |
|  | These assessor locations are defined by location, specifically by town and rural |
| 10. | Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping? |
|  | Yes, Assessor Locations are a unique usable valuation grouping |


| 11. | Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, <br> warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Yes |
| 12. | Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. <br> 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the <br> limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
|  | There is no market significance of the suburban location as this location is only a <br> geographic grouping based on the REGS |

## Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 0 | 5 | 20 |

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

|  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 1/2005 to 06/30/2 | 8 Posted | fore: 01/2 | 2009 |  |  | (!: AVTot=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER of | f Sales: |  | 48 | MEDIAN: | 95 |  | cov: | 38.52 |  | Median | C.I.: 85.3 | to 102.10 | (!: Derived) |
| total Sales | s Price: |  | 3,882,650 | WGT. MEAN: | 89 |  | STD: | 35.94 | 95\% Wg | Mean | C.I.: 79.07 | to 99.33 |  |
| total Adj.Sales | s Price: |  | 3,702,145 | MEAN : | 93 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 26.20 |  | Mean | C.I.: 83. | to 103.47 |  |
| TOTAL Assessed | d Value: |  | 3,302,410 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Adj. Sales | s Price: |  | 77,128 | COD: | 27.59 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 202.42 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Assessed | d Value: |  | 68,800 | PRD : | 104.59 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 16.90 |  |  |  | Printed: 03/25/ | 15:13:24 |
| DATE OF SALE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIn | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 | 7 | 102.10 | 108.98 | 97.04 | 22.10 |  | 112.30 | 61.72 | 156.20 | 61.72 | 2 to 156.20 | 112,071 | 108,755 |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 7 | 104.50 | 105.62 | 103.81 | 14.66 |  | 101.74 | 70.91 | 138.42 | 70.91 | 1 to 138.42 | 51,771 | 53,743 |
| 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 | 5 | 85.34 | 79.35 | 80.55 | 19.04 |  | 98.51 | 52.42 | 105.00 |  | N/A | 73,500 | 59,201 |
| 07/01/06 TO 09/30/06 | 3 | 51.81 | 64.92 | 51.21 | 34.89 |  | 126.76 | 44.36 | 98.59 |  | N/A | 92,665 | 47,456 |
| 10/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 3 | 100.51 | 108.69 | 111.39 | 16.93 |  | 97.58 | 87.26 | 138.30 |  | N/A | 47,233 | 52,613 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 2 | 80.85 | 80.85 | 94.09 | 50.68 |  | 85.92 | 39.87 | 121.82 |  | N/A | 33,250 | 31,285 |
| 04/01/07 то 06/30/07 | 3 | 70.76 | 75.93 | 74.83 | 15.18 |  | 101.47 | 62.41 | 94.63 |  | N/A | 71,350 | 53,391 |
| 07/01/07 то 09/30/07 | 6 | 101.12 | 99.81 | 113.02 | 31.25 |  | 88.32 | 16.90 | 169.44 | 16.90 | 0 to 169.44 | 67,250 | 76,003 |
| 10/01/07 то 12/31/07 | 5 | 80.57 | 73.69 | 81.24 | 35.41 |  | 90.71 | 25.85 | 118.95 |  | N/A | 66,600 | 54,107 |
| 01/01/08 то 03/31/08 | 4 | 85.42 | 111.49 | 79.59 | 43.90 |  | 140.09 | 72.71 | 202.42 |  | N/A | 125,000 | 99,486 |
| 04/01/08 то 06/30/08 | 3 | 85.74 | 85.28 | 88.23 | 25.08 |  | 96.66 | 52.80 | 117.30 |  | N/A | 83,666 | 73,820 |
| _Study Years_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/05 то 06/30/06 | 19 | 100.10 | 99.94 | 94.66 | 20.25 |  | 105.58 | 52.42 | 156.20 | 85.34 | 4 to 111.21 | 79,705 | 75,447 |
| 07/01/06 то 06/30/07 | 11 | 87.26 | 82.76 | 74.68 | 29.65 |  | 110.81 | 39.87 | 138.30 | 44.36 | 6 to 121.82 | 63,658 | 47,541 |
| 07/01/07 то 06/30/08 | 18 | 93.36 | 92.73 | 90.48 | 34.13 |  | 102.48 | 16.90 | 202.42 | 72.71 | 1 to 117.30 | 82,638 | 74,775 |
| _Calendar Yrs_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 18 | 95.68 | 92.05 | 84.59 | 22.02 |  | 108.82 | 44.36 | 138.42 | 70.91 | 1 to 105.00 | 63,866 | 54,023 |
| 01/01/07 то 12/31/07 | 16 | 92.90 | 84.80 | 93.34 | 32.85 |  | 90.85 | 16.90 | 169.44 | 46.77 | 7 to 118.95 | 63,565 | 59,331 |
|  | 48 | 94.95 | 93.30 | 89.20 | 27.59 |  | 104.59 | 16.90 | 202.42 | 85.34 | 4 to 102.10 | 77,128 | 68,800 |
| ASSESSOR LOCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Atkinson | 12 | 93.60 | 87.75 | 84.87 | 21.46 |  | 103.39 | 25.85 | 119.15 | 62.65 | 5 to 111.00 | 54,083 | 45,900 |
| Chambers | 3 | 104.50 | 92.53 | 84.58 | 44.43 |  | 109.40 | 16.90 | 156.20 |  | N/A | 5,166 | 4,370 |
| EWING | 3 | 96.59 | 117.14 | 98.58 | 51.77 |  | 118.83 | 52.42 | 202.42 |  | N/A | 20,333 | 20,045 |
| - 'neill | 24 | 94.95 | 94.93 | 92.33 | 26.40 |  | 102.81 | 44.36 | 169.44 | 70.91 | 1 to 111.21 | 100,060 | 92,384 |
| RURAL | 6 | 91.41 | 86.37 | 80.17 | 20.67 |  | 107.73 | 39.87 | 121.63 | 39.87 | 7 to 121.63 | 95,866 | 76,856 |
| $\ldots$ ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 48 | 94.95 | 93.30 | 89.20 | 27.59 |  | 104.59 | 16.90 | 202.42 | 85.34 | 4 to 102.10 | 77,128 | 68,800 |



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

State Stat Run


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 01/2005 to 06/30/2 | 8 Posted | fore: 01/23/20 | 009 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | f Sale |  | 48 | MEDIAN: | 95 |  | COV: | 38.52 | 95\% | dian | C.I.: 85.3 | to 102.10 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | s Pric |  | 650 | WGT. MEAN: | 89 |  | STD: | 35.94 | 95\% Wg | Mean | C.I.: 79 | to 99.33 |  |
| TOT | L Adj. S | s Pric |  | 145 | MEAN : | 93 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 26.20 |  | Mean | C.I.: 83. | to 103.47 |  |
|  | AL Asse | d Valu |  | 410 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | s Pric |  | 128 | COD : | 27.59 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 202.42 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | 800 | PRD : | 104.59 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 16.90 |  |  |  | Printed: 03/25/ | 15:13:24 |
| ASSESSED VA <br> RANGE | UE * | COUN | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX |  | Median C.I | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PRD | Mrn | MAX |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 4 | 75.69 | 81.12 | 67.17 | 61.13 |  | 120.78 | 16.90 | 156.20 |  | N/A | 3,925 | 2,636 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 4 | 75.64 | 75.54 | 59.20 | 42.59 |  | 127.60 | 39.87 | 111.00 |  | N/A | 12,625 | 7,473 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 8 | 75.69 | 78.33 | 61.09 | 51.84 |  | 128.22 | 16.90 | 156.20 | 16.90 | 0 to 156.20 | 8,275 | 5,055 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 12 | 88.58 | 92.68 | 71.23 | 39.37 |  | 130.12 | 25.85 | 202.42 | 52.42 | 2 to 117.30 | 30,166 | 21,486 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 9 | 94.42 | 96.02 | 93.19 | 16.81 |  | 103.04 | 62.65 | 138.42 | 70.76 | 6 to 121.82 | 43,772 | 40,790 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 9 | 95.27 | 101.13 | 96.51 | 15.85 |  | 104.79 | 62.41 | 138.30 | 91.16 | 6 to 121.63 | 77,355 | 74,658 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 5 | 85.34 | 97.45 | 81.17 | 40.98 |  | 120.06 | 51.81 | 169.44 |  | N/A | 150,759 | 122,368 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 3 | 100.10 | 97.16 | 95.90 | 6.63 |  | 101.31 | 85.74 | 105.64 |  | N/A | 186,000 | 178,381 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 1 | 75.28 | 75.28 | 75.28 |  |  |  | 75.28 | 75.28 |  | N/A | 422,000 | 317,670 |
| $500000+$ |  | 1 | 111.21 | 111.21 | 111.21 |  |  |  | 111.21 | 111.21 |  | N/A | 450,000 | 500,430 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 48 | 94.95 | 93.30 | 89.20 | 27.59 |  | 104.59 | 16.90 | 202.42 | 85.34 | 4 to 102.10 | 77,128 | 68,800 |
| COST RANK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 8 | 80.50 | 79.79 | 70.27 | 45.70 |  | 113.54 | 16.90 | 156.20 | 16.90 | 0 to 156.20 | 23,337 | 16,398 |
| 10 |  | 28 | 91.97 | 89.03 | 82.01 | 26.55 |  | 108.56 | 25.85 | 202.42 | 70.91 | 1 to 102.10 | 68,351 | 56,058 |
| 15 |  | 3 | 91.33 | 101.68 | 82.62 | 23.04 |  | 123.07 | 75.28 | 138.42 |  | N/A | 187,300 | 154,741 |
| 20 |  | 9 | 105.00 | 115.80 | 109.39 | 19.54 |  | 105.85 | 85.34 | 169.44 | 95.27 | 7 to 141.95 | 115,522 | 126,374 |
| _ ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 48 | 94.95 | 93.30 | 89.20 | 27.59 |  | 104.59 | 16.90 | 202.42 | 85.34 | 4 to 102.10 | 77,128 | 68,800 |



## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

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

The assessment actions for 2009 were applied to the population by the County and the statistics indicate all subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are valued within the statutory range.

## 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 | 111 | 48 | 43.24 |
| 2008 | 112 | 52 | 46.43 |
| 2007 | 112 | 57 | 50.89 |
| 2006 | 92 | 49 | 53.26 |
| 2005 | 92 | 48 | 52.17 |

COMMERCIAL:A review of Table II indicates a slight drop in the percent of sales used from the previous year. However, further review of the non-qualified sales roster indicates no excessive trimming of sales.

The Holt County Assessor reviewed all commercial sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

## 2009 Correlation Section

for Holt 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 | 95 | 0.43 | 95 | 95 |
| 2008 | 94.83 | 0.53 | 95 | 94.83 |
| 2007 | 96 | 1.51 | 97 | 100 |
| 2006 | 96 | -0.14 | 95 | 96 |
| 2005 | 93 | 0.04 | 93 | 96 |

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

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 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 Holt County

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

\% Change in Total \% Change in Total Assessed
Assessed Value in the Sales File

| 0 | 2009 | 0.43 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 0 . 0 8}$ | 2008 | 0.53 |
| 21.46 | 2007 | 7.88 |
| 0.93 | 2006 | -0.14 |
| -3.07 | 2005 | 0.04 |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2009 Correlation Section

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 95 | 89 | 93 |

COMMERCIAL:The median and mean measures of central tendency are both within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is below the range.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 27.59 | 104.59 |
| Difference | 7.59 | $\mathbf{1 . 5 9}$ |

COMMERCIAL:The coefficient of dispersion is outside the range and does not support assessment uniformity. The price related differential is slightly above the range.

## 2009 Correlation Section

for Holt County

## 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 | 48 | 48 | 0 |
| Median | 95 | 95 | 0 |
| Wgt. Mean | 89 | 89 | 0 |
| Mean | 93 | 93 | 0 |
| COD | 27.13 | $\mathbf{2 7 . 5 9}$ | 0.46 |
| PRD | 104.57 | 104.59 | 0.02 |
| Minimum | 202.42 | 202.42 | 0.00 |
| Maximum |  | 0.00 |  |

COMMERCIAL:The above table is reflective of the reported assessment actions of the Holt County Assessor.

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

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

__ALL__
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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
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## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

## ype: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009



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

## Agricultural

For assessment year 2009 the Holt County Assessor performed a spreadsheet analysis of agricultural sales and adjusted values according to the market. A new market area was developed in the southern part of the county based on the low water table and the soils within this area.

In market area 1 irrigated value was increased by $16 \%$, dry land value was increased between $5 \%$ and $10 \%$ and grass land value was raised between $5 \%$ and $10 \%$.

In market area 2 4A irrigated values were raised 10\%. 4D1 and 4D dry land increased by $10 \%$. 3D and 3D1 dry land increased by $5 \%$. Grass land value rose between $5 \%$ and $10 \%$.

A land use study of the county began in the fall of 2005 with $75 \%$ now being implemented for assessment year 2009.

The assessor does map all agricultural sales in a book within the office to provide information to the public about current land valuation.

All agricultural sales are reviewed by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

Pickup work was completed and placed on the 2009 assessment roll.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Holt County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Assessor and Deputy |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Assessor and Deputy |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | At this time the County does not have a written policy in place, but plans are to develop one for future use |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | Agricultural land is defined according to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359 |
| 5. | When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | The income approach has never been utilized |
| 6. | If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used? |
|  | N/A |
| 7. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 1995 |
| 8. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | 1987, however another review began in the fall of 2005 |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | Physical inspection and FSA maps |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | Assessor and Deputy |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | $75 \%$ of the review started in 2005 is implemented at this time |


| 9. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the <br> agricultural property class: <br> Three Market Areas |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10. | How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed? <br> Market Areas are developed based on similar soil classes, topography, water table <br> and verified by sales |
| 11. | In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other <br> than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation? <br> Yes or No |
|  | No |
| a. | If yes, list. |
|  | N/A |
| 12. | In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings? |
|  | Between sixty-nine and seventy-five percent |
| 13. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special <br> valuation for agricultural land within the county? |
|  | No |

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 30 | 40 | 70 |

45 - HOLT COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified

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

## NUMBER of Sales:

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

AVG. Assessed Value:
198
$65,320,832$
$60,745,381$
$41,136,305$
306,794
207,759
72 COV: 28.83 95\% Median C.I.: 68.26 to 73.9
5\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 64.75 to 70.69
95\% Mean C.I.: 69.64 to 75.46

| DATE OF SALE * |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/05 TO 09/30/05 | 12 |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 10 |
| 01/01/06 TO 03/31/06 | 27 |
| 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 | 16 |
| 07/01/06 то 09/30/06 | 5 |
| 10/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 11 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 29 |
| 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 | 15 |
| 07/01/07 TO 09/30/07 |  |
| 10/01/07 тO 12/31/07 | 10 |
| 01/01/08 тO 03/31/08 | 42 |
| 04/01/08 то 06/30/08 | 21 |
| Study Years |  |
| 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06 | 65 |
| 07/01/06 то 06/30/07 | 60 |
| 07/01/07 то 06/30/08 | 73 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |
| 01/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 59 |
| 01/01/07 то 12/31/07 | 54 |
| ALL |  |
|  | 198 |


| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73.29 | 79.36 | 78.34 |
| 79.97 | 77.08 | 75.67 |
| 75.56 | 79.81 | 77.31 |
| 75.11 | 87.62 | 74.54 |
| 72.35 | 78.68 | 75.16 |
| 74.44 | 78.14 | 80.35 |
| 75.12 | 74.31 | 71.25 |
| 65.52 | 67.62 | 68.70 |
|  |  |  |
| 69.06 | 68.51 | 62.13 |
| 64.15 | 65.37 | 62.79 |
| 58.18 | 58.69 | 52.27 |
| 75.49 | 81.23 | 76.47 |
| 72.83 | 73.70 | 72.48 |
| 63.17 | 63.87 | 59.49 |
|  |  |  |
| 75.40 | 81.52 | 76.80 |
| 71.78 | 71.37 | 67.98 |
| 71.59 | 72.55 | 67.72 |

. 13
rinted: 03/25/2009 15:13:56
7.72
20.40
07.13
24.70
215.71
68.26 to 73.91

207,759

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

|  | NUMBER of Sales: |  | 198 | MEDIAN: |  |  |  |  | 95\% Median C.I.: 68 |  | to 73.91 | (!: Derived) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: |  | , 832 | WGT. MEAN: | 68 |  | STD: | 20.92 | $95 \% \mathrm{Wg}$ | 64.75 to 70.69 |  |  |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: | 60,745,381 |  | MEAN : | 73 | AVG.ABS.DEV: |  | 14.60 |  | Mean C.I.: 69.64 to 75.46 |  |  |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | 41,136,305 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 306,794 |  | COD : | 20.40 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 215.71 | Printed: 03/25/2009 15:13:56 |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 207,759 |  | PRD : | 107.13 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 24.70 |  |  |  |  |
| GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP \# |  |  |  |  | COD |  | PRD | MIN | Avg. Adj. |  |  | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |  |  |  |  | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1011 | 7 | 71.52 | 69.98 | 65.60 | 11.45 |  | 106.68 | 46.58 | 84.75 | 46.58 to 84.75 | 201,863 | 132,425 |
| 1017 | 3 | 96.56 | 88.91 | 84.66 | 11.72 |  | 105.01 | 68.10 | 102.06 | N/A | 64,000 | 54,183 |
| 1195 | 1 | 122.23 | 122.23 | 122.23 |  |  |  | 122.23 | 122.23 | N/A | 383,223 | 468,410 |
| 1201 | 1 | 70.22 | 70.22 | 70.22 |  |  |  | 70.22 | 70.22 | N/A | 96,000 | 67,410 |
| 1203 | 1 | 116.14 | 116.14 | 116.14 |  |  |  | 116.14 | 116.14 | N/A | 125,000 | 145,180 |
| 1205 | 2 | 48.58 | 48.58 | 47.61 | 14.07 |  | 102.03 | 41.74 | 55.41 | N/A | 199,000 | 94,745 |
| 1207 | 3 | 72.35 | 74.58 | 66.57 | 25.92 |  | 112.03 | 47.57 | 103.82 | N/A | 752,304 | 500,823 |
| 1209 | 6 | 88.78 | 84.01 | 88.60 | 10.56 |  | 94.82 | 53.56 | 96.84 | 53.56 to 96.84 | 123,633 | 109,535 |
| 1289 | 1 | 119.27 | 119.27 | 119.27 |  |  |  | 119.27 | 119.27 | N/A | 46,400 | 55,340 |
| 1293 | 4 | 53.03 | 55.48 | 54.42 | 17.50 |  | 101.94 | 41.95 | 73.91 | N/A | 207,590 | 112,975 |
| 1299 | 1 | 76.37 | 76.37 | 76.37 |  |  |  | 76.37 | 76.37 | N/A | 396,000 | 302,430 |
| 225 | 2 | 63.01 | 63.01 | 67.46 | 16.63 |  | 93.41 | 52.53 | 73.49 | N/A | 69,515 | 46,892 |
| 227 | 2 | 102.52 | 102.52 | 102.16 | 3.22 |  | 100.35 | 99.22 | 105.82 | N/A | 162,750 | 166,267 |
| 229 | 3 | 76.47 | 72.44 | 59.68 | 13.61 |  | 121.39 | 54.82 | 86.04 | N/A | 411,000 | 245,276 |
| 399 | 1 | 34.19 | 34.19 | 34.19 |  |  |  | 34.19 | 34.19 | N/A | 40,000 | 13,675 |
| 403 | 1 | 54.99 | 54.99 | 54.99 |  |  |  | 54.99 | 54.99 | N/A | 729,000 | 400,850 |
| 405 | 3 | 56.99 | 64.51 | 62.69 | 16.34 |  | 102.90 | 54.30 | 82.23 | N/A | 689,375 | 432,158 |
| 407 | 11 | 79.17 | 78.31 | 79.04 | 21.22 |  | 99.08 | 31.16 | 118.50 | 48.77 to 110.81 | 206,090 | 162,894 |
| 409 | 3 | 59.65 | 59.30 | 65.63 | 14.37 |  | 90.37 | 46.27 | 71.99 | N/A | 113,333 | 74,375 |
| 411 | 4 | 94.15 | 91.86 | 93.61 | 10.49 |  | 98.12 | 75.56 | 103.57 | N/A | 160,219 | 149,986 |
| 413 | 3 | 81.78 | 81.92 | 81.61 | 1.30 |  | 100.37 | 80.39 | 83.58 | N/A | 190,333 | 155,338 |
| 473 | 3 | 46.19 | 47.71 | 48.16 | 7.53 |  | 99.08 | 43.25 | 53.69 | N/A | 272,955 | 131,441 |
| 475 | 8 | 69.17 | 70.47 | 69.45 | 15.98 |  | 101.46 | 43.01 | 90.17 | 43.01 to 90.17 | 180,735 | 125,523 |
| 479 | 1 | 82.94 | 82.94 | 82.94 |  |  |  | 82.94 | 82.94 | N/A | 16,000 | 13,270 |
| 481 | 10 | 68.25 | 69.39 | 65.52 | 15.84 |  | 105.90 | 42.19 | 95.81 | 59.09 to 80.17 | 507,612 | 332,581 |
| 483 | 4 | 67.46 | 70.05 | 69.01 | 14.68 |  | 101.50 | 59.54 | 85.74 | N/A | 480,855 | 331,853 |
| 485 | 5 | 68.26 | 67.92 | 62.79 | 8.16 |  | 108.17 | 53.73 | 75.57 | N/A | 273,040 | 171,439 |
| 487 | 4 | 68.18 | 65.90 | 63.08 | 11.36 |  | 104.47 | 51.22 | 76.02 | N/A | 388,875 | 245,285 |
| 653 | 7 | 73.31 | 77.62 | 77.87 | 22.16 |  | 99.68 | 46.03 | 118.13 | 46.03 to 118.13 | 180,457 | 140,523 |
| 655 | 6 | 63.79 | 84.27 | 56.50 | 49.43 |  | 149.15 | 47.51 | 215.71 | 47.51 to 215.71 | 287,200 | 162,264 |
| 657 | 6 | 73.54 | 75.70 | 59.66 | 29.25 |  | 126.89 | 42.77 | 129.12 | 42.77 to 129.12 | 434,086 | 258,967 |
| 659 | 1 | 42.29 | 42.29 | 42.29 |  |  |  | 42.29 | 42.29 | N/A | 491,000 | 207,650 |
| 661 | 5 | 69.34 | 68.17 | 69.99 | 14.39 |  | 97.40 | 46.72 | 88.82 | N/A | 265,685 | 185,953 |
| 663 | 2 | 72.23 | 72.23 | 71.84 | 3.06 |  | 100.55 | 70.02 | 74.44 | N/A | 297,587 | 213,777 |
| 665 | 6 | 62.84 | 64.87 | 60.07 | 17.56 |  | 107.99 | 49.45 | 90.90 | 49.45 to 90.90 | 389,554 | 234,010 |
| 667 | 1 | 90.13 | 90.13 | 90.13 |  |  |  | 90.13 | 90.13 | N/A | 340,000 | 306,440 |
| 737 | 9 | 65.16 | 65.96 | 64.71 | 10.35 |  | 101.93 | 41.37 | 77.60 | 63.17 to 76.04 | 326,482 | 211,266 |
| 739 | 10 | 72.49 | 73.44 | 71.28 | 10.63 |  | 103.02 | 58.61 | 86.96 | 64.55 to 85.96 | 432,624 | 308,379 |
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45 - HOLT COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| NUMBER of Sales: | 198 |  |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $65,320,832$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $60,745,381$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $41,136,305$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 306,794 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 207,759 |

$\begin{array}{cccc}\text { Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 } & \text { Posted Before: 01/23/2009 } \\ 72 & \text { COV : } & 28.83 & 95 \% \text { Medi }\end{array}$

PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified

NUMBER of Sales
(AgLand)

AVG. Assessed Value:

WGT. MEAN: MEAN : 68
73 COD: 20.40 MAX Sales Ratio: 215.71 PRD: 107.13 MIN Sales Ratio: 24.70
PRD: 107.13 MIN Sales Ratio: 2

$$
5.6
$$

66.61

|  |  | Printed: $03 / 25 / 200915: 13: 56$ |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 81.89 | N/A | 329,000 | 246,457 |
| 75.12 | N/A | 461,577 | 269,577 |
| 75.40 | N/A | 594,000 | 447,850 |
| 101.64 | N/A | 213,849 | 157,485 |
| 59.27 | N/A | 96,000 | 56,900 |
| 71.75 | N/A | 120,000 | 76,600 |
| 81.73 | N/A | 483,700 | 347,280 |
| 109.86 | 52.48 to 109.86 | 311,228 | 255,815 |
| 104.78 | N/A | 89,000 | 87,902 |
| 82.72 | N/A | 681,250 | 359,610 |
| 94.66 | 62.16 to 83.67 | 270,299 | 189,730 |
|  |  |  | 306,794 |

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

|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | NUMBER of Sales: | 198 |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $65,320,832$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $60,745,381$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $41,136,305$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 306,794 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 207,759 |


| SCHOOL DISTRICT * RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (blank) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02-0006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02-0049 | 18 | 71.60 | 73.08 | 72.16 | 9.10 | 101.27 | 63.17 | 94.66 | 66.68 to 79.93 | 252,332 | 182,092 |
| 08-0036 | 1 | 88.39 | 88.39 | 88.39 |  |  | 88.39 | 88.39 | N/A | 148,572 | 131,320 |
| 08-0050 | 12 | 72.74 | 75.64 | 80.82 | 30.12 | 93.59 | 31.16 | 118.50 | 52.53 to 103.57 | 133,527 | 107,919 |
| 36-0100 | 2 | 99.30 | 99.30 | 98.92 | 23.09 | 100.38 | 76.37 | 122.23 | N/A | 389,611 | 385,420 |
| 45-0007 | 77 | 71.88 | 70.96 | 67.88 | 17.26 | 104.55 | 24.70 | 109.86 | 68.15 to 75.72 | 324,174 | 220,033 |
| 45-0029 | 12 | 74.52 | 73.17 | 67.17 | 25.79 | 108.94 | 46.58 | 103.82 | 47.57 to 92.24 | 292,625 | 196,549 |
| 45-0044 | 19 | 71.27 | 77.51 | 69.59 | 26.23 | 111.38 | 34.19 | 215.71 | 61.04 to 76.02 | 202,416 | 140,855 |
| 45-0137 | 12 | 71.29 | 76.11 | 68.08 | 28.91 | 111.79 | 41.74 | 119.27 | 55.41 to 102.06 | 147,689 | 100,548 |
| 45-0239 | 44 | 65.94 | 69.91 | 63.95 | 21.13 | 109.33 | 42.19 | 129.12 | 60.75 to 76.47 | 437,412 | 279,725 |
| 54-0583 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 92-0045 | 1 | 50.45 | 50.45 | 50.45 |  |  | 50.45 | 50.45 | N/A | 336,000 | 169,505 |

NonValid School
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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


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


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


## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Based on the analysis in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency of the Agricultural Unimproved sample. The valuation methodology the County uses to analyze sales and determine a schedule of values assures the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar manner. The statistics confirm that the agricultural properties in the county are valued within the acceptable range indicating uniformity and proportionality in the 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 | 322 | 198 | $\mathbf{6 1 . 4 9}$ |
| 2008 | 331 | 197 | 59.52 |
| 2007 | 335 | 186 | 55.52 |
| 2006 | 350 | 194 | 55.43 |
| 2005 | 358 | 161 | 44.97 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Table II indicates that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and the measurement of the class of property was done will all available arm's length sales.

All agricultural sales are reviewed by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

## 2009 Correlation Section

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 | 66 | $\mathbf{8 . 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 2}$ |
| 2008 | 65.7 | $\mathbf{9 . 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 . 2 2}$ |
| 2007 | 70 | 1.07 | 71 | 72 |
| 2006 | 68 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 8}$ | 77 |
| 2005 | 70 | 7.36 | 75 | 78 |

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

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

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

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

| 18 | 2009 | 8.90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8.99 | 2008 | 9.97 |
| 1.00 | 2007 | 1.06 |
| 15.93 | 2006 | 13.56 |
| 19.07 | 2005 | 7.36 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The percent change in the Total Assessed Value in the sales file compared to the percent change in Assessed Value (excl.growth) is showing a nine percent difference (rounded). The difference implies that the assessment actions had more of an effect on the sales file base when compared to the assessed base. Based on the known assessment practices of the County and the similarity between the trended preliminary ratio and the R\&O median in Table III, there is no reason to believe the sales file was treated any differently than the assessed base.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 2009 Correlation Section

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 72 | 68 | 73 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The median and mean measures of central tendencies are within the acceptable range, while the weighted mean is just below the range.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{2 0 . 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7 . 1 3}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{0 . 4 0}$ | 4.13 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The coefficient of dispersion rounds to within the acceptable range for quality assessment. The price related differential is above the range, this statistically suggests regressivity in assessments. A further analysis of the sales revealed with hypothetically removing outlier sales the price related differential falls into the acceptable range.

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

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 205 | 198 | -7 |
| Median | 66 | 72 | 6 |
| Wgt. Mean | 60 | 68 | 8 |
| Mean | 65 | 73 | 8 |
| COD | 22.97 | $\mathbf{2 0 . 4 0}$ | -2.57 |
| PRD | $\mathbf{1 0 8 . 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 7 . 1 3}$ | -1.07 |
| Minimum | 188.29 | 24.70 | 16.03 |
| Maximum | 215.71 | 27.42 |  |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The change between the preliminary statistics and the R\&O statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property by the County. The change in the number of sales is attributable to the removal of those sales that experienced significant physical or economic changes after the sale occurred.

| Total Real Property <br> Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 30 | Records : 12,116 | Value : 1,320,785,034 | Growth 11,940,511 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 01. Res UnImp Land | 529 | 1,956,890 | 67 | 679,000 | 37 | 300,200 | 633 | 2,936,090 |  |
| 02. Res Improve Land | 2,878 | 12,817,745 | 278 | 3,456,590 | 374 | 4,479,384 | 3,530 | 20,753,719 |  |
| 03. Res Improvements | 2,991 | 137,748,165 | 320 | 24,548,380 | 445 | 31,754,095 | 3,756 | 194,050,640 |  |
| 04. Res Total | 3,520 | 152,522,800 | 387 | 28,683,970 | 482 | 36,533,679 | 4,389 | 217,740,449 | 3,885,439 |
| \% of Res Total | 80.20 | 70.05 | 8.82 | 13.17 | 10.98 | 16.78 | 36.22 | 16.49 | 32.54 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05. Com UnImp Land | 84 | 405,925 | 7 | 66,945 | 17 | 71,965 | 108 | 544,835 |  |
| 06. Com Improve Land | 507 | 3,047,465 | 23 | 199,695 | 69 | 682,010 | 599 | 3,929,170 |  |
| 07. Com Improvements | 517 | 30,926,635 | 26 | 1,848,570 | 87 | 9,888,310 | 630 | 42,663,515 |  |
| 08. Com Total | 601 | 34,380,025 | 33 | 2,115,210 | 104 | 10,642,285 | 738 | 47,137,520 | 585,157 |
| \% of Com Total | 81.44 | 72.94 | 4.47 | 4.49 | 14.09 | 22.58 | 6.09 | 3.57 | 4.90 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. Ind UnImp Land | 3 | 107,055 | 1 | 5,390 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 112,445 |  |
| 10. Ind Improve Land | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12,060 | 5 | 89,395 | 7 | 101,455 |  |
| 11. Ind Improvements | 0 | 0 | 2 | 636,670 | 5 | 9,578,140 | 7 | 10,214,810 |  |
| 12. Ind Total | 3 | 107,055 | 3 | 654,120 | 5 | 9,667,535 | 11 | 10,428,710 | 4,062,995 |
| \% of Ind Total | 27.27 | 1.03 | 27.27 | 6.27 | 45.45 | 92.70 | 0.09 | 0.79 | 34.03 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Rec UnImp Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 14. Rec Improve Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 15. Rec Improvements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 16. Rec Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| \% of Rec Total | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Res \& Rec Total } \\ & \text { \% of Res \& Rec Total } \end{aligned}$ | 3,520 | 152,522,800 | 387 | 28,683,970 | 482 | 36,533,679 | 4,389 | 217,740,449 | 3,885,439 |
|  | 80.20 | 70.05 | 8.82 | 13.17 | 10.98 | 16.78 | 36.22 | 16.49 | 32.54 |
| Com \& Ind Total | 604 | 34,487,080 | 36 | 2,769,330 | 109 | 20,309,820 | 749 | 57,566,230 | 4,648,152 |
| \% of Com \& Ind Total | 80.64 | 59.91 | 4.81 | 4.81 | 14.55 | 35.28 | 6.18 | 4.36 | 38.93 |
| 17. Taxable Total | 4,124 | 187,009,880 | 423 | 31,453,300 | 591 | 56,843,499 | 5,138 | 275,306,679 | 8,533,591 |
| \% of Taxable Total | 80.26 | 67.93 | 8.23 | 11.42 | 11.50 | 20.65 | 42.41 | 20.84 | 71.47 |
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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 | 10 | 8,815 | 1,116,405 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 11 | 213,345 | 6,077,445 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 2 | 58,980 | 16,146,140 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | Records | 0 <br> Rural <br> Value Base | 0 <br> Value Excess | 0 <br> Records | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ \text { Total } \\ \text { Value Base } \end{gathered}$ | 0 <br> Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8,815 | 1,116,405 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 213,345 | 6,077,445 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 58,980 | 16,146,140 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  | 23 | 281,140 | 23,339,990 |

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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


| Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| 26. Producing | 295 | 18 | 95 | 408 |
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| Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Urban <br> Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |  |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 4 | 4.00 | 24,000 | 4 | 3.33 | 20,005 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 2 | 0.00 | 120,345 | 2 | 0.00 | 20,720 |  |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 4 | 4.60 | 4,600 | 5 | 6.15 | 6,150 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 4 | 0.00 | 85,545 | 8 | 0.00 | 187,865 |  |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches | 0 | 8.81 | 0 | 0 | 0.76 | 0 |  |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | $0$ <br> Records | $0.00$ <br> Rural <br> Acres | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ \text { Value } \end{array}$ | $0$ <br> Records | $0.00$ <br> Total <br> Acres | 0 <br> Value | Growth |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 30 | 32.82 | 179,370 | 30 | 32.82 | 179,370 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 1,185 | 1,296.87 | 7,781,220 | 1,193 | 1,304.20 | 7,825,225 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 1,194 | 0.00 | 48,663,865 | 1,198 | 0.00 | 48,804,930 | 3,406,920 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 1,228 | 1,337.02 | 56,809,525 |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 69 | 542.12 | 191,600 | 69 | 542.12 | 191,600 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 1,691 | 2,391.74 | 2,287,705 | 1,700 | 2,402.49 | 2,298,455 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 1,909 | 0.00 | 41,578,550 | 1,921 | 0.00 | 41,851,960 | 0 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 1,990 | 2,944.61 | 44,342,015 |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches | 0 | 18,399.00 | 0 | 0 | 18,408.57 | 0 |  |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |  |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 3,218 | 22,690.20 | 101,151,540 | 3,406,920 |
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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 <br> Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 5 | 740.39 | 281,875 | 5 | 740.39 | 281,875 |


| Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Value N/A |  | $0.00$ <br> Rural <br> Acres | 0 Value | 0 Records |  |  |
| 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.


## County 45 Holt

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 4001

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 556.00 | 0.27\% | 1,132,980 | 0.37\% | 2,037.73 |
| 46. 1A | 11,863.12 | 5.80\% | 23,484,320 | 7.68\% | 1,979.61 |
| 47. 2A1 | 22,588.79 | 11.03\% | 42,898,755 | 14.03\% | 1,899.12 |
| 48. 2A | 20,654.07 | 10.09\% | 37,551,455 | 12.28\% | 1,818.11 |
| 49.3A1 | 13,797.69 | 6.74\% | 23,480,930 | 7.68\% | 1,701.80 |
| 50.3A | 73,679.09 | 35.99\% | 116,956,780 | 38.24\% | 1,587.38 |
| 51.4A1 | 43,049.23 | 21.03\% | 42,804,980 | 14.00\% | 994.33 |
| 52. 4A | 18,514.39 | 9.04\% | 17,516,485 | 5.73\% | 946.10 |
| 53. Total | 204,702.38 | 100.00\% | 305,826,685 | 100.00\% | 1,494.01 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 292.00 | 0.56\% | 216,735 | 0.72\% | 742.24 |
| 55. 1D | 5,996.46 | 11.45\% | 4,360,635 | 14.52\% | 727.20 |
| 56. 2D1 | 9,490.12 | 18.12\% | 6,210,675 | 20.69\% | 654.44 |
| 57. 2D | 9,279.03 | 17.72\% | 5,657,105 | 18.84\% | 609.67 |
| 58.3D1 | 3,973.49 | 7.59\% | 2,304,015 | 7.67\% | 579.85 |
| 59.3D | 13,946.26 | 26.63\% | 7,870,685 | 26.21\% | 564.36 |
| 60.4D1 | 4,723.28 | 9.02\% | 1,770,410 | 5.90\% | 374.83 |
| 61.4D | 4,667.62 | 8.91\% | 1,633,670 | 5.44\% | 350.00 |
| 62. Total | 52,368.26 | 100.00\% | 30,023,930 | 100.00\% | 573.32 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 228.20 | 0.00\% | 128,935 | 0.03\% | 565.01 |
| 64. 1G | 9,229.06 | 0.95\% | 5,207,400 | 1.19\% | 564.24 |
| 65. 2G1 | 19,397.21 | 2.01\% | 10,952,585 | 2.51\% | 564.65 |
| 66. 2G | 26,078.91 | 2.70\% | 14,701,580 | 3.36\% | 563.73 |
| 67.3G1 | 11,151.96 | 1.15\% | 6,176,190 | 1.41\% | 553.82 |
| 68. 3G | 189,080.75 | 19.56\% | 108,218,985 | 24.76\% | 572.34 |
| 69.4G1 | 392,128.37 | 40.56\% | 179,572,160 | 41.08\% | 457.94 |
| 70. 4G | 319,581.99 | 33.05\% | 112,160,635 | 25.66\% | 350.96 |
| 71. Total | 966,876.45 | 100.00\% | 437,118,470 | 100.00\% | 452.09 |
| Irrigated Total | 204,702.38 | 15.96\% | 305,826,685 | 39.38\% | 1,494.01 |
| Dry Total | 52,368.26 | 4.08\% | 30,023,930 | 3.87\% | 573.32 |
| Grass Total | 966,876.45 | 75.41\% | 437,118,470 | 56.29\% | 452.09 |
| Waste | 52,051.15 | 4.06\% | 2,704,360 | 0.35\% | 51.96 |
| Other | 6,209.54 | 0.48\% | 930,285 | 0.12\% | 149.82 |
| Exempt | 89.76 | 0.01\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 1,282,207.78 | 100.00\% | 776,603,730 | 100.00\% | 605.68 |
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## County 45 Holt

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 4002

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 46. 1A | 3,682.00 | 7.87\% | 6,406,680 | 8.16\% | 1,740.00 |
| 47. 2A1 | 10,413.28 | 22.26\% | 18,119,110 | 23.09\% | 1,740.00 |
| 48. 2A | 5,642.28 | 12.06\% | 9,817,570 | 12.51\% | 1,740.00 |
| 49.3A1 | 2,791.98 | 5.97\% | 4,854,715 | 6.19\% | 1,738.81 |
| 50.3A | 20,031.97 | 42.82\% | 34,783,680 | 44.32\% | 1,736.41 |
| 51.4A1 | 2,132.64 | 4.56\% | 2,525,130 | 3.22\% | 1,184.04 |
| 52. 4A | 2,088.00 | 4.46\% | 1,981,235 | 2.52\% | 948.87 |
| 53. Total | 46,782.15 | 100.00\% | 78,488,120 | 100.00\% | 1,677.74 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 55. 1D | 1,143.45 | 15.85\% | 874,760 | 18.83\% | 765.02 |
| 56. 2D1 | 3,271.91 | 45.35\% | 2,175,865 | 46.83\% | 665.01 |
| 57. 2D | 872.16 | 12.09\% | 532,010 | 11.45\% | 609.99 |
| 58.3D1 | 427.48 | 5.92\% | 260,055 | 5.60\% | 608.34 |
| 59.3D | 1,053.97 | 14.61\% | 642,920 | 13.84\% | 610.00 |
| 60.4D1 | 199.50 | 2.77\% | 74,745 | 1.61\% | 374.66 |
| 61. 4D | 246.41 | 3.42\% | 86,250 | 1.86\% | 350.03 |
| 62. Total | 7,214.88 | 100.00\% | 4,646,605 | 100.00\% | 644.03 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 64. 1G | 1,133.19 | 3.72\% | 689,135 | 4.23\% | 608.14 |
| 65. 2G1 | 4,063.19 | 13.35\% | 2,476,540 | 15.22\% | 609.51 |
| 66. 2G | 2,193.96 | 7.21\% | 1,330,500 | 8.17\% | 606.44 |
| 67. 3G1 | 838.35 | 2.75\% | 506,410 | 3.11\% | 604.06 |
| 68.3G | 13,290.71 | 43.65\% | 7,910,345 | 48.60\% | 595.18 |
| 69.4G1 | 3,673.68 | 12.07\% | 1,555,685 | 9.56\% | 423.47 |
| 70.4G | 5,253.13 | 17.25\% | 1,807,425 | 11.10\% | 344.07 |
| 71. Total | 30,446.21 | 100.00\% | 16,276,040 | 100.00\% | 534.58 |
| Irrigated Total | 46,782.15 | 54.27\% | 78,488,120 | 78.81\% | 1,677.74 |
| Dry Total | 7,214.88 | 8.37\% | 4,646,605 | 4.67\% | 644.03 |
| Grass Total | 30,446.21 | 35.32\% | 16,276,040 | 16.34\% | 534.58 |
| Waste | 784.50 | 0.91\% | 39,025 | 0.04\% | 49.75 |
| Other | 981.46 | 1.14\% | 146,920 | 0.15\% | 149.70 |
| Exempt | 17.18 | 0.02\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 86,209.20 | 100.00\% | 99,596,710 | 100.00\% | 1,155.29 |
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## County 45 Holt

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 4003

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 46. 1A | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 48. 2A | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 49.3A1 | 769.17 | 7.32\% | 897,330 | 10.35\% | 1,166.62 |
| 50.3A | 2,525.78 | 24.05\% | 2,800,015 | 32.31\% | 1,108.57 |
| 51.4A1 | 7,088.71 | 67.49\% | 4,890,220 | 56.43\% | 689.86 |
| 52.4A | 119.00 | 1.13\% | 78,540 | 0.91\% | 660.00 |
| 53. Total | 10,502.66 | 100.00\% | 8,666,105 | 100.00\% | 825.13 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 55. 1D | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 56.2D1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 57.2D | 237.72 | 3.77\% | 144,335 | 4.45\% | 607.16 |
| 58.3D1 | 1,184.73 | 18.79\% | 677,305 | 20.86\% | 571.70 |
| 59.3D | 3,206.69 | 50.85\% | 1,807,265 | 55.66\% | 563.59 |
| 60.4D1 | 1,241.13 | 19.68\% | 465,425 | 14.33\% | 375.00 |
| 61. 4D | 435.86 | 6.91\% | 152,550 | 4.70\% | 350.00 |
| 62. Total | 6,306.13 | 100.00\% | 3,246,880 | 100.00\% | 514.88 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 64. 1G | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 66. 2G | 2,190.22 | 2.07\% | 1,221,160 | 2.20\% | 557.55 |
| 67.3G1 | 2,041.69 | 1.93\% | 1,105,240 | 1.99\% | 541.34 |
| 68. 3G | 34,829.10 | 32.92\% | 21,421,320 | 38.58\% | 615.04 |
| 69.4G1 | 55,614.85 | 52.57\% | 27,389,630 | 49.33\% | 492.49 |
| 70. 4G | 11,113.97 | 10.51\% | 4,388,920 | 7.90\% | 394.90 |
| 71. Total | 105,789.83 | 100.00\% | 55,526,270 | 100.00\% | 524.87 |
| Irrigated Total | 10,502.66 | 7.85\% | 8,666,105 | 12.72\% | 825.13 |
| Dry Total | 6,306.13 | 4.71\% | 3,246,880 | 4.77\% | 514.88 |
| Grass Total | 105,789.83 | 79.08\% | 55,526,270 | 81.50\% | 524.87 |
| Waste | 10,217.41 | 7.64\% | 542,070 | 0.80\% | 53.05 |
| Other | 967.00 | 0.72\% | 145,050 | 0.21\% | 150.00 |
| Exempt | 100.99 | 0.08\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 133,783.03 | 100.00\% | 68,126,375 | 100.00\% | 509.23 |
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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 | 15.35 | 26,165 | 3.13 | 5,445 | 261,968.71 | 392,949,300 | 261,987.19 | 392,980,910 |
| 77. Dry Land | 4.05 | 2,235 | 32.18 | 20,590 | 65,853.04 | 37,894,590 | 65,889.27 | 37,917,415 |
| 78. Grass | 280.72 | 128,935 | 852.21 | 356,655 | 1,101,979.56 | 508,435,190 | 1,103,112.49 | 508,920,780 |
| 79. Waste | 4.00 | 200 | 21.00 | 1,050 | 63,028.06 | 3,284,205 | 63,053.06 | 3,285,455 |
| 80. Other | 10.00 | 1,500 | 11.00 | 1,650 | 8,137.00 | 1,219,105 | 8,158.00 | 1,222,255 |
| 81. Exempt | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 207.93 | 0 | 207.93 | 0 |
| 82. Total | 314.12 | 159,035 | 919.52 | 385,390 | 1,500,966.37 | 943,782,390 | 1,502,200.01 | $\mathbf{9 4 4 , 3 2 6 , 8 1 5}$ |


|  | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | $261,987.19$ | $17.44 \%$ | $392,980,910$ | $41.61 \%$ | $1,500.00$ |
| Dry Land | $65,889.27$ | $4.39 \%$ | $37,917,415$ | $4.02 \%$ | 575.47 |
| Grass | $1,103,112.49$ | $73.43 \%$ | $508,920,780$ | $53.89 \%$ | 461.35 |
| Waste | $63,053.06$ | $4.20 \%$ | $3,285,455$ | $0.35 \%$ | 52.11 |
| Other | $8,158.00$ | $0.54 \%$ | $1,22,255$ | $0.13 \%$ | 149.82 |
| Exempt | 207.93 | $0.01 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 , 5 0 2 , 2 0 0 . 0 1}$ | $100.00 \%$ | $\mathbf{9 4 4 , 3 2 6 , 8 1 5}$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
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## 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

| 45 Holt |  |  |  | E3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2008 \text { CTL } \\ & \text { County Total } \end{aligned}$ | 2009 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2009 form 45-2008 CTL) | Percent Change | 2009 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | Percent Change excl. Growth |
| 01. Residential | 201,518,285 | 217,740,449 | 16,222,164 | 8.05\% | 3,885,439 | 6.12\% |
| 02. Recreational | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling | 55,977,110 | 56,809,525 | 832,415 | 1.49\% | 3,406,920 | -4.60\% |
| 04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 257,495,395 | 274,549,974 | 17,054,579 | 6.62\% | 7,292,359 | 3.79\% |
| 05. Commercial | 46,323,605 | 47,137,520 | 813,915 | 1.76\% | 585,157 | 0.49\% |
| 06. Industrial | 6,365,715 | 10,428,710 | 4,062,995 | 63.83\% | 4,062,995 | 0.00\% |
| 07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 41,423,915 | 44,342,015 | 2,918,100 | 7.04\% | 0 | 7.04\% |
| 08. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 94,113,235 | 101,908,245 | 7,795,010 | 8.28\% | 4,648,152 | 3.34\% |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 351,608,630 | 376,458,219 | 24,849,589 | 7.07\% | 11,940,511 | 3.67\% |
| 11. Irrigated | 346,484,295 | 392,980,910 | 46,496,615 | 13.42\% |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 37,605,905 | 37,917,415 | 311,510 | 0.83\% |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 478,570,140 | 508,920,780 | 30,350,640 | 6.34\% |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 3,257,195 | 3,285,455 | 28,260 | 0.87\% |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 1,215,005 | 1,222,255 | 7,250 | 0.60\% |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 867,132,540 | 944,326,815 | 77,194,275 | 8.90\% |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of all Real Property | 1,218,741,170 | 1,320,785,034 | 102,043,864 | 8.37\% | 11,940,511 | 7.39\% |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## PLAN OF ASSESSMENT HOLT COUNTY

Pursuant to section 77-1311 of the statutes of Nebraska, as amended, submitted herewith is the 3-year Plan of Assessment. Said plan is originally submitted to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 of each year and a copy sent to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

Holt County has a total count of 12,043 taxable parcels, being further identified as: 36\% $(4,356)$ residential parcels; $6 \%(750)$ commercial/industrial parcels; and $58 \%(6,937)$ agricultural parcels. There are also 403 exempt parcels.

For 2008, 2289 personal property schedules were filed, plus applications were taken for homestead exemptions. Applications for exemption and/or affidavits for continuing exemption are received annually. For 2008, affidavits were filed by 63 organizations, plus one new application.

Staff for the office consists of the elected assessor, one deputy, and three full-time clerks. Maintenance of property record cards is performed by any staff member. Changes due to transfer are primarily completed by either the assessor or one of the clerks. Personal property filings are managed by the assessor, the deputy or another of the clerks. The third clerk assists with maintaining computer files of real property, plus wherever else needed. Reports required are prepared by the assessor with assistance of all personnel.

The budget requested for 2008-09 is $\$ 175,004$, approximately $\$ 68,478$ of which is expected to be used for appraisal maintenance. The CAMA portion within the appraisal maintenance includes a cost of about $\$ 11,450$.

The assessor anticipates attending the 2008 Workshop, which offers hours of continuing education for maintaining the Assessor's certificate. To date, the assessor has accumulated 59 hours towards renewal of the certificate. Both the assessor and deputy anticipate acquiring additional hours toward renewal of their respective certificates. No other staff member holds an Assessor's certificate.

Cadastral maps are maintained by the assessor and the clerk processing the transfer statements. Photo background of the cadastral maps is 1966. Ownership and descriptions are kept current by the assessor and said clerk.

Reports are generated as follows:

- Real Estate Abstract is to be submitted on or before March 19.
- The Personal Property Abstract is to be submitted on or before June 15.
- A report on the review of ownership and use of all cemetery real property is to be presented to the county board of equalization on or before August 1 .
- Certificates of value for taxing authorities are to be submitted on or before August 20.
- School District Taxable Value Report is to be submitted on or before August 25.
- The Plan of Assessment is to be submitted on or before July 31.
- The report of the average assessed value of single-family residential properties is to be reported on or before September 1.
- A list of trusts owning agricultural land is certified to the Nebraska Secretary of State by October 1.
- The Tax Roll is to be delivered to the County Treasurer by November 22, along with tax bills.
- Homestead Exemption Tax Loss is to be certified on or before November 30.
- The Certificate of Taxes Levied is to be submitted on or before December 1.

Tax List Corrections are periodically submitted to the County Board of Equalization for approval, showing reasons for said corrections. Meetings of the County Board of Equalization are attended by the County Assessor.

Notice that a list of the applications from organizations seeking tax exemption, descriptions of the property, and the recommendation of the county assessor are available in the county assessor's office, is published in local newspapers at least ten days prior to consideration of the applications by the county board of equalization.

By March 1, governmental subdivisions are notified of intent to tax property not used for a public purpose, and not paying an in-lieu-of tax.

Property record cards contain all information required by Reg. 10-004, including legal description, property owner, classification codes and supporting documentation. New property record cards were obtained for residential properties for 2001 and for commercial/industrial properties for 2002 . New property record cards for agricultural properties were obtained for use for 2008.

Applications for Homestead Exemption are accepted February 1 through June 30, according to statute. Applications are mailed on or before April 1 to previous fliers if applicants have not yet filed for that year. Approximately 563 applications were received in 2008. News releases and newspaper ads are prepared to alert property owners of the time period in which to file, and to summarize qualifications. Information guides prepared by the Department of Revenue are made available to the public. Approved Homestead Exemption applications are sent to the Department of Revenue by August 1.

Personal property schedules are to be filed by May 1 to be timely. In early April, ads are placed in the local newspapers and news releases given to the local radio to remind taxpayers of the filing deadline, the necessary documentation to submit, and of the penalties for not filing in a timely manner. Schedules filed after May 1 and before July 31 receive a $10 \%$ penalty. Filings after July 31 receive a $25 \%$ penalty. Schedules are pre-printed as soon after the first of the year as possible. Verification is achieved from depreciation worksheets and personal contacts with owners.

Real property is up-dated annually through pick-up work and maintenance. Pick-up work, done by the assessor or deputy, involves physical inspection of properties flagged
on computer records as having building permits or other information meriting attention. Lists of approved building permits are gathered from city clerks where permits are required. Improvement Information Statements are received where permits are not required. Personal observation by the staff also triggers flags for possible required changes.

On or before June 1, certification of the real estate assessment roll is made and published in the local newspapers. Also by that date, Notices of Valuation Change are mailed by first-class mail to owners of any real property that has changed in value from the previous year. By June 6, assessment/sales ratio statistics (as determined by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission) are mailed to media and posted in the Assessor's Office.

All residential property (urban, suburban, and rural) was re-appraised for 2001 under contract with High Plains Appraisal Service. New photos were taken and listings were verified and/or corrected, re-measuring where necessary. Properties are sketched into computer records. Costs are generated using CAMA of ASI, utilizing Marshall \& Swift costs of June 2002. For 2008, the median level of value for residential property is $95 \%$. The COD is 24.69 and the PRD is 110.52 . Subsequent sales need to be studied to determine trends and changes in the market.

Commercial and industrial properties were re-appraised for 2002. New photos were taken, and improvements re-measured and inspected. Properties are sketched into computer records. Costs are generated using CAMA by ASI, utilizing Marshall \& Swift costs of June 2002. A depreciation study was made. Income data was gathered where appropriate. The median level of assessment of commercial/industrial properties for 2008 is $95 \%$. The COD is 23.09 and the PRD is 103.41. Subsequent sales need to be studied to determine trends and changes in the market.

The median level of assessment of agricultural property for 2008 is $72 \%$. The COD is 20.63 and the PRD is 105.09. Agricultural improvements need to be re-inspected. Plans are to begin the process, anticipated to require two years, in 2008. Properties will be inspected by the assessor and/or deputy, measurements confirmed and condition noted. Interior inspections are to be completed wherever possible. Appropriate sketches of improvements have been entered into computer records by the clerks and improvements re-priced using CAMA, utilizing costs of June 2002. A depreciation study is to be completed. Land use needs to be up-dated, with plans for the assessor and/or deputy to complete physically viewing and verifying land use in 2008 for the 2009 tax year.

Real estate transfer statements are filed in as timely of a manner as possible considering other time demands of the assessor. Completion of the supplemental data is by the assessor and the clerk who assists in maintaining cadastral records. Questionnaires are mailed to both the buyers and sellers of properties sold to assist the assessor in verifying sales. The response rate is approximately $80 \%$.

For 2009, any changes in land use observed in the 2008 review will be implemented. Field work by the assessor and/or deputy will continue for the re-appraisal of farm
improvements, concentrating on the Southeast quadrant of the county, involving approximately 334 farmsteads. If time permits, work will expand into the Southwest quadrant of the county, approximately 237 additional farmsteads. Sales of residential and commercial properties will be analyzed for any needed adjustments. Strive to improve quality and uniformity in assessments of both residential and commercial properties. Begin review of each property so that all parcels will have been reviewed and inspected over a six-year period. Pick-up work will be completed. Change of Valuation Notices will be mailed as required.

For 2010, continue field work by the assessor and/or deputy on re-appraisal of farm improvements, extending work into the north half of the county. The Northeast quadrant includes approximately 282 farmsteads, and the Northwest quadrant approximately 385. Study sales for possible adjustments needed for residential or commercial properties. Adjust for changes in agricultural land use. Continue review of a portion of all parcels to conclude in a six-year period. Complete pick-up work. Send notices as required.

For 2011, complete pick-up work. Adjust for changes in agricultural land use as required. Study sales for market-based changes of residential, commercial and agricultural properties. Continue on-site review of a portion of all properties to conclude in a six-year period. Mail Change of Valuation notices as appropriate.

## Respectfully

## Holt County Assessor

June 15, 2008

AMENDMENTS:
Oct. 15, 2008
The approved budget for 2008-2009 is $\$ 168,259.10$. The amount included therein for appraisal maintenance (including the CAMA portion) is $\$ 62,323$.
Due to time and money constraints, field work for re-appraisal of farm improvements will in all probability not be completed until 2010.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Holt County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
| 3. | 0 |
|  | Other full-time employees |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 0 |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 1 employee is shared with the Treasurer's office, four months of the year. |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
|  | $\$ 175,004$ |
| 7. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
| 8. | $\$ 12,450$ |
|  | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
| 9. | \$168,259 |
|  | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | $\$ 600$ |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | N/A |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | $\$ 500$ from General Fund |
| 13. | Total budget |
|  | $\$ 168,259$ |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
|  | No |
|  |  |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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


|  | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4. | Yes |
|  | Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
| 5. | Assessor and Clerk |
|  | Does the county have GIS software? |
| The County Board recently signed a contract in the fall of 2008 with GIS Workshop <br> for future implementation. |  |
| 6. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
| 7. | N/A |
|  | Personal Property software: |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Yes |
|  | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
| 3. | Yes |
|  | What municipalities in the county are zoned? |
| 4. | Atkinson, Ewing, O'Neill and Stuart |
|  | When was zoning implemented? |

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | In-House |
|  | Other services |
|  | Stanard Appraisal was contracted with for appraisal of the Ethanol Plant |

## 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 Holt County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



