

Table of Contents

2009 Commission Summary

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

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

Residential Correlation

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

Commercial Reports

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

Commercial Correlation

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

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

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

Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

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

County Reports

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

Certification**Maps**

- Market Areas
- Registered Wells > 500 GPM
- Geo Codes
- Soil Classes

Valuation History Charts

2009 Commission Summary

51 Keith

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	276	COD	13.51
Total Sales Price	\$22,383,130	PRD	105.26
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$22,375,630	COV	27.25
Total Assessed Value	\$21,175,585	STD	27.15
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$81,071	Avg. Absolute Deviation	13.01
Avg. Assessed Value	\$76,723	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$52,960
Median	96	Wgt. Mean	95
Mean	100	Max	351
Min	44.53		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.92 to 97.45
95% Mean C.I	96.41 to 102.81
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.72 to 96.55

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	42.14
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.51
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.53

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	343	95	14.96	103.82
2007	388	97	13.51	104.56
2006	378	97	17.1	107.1
2005	416	97	19.6	107.74

2009 Commission Summary

51 Keith

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	53	COD	21.48
Total Sales Price	\$15,123,923	PRD	103.29
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$13,920,923	COV	35.09
Total Assessed Value	\$12,476,645	STD	32.48
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$262,659	Avg. Absolute Deviation	20.85
Avg. Assessed Value	\$235,408	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$133,132
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	90
Mean	93	Max	236
Min	10		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	80.24 to 102.54
95% Mean C.I	83.83 to 101.32
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	81.44 to 97.81

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 12.75

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 7.19

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 12.72

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	47	99	20.77	109.25
2007	43	99	12.15	111.51
2006	45	94	14.75	131.94
2005	47	100	13.26	106.91

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Keith 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 Keith County is 96.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Keith County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Keith County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Keith County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Keith County is 74.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Keith County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	276	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	35.79	95% Median C.I.:	88.80 to 94.05
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,383,130	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.69 to 92.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,375,630	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.70	95% Mean C.I.:	93.22 to 101.44
TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,122,185						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,071	COD:	20.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	351.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,906	PRD:	108.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.53		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:52

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	39	94.87	96.98	93.24	14.23	104.00	63.89	206.50	87.50 to 99.83		78,579	73,270
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	31	94.32	96.86	90.56	11.58	106.96	71.76	150.23	88.45 to 100.00		92,938	84,161
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	21	90.34	89.92	89.80	13.06	100.13	59.96	118.25	85.83 to 99.08		73,733	66,213
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	40	90.06	97.26	89.19	24.42	109.05	45.21	300.83	81.13 to 96.13		84,760	75,599
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	44	87.63	97.17	88.86	23.36	109.36	51.73	351.10	83.26 to 95.95		84,761	75,317
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	39	89.31	104.82	90.35	27.38	116.01	61.02	266.71	84.82 to 99.35		75,472	68,190
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	20	93.68	97.49	90.71	19.20	107.46	50.79	137.21	83.02 to 112.16		75,247	68,260
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	42	91.49	94.89	87.60	22.90	108.32	44.53	322.70	83.82 to 98.36		78,886	69,108
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	131	93.29	95.91	90.78	16.61	105.65	45.21	300.83	89.97 to 95.77		83,087	75,427
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	145	89.38	98.61	89.12	24.03	110.65	44.53	351.10	86.34 to 93.95		79,249	70,628
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	144	89.29	98.21	89.46	23.26	109.78	45.21	351.10	86.34 to 92.10		80,637	72,138
____ALL____												
	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05		81,071	72,906

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
BRULE	11	95.19	116.63	100.00	28.33	116.63	82.93	322.70	87.97 to 116.75		33,754	33,754
LAKE	62	96.04	102.44	91.12	24.99	112.42	44.53	300.83	91.04 to 100.23		94,222	85,856
OG SUB	8	87.66	97.99	87.97	17.56	111.40	75.54	145.91	75.54 to 145.91		111,500	98,083
OG-SUB	2	87.76	87.76	87.94	3.45	99.79	84.73	90.78	N/A		243,950	214,535
OGALLALA	169	89.78	93.74	89.31	17.25	104.96	50.79	266.71	86.73 to 93.40		75,942	67,824
PAXTON	10	95.38	117.60	94.95	40.54	123.86	67.99	351.10	73.50 to 122.69		61,400	58,298
RURAL	14	88.78	89.28	87.58	12.62	101.95	59.96	134.58	73.96 to 98.09		95,314	83,473
____ALL____												
	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05		81,071	72,906

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	190	90.41	96.32	89.85	19.36	107.21	50.79	351.10	87.29 to 93.95		72,734	65,351
2	13	87.82	92.94	87.47	14.91	106.26	59.96	145.91	82.74 to 99.41		117,838	103,068
3	73	94.66	100.72	90.62	23.45	111.14	44.53	300.83	90.15 to 98.09		96,221	87,199
____ALL____												
	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05		81,071	72,906

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	276	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	35.79	95% Median C.I.:	88.80 to 94.05
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,383,130	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.69 to 92.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,375,630	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.70	95% Mean C.I.:	93.22 to 101.44
TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,122,185						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,071	COD:	20.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	351.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,906	PRD:	108.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.53		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:52

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	245	90.78	95.42	89.53	18.13	106.59	45.21	351.10	88.22 to 93.70	86,348	77,303
2	26	99.59	116.98	104.49	39.84	111.95	44.53	300.83	75.54 to 128.40	25,471	26,615
3	5	87.28	88.40	87.96	9.32	100.51	73.78	103.72	N/A	111,600	98,160
____ALL____											
	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05	81,071	72,906

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	253	90.78	95.55	89.25	18.61	107.05	45.21	351.10	88.17 to 93.88	84,500	75,418
06	16	96.88	125.87	107.08	44.95	117.55	44.53	300.83	92.90 to 186.05	52,046	55,733
07	7	90.15	96.34	91.04	23.68	105.83	51.73	150.50	51.73 to 150.50	23,457	21,354
____ALL____											
	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05	81,071	72,906

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
03-0500											
25-0095	23	93.88	109.25	87.85	26.81	124.36	61.02	322.70	87.97 to 99.50	104,228	91,564
35-0001	1	300.83	300.83	300.83			300.83	300.83	N/A	3,000	9,025
51-0001	235	90.79	94.61	90.04	18.10	105.08	44.53	266.71	88.04 to 94.05	79,444	71,527
51-0006	17	93.95	106.81	91.74	31.15	116.43	59.96	351.10	73.96 to 108.57	76,823	70,478
68-0020											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05	81,071	72,906

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	276	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	35.79	95% Median C.I.:	88.80 to 94.05
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,383,130	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.69 to 92.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,375,630	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.70	95% Mean C.I.:	93.22 to 101.44
TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,122,185						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,071	COD:	20.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	351.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,906	PRD:	108.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.53		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:52

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	34	96.36	109.90	96.75	31.04	113.59	44.53	300.83	92.90 to 105.56	57,220	55,362
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	20	93.35	110.64	92.74	31.09	119.30	64.15	322.70	87.03 to 116.75	50,785	47,096
1920 TO 1939	44	85.66	92.27	83.68	23.68	110.27	50.79	266.71	78.49 to 93.29	55,410	46,367
1940 TO 1949	19	97.33	101.48	98.85	14.73	102.66	69.81	136.49	87.97 to 119.06	48,855	48,292
1950 TO 1959	48	86.11	90.03	87.60	15.77	102.77	51.73	166.67	82.70 to 93.40	73,539	64,422
1960 TO 1969	29	90.86	103.48	92.73	19.94	111.60	73.95	351.10	86.34 to 100.31	76,437	70,882
1970 TO 1979	44	93.01	94.21	91.49	16.40	102.98	45.21	150.50	85.83 to 102.38	92,432	84,568
1980 TO 1989	11	88.22	87.58	84.62	12.35	103.49	59.49	105.64	76.26 to 105.15	110,590	93,586
1990 TO 1994	2	91.72	91.72	93.65	5.21	97.94	86.95	96.50	N/A	142,500	133,455
1995 TO 1999	7	92.61	94.02	91.30	9.08	102.97	78.87	118.76	78.87 to 118.76	160,840	146,851
2000 TO Present	18	91.11	91.76	87.25	12.06	105.17	61.02	133.72	82.56 to 96.75	200,394	174,836
ALL	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05	81,071	72,906

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	166.67	170.68	160.97	51.26	106.03	44.53	300.83	N/A	3,250	5,231
5000 TO 9999	5	144.27	172.96	168.28	46.84	102.78	94.71	322.70	N/A	6,460	10,871
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	155.47	172.10	166.59	49.57	103.31	44.53	322.70	44.53 to 322.70	5,256	8,756
10000 TO 29999	39	102.71	115.21	111.17	28.82	103.63	51.73	351.10	92.90 to 119.06	16,928	18,819
30000 TO 59999	74	95.35	98.82	97.24	20.20	101.62	45.21	216.67	90.48 to 99.50	44,506	43,276
60000 TO 99999	82	89.29	89.81	90.18	12.55	99.59	50.79	134.58	86.28 to 92.61	77,641	70,015
100000 TO 149999	41	84.73	85.39	85.34	13.70	100.05	54.75	133.72	79.47 to 92.10	123,747	105,611
150000 TO 249999	24	88.11	89.61	89.61	8.28	100.00	73.96	115.08	83.26 to 96.11	181,629	162,759
250000 TO 499999	7	82.56	81.09	79.70	9.49	101.74	61.02	94.24	61.02 to 94.24	297,221	236,894
500000 +	1	95.97	95.97	95.97			95.97	95.97	N/A	500,000	479,845
ALL	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05	81,071	72,906

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	276	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	35.79	95% Median C.I.:	88.80 to 94.05
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,383,130	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.69 to 92.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,375,630	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.70	95% Mean C.I.:	93.22 to 101.44
TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,122,185						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,071	COD:	20.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	351.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,906	PRD:	108.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.53		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:52

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	70.57	70.57	74.29	36.90	94.99	44.53	96.60	N/A	4,375	3,250
5000 TO 9999	6	93.81	134.77	103.35	56.11	130.40	69.67	300.83	69.67 to 300.83	7,833	8,095
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	93.81	118.72	98.79	49.02	120.18	44.53	300.83	44.53 to 300.83	6,968	6,884
10000 TO 29999	44	95.27	104.64	90.58	27.98	115.52	45.21	322.70	88.76 to 113.56	20,869	18,903
30000 TO 59999	87	91.04	97.87	90.09	23.01	108.63	50.79	351.10	85.83 to 95.77	50,412	45,418
60000 TO 99999	82	89.55	94.43	89.72	17.14	105.25	54.75	216.67	86.24 to 94.87	87,216	78,247
100000 TO 149999	32	90.40	91.39	90.07	9.73	101.46	73.96	129.65	83.26 to 94.49	138,821	125,036
150000 TO 249999	21	90.78	92.79	89.66	11.18	103.49	61.02	133.72	84.92 to 96.50	219,624	196,918
250000 TO 499999	2	88.57	88.57	90.31	8.35	98.08	81.17	95.97	N/A	404,819	365,582
ALL											
	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05	81,071	72,906

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	86.48	81.81	85.10	10.83	96.13	59.96	94.32	N/A	148,585	126,451
0	30	98.26	113.65	101.88	32.45	111.55	44.53	300.83	94.66 to 113.56	45,038	45,883
10	22	101.56	104.96	97.71	21.85	107.42	45.21	166.67	86.73 to 120.65	27,861	27,222
15	10	98.41	121.56	101.61	42.61	119.63	51.73	351.10	67.99 to 139.80	30,700	31,193
20	72	90.86	94.60	89.72	16.76	105.44	64.15	266.71	86.89 to 95.16	61,645	55,309
25	43	86.24	88.97	87.28	13.81	101.93	58.45	150.23	82.53 to 88.47	77,774	67,884
30	59	91.43	96.29	90.26	18.63	106.68	50.79	322.70	85.13 to 96.35	104,481	94,302
35	12	92.44	94.81	92.49	14.37	102.52	54.75	136.25	84.38 to 108.22	128,708	119,037
40	11	94.36	95.17	85.51	18.36	111.30	61.02	133.72	72.93 to 118.76	172,881	147,829
45	3	87.50	87.67	87.85	2.30	99.79	84.73	90.78	N/A	204,300	179,480
50	9	85.92	85.07	85.67	9.87	99.31	59.49	97.31	73.82 to 94.24	154,722	132,546
60	1	69.94	69.94	69.94			69.94	69.94	N/A	111,450	77,950
ALL											
	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05	81,071	72,906

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	276	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	35.79	95% Median C.I.:	88.80 to 94.05
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,383,130	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	34.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.69 to 92.17
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,375,630	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.70	95% Mean C.I.:	93.22 to 101.44
TOTAL Assessed Value:	20,122,185						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,071	COD:	20.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	351.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	72,906	PRD:	108.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.53		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:52

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	86.48	82.52	85.95	11.92	96.01	59.96	96.13	59.96 to 96.13	123,206	105,892
0	28	99.38	115.77	103.38	33.27	111.99	44.53	300.83	94.66 to 114.41	43,080	44,534
101	212	90.57	95.15	89.32	17.55	106.53	45.21	351.10	88.22 to 93.40	84,736	75,688
102	7	83.02	84.06	83.25	9.88	100.97	73.50	102.65	73.50 to 102.65	88,542	73,712
104	23	91.51	102.80	90.89	30.54	113.11	54.75	322.70	80.69 to 108.11	80,265	72,953
ALL	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05	81,071	72,906

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	86.48	82.52	85.95	11.92	96.01	59.96	96.13	59.96 to 96.13	123,206	105,892
0	28	99.38	115.77	103.38	33.27	111.99	44.53	300.83	94.66 to 114.41	43,080	44,534
10	9	95.03	94.56	87.81	14.00	107.69	69.67	119.06	73.78 to 113.76	32,444	28,488
15	11	116.75	146.84	116.59	48.81	125.94	70.23	351.10	88.76 to 322.70	22,800	26,583
20	32	93.25	93.12	90.08	19.17	103.37	50.79	150.50	81.87 to 102.19	61,415	55,325
25	25	85.24	89.67	86.55	17.98	103.61	58.45	136.49	77.75 to 97.33	86,176	74,583
30	101	90.78	95.64	90.46	16.11	105.73	51.73	266.71	88.17 to 94.24	102,361	92,598
35	22	88.46	86.33	83.36	12.54	103.56	54.75	113.32	76.26 to 95.95	87,081	72,590
40	31	86.45	93.34	88.15	19.41	105.89	45.21	150.23	81.99 to 94.15	80,524	70,981
45	10	91.38	89.36	88.97	8.18	100.45	69.94	105.56	80.99 to 98.36	95,205	84,702
50	1	91.04	91.04	91.04			91.04	91.04	N/A	65,000	59,175
ALL	276	90.95	97.33	89.93	20.56	108.23	44.53	351.10	88.80 to 94.05	81,071	72,906

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

Residential

The 2009 residential assessment actions reported by the Keith County Appraiser include the following:

The residential properties within the City of Ogallala received new appraisals with new measurements, new photos, and inspections. The costing tables were updated to June/2005 to complete the entire county of residential properties using the same costing tables. New depreciation tables built according to the market included four neighborhoods instead of the six used in 2008.

New depreciation tables for rural residential and to Ogallala Suburban locations were created for this assessment year. This equalizes the rural residential and suburban areas. Rural residential land values were increased by 10% to keep up with the market.

For this assessment year, no changes were made to the locations and neighborhoods at Lake McConaughy.

2009 Assessment Survey for Keith County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Appraisal Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraisal Staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June/2005 for all residential property in the county
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	In 2009 for Ogallala, Ogallala Suburban and Rural Residential. Every year the depreciation tables are updated for the actual age calculations.
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Cost Approach
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	The assessor location of Ogallala has 4 neighborhoods; The assessor location of Paxton has only 1 neighborhood; The assessor location of Brule has only 1 neighborhood; The assessor location of Rural Residential has 7 neighborhoods; The assessor location of Lake McConaughy has 35 neighborhoods; The assessor location of Ogallala Suburban has 4 neighborhoods; The assessor location of the K Areas at the Lake has 4 neighborhoods.
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	By market within the location within similar characteristics.
9.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Assessor Locations are usable valuation groupings, but neighborhoods are too specific with over 50 within the residential property class to use as valuation groupings.
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.)
	Yes, for Ogallala Suburban there is a market difference shown

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, the same depreciation tables are used for both and the same site value is used.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
162	0	203	365

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	276	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	27.25	95% Median C.I.:	94.92 to 97.45
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,383,130	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	27.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.72 to 96.55
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,375,630	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.01	95% Mean C.I.:	96.41 to 102.81
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,175,585						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,071	COD:	13.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	351.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	76,723	PRD:	105.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.53		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/21/2009 13:16:41

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	39	97.17	99.40	97.81	11.33	101.63	68.70	206.50	93.80 to 100.23	78,579	76,855
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	31	101.10	99.32	93.61	9.03	106.10	72.93	142.88	95.09 to 103.56	92,938	86,996
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	21	96.60	94.43	93.68	8.19	100.81	65.92	118.25	87.88 to 101.86	73,733	69,070
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	40	93.79	101.43	93.88	21.36	108.05	45.21	300.83	91.04 to 101.06	84,760	79,568
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	44	95.07	103.68	95.61	17.22	108.44	73.36	351.10	91.45 to 101.24	84,761	81,038
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	39	94.49	101.99	92.90	15.44	109.79	70.46	216.67	91.70 to 99.35	75,472	70,112
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	20	97.34	96.57	91.24	12.24	105.85	63.07	135.19	86.63 to 102.54	75,247	68,655
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	42	95.82	95.85	95.82	8.65	100.02	44.53	119.50	94.31 to 98.97	78,886	75,592
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	131	96.75	99.21	94.88	13.46	104.56	45.21	300.83	94.71 to 99.83	83,087	78,835
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	145	96.08	99.98	94.40	13.50	105.90	44.53	351.10	94.21 to 97.46	79,249	74,814
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	144	95.27	101.25	94.16	16.49	107.53	45.21	351.10	93.29 to 97.26	80,637	75,925
____ALL____											
	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BRULE	11	93.29	95.69	95.58	9.24	100.11	81.33	116.75	82.01 to 106.42	33,754	32,263
LAKE	62	96.10	101.40	91.27	22.06	111.10	44.53	300.83	92.38 to 100.23	94,222	85,995
OG SUB	8	95.14	102.62	95.08	16.25	107.93	75.54	145.91	75.54 to 145.91	111,500	106,013
OG-SUB	2	89.77	89.77	90.16	7.06	99.57	83.43	96.11	N/A	243,950	219,950
OGALLALA	169	96.46	98.71	96.69	9.18	102.09	54.41	172.42	95.09 to 98.41	75,942	73,428
PAXTON	10	99.13	118.07	95.78	39.35	123.28	67.01	351.10	73.50 to 120.47	61,400	58,806
RURAL	14	92.90	92.14	90.19	11.37	102.16	65.92	114.53	78.89 to 104.39	95,314	85,964
____ALL____											
	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	190	96.51	99.56	96.62	10.83	103.04	54.41	351.10	94.94 to 98.54	72,734	70,275
2	13	96.11	97.82	93.06	14.37	105.12	65.92	145.91	83.43 to 108.11	117,838	109,655
3	73	95.97	100.07	91.08	20.30	109.87	44.53	300.83	91.75 to 99.83	96,221	87,639
____ALL____											
	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	276	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	27.25	95% Median C.I.:	94.92 to 97.45
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,383,130	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	27.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.72 to 96.55
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,375,630	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.01	95% Mean C.I.:	96.41 to 102.81
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,175,585						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,071	COD:	13.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	351.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	76,723	PRD:	105.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.53		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/21/2009 13:16:41

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	245	96.25	98.40	94.70	10.95	103.90	45.21	351.10	94.71 to 97.56	86,348	81,772
2	26	97.31	113.22	98.23	37.61	115.26	44.53	300.83	78.89 to 118.25	25,471	25,019
3	5	87.28	88.40	87.96	9.32	100.51	73.78	103.72	N/A	111,600	98,160
____ALL____											
	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	253	96.25	98.09	94.29	11.78	104.03	45.21	351.10	94.62 to 97.46	84,500	79,671
06	16	96.34	120.62	102.43	39.81	117.76	44.53	300.83	92.90 to 154.14	52,046	53,310
07	7	100.53	106.70	100.92	14.64	105.74	88.90	150.50	88.90 to 150.50	23,457	23,672
____ALL____											
	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
03-0500											
25-0095	23	93.29	100.30	89.20	17.18	112.45	70.46	216.67	87.97 to 104.39	104,228	92,967
35-0001	1	300.83	300.83	300.83			300.83	300.83	N/A	3,000	9,025
51-0001	235	96.25	98.11	95.46	11.14	102.78	44.53	206.50	94.92 to 97.56	79,444	75,834
51-0006	17	97.13	107.63	92.44	29.56	116.43	65.92	351.10	73.50 to 108.57	76,823	71,018
68-0020											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	276	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	27.25	95% Median C.I.:	94.92 to 97.45
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,383,130	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	27.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.72 to 96.55
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,375,630	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.01	95% Mean C.I.:	96.41 to 102.81
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,175,585						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,071	COD:	13.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	351.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	76,723	PRD:	105.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.53		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/21/2009 13:16:41

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	34	96.88	107.79	95.76	28.81	112.56	44.53	300.83	92.90 to 104.39	57,220	54,795
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	20	96.66	98.48	92.58	10.90	106.38	73.21	142.70	91.46 to 104.40	50,785	47,016
1920 TO 1939	44	94.19	98.13	95.77	12.75	102.47	63.07	172.42	92.47 to 99.28	55,410	53,067
1940 TO 1949	19	100.42	100.91	98.53	8.42	102.42	83.26	130.47	91.52 to 104.99	48,855	48,136
1950 TO 1959	48	95.53	96.72	94.15	10.78	102.74	67.17	166.67	91.33 to 99.35	73,539	69,236
1960 TO 1969	29	97.91	106.11	98.32	14.53	107.92	82.01	351.10	93.95 to 101.06	76,437	75,155
1970 TO 1979	44	99.82	99.41	97.99	10.41	101.45	45.21	150.50	94.31 to 103.38	92,432	90,578
1980 TO 1989	11	94.94	92.02	90.84	9.56	101.30	59.49	105.40	83.62 to 103.25	110,590	100,460
1990 TO 1994	2	95.97	95.97	96.57	1.56	99.38	94.47	97.46	N/A	142,500	137,607
1995 TO 1999	7	96.11	94.77	92.45	8.61	102.52	78.87	118.76	78.87 to 118.76	160,840	148,691
2000 TO Present	18	92.74	92.29	89.08	9.61	103.60	70.46	133.72	84.58 to 96.75	200,394	178,512
ALL	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	166.67	170.68	160.97	51.26	106.03	44.53	300.83	N/A	3,250	5,231
5000 TO 9999	5	98.97	119.60	114.64	23.52	104.32	94.71	206.50	N/A	6,460	7,406
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	100.09	138.75	125.39	55.00	110.66	44.53	300.83	44.53 to 300.83	5,256	6,590
10000 TO 29999	39	100.80	112.35	108.35	22.19	103.69	54.41	351.10	94.07 to 113.56	16,928	18,341
30000 TO 59999	74	96.91	98.92	97.91	13.19	101.03	45.21	216.67	94.71 to 99.50	44,506	43,576
60000 TO 99999	82	95.79	96.04	96.39	7.74	99.63	59.48	127.80	94.11 to 99.58	77,641	74,840
100000 TO 149999	41	95.09	95.65	95.66	9.62	99.99	59.49	133.72	91.14 to 98.64	123,747	118,379
150000 TO 249999	24	92.32	92.14	92.20	8.26	99.94	73.21	115.37	84.58 to 97.31	181,629	167,453
250000 TO 499999	7	82.56	82.43	81.40	7.84	101.25	70.46	96.11	70.46 to 96.11	297,221	241,952
500000 +	1	95.97	95.97	95.97			95.97	95.97	N/A	500,000	479,845
ALL	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	276	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	27.25	95% Median C.I.:	94.92 to 97.45
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,383,130	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	27.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.72 to 96.55
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,375,630	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.01	95% Mean C.I.:	96.41 to 102.81
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,175,585						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,071	COD:	13.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	351.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	76,723	PRD:	105.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.53		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/21/2009 13:16:41

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	70.57	70.57	74.29	36.90	94.99	44.53	96.60	N/A	4,375	3,250
5000 TO 9999	8	96.84	129.78	108.76	38.35	119.33	88.90	300.83	88.90 to 300.83	7,350	7,993
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	95.66	117.94	104.29	36.50	113.08	44.53	300.83	88.90 to 166.67	6,755	7,045
10000 TO 29999	41	99.35	103.07	95.31	19.47	108.14	45.21	206.50	91.46 to 110.46	19,645	18,723
30000 TO 59999	81	96.25	99.96	95.31	14.95	104.89	59.48	351.10	93.98 to 98.09	47,939	45,688
60000 TO 99999	77	96.65	98.83	96.49	9.19	102.42	59.49	216.67	94.49 to 100.04	82,228	79,343
100000 TO 149999	41	96.16	95.03	94.17	7.59	100.91	73.21	112.81	91.66 to 98.64	131,678	124,005
150000 TO 249999	23	96.11	97.25	94.54	10.96	102.87	72.93	133.72	88.55 to 101.28	204,513	193,355
250000 TO 499999	3	81.17	82.53	84.02	10.48	98.24	70.46	95.97	N/A	395,109	331,955
ALL											
	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	87.15	85.62	87.16	11.71	98.23	65.92	102.28	N/A	148,585	129,513
0	30	97.31	110.75	99.54	30.58	111.26	44.53	300.83	94.62 to 108.11	45,038	44,832
10	22	101.00	105.00	97.06	18.27	108.19	45.21	172.42	89.08 to 111.65	27,861	27,041
15	10	102.09	127.86	107.35	36.20	119.11	67.01	351.10	88.76 to 130.80	30,700	32,956
20	72	96.28	96.69	95.18	9.08	101.59	67.17	144.61	93.80 to 99.35	61,645	58,672
25	43	95.61	96.12	95.25	8.32	100.92	73.50	142.88	91.14 to 97.91	77,774	74,076
30	59	95.44	97.20	95.94	8.82	101.31	63.07	142.70	93.63 to 100.31	104,481	100,242
35	12	97.51	97.74	97.51	3.59	100.23	90.64	106.11	94.03 to 102.33	128,708	125,507
40	11	96.75	99.20	89.66	18.66	110.64	70.46	133.72	72.93 to 133.21	172,881	154,998
45	3	86.62	88.72	89.44	4.88	99.19	83.43	96.11	N/A	204,300	182,726
50	9	92.38	88.54	87.15	7.89	101.60	59.49	98.54	82.56 to 97.31	154,722	134,842
60	1	81.83	81.83	81.83			81.83	81.83	N/A	111,450	91,200
ALL											
	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	276	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	27.25	95% Median C.I.:	94.92 to 97.45
TOTAL Sales Price:	22,383,130	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	27.15	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.72 to 96.55
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,375,630	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.01	95% Mean C.I.:	96.41 to 102.81
TOTAL Assessed Value:	21,175,585						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,071	COD:	13.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	351.10		
AVG. Assessed Value:	76,723	PRD:	105.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.53		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/21/2009 13:16:41

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	87.15	87.63	89.16	12.68	98.28	65.92	104.39	65.92 to 104.39	123,206	109,852
0	28	97.31	112.11	99.81	31.83	112.33	44.53	300.83	94.62 to 113.56	43,080	42,996
101	212	96.11	98.43	94.10	11.42	104.60	45.21	351.10	94.47 to 97.31	84,736	79,738
102	7	90.32	94.07	94.69	16.46	99.35	73.21	133.21	73.21 to 133.21	88,542	83,837
104	23	97.95	100.12	98.65	8.91	101.49	81.40	135.19	92.25 to 104.40	80,265	79,183
ALL	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	87.15	87.63	89.16	12.68	98.28	65.92	104.39	65.92 to 104.39	123,206	109,852
0	28	97.31	112.11	99.81	31.83	112.33	44.53	300.83	94.62 to 113.56	43,080	42,996
10	9	100.80	105.32	91.70	16.79	114.86	73.78	172.42	86.36 to 112.20	32,444	29,750
15	11	94.05	120.87	107.65	35.06	112.28	82.01	351.10	84.30 to 130.80	22,800	24,544
20	32	100.81	99.20	97.16	12.21	102.10	63.07	150.50	92.87 to 105.93	61,415	59,672
25	25	94.11	93.70	92.58	9.94	101.21	73.50	119.50	86.63 to 101.87	86,176	79,783
30	101	96.11	97.78	94.36	9.25	103.63	68.70	166.67	94.49 to 97.31	102,361	96,583
35	22	94.80	95.59	94.91	5.08	100.72	82.00	108.57	91.52 to 99.99	87,081	82,647
40	31	96.46	96.95	93.54	13.00	103.65	45.21	144.61	92.07 to 101.06	80,524	75,325
45	10	95.69	95.74	94.87	6.64	100.91	81.83	106.97	85.35 to 104.22	95,205	90,321
50	1	91.04	91.04	91.04			91.04	91.04	N/A	65,000	59,175
ALL	276	96.29	99.61	94.64	13.51	105.26	44.53	351.10	94.92 to 97.45	81,071	76,723

2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The goals accomplished by the Keith County Appraiser and staff are shown through the R&O statistics for the residential property class. A new appraisal was completed for properties within the City of Ogallala with June/2005 costing tables and depreciation tables. The preliminary median for Ogallala was at 89.78 and the final median for this assessor location is 96.46 with acceptable qualitative measures also. Other changes made include new depreciation tables being used for rural residentials and Ogallala Suburban locations. Land values within the rural residential areas increased 10% to stay within statistical parameters of the market. The appraisal staff continues to monitor the rapid pace of the market changes at Lake McConaughy, although no changes were necessary for 2009. Keith County has performed uniform and proportionate assessment practices as shown through the actions and coefficient of dispersion. The level of value for residential property in Keith County is best represented by the median of 96.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	437	276	63.16
2008	477	343	71.91
2007	517	388	75.05
2006	514	378	73.54
2005	510	416	81.57

RESIDENTIAL:2009 reflects a lower percent of the residential sales used for statistical measures, likewise the total numbers are also decreased by 40 sales. In reviewing the usability codes, there are approximately 55 sales in the non-qualified codes that are located at Lake McConaughy. These sales at the Lake have different contributing factors to the qualification issues. Several of these sales are mobile homes and some have been substantially changed. The constant change and new construction on parcels at the Lake make the usability difficult to determine at times. If these could be used, the percent used would increase to 76% of the total sales file for residential.

2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County

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

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

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	91	1.69	93	96
2008	94.19	2.03	96	94.8
2007	95	2.47	97	97
2006	93	4.50	97	97
2005	94	0.56	95	97

RESIDENTIAL: The major residential assessment actions reflect the new appraisals completed for properties within the City of Ogallala. The Trended Preliminary Ratio only represents the countywide percent change in assessed value; where Ogallala would only represent approximately 40% of the residential base. The R&O Ratio is reflecting approximately 61% of the sales for residential sold properties within this study period. There is no indication that the treatment of sold and unsold properties was not done as fairly as possible. The R&O Ratio will support the level of value for the residential property class in Keith County.

2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County

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

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

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
5.62	2009	1.69
3.57	2008	2.03
5.00	2007	2.47
2.64	2006	4.50
1.92	2005	0.56

RESIDENTIAL: The sales file is reflecting the assessment actions to apply new values for properties within the City of Ogallala. New depreciation tables for rural residentials also. The assessor locations of Ogallala and Rural Res make up approximately 66% of the sales file base where a larger percent change is shown. This is consistent with the actions reported by the Appraiser.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

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
for Keith County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	96	95	100

RESIDENTIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and the median and weighted mean show strong support for each other. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the residential class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

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	13.51	105.26
Difference	0.00	2.26

RESIDENTIAL: Although the price related differential is above the acceptable range, the coefficient of dispersion is within the prescribed standards. A review of the statistics may indicate the sales with the assessor location at the Lake and the Village of Paxton are weighting the higher PRD. Based on the known assessment practices in Keith County and no other information available, it is believed the county has attained uniform and proportionate assessment practices.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Keith 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	276	276	0
Median	91	96	5
Wgt. Mean	90	95	5
Mean	97	100	3
COD	20.56	13.51	-7.05
PRD	108.23	105.26	-2.97
Minimum	44.53	44.53	0.00
Maximum	351.10	351.10	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: The reports and opinions statistics represent the assessment actions taken to apply new valuations to residential properties within the City of Ogallala. New costing tables and depreciation tables improved the statistics from the preliminary calculations. Each measure of central tendency fairly represents the residential property class for 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

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	276	261	15
Median	96	99	-3
Wgt. Mean	95	96	-1
Mean	100	103	-3
COD	13.51	24.32	-10.81
PRD	105.26	107.27	-2.01
Minimum	44.53	15.84	28.69
Maximum	351.10	309.64	41.46

Table VIII is a result of comparing the R&O statistics to a set of trending statistics that are generated beginning with the taxable value of the sold property prior to the sale date. Each year thereafter the value is trended by the county overall percent of change in the residential base.

All three measures of central tendency are supportive of the level of residential value with a 3.47 or less spread between the trended and R&O statistics. The weighted mean strongly supports the fair treatment used in Keith County with a slight 1.45 point difference. Only the coefficient of dispersion reflects a larger spread of 12.82. The 261 sample size fairly represents each assessor location within the county. Every indication leads to the fair treatment of sold and unsold residential property within the county.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales: 53 **MEDIAN: 89** COV: 42.01 95% Median C.I.: 73.18 to 100.61
 TOTAL Sales Price: 14,732,423 WGT. MEAN: 84 STD: 35.98 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 74.09 to 94.13
 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 13,529,423 MEAN: 86 AVG.ABS.DEV: 24.94 95% Mean C.I.: 75.96 to 95.33
 TOTAL Assessed Value: 11,379,255
 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 255,272 COD: 28.05 MAX Sales Ratio: 235.91
 AVG. Assessed Value: 214,702 PRD: 101.82 MIN Sales Ratio: 9.94

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:01

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	95.75	95.72	96.77	4.73	98.92	88.91	102.51	N/A		82,184	79,530
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	81.55	81.55	80.70	2.62	101.05	79.41	83.68	N/A		107,240	86,537
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	79.15	79.15	84.52	7.54	93.65	73.18	85.12	N/A		1,343,000	1,135,082
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	84.99	84.50	85.25	4.13	99.12	78.99	89.51	N/A		61,333	52,285
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	101.29	92.19	99.83	10.96	92.35	61.43	104.77	N/A		338,723	338,153
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	80.02	76.05	83.82	21.99	90.73	40.45	106.81	40.45 to 106.81		84,500	70,827
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	102.65	115.69	97.38	22.55	118.80	70.23	235.91	70.23 to 235.91		241,054	234,733
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	58.21	74.19	58.44	27.89	126.95	57.83	106.54	N/A		260,166	152,046
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	101.07	85.74	83.66	16.21	102.49	53.50	102.66	N/A		294,500	246,390
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	60.41	72.68	73.31	38.33	99.13	42.46	110.20	N/A		49,892	36,577
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	64.35	67.20	91.09	28.69	73.77	36.52	99.79	36.52 to 99.79		410,700	374,105
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	106.08	87.55	54.84	42.97	159.66	9.94	185.32	9.94 to 185.32		231,385	126,883
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	10	85.06	86.21	85.22	7.24	101.16	73.18	102.51	78.99 to 95.75		333,103	283,868
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	100.61	93.96	89.95	22.87	104.45	40.45	235.91	70.23 to 104.77		217,658	195,790
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	22	70.66	77.45	78.70	44.75	98.41	9.94	185.32	51.14 to 102.66		255,798	201,317
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	15	84.99	82.46	88.86	16.64	92.80	40.45	106.81	73.18 to 100.76		315,459	280,306
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	100.61	93.09	84.75	25.49	109.84	42.46	235.91	58.21 to 106.54		202,205	171,371
____ALL____												
	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61		255,272	214,702

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BRULE	5	106.54	106.87	126.75	30.65	84.32	36.52	185.32	N/A		13,980	17,719
LAKE	3	73.18	123.51	131.08	79.48	94.22	61.43	235.91	N/A		99,500	130,425
OG SUB	1	83.68	83.68	83.68			83.68	83.68	N/A		64,480	53,960
OGALLALA	40	87.02	81.71	85.29	23.49	95.80	9.94	113.80	70.53 to 100.61		264,863	225,893
PAXTON	2	83.93	83.93	96.67	15.64	86.82	70.80	97.05	N/A		862,500	833,742
RURAL	2	57.23	57.23	18.30	76.60	312.72	13.39	101.07	N/A		388,500	71,097
____ALL____												
	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61		255,272	214,702

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	42.01	95% Median C.I.:	73.18 to 100.61
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,732,423	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	35.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.09 to 94.13
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,529,423	MEAN:	86	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.94	95% Mean C.I.:	75.96 to 95.33
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,379,255						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	255,272	COD:	28.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	235.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	214,702	PRD:	101.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.94		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:01

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	47	93.24	85.85	87.19	22.65	98.47	9.94	185.32	79.14 to 100.76	264,362	230,487
2	2	60.10	60.10	78.54	39.23	76.52	36.52	83.68	N/A	36,190	28,422
3	4	67.31	95.98	47.43	87.02	202.34	13.39	235.91	N/A	258,000	122,376
ALL	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61	255,272	214,702

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	41	97.48	93.03	86.77	22.42	107.21	13.39	235.91	79.41 to 101.84	301,135	261,293
2	12	59.31	60.41	56.32	32.45	107.26	9.94	106.54	40.45 to 83.68	98,573	55,520
ALL	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61	255,272	214,702

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
03-0500											
25-0095	5	106.54	106.87	126.75	30.65	84.32	36.52	185.32	N/A	13,980	17,719
35-0001											
51-0001	46	85.06	83.41	82.01	27.94	101.71	9.94	235.91	70.53 to 100.61	255,098	209,199
51-0006	2	83.93	83.93	96.67	15.64	86.82	70.80	97.05	N/A	862,500	833,742
68-0020											
NonValid School											
ALL	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61	255,272	214,702

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	42.01	95% Median C.I.:	73.18 to 100.61
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,732,423	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	35.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.09 to 94.13
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,529,423	MEAN:	86	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.94	95% Mean C.I.:	75.96 to 95.33
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,379,255						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	255,272	COD:	28.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	235.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	214,702	PRD:	101.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.94		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:01

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	17	70.53	67.95	65.16	28.94	104.28	9.94	106.54	48.54 to 88.91	109,816	71,558
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	55.76	55.76	55.76			55.76	55.76	N/A	100,000	55,760
1900 TO 1919	2	65.99	65.99	65.70	35.65	100.43	42.46	89.51	N/A	61,750	40,570
1920 TO 1939	3	113.80	134.19	114.04	23.98	117.67	103.45	185.32	N/A	113,333	129,240
1940 TO 1949	4	74.90	76.09	61.27	18.61	124.19	53.50	101.07	N/A	111,625	68,391
1950 TO 1959	7	99.17	96.28	98.02	9.31	98.23	64.35	108.88	64.35 to 108.88	117,142	114,823
1960 TO 1969	5	85.12	77.31	73.38	27.22	105.35	13.39	106.81	N/A	774,700	568,498
1970 TO 1979	6	100.20	88.38	92.92	18.75	95.11	51.14	113.80	51.14 to 113.80	298,360	277,221
1980 TO 1989	6	101.64	116.46	96.09	32.55	121.20	70.23	235.91	70.23 to 235.91	328,147	315,315
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	97.05	97.05	97.05			97.05	97.05	N/A	1,700,000	1,649,785
2000 TO Present	1	102.66	102.66	102.66			102.66	102.66	N/A	500,000	513,320
ALL											
	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61	255,272	214,702

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	3	95.75	79.60	77.99	24.38	102.07	36.52	106.54	N/A	7,466	5,823
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	95.75	79.60	77.99	24.38	102.07	36.52	106.54	N/A	7,466	5,823
10000 TO 29999	6	75.85	91.15	90.77	45.25	100.42	48.54	185.32	48.54 to 185.32	22,743	20,643
30000 TO 59999	7	64.35	73.65	73.82	28.12	99.77	40.45	108.88	40.45 to 108.88	43,500	32,112
60000 TO 99999	7	83.68	69.84	69.15	24.26	101.00	9.94	99.17	9.94 to 99.17	75,711	52,354
100000 TO 149999	8	102.18	108.71	108.03	28.18	100.63	55.76	235.91	55.76 to 235.91	121,819	131,606
150000 TO 249999	8	104.77	101.79	101.87	8.02	99.93	79.41	113.80	79.41 to 113.80	165,150	168,234
250000 TO 499999	7	58.21	70.83	70.07	26.58	101.09	53.33	101.82	53.33 to 101.82	345,142	241,837
500000 +	7	97.05	81.29	83.78	19.79	97.03	13.39	102.66	13.39 to 102.66	1,117,761	936,437
ALL											
	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61	255,272	214,702

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 53 **MEDIAN: 89** COV: 42.01 95% Median C.I.: 73.18 to 100.61
TOTAL Sales Price: 14,732,423 WGT. MEAN: 84 STD: 35.98 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 74.09 to 94.13
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 13,529,423 MEAN: 86 AVG.ABS.DEV: 24.94 95% Mean C.I.: 75.96 to 95.33
TOTAL Assessed Value: 11,379,255
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 255,272 COD: 28.05 MAX Sales Ratio: 235.91
AVG. Assessed Value: 214,702 PRD: 101.82 MIN Sales Ratio: 9.94

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:01

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	36.52	36.52	36.52			36.52	36.52	N/A	7,900	2,885
5000 TO 9999	4	88.33	73.28	27.62	31.55	265.37	9.94	106.54	N/A	28,625	7,905
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	80.90	65.93	28.19	38.52	233.87	9.94	106.54	N/A	24,480	6,901
10000 TO 29999	7	51.14	60.57	56.63	30.72	106.96	40.45	110.20	40.45 to 110.20	34,208	19,371
30000 TO 59999	9	83.68	92.11	82.55	29.78	111.58	55.76	185.32	61.43 to 108.88	53,275	43,980
60000 TO 99999	6	82.07	73.13	41.68	21.80	175.46	13.39	99.17	13.39 to 99.17	203,583	84,849
100000 TO 149999	6	102.18	98.10	97.49	6.46	100.63	79.41	106.81	79.41 to 106.81	139,758	136,245
150000 TO 249999	11	97.48	85.01	75.98	23.39	111.88	53.33	113.80	53.50 to 113.80	251,563	191,150
250000 TO 499999	3	101.82	146.11	120.43	44.29	121.33	100.61	235.91	N/A	256,666	309,095
500000 +	6	98.42	92.60	91.06	8.60	101.69	70.23	102.66	70.23 to 102.66	1,181,805	1,076,138
ALL											
	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61	255,272	214,702

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	17	70.53	67.95	65.16	28.94	104.28	9.94	106.54	48.54 to 88.91	109,816	71,558
10	18	98.33	92.30	80.28	28.79	114.97	13.39	235.91	64.35 to 106.81	166,247	133,464
20	17	100.76	95.41	89.04	18.35	107.15	53.50	185.32	70.80 to 103.45	489,416	435,781
30	1	100.61	100.61	100.61			100.61	100.61	N/A	350,000	352,130
ALL											
	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61	255,272	214,702

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	42.01	95% Median C.I.:	73.18 to 100.61
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,732,423	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	35.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.09 to 94.13
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,529,423	MEAN:	86	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.94	95% Mean C.I.:	75.96 to 95.33
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,379,255						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	255,272	COD:	28.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	235.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	214,702	PRD:	101.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	9.94		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:01

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	17	70.53	67.95	65.16	28.94	104.28	9.94	106.54	48.54 to 88.91	109,816	71,558
343	7	103.45	101.50	91.55	5.84	110.87	85.12	113.80	85.12 to 113.80	580,000	530,980
344	2	71.54	71.54	91.80	40.64	77.93	42.46	100.61	N/A	206,250	189,335
349	2	92.02	92.02	77.55	23.68	118.65	70.23	113.80	N/A	449,818	348,852
350	1	55.76	55.76	55.76			55.76	55.76	N/A	100,000	55,760
352	6	100.50	94.69	99.09	9.06	95.56	64.35	107.08	64.35 to 107.08	157,258	155,828
353	5	89.51	85.08	91.58	15.85	92.91	53.50	102.66	N/A	362,278	331,762
406	3	51.14	58.24	17.56	63.10	331.69	13.39	110.20	N/A	261,653	45,945
412	1	106.81	106.81	106.81			106.81	106.81	N/A	130,000	138,850
419	1	57.83	57.83	57.83			57.83	57.83	N/A	350,000	202,415
434	2	79.28	79.28	79.32	0.17	99.94	79.14	79.41	N/A	113,500	90,027
442	1	235.91	235.91	235.91			235.91	235.91	N/A	110,000	259,500
444	1	108.88	108.88	108.88			108.88	108.88	N/A	40,000	43,550
492	2	143.20	143.20	131.82	29.42	108.63	101.07	185.32	N/A	34,250	45,147
528	1	70.80	70.80	70.80			70.80	70.80	N/A	25,000	17,700
531	1	97.05	97.05	97.05			97.05	97.05	N/A	1,700,000	1,649,785
____ALL____	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61	255,272	214,702

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	1	64.35	64.35	64.35			64.35	64.35	N/A	55,000	35,390
03	52	89.21	86.05	84.19	27.96	102.21	9.94	235.91	78.99 to 100.61	259,123	218,151
04											
____ALL____	53	88.91	85.64	84.11	28.05	101.82	9.94	235.91	73.18 to 100.61	255,272	214,702

**Keith County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the
following property classes/subclasses:**

Commercial

The Keith County Appraiser reports 2009 land tables for commercial properties in neighborhood 2015, Ogallala were changed according to the market analysis. Three neighborhoods around Interstate 80 and Ogallala suburban were adjusted according to the Market. Larger parcels received increases based on these breaking points of size. Annual pickup and review work was completed for this assessment year.

2009 Assessment Survey for Keith County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Appraiser and Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraiser and Staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June/2005
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	Depreciation tables were updated in 2009 for the actual age, and no other changes were made to the depreciation tables.
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?
	2005 when the information was available on properties which supported the cost approach.
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Cost approach and income when available
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	The assessor location of Ogallala has 5 neighborhoods; The assessor location of Paxton has 2 neighborhoods; The assessor location of Brule has 2 neighborhoods; The assessor location of Rural has 3 neighborhoods; The assessor location of Lake McConaughy has 5 neighborhoods; The assessor location of Ogallala Suburban has 2 neighborhoods
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	By market data and similar characteristics
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Assessor Locations are usable valuation groupings, but neighborhoods are too specific within the commercial property class to use as a valuation grouping for mass appraisal.
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	Yes

12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? <i>(Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</i>
	Yes, Interstate 80 and the corridor along the Interstate is primarily within the City of Ogallala.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
24	0	39	63

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	35.09	95% Median C.I.:	80.24 to 102.54
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,123,923	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	32.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	81.44 to 97.81
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,920,923	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.85	95% Mean C.I.:	83.83 to 101.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,476,645						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	262,658	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	235.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	235,408	PRD:	103.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.11		

Printed: 03/21/2009 13:16:50

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	103.17	104.39	107.43	5.98	97.18	95.75	114.26	N/A		82,184	88,288
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	90.07	90.07	86.15	10.92	104.55	80.24	99.91	N/A		107,240	92,392
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	79.20	79.20	84.62	7.61	93.59	73.17	85.23	N/A		1,343,000	1,136,465
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	78.99	73.11	69.46	16.33	105.24	50.82	89.51	N/A		61,333	42,605
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	101.57	93.38	101.07	12.17	92.39	61.43	108.93	N/A		338,723	342,350
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	86.19	82.47	85.85	19.20	96.06	58.56	106.81	58.56 to 106.81		84,500	72,543
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	105.18	116.80	98.17	22.18	118.98	70.23	235.91	70.23 to 235.91		241,054	236,639
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	77.63	80.67	68.99	20.92	116.92	57.83	106.54	N/A		260,166	179,496
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	53.50	55.42	57.97	57.66	95.60	10.11	102.66	N/A		425,000	246,390
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	96.09	89.55	91.32	13.96	98.06	56.32	110.20	N/A		49,892	45,561
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	72.08	79.84	91.88	20.38	86.89	56.81	99.79	56.81 to 99.79		410,700	377,341
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	113.80	116.80	110.00	17.23	106.19	77.22	185.32	77.22 to 185.32		231,385	254,517
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	10	87.37	87.10	85.57	15.35	101.79	50.82	114.26	73.17 to 103.17		333,103	285,039
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	100.60	97.37	92.68	20.77	105.06	57.83	235.91	77.63 to 106.81		217,658	201,726
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	22	97.51	90.48	89.55	23.77	101.04	10.11	185.32	70.80 to 106.08		273,593	244,999
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	15	85.23	83.07	88.87	18.50	93.47	50.82	108.93	61.43 to 100.60		315,459	280,360
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	99.17	94.23	80.28	25.52	117.38	10.11	235.91	70.23 to 106.91		222,810	178,872
____ALL____												
	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54		262,658	235,408

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BRULE	5	106.54	119.16	133.69	19.11	89.13	95.75	185.32	N/A		13,980	18,690
LAKE	3	73.17	123.50	131.07	79.49	94.22	61.43	235.91	N/A		99,500	130,418
OG SUB	1	99.91	99.91	99.91			99.91	99.91	N/A		64,480	64,420
OGALLALA	40	96.55	88.52	88.02	16.91	100.56	50.82	114.26	79.14 to 102.54		264,863	233,138
PAXTON	2	83.93	83.93	96.67	15.64	86.82	70.80	97.05	N/A		862,500	833,742
RURAL	2	65.76	65.76	79.97	84.63	82.23	10.11	121.41	N/A		584,250	467,250
____ALL____												
	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54		262,658	235,408

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	35.09	95% Median C.I.:	80.24 to 102.54
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,123,923	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	32.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	81.44 to 97.81
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,920,923	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.85	95% Mean C.I.:	83.83 to 101.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,476,645						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	262,658	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	235.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	235,408	PRD:	103.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.11		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/21/2009 13:16:51

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	47	97.00	89.71	86.78	19.27	103.37	10.11	185.32	80.24 to 102.54	272,692	236,653
2	2	98.94	98.94	99.70	0.98	99.24	97.97	99.91	N/A	36,190	36,080
3	4	97.29	122.98	124.20	57.23	99.01	61.43	235.91	N/A	258,000	320,447
ALL	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54	262,658	235,408

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	42	98.33	94.92	90.32	22.37	105.10	10.11	235.91	85.23 to 103.17	311,429	281,273
2	11	96.09	83.59	78.86	16.97	106.00	50.82	106.54	60.07 to 100.00	76,443	60,285
ALL	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54	262,658	235,408

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
03-0500											
25-0095	5	106.54	119.16	133.69	19.11	89.13	95.75	185.32	N/A	13,980	18,690
35-0001											
51-0001	46	96.55	90.06	88.37	21.74	101.91	10.11	235.91	78.99 to 102.54	263,609	232,950
51-0006	2	83.93	83.93	96.67	15.64	86.82	70.80	97.05	N/A	862,500	833,742
68-0020											
NonValid School											
ALL	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54	262,658	235,408

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	35.09	95% Median C.I.:	80.24 to 102.54
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,123,923	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	32.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	81.44 to 97.81
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,920,923	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.85	95% Mean C.I.:	83.83 to 101.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,476,645						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	262,658	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	235.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	235,408	PRD:	103.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.11		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/21/2009 13:16:51

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	17	95.75	84.92	78.22	17.78	108.57	50.82	114.26	61.43 to 100.00	109,816	85,895
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	58.56	58.56	58.56			58.56	58.56	N/A	100,000	58,560
1900 TO 1919	2	87.74	87.74	87.71	2.02	100.03	85.96	89.51	N/A	61,750	54,162
1920 TO 1939	3	113.80	134.19	114.04	23.98	117.67	103.45	185.32	N/A	113,333	129,240
1940 TO 1949	4	62.15	53.35	32.64	34.67	163.42	10.11	78.99	N/A	209,500	68,391
1950 TO 1959	7	99.17	97.12	98.71	10.16	98.39	64.35	110.59	64.35 to 110.59	117,142	115,635
1960 TO 1969	5	100.60	98.86	93.84	12.48	105.34	80.24	121.41	N/A	774,700	727,009
1970 TO 1979	6	101.27	89.59	93.42	18.05	95.91	56.32	113.80	56.32 to 113.80	298,360	278,713
1980 TO 1989	6	102.86	116.87	96.93	31.98	120.57	70.23	235.91	70.23 to 235.91	328,147	318,063
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	97.05	97.05	97.05			97.05	97.05	N/A	1,700,000	1,649,785
2000 TO Present	1	102.66	102.66	102.66			102.66	102.66	N/A	500,000	513,320
ALL	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54	262,658	235,408

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	3	97.97	100.09	99.67	3.67	100.42	95.75	106.54	N/A	7,466	7,441
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	97.97	100.09	99.67	3.67	100.42	95.75	106.54	N/A	7,466	7,441
10000 TO 29999	6	84.54	98.62	97.36	38.11	101.30	56.32	185.32	56.32 to 185.32	22,743	22,142
30000 TO 59999	6	71.67	78.59	78.02	23.21	100.73	60.07	110.59	60.07 to 110.59	43,500	33,938
60000 TO 99999	7	89.51	86.36	86.07	13.27	100.34	50.82	100.00	50.82 to 100.00	75,711	65,162
100000 TO 149999	8	106.86	113.47	112.26	26.24	101.07	58.56	235.91	58.56 to 235.91	121,819	136,752
150000 TO 249999	8	104.77	101.90	101.96	7.92	99.94	80.24	113.80	80.24 to 113.80	165,150	168,390
250000 TO 499999	8	67.53	67.06	65.06	33.31	103.07	10.11	102.74	10.11 to 102.74	356,375	231,853
500000 +	7	99.79	96.99	94.14	10.61	103.03	70.23	121.41	70.23 to 121.41	1,117,761	1,052,245
ALL	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54	262,658	235,408

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	35.09	95% Median C.I.:	80.24 to 102.54
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,123,923	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	32.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	81.44 to 97.81
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,920,923	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.85	95% Mean C.I.:	83.83 to 101.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,476,645						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	262,658	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	235.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	235,408	PRD:	103.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.11		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/21/2009 13:16:51

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	4	97.49	99.32	98.84	3.02	100.48	95.75	106.54	N/A	8,100	8,006
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	97.49	99.32	98.84	3.02	100.48	95.75	106.54	N/A	8,100	8,006
10000 TO 29999	5	70.80	73.89	72.15	18.61	102.42	56.32	110.20	N/A	26,292	18,969
30000 TO 59999	11	78.99	81.07	48.62	37.08	166.72	10.11	185.32	50.82 to 110.59	90,863	44,180
60000 TO 99999	5	99.17	90.28	88.34	9.60	102.20	73.17	100.00	N/A	91,496	80,824
100000 TO 149999	7	106.81	101.94	100.79	7.15	101.13	80.24	114.26	80.24 to 114.26	134,079	135,144
150000 TO 249999	10	100.47	88.71	80.57	20.04	110.10	53.50	113.80	56.81 to 113.80	234,320	188,783
250000 TO 499999	4	101.67	129.22	105.54	39.45	122.44	77.63	235.91	N/A	298,500	315,025
500000 +	7	99.79	96.99	94.14	10.61	103.03	70.23	121.41	70.23 to 121.41	1,117,761	1,052,245
ALL											
	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54	262,658	235,408

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	17	95.75	84.92	78.22	17.78	108.57	50.82	114.26	61.43 to 100.00	109,816	85,895
10	18	99.48	101.49	108.00	22.36	93.97	56.32	235.91	79.14 to 110.20	166,247	179,546
20	17	97.05	90.18	85.23	24.32	105.81	10.11	185.32	70.23 to 103.45	512,446	436,765
30	1	102.74	102.74	102.74			102.74	102.74	N/A	350,000	359,580
ALL											
	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54	262,658	235,408

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	35.09	95% Median C.I.:	80.24 to 102.54
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,123,923	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	32.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	81.44 to 97.81
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,920,923	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.85	95% Mean C.I.:	83.83 to 101.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,476,645						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	262,658	COD:	21.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	235.91		
AVG. Assessed Value:	235,408	PRD:	103.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.11		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/21/2009 13:16:51

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	17	95.75	84.92	78.22	17.78	108.57	50.82	114.26	61.43 to 100.00	109,816	85,895
343	7	103.45	102.11	91.74	6.40	111.30	85.23	113.80	85.23 to 113.80	580,000	532,092
344	2	94.35	94.35	100.20	8.89	94.17	85.96	102.74	N/A	206,250	206,652
349	2	92.02	92.02	77.55	23.68	118.65	70.23	113.80	N/A	449,818	348,852
350	1	58.56	58.56	58.56			58.56	58.56	N/A	100,000	58,560
352	6	99.88	94.60	98.79	9.03	95.76	64.35	107.08	64.35 to 107.08	157,258	155,350
353	5	89.51	85.44	92.44	16.25	92.43	53.50	102.66	N/A	362,278	334,876
406	3	110.20	95.98	118.69	19.69	80.87	56.32	121.41	N/A	261,653	310,546
412	1	106.81	106.81	106.81			106.81	106.81	N/A	130,000	138,850
419	1	57.83	57.83	57.83			57.83	57.83	N/A	350,000	202,415
434	2	79.69	79.69	79.87	0.69	99.77	79.14	80.24	N/A	113,500	90,652
442	1	235.91	235.91	235.91			235.91	235.91	N/A	110,000	259,500
444	1	110.59	110.59	110.59			110.59	110.59	N/A	40,000	44,235
492	2	97.72	97.72	19.63	89.65	497.80	10.11	185.32	N/A	230,000	45,147
528	1	70.80	70.80	70.80			70.80	70.80	N/A	25,000	17,700
531	1	97.05	97.05	97.05			97.05	97.05	N/A	1,700,000	1,649,785
____ALL____	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54	262,658	235,408

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	1	64.35	64.35	64.35			64.35	64.35	N/A	55,000	35,390
03	52	97.27	93.11	89.73	21.20	103.78	10.11	235.91	85.23 to 102.54	266,652	239,254
04											
____ALL____	53	97.05	92.57	89.63	21.48	103.29	10.11	235.91	80.24 to 102.54	262,658	235,408

**2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:In reviewing the statistical measures of the commercial class of property in Keith County there has been improvement in the uniform and proportionality issues. Actions taken by the appraiser and staff for 2009 has narrowed the difference between the median and weighted mean, at 7.42 point spread compared to the 12.05 difference in 2008. New land tables were applied for commercial properties in some neighborhoods in Ogallala where the market supported the size adjustment breakdown. Both the median and mean are within the acceptable parameters for measures of central tendency. For the representatiion of the level value for commercial property in Keith County, the median of 97 will be used. Keith County has attained uniform and proportionate assessment practices as shown through the price related differential and overall knowledge of the practices used by the county.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	100	53	53.00
2008	99	47	47.47
2007	75	43	57.33
2006	76	45	59.21
2005	71	47	66.20

COMMERCIAL:In reviewing the usability code used by the county, there are 8 sales that were coded substantially changed since the date of sale. Theoretically if these sales could be used, the percent used would increase to 61%. The county reviews each class for qualification purposes and there is no indication that the sample has been excessively trimmed.

2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County

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

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

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	89	10.53	98	97
2008	86.28	8.69	94	98.73
2007	92	6.02	98	99
2006	95	-0.27	95	94
2005	89	5.40	93	100

COMMERCIAL:Keith County applied new land tables for commercial properties that reflect the 10.53% change in assessed value (excl. growth). Larger tracts received more value based on the size of the parcel. The sales file that calculates the R&O Ratio does not contain as many larger tracts compared to the overall county base. The R&O Ratio of 97.00 fairly represents the level of value for the commercial property class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County

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

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

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
13.92	2009	10.53
14.39	2008	8.69
6.55	2007	6.02
-5.21	2006	-0.27
31.64	2005	5.40

COMMERCIAL:Commercial lot values were adjusted for 2009, whereas the unimproved commercial sales make 21% of the sold parcels. There is no indication that sold and unsold properties are not treated in the same manner.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

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
for Keith County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	97	90	93

COMMERCIAL:Two of the central tendency measures are acceptable with the weighted mean falling slightly below the range. A review of the sample shows 75% of the sales occurring in the assessor location Ogallala where the median rounds to 97.00 respectively. Both median measures support the level of value for the commercial property class at 97.00

**2009 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

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	21.48	103.29
Difference	1.48	0.29

COMMERCIAL: Both qualitative statistics are slightly highly over the acceptable ranges for commercial property. In reviewing the statistical data, two assessor locations with very few sales are skewing the overall county qualitative measurements. Only three commercial sales are located on the Lake, with a COD of 79.49 and two sales in Paxton reflect a COD of 84.63. When you analyze the heavy commercial base of 40 sales in Ogallala, the COD is 16.91 and the PRD is 100.56. Both of these measures support the uniform and proportionate assessment practices in the commercial class of real property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Keith 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	53	53	0
Median	89	97	8
Wgt. Mean	84	90	6
Mean	86	93	7
COD	28.05	21.48	-6.57
PRD	101.82	103.29	1.47
Minimum	9.94	10.11	0.17
Maximum	235.91	235.91	0.00

COMMERCIAL: New land values in one neighborhood highly improved the statistics for the commercial property class. These statistics are supportive of the actions taken by the appraiser for 2009.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

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

Agricultural

Keith County created new market areas for 2009 which consists of three areas. Market Area 1 lies north of Lake McConaughy and the North Platte River across the county and north to Arthur County. Market Area 2 is located in the central region of Keith County lying south of Area 1 to the north side of the South Platte River Valley. Market Area 3 is located throughout the southern portion of the county. This area consists of the majority of the irrigation wells in Keith County. The new market areas are more closely aligned with the terrain and soil types separated by the Rivers. This gives the Keith County a better equalization between the market areas and representation of the market. The Keith County Appraiser analyzed the sales and the characteristics that were similar in the county. The three new market areas flow well with the physical characteristics and the differences shown in the market.

Market Area 1 consists of grass sales that have the same characteristics of grass in Arthur County and the corner of McPherson Counties. Keith County analyzed all sales within the area and neighboring counties for the valuation process of setting the 2009 values. These grass land acres contain mostly sandy soils formed in eolian sands on uplands in the sand hills. The 2009 grass land in area 1 is valued at \$225. The same in Arthur County is set at \$223; McPherson is valued at \$235. This valuation process includes the same soil and physical characteristics. This creates equalization between counties and school districts.

Market Area 2 lies in the central part of Keith County and mainly consists of a table top between the North Platte and South Platte River valleys. This area is approximately 300 feet higher than the areas along the river bottoms. Irrigation is much harder to reach and on the west portion of this market area, bordering Deuel County there is a very few number of irrigated wells. The soil is defined as well drained silty land and in depressions formed in loess. The majority of the sales that are included in this area are dry land use due to the few irrigated wells.

Market Area 3 is located in the southern part of Keith County and expands from the Deuel County border to Lincoln County on the east end. Market Area 3 contains approximately 80% of the irrigated wells in Keith County where the soil consists mostly of moderately well drained silty soil. The Natural Resource District has allowed several operators to move the allocated water from location to location. This has been a contributing factor in the increased market for irrigated land uses.

2009 Assessment Survey for Keith County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Appraiser and Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraiser and Staff
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	The County Board has not passed a policy to define agricultural land in Keith County.
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	It is the policy of Keith County to assess the above referenced land in accordance with Nebraska Revised Statute 77-1359 and all current regulations and directives.
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?
	N/A
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?
	The new 2008 soil survey was implemented for the 2009 valuation process.
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	Each year since 2003 the assessment office has kept the land use current for each parcel.
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	AgriData maps were used to compare with the computer digital cadastral maps on file.
b.	By whom?
	The assessment staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	There are 3 new market areas in Keith County for this assessment year compared to 5 in 2008.
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	The 3 market areas were developed by aligning the similar soil types and terrain which follow the river locations.
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?

	Yes or No
	Yes
a.	If yes, list.
	Similar soil and physical characteristics within each market area would be more appropriate for valuation groupings. Some areas are more like the bordering counties or soil types.
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	69-75% of market value
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	Yes in 2007

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
21	0	63	84

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7263

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	77	COV:	26.52	95% Median C.I.:	70.19 to 80.20	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,931,454	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	20.51	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.35 to 79.99	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,709,283	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.93	95% Mean C.I.:	72.71 to 81.93	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,781,065							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,016	COD:	19.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.58			
AVG. Assessed Value:	168,171	PRD:	107.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.47			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:19:48

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	77.50	78.17	86.41	10.08	90.46	66.78	90.22	N/A		120,551	104,170
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	8	89.58	86.45	88.65	13.83	97.52	52.99	116.56	52.99 to 116.56		214,863	190,476
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	112.82	112.82	130.42	33.47	86.51	75.06	150.58	N/A		191,000	249,100
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	10	89.85	83.62	80.61	14.70	103.74	55.05	112.71	60.61 to 101.33		113,584	91,557
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	86.40	86.35	84.57	12.80	102.11	69.74	102.88	N/A		107,835	91,197
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	14	72.23	72.90	71.88	19.86	101.42	46.83	126.84	52.72 to 81.65		155,211	111,563
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	78.53	79.44	78.26	8.07	101.52	70.33	97.63	70.33 to 97.63		250,000	195,643
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	7	67.85	82.53	68.68	35.90	120.17	49.84	128.57	49.84 to 128.57		432,957	297,360
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	68.82	69.99	73.28	11.01	95.51	57.39	84.94	N/A		131,737	96,535
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	74.26	74.11	74.12	3.35	99.99	70.11	79.77	N/A		443,607	328,803
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	5	64.42	57.55	48.21	21.62	119.37	33.47	78.50	N/A		405,641	195,544
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	61.08	61.82	55.78	19.17	110.82	38.45	78.84	38.45 to 78.84		283,779	158,290
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	23	89.70	86.43	90.32	16.59	95.69	52.99	150.58	75.06 to 90.57		156,452	141,308
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	33	77.22	78.16	73.00	19.00	107.07	46.83	128.57	67.85 to 81.53		231,363	168,889
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	20	69.04	65.46	61.11	15.25	107.11	33.47	84.94	57.39 to 74.60		323,793	197,881
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	30	80.06	80.93	81.04	20.13	99.86	46.83	150.58	67.85 to 89.70		137,405	111,348
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	73.74	77.66	73.01	16.07	106.37	49.84	128.57	70.11 to 80.57		323,987	236,534
<u>ALL</u>												
	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20		233,016	168,171

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7263

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	77	COV:	26.52	95% Median C.I.:	70.19 to 80.20	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,931,454	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	20.51	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.35 to 79.99	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,709,283	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.93	95% Mean C.I.:	72.71 to 81.93	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,781,065							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,016	COD:	19.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.58			
AVG. Assessed Value:	168,171	PRD:	107.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.47			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:19:48

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
2563	2	89.58	89.58	90.20	1.10	99.32	88.60	90.57	N/A		420,000	378,825
2565	4	90.00	86.08	85.72	4.39	100.43	74.26	90.08	N/A		177,475	152,126
2567	2	77.19	77.19	75.26	3.35	102.55	74.60	79.77	N/A		751,000	565,227
2775	1	69.74	69.74	69.74			69.74	69.74	N/A		125,000	87,175
2779	1	90.22	90.22	90.22			90.22	90.22	N/A		280,000	252,620
2855	5	78.51	78.75	78.10	7.26	100.83	66.78	91.95	N/A		127,243	99,380
2857	2	68.78	68.78	69.21	1.94	99.37	67.44	70.11	N/A		239,828	165,987
2859	2	63.57	63.57	61.93	16.64	102.65	52.99	74.14	N/A		90,900	56,290
2861	5	62.57	71.14	40.52	35.70	175.58	33.47	112.71	N/A		280,327	113,578
2865	2	81.75	81.75	87.71	25.85	93.20	60.61	102.88	N/A		28,072	24,622
3065	4	55.06	56.78	55.67	12.73	102.00	46.83	70.19	N/A		90,250	50,242
3067	7	64.91	64.76	65.21	11.31	99.31	50.23	81.65	50.23 to 81.65		188,440	122,877
3069	2	89.91	89.91	84.70	12.70	106.15	78.50	101.33	N/A		184,000	155,855
3071	5	75.06	76.48	75.20	11.28	101.70	64.66	94.00	N/A		160,200	120,475
3073	4	77.83	84.75	86.94	16.64	97.48	66.78	116.56	N/A		156,288	135,876
3075	2	85.87	85.87	87.16	9.74	98.51	77.50	94.23	N/A		59,166	51,570
3077	2	74.68	74.68	75.14	13.74	99.38	64.42	84.94	N/A		200,897	150,962
3151	3	85.37	99.68	111.83	16.98	89.13	85.09	128.57	N/A		135,666	151,715
3153	6	89.07	100.60	102.10	22.93	98.53	79.84	150.58	79.84 to 150.58		215,616	220,153
3155	4	58.91	72.01	58.41	43.12	123.28	43.37	126.84	N/A		503,340	293,986
3157	2	68.36	68.36	59.37	19.27	115.14	55.19	81.53	N/A		236,250	140,262
3159	5	73.22	71.46	72.89	8.61	98.03	54.63	80.57	N/A		254,600	185,581
3161	1	67.85	67.85	67.85			67.85	67.85	N/A		598,000	405,750
3163	3	70.33	68.51	62.01	27.63	110.47	38.45	96.75	N/A		481,666	298,705
ALL	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20		233,016	168,171

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
1	10	89.30	83.78	82.05	7.16	102.11	69.74	90.57	74.26 to 90.22		345,690	283,640
2	21	74.14	73.96	60.86	16.96	121.52	33.47	112.71	64.42 to 79.92		171,491	104,368
3	45	75.06	77.45	72.79	22.88	106.40	38.45	150.58	67.85 to 80.57		236,690	172,287
ALL	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20		233,016	168,171

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7263

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	77	COV:	26.52	95% Median C.I.:	70.19 to 80.20	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,931,454	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	20.51	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.35 to 79.99	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,709,283	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.93	95% Mean C.I.:	72.71 to 81.93	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,781,065							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,016	COD:	19.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.58			
AVG. Assessed Value:	168,171	PRD:	107.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.47			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:19:48

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	2	71.09	71.09	78.89	19.48	90.11	57.24	84.94	N/A	134,312	105,960
2	74	76.72	77.49	72.07	19.51	107.52	33.47	150.58	70.33 to 79.92	235,684	169,853
____ALL____											
	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20	233,016	168,171

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
03-0500	1	79.77	79.77	79.77			79.77	79.77	N/A	192,000	153,160
25-0095	18	80.35	88.18	91.91	16.93	95.95	64.42	150.58	77.50 to 91.95	155,502	142,916
35-0001											
51-0001	34	74.83	76.75	68.63	20.85	111.83	33.47	126.84	67.85 to 89.70	278,176	190,911
51-0006	23	70.19	69.56	67.76	17.48	102.65	38.45	102.88	60.61 to 77.22	228,705	154,975
68-0020											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20	233,016	168,171

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	64.91	64.91	64.91			64.91	64.91	N/A	320,000	207,710
10.01 TO 30.00	1	90.08	90.08	90.08			90.08	90.08	N/A	6,400	5,765
30.01 TO 50.00	2	81.75	81.75	87.71	25.85	93.20	60.61	102.88	N/A	28,072	24,622
50.01 TO 100.00	6	78.71	80.64	76.32	17.11	105.66	57.24	112.71	57.24 to 112.71	39,385	30,060
100.01 TO 180.00	32	73.68	74.32	74.09	17.77	100.32	43.37	126.84	67.85 to 80.50	179,099	132,688
180.01 TO 330.00	15	69.74	82.03	78.81	32.76	104.09	38.45	150.58	62.57 to 96.75	213,707	168,413
330.01 TO 650.00	13	76.82	77.43	67.43	12.21	114.83	49.84	101.33	67.85 to 88.60	314,430	212,021
650.01 +	6	84.88	76.44	69.10	16.29	110.63	33.47	90.57	33.47 to 90.57	677,672	468,245
____ALL____											
	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20	233,016	168,171

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7263

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	77	COV:	26.52	95% Median C.I.:	70.19 to 80.20	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,931,454	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	20.51	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.35 to 79.99	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,709,283	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.93	95% Mean C.I.:	72.71 to 81.93	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,781,065							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,016	COD:	19.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.58			
AVG. Assessed Value:	168,171	PRD:	107.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.47			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:19:48

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	13	70.19	72.21	72.62	13.68	99.44	52.99	91.95	62.57 to 81.53	120,840	87,750
DRY-N/A	12	67.65	62.25	50.18	20.55	124.05	33.47	89.70	43.37 to 76.61	299,935	150,512
GRASS	19	79.77	80.24	80.80	16.54	99.31	46.83	112.71	71.82 to 90.22	222,654	179,896
GRASS-N/A	10	79.52	77.46	77.30	15.06	100.21	55.05	114.86	57.39 to 85.37	128,492	99,328
IRRGTD	2	83.90	83.90	68.75	22.63	122.03	64.91	102.88	N/A	178,000	122,372
IRRGTD-N/A	20	79.17	86.18	77.66	24.00	110.98	49.84	150.58	70.33 to 96.75	333,388	258,904
ALL	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20	233,016	168,171

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	19	74.14	72.62	71.59	12.59	101.43	52.99	91.95	64.42 to 80.84	113,822	81,489
DRY-N/A	6	48.05	51.00	46.50	26.15	109.66	33.47	70.11	33.47 to 70.11	501,253	233,101
GRASS	22	79.99	79.43	80.41	15.86	98.79	46.83	112.71	71.82 to 90.08	203,802	163,872
GRASS-N/A	7	78.84	78.81	78.13	16.38	100.86	55.05	114.86	55.05 to 114.86	147,385	115,158
IRRGTD	17	78.50	89.17	85.21	24.80	104.65	63.23	150.58	67.97 to 116.56	255,810	217,963
IRRGTD-N/A	5	79.84	75.12	64.20	21.47	117.01	49.84	96.75	N/A	535,000	343,491
ALL	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20	233,016	168,171

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	24	68.98	68.04	57.08	16.85	119.20	33.47	91.95	62.57 to 78.51	211,214	120,569
DRY-N/A	1	52.72	52.72	52.72			52.72	52.72	N/A	101,000	53,245
GRASS	25	79.77	79.85	80.46	17.04	99.24	46.83	114.86	74.26 to 90.00	201,374	162,031
GRASS-N/A	4	75.69	75.72	74.95	10.10	101.03	66.42	85.09	N/A	120,250	90,132
IRRGTD	22	79.17	85.97	77.21	24.00	111.36	49.84	150.58	67.97 to 97.63	319,262	246,492
ALL	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20	233,016	168,171

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 7263

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	77	COV:	26.52	95% Median C.I.:	70.19 to 80.20	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	18,931,454	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	20.51	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.35 to 79.99	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,709,283	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.93	95% Mean C.I.:	72.71 to 81.93	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	12,781,065							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	233,016	COD:	19.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.58			
AVG. Assessed Value:	168,171	PRD:	107.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.47			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:19:48

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	1	90.08	90.08	90.08			90.08	90.08	N/A		6,400	5,765
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	90.08	90.08	90.08			90.08	90.08	N/A		6,400	5,765
10000 TO 29999	3	90.00	87.77	88.04	19.30	99.70	60.61	112.71	N/A		22,209	19,553
30000 TO 59999	8	78.71	76.20	73.88	16.85	103.14	50.23	102.88	50.23 to 102.88		44,249	32,692
60000 TO 99999	9	76.61	75.70	75.23	9.51	100.62	57.39	94.23	67.85 to 81.53		76,848	57,815
100000 TO 149999	12	72.40	72.52	72.64	23.72	99.84	43.37	114.86	52.72 to 85.09		117,232	85,157
150000 TO 249999	17	76.82	80.83	80.70	20.16	100.16	54.63	126.84	64.42 to 94.00		186,668	150,642
250000 TO 499999	20	77.86	81.64	80.97	17.72	100.84	55.19	150.58	70.11 to 80.57		308,873	250,080
500000 +	6	58.85	59.13	57.44	31.51	102.95	33.47	90.57	33.47 to 90.57		972,166	558,390
ALL												
	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20		233,016	168,171

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	1	90.08	90.08	90.08			90.08	90.08	N/A		6,400	5,765
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	90.08	90.08	90.08			90.08	90.08	N/A		6,400	5,765
10000 TO 29999	5	66.78	76.07	69.83	27.51	108.93	50.23	112.71	N/A		31,056	21,686
30000 TO 59999	14	72.16	71.11	66.44	18.33	107.03	46.83	102.88	52.99 to 85.37		69,117	45,920
60000 TO 99999	12	75.84	71.82	68.40	14.65	105.01	43.37	94.23	55.05 to 81.65		112,599	77,018
100000 TO 149999	9	74.26	76.38	74.80	12.07	102.12	62.57	101.33	64.42 to 88.60		166,243	124,346
150000 TO 249999	24	78.67	81.25	77.48	16.02	104.87	55.19	126.84	70.11 to 84.94		257,730	199,691
250000 TO 499999	8	90.11	86.99	69.69	32.79	124.82	33.47	150.58	33.47 to 150.58		519,629	362,134
500000 +	3	74.60	71.67	67.58	18.20	106.05	49.84	90.57	N/A		1,130,000	763,655
ALL												
	76	76.72	77.32	72.17	19.47	107.13	33.47	150.58	70.19 to 80.20		233,016	168,171

Final 2009

Methodology for Special Valuation

Keith County

The Keith County State Assessment office submits this report to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation, pursuant to 350, Nebraska Administrative Code, Chapter 11, §005.04 (05/07/05). Keith County submits that the following methodologies are used to value agricultural land that is influenced by forces other than purely agricultural purposes. The influences identified are; residential, commercial and recreational (mostly along the rivers).

Market Areas

Keith County currently has 3 Agricultural Market Areas throughout the county.

All of the market areas are located along the river corridors of the North Platte River, the South Platte River, or Lake McConaughy. For over a decade the areas along the rivers and lake have sold for other than agriculture usage. The influence on these sales has been for recreational use of land lying adjacent to the river corridors of the Platte Rivers, as well as Lake McConaughy (e.g., hunting, fishing and quiet enjoyment). These sales have been to private individuals, as well as to several commercial enterprises. Another location that has experienced sales for other than agricultural use (e.g., commercial enterprise) is the location surrounding Interstate 80 which lies just south of the South Platte River.

Market Area 1 lies to the north of the Lake McConaughy and the North Platte River across the entire east-west expanse of Keith County and consists of grassland sales. It consists mostly of excessively drained sandy soils formed in eolian sands on uplands in sand hills. Area 1 consists of only grassland sales for the year 2009.

Market Area 2 lies in the central region of Keith County lying south of Lake MC Conaughy and the North Platte River and north of the South Platte River Valley. A majority of this area consist of a table top between the North Platte River Valley and the South Platte River Valley. This table top is approximately 300 feet higher than the river bottoms. The west portion of this Market Area 2 along the Deuel County line is defined as that land on which it is difficult to obtain water and consist of moderately well drained silty soils on uplands and in depressions formed in loess; therefore, there are only a handful of wells for irrigation scattered over this area. The land in the middle of Market Area 2 has several wells on the table top. A majority of the wells are located in the eastern portion of Market Area 2 in the North Platte River Valley. Two of the sales in this area had some irrigation but a majority of the sales in this area were dry land sales for 2009.

Market Area 3 is located in the southern portion of the Keith County. The north boundary is the north edge of the South Platte River Valley. This area spans the entire east-west expanse of this southern region of Keith County. This Area 3 consists mostly of moderately well drained silty soils on uplands and in depressions formed in loess. The land surrounding the river is excessively drained sandy soils formed in alluvium in valleys. Due to the irrigation well moratorium, prior to 2006, there had been an increase in dry land sales that were purchased and then converted to irrigation in this area. Since then we have had only a few dry land sales, however, this past year we are again seeing dry land sales of which some are dry land being converted to irrigation despite the moratorium. The reason for new wells being allowed is that property owners are receiving permission from the NRD to move their allocation of irrigated acres from one location to another location. Area 3 contains at least 80% of the wells in Keith County. Area 3 consists of mostly irrigated land sales for 2009.

Identification

The land in all the market areas in Keith County that are adjacent to the North Platte River, the South Platte River and Lake McConaughy, have been identified as lake or accretion areas. These parcels have river or lake frontage and are located in areas that are used primarily for recreational purposes along Lake Mc Conaughy and agricultural purposes for the land lying adjacent to the accretion of the rivers.

Another area that was affected by other than agricultural influences is the area surrounding Interstate 80. Due to the purchase of land in this location by Wal-Mart the land surrounding this location was being platted into commercial subdivisions. The Appraiser had projected the land surrounding the Wal-Mart Subdivision, not yet platted into commercial subdivisions, to also sell for other than agriculture usage; and developed a Market Area along this area. However, Wal-Mart decided not to locate in Keith County and has since sold the land to the Ogallala Community Redevelopment Authority.

Zoning

Zoning is no longer a criteria for determining special valuation. Each parcel must be looked at separately to determine the primary usage and commercial production, if any. The rural residential county zoning and the transitional agriculture county zoning, list crop production as a primary use in these zones, therefore special valuation for properties in these areas had been recommended and approved by the Appraiser.

Agricultural Values

Values are placed on agricultural properties using the sales comparison approach. Visual observation and analysis of sales data are used to check for influences other than pure agricultural usage. The highest and best use analysis allows the separation of these sales to create a pure agricultural value, which when applied, indicates the appropriate special valuation.

Each of the special valuation market areas are delineated individually with the surrounding agricultural market areas 1 through 3. To date, special valuation has values determined by the agricultural tables developed for the related market areas. These relationships were determined geographically and are considered to be the best indicators.

Market Values


Analysis of sales in the special valuation areas creates a market value for properties that are influenced by other use purposes. In the case of recreational sales, these sales will be located as near the subject property as possible.

The sales that indicate a higher value for use other than agricultural use become the market value. Further market analysis shows specific areas where these values are applied.

Qualifying Property

Properties with questionable agricultural usage were notified of the intent to remove these properties from special valuation consideration initially in 2007. The Keith County staff will investigate any applications or claims of qualification for special valuation regarding these properties, as well as any new applications or claims in 2009.


Cheryl Schiel
Assessment Manager
for Keith County


Bryan Hill
State Appraiser
for Keith County

Agricultural Correlation

2009 CORRELATION SECTION

For Keith County

Agricultural or Special Valuation

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL LAND: The Keith County Appraiser began reviewing and analyzing the agricultural land sales countywide and the past market areas used in the county. Recent market information reflected sold properties that shared one or more characteristics typically common to all properties in one area. When analyzing the sales, the need to develop new market area boundaries was supported within the market. Three new market areas were applied to Keith County for the 2009 assessment year. The map is located under the map section of the Reports and Opinions for reporting purposes. Area 1 is located in the upper 1/3 of the county near Arthur County. Area 2 is located in the central region lying along the north side of the South Platte River Valley. Area 3 is located throughout the southern portion of the county and contains the majority of the irrigation wells within Keith County. The three new market areas represent boundaries that identify areas that influence valuation. Market area 1 consists mainly of grass land that has similar characteristics as grass in Arthur and McPherson County. These grass land acres contain mostly sandy soils on uplands in the sand hills. The appraiser analyzed similar agland sales in Arthur County to the sales within area 1 to determine the assessed value of grass at \$225. If you consider the Arthur County sales with Market Area One sales to determine the expanded sales to determine the level of value for Market Area One the level of value is 74%. The same in Arthur County is set at \$223; and McPherson is \$235. The county line is an arbitrary line for county government reasons but does not distinguish between the similar physical and market factors for grass acres. If you were to drive the area and not see the county sign you would see the same type of grass between these counties. Grazing patterns are similar and rainfall amounts for grass production. Market area 2 is consisting of table top soils that are approximately 300 feet higher than the areas along the river bottoms. The market most typically holds dry land acres due to the few irrigated wells in this area. Market area 3, in the southern portion contains a moderately well drained silty soil where nearly 80% of the irrigated wells are located. This has been a factor in the increased market for irrigated land.

In the valuation process, the appraiser used the similar market characteristics to set the valuations for area one. Within Keith County, market area one only contains 10 sales so the additional four unimproved sales within Arthur County gave the county enough market data to set the new 2009 values. The minimally improved Arthur County sales added three more to support the 4,917 sold acres in Arthur to analyze. The 10 sales in area one is not representative of the overall Keith County level of value. As you review the area one sales, the sale date is heavily weighted on the oldest study period. Six of the 10 have sold between July 18, 2005 to April 18, 2006. In both the unimproved agricultural statistics and the minimally improved statistics, the median is calculated from a sale occurring in 2006 (Book 2006 page 1874). As you recognize the level of value for

each study year, 89.70, 76.91, and 69.04 the market has been increasing and the level of value decreasing. Area 2 and Area 3 is representative of the market within Keith County with 23 and 46 sales respectfully with a median calculation of 74.14. Based on the misrepresentation of the sample in Market Area One, the best described level of value in Keith County for the agricultural class of property at 74%. The appraiser has taken qualitative and uniform assessment practices to equalize each of the three new market areas with similar sales to equalize Keith County in this class.

SPECIAL VALUATION: Keith County has designated the area that is affected by special value. This is located south of I-80 Interstate and around the west and east side of the I-80 corridor where accretion land is primarily located. For assessment valuation purposes, the special value has been established using similar sales which have occurred in the surrounding area and valued using the same process as other agricultural property in the county. It is the opinion that the level of value for special value is equal to the agricultural unimproved level at 74 in market area two and the minimally improved level of value in market areas two and three.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 9,306

Value : 769,688,085

Growth 4,833,266

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	213	2,094,660	116	1,195,650	295	4,330,460	624	7,620,770	
02. Res Improve Land	2,234	19,466,305	153	2,290,840	1,320	21,134,060	3,707	42,891,205	
03. Res Improvements	2,394	139,995,200	165	19,483,300	1,919	103,672,770	4,478	263,151,270	
04. Res Total	2,607	161,556,165	281	22,969,790	2,214	129,137,290	5,102	313,663,245	2,460,896
% of Res Total	51.10	51.51	5.51	7.32	43.39	41.17	54.82	40.75	50.92
05. Com UnImp Land	117	3,447,470	26	2,479,850	46	8,147,390	189	14,074,710	
06. Com Improve Land	393	14,711,980	35	1,372,530	63	1,977,810	491	18,062,320	
07. Com Improvements	419	49,397,140	42	4,901,950	72	8,556,070	533	62,855,160	
08. Com Total	536	67,556,590	68	8,754,330	118	18,681,270	722	94,992,190	634,975
% of Com Total	74.24	71.12	9.42	9.22	16.34	19.67	7.76	12.34	13.14
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	1	24,010	0	0	1	24,010	
10. Ind Improve Land	13	337,030	1	36,170	0	0	14	373,200	
11. Ind Improvements	13	2,623,785	1	105,195	0	0	14	2,728,980	
12. Ind Total	13	2,960,815	2	165,375	0	0	15	3,126,190	0
% of Ind Total	86.67	94.71	13.33	5.29	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.41	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	1,008	9,367,130	1,008	9,367,130	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	12	220,585	12	220,585	
15. Rec Improvements	1	1,195	0	0	13	1,075,395	14	1,076,590	
16. Rec Total	1	1,195	0	0	1,021	10,663,110	1,022	10,664,305	149,460
% of Rec Total	0.10	0.01	0.00	0.00	99.90	99.99	10.98	1.39	3.09
Res & Rec Total	2,608	161,557,360	281	22,969,790	3,235	139,800,400	6,124	324,327,550	2,610,356
% of Res & Rec Total	42.59	49.81	4.59	7.08	52.82	43.10	65.81	42.14	54.01
Com & Ind Total	549	70,517,405	70	8,919,705	118	18,681,270	737	98,118,380	634,975
% of Com & Ind Total	74.49	71.87	9.50	9.09	16.01	19.04	7.92	12.75	13.14
17. Taxable Total	3,157	232,074,765	351	31,889,495	3,353	158,481,670	6,861	422,445,930	3,245,331
% of Taxable Total	46.01	54.94	5.12	7.55	48.87	37.52	73.73	54.89	67.15

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	3	10,390	225,840		0	0	0
19. Commercial	14	1,280,010	6,798,085		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		3	10,390	225,840
19. Commercial	0	0	0		14	1,280,010	6,798,085
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					17	1,290,400	7,023,925

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	65	37,060	65	37,060	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	65	37,060	65	37,060	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	228	81	366	675

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	3	337,430	105	11,543,825	1,762	215,593,515	1,870	227,474,770
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	9,790	39	3,515,650	435	69,833,915	475	73,359,355
29. Ag Improvements	1	163,520	40	3,996,805	469	42,210,645	510	46,370,970
30. Ag Total							2,380	347,205,095

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	2.00	24,200	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	28	32.00	365,900	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	29	32.00	2,875,015	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	2.30	3,335	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	6.75	9,790	23	22.54	32,690	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	163,520	33	0.00	1,121,790	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	4.69	0	0	182.23	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	9	9.00	108,900	11	11.00	133,100	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	318	340.50	4,120,030	346	372.50	4,485,930	
33. HomeSite Improvements	334	335.00	26,868,175	363	367.00	29,743,190	1,587,935
34. HomeSite Total				374	383.50	34,362,220	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	15	6.18	8,980	16	8.48	12,315	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	277	328.01	489,515	301	357.30	531,995	
37. FarmSite Improvements	431	0.00	15,342,470	465	0.00	16,627,780	0
38. FarmSite Total				481	365.78	17,172,090	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,919.30	0	0	5,106.22	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				855	5,855.50	51,534,310	1,587,935

Schedule VII : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Detail - Game & Parks

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	2	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	3	0.00	0	5	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	48	7,524.24	4,956,385
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	48	7,524.24	8,525,035
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	168	39,964.48	17,731,720	216	47,488.72	22,688,105
44. Recapture Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	3.41	0.03%	2,385	0.03%	699.41
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	661.58	6.44%	456,495	6.57%	690.01
49. 3A1	75.18	0.73%	51,495	0.74%	684.96
50. 3A	2,491.32	24.26%	1,694,095	24.40%	680.00
51. 4A1	5,039.85	49.08%	3,401,965	48.99%	675.01
52. 4A	1,996.52	19.44%	1,337,670	19.26%	670.00
53. Total	10,267.86	100.00%	6,944,105	100.00%	676.30
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	31.45	2.18%	10,220	2.66%	324.96
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	184.04	12.78%	54,290	14.11%	294.99
58. 3D1	275.19	19.11%	77,050	20.03%	279.99
59. 3D	470.55	32.67%	124,700	32.41%	265.01
60. 4D1	349.61	24.28%	87,430	22.73%	250.08
61. 4D	129.26	8.98%	31,010	8.06%	239.90
62. Total	1,440.10	100.00%	384,700	100.00%	267.13
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	130.37	0.05%	33,020	0.05%	253.28
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	736.46	0.28%	168,815	0.28%	229.22
67. 3G1	1,001.72	0.38%	234,105	0.39%	233.70
68. 3G	5,250.36	1.97%	1,205,400	2.00%	229.58
69. 4G1	48,942.66	18.36%	11,106,510	18.44%	226.93
70. 4G	210,580.59	78.97%	47,478,095	78.83%	225.46
71. Total	266,642.16	100.00%	60,225,945	100.00%	225.87
Irrigated Total	10,267.86	3.64%	6,944,105	10.22%	676.30
Dry Total	1,440.10	0.51%	384,700	0.57%	267.13
Grass Total	266,642.16	94.57%	60,225,945	88.67%	225.87
Waste	3,597.52	1.28%	367,695	0.54%	102.21
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	36,470.58	12.94%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	281,947.64	100.00%	67,922,445	100.00%	240.90

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	1,917.42	22.50%	1,802,375	23.06%	940.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	3,869.00	45.39%	3,559,485	45.54%	920.00
49. 3A1	199.35	2.34%	181,410	2.32%	910.01
50. 3A	1,936.41	22.72%	1,742,780	22.30%	900.01
51. 4A1	66.40	0.78%	59,095	0.76%	889.98
52. 4A	534.66	6.27%	470,500	6.02%	880.00
53. Total	8,523.24	100.00%	7,815,645	100.00%	916.98
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	34,739.11	68.73%	14,416,765	72.47%	415.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	6,285.45	12.44%	2,357,195	11.85%	375.02
58. 3D1	1,269.75	2.51%	450,755	2.27%	355.00
59. 3D	4,751.83	9.40%	1,591,870	8.00%	335.00
60. 4D1	772.79	1.53%	247,295	1.24%	320.00
61. 4D	2,724.06	5.39%	830,840	4.18%	305.00
62. Total	50,542.99	100.00%	19,894,720	100.00%	393.62
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	3,693.45	4.23%	1,155,140	4.26%	312.75
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	3,354.52	3.84%	1,043,135	3.85%	310.96
67. 3G1	1,029.00	1.18%	323,265	1.19%	314.15
68. 3G	4,228.84	4.85%	1,319,230	4.87%	311.96
69. 4G1	2,815.89	3.23%	875,195	3.23%	310.81
70. 4G	72,134.20	82.67%	22,376,150	82.59%	310.20
71. Total	87,255.90	100.00%	27,092,115	100.00%	310.49
Irrigated Total	8,523.24	5.71%	7,815,645	14.18%	916.98
Dry Total	50,542.99	33.85%	19,894,720	36.09%	393.62
Grass Total	87,255.90	58.45%	27,092,115	49.15%	310.49
Waste	2,971.92	1.99%	323,750	0.59%	108.94
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	639.49	0.43%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	149,294.05	100.00%	55,126,230	100.00%	369.25

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	155.17	0.17%	244,395	0.18%	1,575.01
46. 1A	48,619.90	54.48%	75,798,905	55.25%	1,559.01
47. 2A1	10.90	0.01%	16,840	0.01%	1,544.95
48. 2A	23,658.41	26.51%	36,173,935	26.37%	1,529.01
49. 3A1	3,528.78	3.95%	5,346,145	3.90%	1,515.01
50. 3A	5,128.51	5.75%	7,629,385	5.56%	1,487.64
51. 4A1	6,635.91	7.44%	9,850,660	7.18%	1,484.45
52. 4A	1,513.10	1.70%	2,140,800	1.56%	1,414.84
53. Total	89,250.68	100.00%	137,201,065	100.00%	1,537.26
Dry					
54. 1D1	3.30	0.01%	1,360	0.01%	412.12
55. 1D	36,166.18	59.17%	14,108,865	62.16%	390.11
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	12,819.98	20.97%	4,600,305	20.27%	358.84
58. 3D1	2,669.50	4.37%	894,275	3.94%	335.00
59. 3D	2,327.82	3.81%	809,085	3.56%	347.57
60. 4D1	6,184.55	10.12%	1,987,245	8.76%	321.32
61. 4D	951.37	1.56%	296,730	1.31%	311.90
62. Total	61,122.70	100.00%	22,697,865	100.00%	371.35
Grass					
63. 1G1	3.20	0.00%	1,025	0.01%	320.31
64. 1G	4,709.31	10.38%	1,183,865	10.59%	251.39
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	8,646.02	19.05%	2,247,060	20.10%	259.90
67. 3G1	1,423.05	3.14%	380,200	3.40%	267.17
68. 3G	3,775.35	8.32%	928,030	8.30%	245.81
69. 4G1	7,789.14	17.16%	1,977,200	17.69%	253.84
70. 4G	19,035.65	41.95%	4,459,970	39.90%	234.30
71. Total	45,381.72	100.00%	11,177,350	100.00%	246.30
<hr/>					
Irrigated Total	89,250.68	43.69%	137,201,065	79.48%	1,537.26
Dry Total	61,122.70	29.92%	22,697,865	13.15%	371.35
Grass Total	45,381.72	22.22%	11,177,350	6.48%	246.30
Waste	8,512.86	4.17%	1,545,830	0.90%	181.59
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	630.42	0.31%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	204,267.96	100.00%	172,622,110	100.00%	845.08

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	197.20	299,505	6,759.97	10,119,920	101,084.61	141,541,390	108,041.78	151,960,815
77. Dry Land	73.85	26,875	4,519.44	1,784,240	108,512.50	41,166,170	113,105.79	42,977,285
78. Grass	12.46	11,050	8,176.25	2,433,345	391,091.07	96,051,015	399,279.78	98,495,410
79. Waste	0.00	0	1,580.78	295,845	13,501.52	1,941,430	15,082.30	2,237,275
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	165.91	0	984.20	0	36,590.38	0	37,740.49	0
82. Total	283.51	337,430	21,036.44	14,633,350	614,189.70	280,700,005	635,509.65	295,670,785

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	108,041.78	17.00%	151,960,815	51.40%	1,406.50
Dry Land	113,105.79	17.80%	42,977,285	14.54%	379.97
Grass	399,279.78	62.83%	98,495,410	33.31%	246.68
Waste	15,082.30	2.37%	2,237,275	0.76%	148.34
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	37,740.49	5.94%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	635,509.65	100.00%	295,670,785	100.00%	465.25

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

51 Keith

F3

	2008 CTL County Total	2009 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL)	Percent Change	2009 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	305,407,355	313,663,245	8,255,890	2.70%	2,460,896	1.90%
02. Recreational	10,962,455	10,664,305	-298,150	-2.72%	149,460	-4.08%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	31,566,795	34,362,220	2,795,425	8.86%	1,587,935	3.83%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	347,936,605	358,689,770	10,753,165	3.09%	4,198,291	1.88%
05. Commercial	85,369,775	94,992,190	9,622,415	11.27%	634,975	10.53%
06. Industrial	2,829,500	3,126,190	296,690	10.49%	0	10.49%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	16,193,855	17,172,090	978,235	6.04%	0	6.04%
08. Minerals	37,845	37,060	-785	-2.07	0	-2.07
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	104,430,975	115,327,530	10,896,555	10.43%	634,975	9.83%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	452,367,580	474,017,300	21,649,720	4.79%	4,833,266	3.72%
11. Irrigated	102,120,715	151,960,815	49,840,100	48.81%		
12. Dryland	39,117,650	42,977,285	3,859,635	9.87%		
13. Grassland	78,140,700	98,495,410	20,354,710	26.05%		
14. Wasteland	2,253,770	2,237,275	-16,495	-0.73%		
15. Other Agland	5	0	-5	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	221,632,840	295,670,785	74,037,945	33.41%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	674,000,420	769,688,085	95,687,665	14.20%	4,833,266	13.48%

2008 Plan of Assessment for Keith County

Assessment Years 2009, 2010, and 2011

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the Assessment Manager shall prepare a Plan of Assessment, (herein after referred to as the “Plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The Plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the assessment office plans to examine during the years contained in the Plan of Assessment. The Plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices, required by law, along with the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the Assessment Manager shall present the Plan to the County Board of Equalization. A copy of the Plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) Beginning Tax Year 2007; down from 80% to 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) Beginning Tax Year 2007; down from 80% to 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344 and 75% of its recapture value as defined in §77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

General Description of Real Property in Keith County:

Per the 2008 County Abstract, Keith County consists of the following real property types:

Totals	10107	Parcels	640,438,980	Value
	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base	
Residential	5123	51%	307,850,880	46%
Commercial	709	7%	84,607,310	13%
Industrial	15	1 %	3,156,930	.5%
Recreational	1061	11%	21,318,200	3.2%
Agricultural	2368	24%	270,808,840	40%
Special Value	146	2%	21,113,605	3.2%
Exempt	678	7%		0%
Tax Increment Financing	18	1 %	8,529,865	0 %
Minerals	65	1 %	37,845	.01 %
Game & Parks	5	%		0%

The majority of parcels and valuation by class in Keith County are Residential. It is important to note that 60% of these Residential properties surround Lake Mc Conaughy. Also, 11% of the total Residential parcels are mobile homes.

While the Agricultural parcel count consists of less than half of the Residential parcel count the Agricultural total valuations is only 6% less than the Residential total valuation. This has been a shift from 2005 when Residential and Agricultural valuations were almost equal. As you can see from the acre count and values listed below, the majority of Agricultural land use consists of Grassland. The majority of the Grassland lies in the northern region of Keith County which is north of Lake Mc Conaughy and the North Platte River. Prior to 2008 the total Grassland valuation ran a close second to Irrigated land for the largest valuation per use of Keith County Agricultural land. However, in 2008, due to major increases in Irrigated Land Values, the total Grassland Valuation is only 75% of the valuation of Irrigated Land. While Irrigated acres consist of a little over a fourth of the Grassland acres the valuation of Irrigated Land is higher than the total Grassland valuation. Dry land consists of slightly more acres than Irrigated; however, it comprises the least amount of valuation per use. Please note that 2007 was the first year that the Appraiser implemented market value on Accretion. Also, in 2008 the Appraiser implemented market value on 33 parcels of Agland lying near the I-80 Interchange

Agricultural land consists of 636,506.16 taxable acres. (*According to the 2008 Abstract*)

Use	Acres	Value
Irrigated	108,042.51	102,406,210
Dry	113,305.97	39,754,980
Grass	399,494.29	79,023,550
Waste	1,853.74	73,280
Other (Accretion)	13,809.65	2,419,775
Sub-Total Land only	636,506.16	223,677,795
Ag Home Sites	380.50	4,166,120
Ag Farm Sites	356.63	475,075
Improvements		42,489,850
		270,808,840

New Property

The County implemented zoning in 1975. The villages/cities with zoning include Ogallala, Brule and Paxton. Building Permits are noted within the CAMA system on the parcel they pertain to and are also filed in numerical order. They are utilized as another form of discovery for new construction and are put in with all other pick up work to be valued for the following year.

For assessment year 2008, an estimated 222 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county. Nearly 5.7 million in valuation was added for 2008 due to new construction that is valued using all forms of discovery from building permits, self reporting, neighbor reporting, newspaper realtor advertising, etc. Unfortunately, Keith County does not require building permits for our Agricultural Zoned Parcels and only several Information Statements have ever been completed and returned to the office since 1998. With the reappraisal of all rural improvements in 2006 we identified multiple new improvements and changes in existing improvements. As we assumed, our fear was that we were not locating all the changes in improvements or new construction in the rural areas due to Information Statements not being filed. This problem needs to be remedied. With consistent appraisal staffing we anticipate improved identification of new construction in the rural areas. We have visited with our board again and encourage utilization of permits in the rural area and will again attempt education on filing the Information Statements. This year we will again attempt a mailing of the information statements to owners of agricultural zoned parcels.

Pick up work as defined in Regulation 50-001.06 is constantly ongoing with discovery and completion set for March first, keeping in mind the assessment date of January 1. The data is gathered using all forms of discovery in a systematic process so that all properties are treated uniformly and the values are equalized with comparable properties. In 2008, other than the 222 building permits, an additional 281 parcels had improvements picked up that did not have new permits issued for the current year.

Current Resources

Budget/Staff/Training Personnel Count

Keith County Board voted to have the State assume the Assessment Office of Keith County in September 1998 and the State assumed the office in July 1999. The County Assessor became a State Assessor July 1, 1999 and in July 2003 the State Assessor was reclassified as an Assessment Administrative Manager. In late November 1999 the ASI Terra Scan CAMA Program replaced the former MIPS that had been in use prior to state assumption. As of July 2007 the office is budgeted through the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division.

Assessment Staff and Functions

Assessment Manager, Cheryl Schiel, is current with her continuing education requirements for training and certification per Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-414 thru §77-422 and has completed several IAAO appraisal courses prior to 2001 and education thru workshops in 2001 and thereafter. She supervises two assessment clerks, oversees all administrative reports, processes all splits and new subdivisions, attends all County Board of Equalization Hearings and verifies agricultural sales. Her main goal is to insure uniform and proportionate assessment.

Assessment Clerk 1, Marlene Jorgensen, updates the Real Property 521 property transfers along with updating the Master Name and Address files for all real property, updates Improvement on Leased Land ownership per Mobile Home Transfers and Bills of Sale, records and files 402 and 402 P forms on all Improvements on Leased Land, updates ownership list for the cadastral maps, processes 451 Applications and 451A Affidavits for Permissive Use Exemptions, processes Homestead Applications pursuant to 77-3501 thru 77-3530 for submittal to the Department of Revenue, assists with Change of Valuation notices, updates and generates Ag Trust Report, orders all supplies for the office, does all the backups for the server, answers the main phone line, assists with updating for the new Soil Conversion and handles the mail for the office. This clerk has completed Real Estate Law course, Terra Scan training, the Basic Course for Assessment, a Basic GIS Course and Excel training.

Assessment Clerk 2, Karla Plunket updates the Personal Property Records pursuant to 77-1201 through 77-1236, assists with mailing of Change of Value notices, balances Real Estate Records, processes Homestead Exemptions pursuant to 77-3501 thru 77-3530 after approval/disapproval list is presented to the office from the Department of Revenue, processes agricultural use updates upon FSA verification, and assists with updating for the new Soil Conversion. This clerk has completed the Basic Course for Assessment, IAAO Course 101, and Mathematics for Assessing Officers, Terra Scan training, and IAAO Workshop 150.

Both Assessment Clerks and Assessment Administrative Manager share responsibility for waiting on the counter, filing paperwork, and assisting with phone calls. We have a "Read Only" computer on the counter which is available for public use. This has been a great asset and benefits public relations. In June 2006 we received Web access and this has benefited the office in assisting the numerous requests we have for information.

Appraisal Staff and Functions

As of April 2002 the State Appraiser position was filled by Bryan Hill. Keith County is a State County so the Appraiser is ultimately responsible for estimating all the values of Real Property within the county. Bryan became a Registered Real Property Appraiser with the State of Nebraska in 2002. He is current with his continuing education requirements and has completed Fundamentals of Real Property Appraisal, Residential Data Collection, Aggregate Mining in Nebraska Income Approach to Value, National USPAP Course, Narrative Report Writing, Fundamentals of Mass Appraisal, National USPAP Update Course, Regression Analysis in Appraisal Practice, Mathematically Modeling Real Estate Data, Use & Development of Discounted Cash Flow, National USPAP Course and Residential Quality, Condition & Effective Age Seminar and Residential Report Writing & Case Studies. The Appraiser is ultimately responsible for executing and directing the estimation of market value to the best of his ability of all residential, commercial and agricultural real property in Keith County. He supervises two assistant appraisers and oversees all appraisal work.

Appraiser Assistant 1 (Sara Huckfeldt) primary responsibility for 2008 was the physical review and valuation of all Residential property located within the Village of Brule with 175 improved parcels. She calls the condition from the field and enters all the data she collects into the Terra Scan System. She has completed IAAO Course 600 Principles and Techniques of Cadastral Mapping, Residential Data Collection, Residential Appraisal Report Writing, IAAO 101 Fundamentals of Real Property Appraisal, National USPAP, IAAO 102 Residential Sales Comparison & Income Approaches, Residential Market Analysis & Highest & Best Use, Residential Quality, Condition & Effective Age Seminar and Terra Scan training. She passed the Nebraska Exam for Appraisal License in December 2007.

Appraiser Assistant 2 (Renae Zinc) primary responsibilities for 2008 was the physical review and valuation of all Residential Property within Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben with 96 improved parcels. She calls the condition from the field and enters all the data she collects into the Terra Scan System. She is responsible for entering all of the building permit information. She is responsible for the sales file questionnaire for all sold properties which are mailed to the seller. She has completed Residential Data Collection, Fundamentals of Real Estate Appraisal, Residential Sales Comparison & Income Approach, National USPAP, Residential Report Writing & Case Studies, and Residential Market Analysis & Highest & Best Use. She passed the Nebraska Exam for Appraisal License in December 2007.

Both Assistants responsibilities include field data collection, taking digital photos, annual pick-up work, reviewing all protested properties, entering protests information into the County Board of Equalization File of the Terra Scan system and assist property owners at the counter and on the phone with questions in regards to their values. They assist the Appraiser at the County Board of Equalization Hearings. They also continue the annual physical review of the county which includes new pictures and measuring of all improvements. With the current technology and staff all appraisal tasks are completed within the department and no contracted external assistance will be necessary.

Cadastral Maps

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1329 the Assessment Manager shall maintain tax maps. Keith County was flown in 1988 for aerial maps. All mapping is kept up to date by the Assessment Manager and Assessment Clerk 1. Ownership maintenance is updated continually utilizing the information from the 521 transfer statement by Assessment Clerk 1.

Aerials are bound in large books with 4 sections per page. There are two sets of overlays. One with ownership boundary lines; and the other with soil and use lines bound in separate books. In 1988 Sall Engineering was hired by the Keith County Assessor to fly Keith County to provide the County with new aerials. When the new maps were completed acres were computer digitized to provide accuracy with soil types and land valuation groups captured in the computer system. It is important to note that prior to 1994 all sections were recorded as exactly 640 Acres and the Accretion ran straight with the Section Lines. With the new aerials being utilized the accretion lines were drawn in perpendicular to the thread of the river, as the river laid at the time the new aerial was produced. Therefore, the way accretion was distributed between land owners was changed. The acres from the new aerials were utilized in 1994. Changes were implemented on all parcels with Accretion. Some Accretion acres changed substantially. Letters were sent out to all landowners explaining the change in methodology of Accretion acres as well as Sections no longer being exactly 640 Acres. The letter requested property owners to come in to the Assessment Office if the property owner had any questions. Very few property owners contacted the Assessment Office with questions about new acre counts. If they had a survey the acres were corrected to match the survey.

The soil survey is dated 1988 and the 1996 Soil Conversion is currently utilized. However, a new Soil Conversion will be implemented in 2009. Composite maps are utilized for a record of soils. Use change updates are completed on an annual basis on the composite overlay by the Assessment Staff utilizing information obtained from Farm Service Agency, well registration and physical review. Prior to April 2008 updates were completed by utilizing a grid and counting dots. As of April 2008 a new Agri Data, Inc Website will be utilized to more

accurately inventory soil types per use. We have a blue line copy that includes both the aerial picture and the ownership boundary lines. There are also separate pages for each subdivision filed directly behind the section map the subdivision is located in. For each blue line there is a corresponding page that lists Cadastral Map #, Parcel #, Ownership Name and Legal Description. Maps for split updates and new subdivisions are completed by the Assessment Manager. These maps, maintained by assessment staff, are kept up to date and in good condition. However, we anxiously anticipate a GIS system.

We have several boundary disputes over Accretion land now that it has become so valuable. There has been a District Court case between Westerbuhr and TBT in an Accretion boundary dispute that was appealed to a higher court. The Nebraska Court of Appeals reversed the District Court decision and ruled in favor of Westerbuhr. The Supreme Court upheld the decision of the District Court. Therefore, Accretion Acres are left as they have been inventoried since 1994.

Property Record Cards

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1303 and §77-1331 Record Maintenance is kept current almost 100% on computerized form with anticipation of relying solely on computer generated cards. As soon as we complete the first cycle of our annual review we will have all of our cards completely generated by the computer system. We need to have all appraisal and cost tables generated on all parcels in Terra Scan and be assured that the CAMA stores all the annual property record cards. Property Record Cards contain the information as set forth in Regulation 10-004.04 and 10-001.10 including ownership, legal description, cadastral map reference data, parcel I.D., property classification codes, taxing district, land information, building characteristics and annual value postings.

The appraisal staff updates the sketches and the appraisal information in the CAMA. The Assessment Manager is in anticipation of all appraisal information being completed on the Terra Scan system so all parcels will be valued using the same costing tables. Residential Improvements including Mobile Homes in Ogallala and Ogallala Suburban are on 2002 cost. All Commercial Improvements in Ogallala and Ogallala Suburban are on 2004 cost. The 2005 cost is

on all Residential and Commercial Improvements on the Lake, Agricultural, Rural Residential, Paxton and Brule. The appraisal file is a work in progress file and does not always balance with the ATR file. Therefore, we are in the process of adding a disclaimer for accuracy of information within the computer file. It is confusing to the public and it will be a great asset to have all parcels valued within the CAMA system. A Historic File is within the CAMA system; however, these files need to be perfected to enable utilization of full potential. One of the problems with the Historical File is that when the current ownership is updated on the ATR Current screen it also updates the ownership on the Historic File Record. Since the Historic File is our permanent Property Record Card this needs to be corrected. We are working on a notation within the record file referencing the correlation of the three approaches to value and the reconciliation of the approach carrying the most weight in determining the final estimate of value.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

Sales File

A 521 Real Estate Transfer Statement must be filed with every deed recorded in the County Clerks office. The Register of Deeds is required to forward the canary and pink copy of the 521 Transfer Statements to the Assessment office. Assessment Clerk 1 enters all information into the sales file, which automatically updates all parcels with the correct ownership. The Sales File is then monitored by the Assessment Manager and the Appraiser. The pink copy of the 521 is then forwarded to the Property Assessment Division. Our information is then electronically submitted from our computer system into the State Sales File Fox Pro system rather than being hand entered like it had previously been done. This process has saved a lot of time; however, it still needs to be monitored for accuracy. One issue that needs constant monitoring is the value on the date of sale. This value is pulled from the ATR file when the sale is entered into the Sales File; therefore, depending on the date it is entered the value at the time of sale may not represent the value that automatically imports into the sales file. Overall, we are anticipating fewer errors and saving countless hours of editing for accuracy. Every canary copy of the 521, copy of the deed, and any other pertinent information is filed in a 3-ring binder book numerically by Book

and Page number so they are kept in good condition for future reference and verification. Copies of the property record card are also put into a sales file booklet under headings of Residential, Commercial and Agricultural, etc to assist the public when researching recent sales.

We attempt verification of all sales within the office either by mail, phone or personal contact. When the properties are sold a Sales Verification Form is mailed to both the Grantor (Seller) and the Grantee (Buyer). These returned Sales Verification Forms are filed in a booklet for documentation of the qualification determination for the Sales File. An attempt to contact the Grantee (Buyer) is also made at the on-site review. The sold parcel is put in with the pickup work for an on-site physical review of the sold property. On-site physical reviews of all sold properties are completed by the assistants as an attempt to insure accuracy of the data on our property record card for a true representation of what actually sold with the anticipated end result of accurate data leading to better assessment. Comments are entered into the Sales File by the Appraiser Assistants based on the information obtained from the Sales Review. The Sales Review is completed utilizing the acceptable Sales Review Standards set forth by the Property Assessment Division in order to make a qualification determination about the usability of each sale for measurement purposes. The Assessment Manager encourages the Appraisal Staff to monitor properties within the sales file that are obtaining new building permits at the time the building permit information is entered into the computer system. These parcels need to be monitored and coded out as substantially changed when a major improvement is added to the sold property, as the new value does not represent what was sold.

Prior to 2009 the Assessment Manager verified all the Personal Property deductions on the Agricultural Sales by phone contact. If there is irrigated land involved, sales are verified to see if Personal Property was included in the Sale Price so the Personal Property is correctly deducted to provide an accurate price of what was actually paid for the land.

Our Sales File is edited constantly for accuracy and updated as new information is obtained. It is an ongoing process to insure the accuracy of not only our Terra Scan Sales File but also the State's Fox Pro Sales File. We spend numerous hours editing and correcting two different sales files. Since the market analysis depends heavily on sales file information, accuracy is imperative. We are of the opinion that one sales file would be ideal and solve many

errors and duplication of effort to insure accuracy. The effect of the download of the Sales Information Process has been a positive improvement, however, information still needs to be monitored and verified. One example of the need for the Sales Files needing monitored is that if a Prior Year Sale is entered in the Sales File in the Current Year the Current Year Assessment pulls into the Sales File rather than the Prior Year Assessment as the Value on the Date of Sale.

Discover, List & Inventory all property

Data Collection is completed on an annual basis of all new construction utilizing all forms of discovery. All sold properties are physically reviewed for accuracy of our property record card. Due to the fact that 1992 was the last complete physical review that was completed in Keith County, the physical review was on our list to be started in 2001. However, due to staffing changes in the appraisal department, time restraints and our aggressive market activity this process was detained until 2004. In 2004 we started an annual physical review and data collection to include complete relisting and remeasuring of all Mobile Homes in Keith County. In 2005 we continued the annual physical review and data collection to include complete relisting of all of our Commercial properties. In 2006 we continued the annual physical review and data collection to include complete relisting and remeasuring of all of our Agricultural and Rural-Residential properties. In 2007 we continued our annual physical review and data collection to include complete relisting and remeasuring of all of our Residential and Recreational properties surrounding Lake Mc Conaughy. In 2008 it was our goal to continue the annual physical review and data collection to include complete relisting and remeasuring of all the Residential properties in Keystone, Sarben, Roscoe, Brule and Paxton as well as beginning the physical review in the town of Ogallala as it has slightly over 2000 improved parcels. In 2008 the Appraisal Staff completed the complete relisting and remeasuring of the 175 improved Residential properties in Brule, as well as 96 improved parcels within Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben. The Appraiser is confident his staff will be able to complete the physical review and data collection to include complete relisting and remeasuring of all Residential properties in the City of Ogallala for 2009. It is our goal to continue this annual physical review and data collection to

include complete relisting and remeasuring of all properties on a cyclical basis within the statutory 6 year time frame; noting that the commercial and rural will be increasingly more time consuming than the urban and lake properties due to location proximity, number of improvements per parcel and complexity of improvements.

Data Collection is completed by the Appraiser Assistants along with the market analysis as overseen by the Appraiser. Our CAMA system allows the Appraiser to review assessment sales ratio studies at anytime on Residential and Commercial properties. An excel spreadsheet is utilized to analyze the agricultural ratio study. We compare our office generated ratio studies with the Property Assessment Division Sales File Roster to ensure accuracy. If errors are discovered we work with our Field Liaison to attempt accuracy in both files. We are looking forward to the utilization of the new Sales File where we can monitor and correct sales online.

A. Approaches to Value

- 1) Market Approach; sales comparisons,
- 2) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study,
- 3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market,
- 4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land

B. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.

D. Notices and Public Relations

Per regulation 50-001.03 the appraisal process is a systematic analysis of the factors that affect the value of real property. It is a documented, orderly system by which the problem is defined, the work necessary to solve the problem is planned, necessary data gathered, classified, analyzed, and interpreted into a written opinion of value. It shall include the grouping of similar properties so that all properties within a class or subclass are collectively examined and valued.

Regulation 50 entitled Assessment Process Regulation specifically sets the guidelines for the appraisal functions. This is accomplished by reviewing all of the sales to insure they are representative of what actually sold and are entered correctly into Terra Scan. Once all of the sales are entered and the property information is verified for accuracy, statistics for each neighborhood can be run.

The Appraiser is then able to prioritize the neighborhoods for revaluation. Resources are measured; work plan is prepared and then implemented. Once all the information is gathered and entered in Terra Scan new depreciation tables are built and applied to the area for the annual review of a portion of the county. The accomplishment to value everything off of the Terra Scan system has been a time intensive process. This plan has been approached aggressively. Great strides have been made to get information entered into Terra Scan which enables us to value all property in the county with the CAMA system. We are accomplishing this goal a step at a time and a year at a time.

One of our major goals has been to have all properties valued utilizing the Terra Scan system. This fall we will continue our annual review process of a portion of the county in our attempt to review the statutory one sixth of the county every year. This physical reappraisal is to insure accurate data used in the efforts to allow uniform and proportionate equalization of Keith County's assessed values. As of 2008 we have all of our Residential or Recreational improvements valued on Terra Scan using the 2002 or 2005 cost and new depreciation tables. The City of Ogallala Improvements and all Mobile Homes within the County are on with the 2002 cost. Improvements in Paxton, Brule and Suburban Ogallala; along with Agricultural Improvements, Rural Residential Improvements and the Lake Property Improvements, excluding all mobile homes, are all on the 2005 cost. All Commercial Improvements are on 2004 Cost. All improved parcels have current digital pictures. All of the urban residential land and improvements, all commercial land and improvements are valued using the Terra Scan System. All of the agricultural land is being valued using Terra Scan. We will continue our annual physical review of a portion of the county until the entire physical review of Keith County is completed and our goal attained in 2010. At that time the cyclical review will again commence.

Results to date are that all data for residential, commercial, and agricultural properties was entered into Terra Scan with data from the old Property Record Card prior to any physical review. Corrections are made to the physical characteristics when new information is noted during the physical reviews. Results of the annual physical review include completion of Mobile Home Parks in 2004, all Commercial Improvements in 2005, all Agricultural Improvements in 2006, Lake Residential & Recreational Improvements, excluding Mobile Homes in Mobile

Home Parks, in 2007 and Residential Improvements within Brule, Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben in 2008.

There are three approaches to value (Sales Comparison Approach, Income Approach, and the Cost Approach). All approaches to value are looked at. Currently, the Cost Approach bears the most weight. We are working on a notation within the record file referencing the correlation of the three approaches to value and the reconciliation of the approach carrying the most weight in determining the final estimate of value.

Also used as a guideline for revaluation is “Mass Appraisal of Real Property” pg 27 by Robert J. Gloudemans and Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice by Appraisal Standards Board. After determining the market value; residential and commercial real estate are both targeted to be assessed at 100% of market value. This includes all agricultural dwellings and outbuildings. Due to a Legislative Change; beginning year 2007, all agricultural land is targeted to be assessed at 75% of market value.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2008

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	95	14.96	103.82
Commercial	99	20.77	109.25
Agricultural Land	71	21.83	110.24
Special Value Agland			

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2008 Reports & Opinions.

History Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity

Residential Real Property Class

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Sales</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
2008	343	95	14.96	103.82
2007	388	96.56	13.51	104.56

2006	378	96.56	17.10	107.10
2005	416	96.54	19.60	107.74
2004	423	96.63	18.96	108.85
2003	476	98	14.46	102.95
2002	607	93	18.66	103.87
2001	650	94	22.3	108.87

Commercial Real Property Class

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Sales</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
2008	47	99	20.77	109.25
2007	43	99.12	12.15	111.51
2006	45	94.06	14.75	131.94
2005	47	99.95	13.26	106.91
2004	66	94.82	36.37	115.28
2003	73	95	32.77	120.27
2002	86	93	27.50	109.38
2001	90	96	21.01	110.83

Agricultural Real Property Class

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Sales</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
2008	93	71	21.83	110.24
2007	66	74	18.89	99.10
2006	52	76.33	13.57	104.78
2005	81	75.18	15.33	104.36
2004	66	75.23	14.56	104.07
2003	55	78	11.34	100.81
2002	59	79	11.88	101.81
2001	71	79	9.84	102.78

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

Residential (and/or subclasses): Continue to Relist, Remeasure and Complete Reappraisal of Residential Property to include all residential properties within Ogallala using 06/05 cost tables and depreciation tables.

Identify contiguous lots that are valued with a price break on excessive square footage or acres and combine them for valuation or value as if combined to provide equalization of all land.

Verify improvements valued as shops verses utility storage.

Verify pole buildings valued in the residential file verses valued in the farm file.

Review Mobile Home Parks at the lake for need of leasehold values.

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Identify contiguous lots that are valued with a price break on excessive square footage or acres and combine them for valuation or value as if combined to provide equalization of all land.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): Continue analysis of Ag Land Market Areas. Refine as indicated. Implement Soil Conversion.

Special Value – Agland: Continue analysis for Special Valuation and refine as indicated.

Complete all pickup work from all forms of discovery by March 1.

Mail Information Statements to all Agland owners.

Map all new splits and subdivisions.

Mail USDA Permission of Release form for FSA use verification to all new Agland owners.

Verify Irrigation Use with Well Registration List.

Identify and remap agricultural land use changes.

Edit Property Assessment Division Sales File to insure it is identical to the Terra Scan Sales File.

Review all sold properties July 01, 2007 thru June 30, 2008.

Edit all Property Assessment Division NDR classification codes for accuracy.

Continued Education for all staff

Continued annual review of a portion of the county of all property in Keith County

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010:

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Continue to Relist, Remeasure and Complete Reappraisal of Residential Property to include all Residential properties within Paxton and Ogallala Suburban using new cost tables and depreciation tables as well as all Mobile Homes within the County.

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): Continue analysis of Ag Land Market Areas. Refine as indicated.

Special Value – Agland: Continue analysis for Special Valuation and refine as indicated

Complete all pickup work from all forms of discovery by March 1.

Mail Information Statements to all Agland owners.

Map all new splits and subdivisions.

Mail USDA Permission of Release form for FSA use verification to all new Agland owners.

Verify Irrigation Use with Well Registration List.

Identify and remap agricultural land use changes.

Edit Property Assessment Division Sales File to insure it is identical to the Terra Scan Sales File.
Review all sold properties July 01, 2008 thru June 30, 2009.
Edit all Property Assessment Division NDR classification codes for accuracy.
Continued Education for all staff
Continued annual review of a portion of the county of all property in Keith County
Complete reappraising any areas of the county that have not been revalued using new cost tables and depreciation tables for continuation of our annual review of all property in Keith County.
Measure and value all exempt buildings in County.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): Relist, Remeasure and Complete Reappraisal of all Commercial Property to include all Commercial properties within Keith County using new cost tables and depreciation tables.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): Continue analysis of Ag Land Market Areas. Refine as indicated.

Special Value – Agland: Continue Analysis of Special Valuation and refine as indicated.

Complete all pickup work from all forms of discovery by March 1.

Mail Information Statements to all Agland owners.

Map all new splits and subdivisions.

Mail USDA Permission of Release form for FSA use verification to all new Agland owners.

Verify Irrigation Use with Well Registration List.

Identify and remap agricultural land use changes.

Utilize new NRD maps to identify land use.

Edit Property Assessment Division Sales File to insure it is identical to the Terra Scan Sales File.

Review all sold properties July 01, 2006 thru June 30, 2007.

Edit all Property Assessment Division NDR classification codes for accuracy.

Verify all Zoning based on Zoning Map.

Input last Deed Book & Page on parcels not in Sales File for historical research capability

Verify Situs

Continued Education for all staff

Continued annual review of a portion of the county of all property in Keith County

Other functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
 - b. Assessment Manager Survey & Comments
 - c. Sales information to PAD rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
 - d. Change of Valuation Notices
 - e. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - f. School District Taxable Value Report
 - g. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - h. Average Assessed Value Report for Homestead
 - i. Agricultural Trust Report
 - j. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - k. Generate Tax Roll
 - l. Board of Education Lands & Funds Report of current values
 - m. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property

- n. Annual Plan of Assessment Report (3 yr update)
3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required per 2002 Property Assessment Division Policy
 4. Permissive Use Exemptions Form 451 and 451A: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
 5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, prepare and attend all County Board of Equalization hearings, etc.
 6. Homestead Exemptions Form 458; administer 500 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
 7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
 8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
 9. Process school Merges, Dissolutions & Consolidations, Educational Service Unit Mergers, Dissolutions & Consolidations, City and Village Annexations
 10. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information;

compile/input/review of tax rates set by County Board of Equalization used for tax billing process.

11. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
12. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
13. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information
14. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
15. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
16. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. The Assessment Administrative Manager has attended all workshops in the past years for continuing education. Due to budget restraints she has not been able to attend other IAAO classes offered.
17. Sale Review Process
18. Review Records Retention Schedule
19. Annually publish in a newspaper of general circulation and to licensed broadcast media in the county as required by law/regulation or Property Assessment Division procedure:

- a. Certify completion of Real Property Assessment Roll
- b. Statistical measure of central tendency as determined by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission for Keith County based on qualified sales statistical reports.
- c. Personal Property Filing Requirements & Deadlines
- d. Homestead Exemption Requirements & Deadlines

Procedure Manual

A Procedural Manual developed by Property Assessment Division is on file within the office. Also, a procedural manual, developed jointly by the Assessment Manager and the Appraiser, generally describes each assessment process in the office based on Regulations and IAAO Guide Lines in the attempt to provide assurance to the property owner the uniform and proportionate processes used in the valuation of all property within Keith County. The Assessment Manager establishes guidelines for Assessment functions while the Appraiser establishes guide lines for Appraisal functions.

This manual contains detailed explanation of office tasks and procedures and is attempted to be sufficient detail to permit a reader of the manual easy understanding of the assessment process in place in Keith County. This manual contains definition of terms like appraisal, listing, verification and review. These terms are attempted to be used precisely enough to adequately describe the assessment process of the county to any reader or user of the manual.

This manual is a work in progress and is updated as needed due to new statutes or change in procedure. This Procedure Manual contains the Steps in a Revaluation drawn from the textbook, Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, 1999.

A general handbook that was developed by the Appraiser that includes an Appraisal Calendar, a Step by Step process for developing a neighborhood in the CAMA system, a guideline for quality and condition; to insure uniformity based on the Marshall and Swift Manual

within the county, and a detailed checklist of the procedure to physically inspect parcels.

Personal Property

We have over 900 Personal Property parcels and diligently try to assess all personal property in Keith County. We have frustration with this “honest man’s tax”. Many Assessors are of the opinion that we would like to see Depreciation Worksheets required to be filed with the Personal Property Schedules. Within the corporate limits we often see a decline in valuation as Property Owners continue to file without the worksheet for us to verify the self reported information. When we finally are successful in obtaining a Depreciation Worksheet; Assessment Clerk 2 spends countless hours correcting past years due to prior years inaccurate filings. Property Owners are then extremely upset about the penalties and interest on past years tax. If we could have the Depreciation Worksheet at the time of filing these issues would be eliminated.

Another concern for Personal Property is the assessment of towers equitably. We would find it beneficial if the Property Assessment Division would provide a regulation or some directive on valuing these towers.

Residential Real Property

All Residential Properties are valued using the cost approach to value in the Terra Scan system. More weight is put on the cost and market approaches to value. The sampling of sales is approximately 10% of the total taxable residential properties.

Digital photos and sketches are entered on the residential properties into Terra Scan. If there is any indication that information on the property record card is incorrect; a note is entered into our pick up work for further investigation. Editing and rebuilding of parcel data in the Terra Scan program is constantly ongoing. Residential Improvements including all Mobile Homes within the City of Ogallala are on 06-02 cost. In 2006 all Agricultural, Rural Residential, Ogallala Suburban and Paxton Improvements were revalued using 06-05 cost tables and depreciation tables built from the market. For 2007 all Lake Residential and Recreational, Rural Residential, and Brule were revalued using 06-05 cost tables and depreciation tables built from

the market. In 2008 all Residential Properties in Keystone, Roscoe, and Sarben were revalued using 06-05 cost tables and depreciation tables built from the market. In 2009 Ogallala Residential Improvements will be revalued using 06-05 cost table and depreciation tables built from the market.

Along with Brule, Keystone, Roscoe, and Sarben being valued using 06-05 cost tables and depreciation tables in 2008 a 10% increase was given to all Agricultural Home Sites and Outbuilding Sites as well as depreciation tables being adjusted on the Agricultural Dwelling Improvements. The Agricultural Out-Building Improvements were not adjusted.

Leasehold values had been valued on the K-Area Improvements on Leased Land parcels for over twenty years. Leasehold values are abstracted from the total value where the market indicates, on all Improvements on Leased Land parcels. For 2007 the K-Area Leasehold values were reviewed and revalued as indicated by the current market. Due to the foreseen increase in Central Nebraska Public Power's annual lease to the Improvements located on Central's property, the Keith County Board decided to lower the leasehold values for 2007 in two of the four K Areas using a discounted Cash Flow by discounting Lots in K-1 and K-3 by 50%. The Leasehold values on K-2 and K-4; as well as all other leasehold values surrounding Lake Mc Conaughy, were not adjusted by the County Board of Equalization in 2007. The result was lower than acceptable ranges in the K-1 and K-3 Areas causing equalization issues with all other property in Keith County. For 2008 the Assessment Manager set up a new Assessor's Location named the "K-Areas" to track these sales and any of County Board's adjusted values. This inequity caused by the County Board of Equalization's values, as seen in the 2008 Preliminary Statistics, of these K-Areas needed to be equalized. Therefore, in order to allow equalization for 2008, these Leasehold values on the K-1 and K-3 Areas were reinstated to the values assigned by the Appraiser in 2007.

In 2008 the Assessment Office sent a Notice of Taxable Status to Central Nebraska Public Power District (CNPPD) in order to value their property that is not used for Public Purpose for the areas they lease out for location of Improvements on Leased Land. CNPPD protested to the County Board of Equalization and the County Board of Equalization ruled in favor of CNPPD so

the Assessment Office had to put the value back on the lessees. The Property Assessment Division has appealed the County Boards Decision to the Tax Equalization Review Commission.

The residential sales have been entered into the CAMA program and statistical reports can be generated. All of the Values within Keith County are table driven within the Terra Scan system.

Commercial Real Property

Commercial sales have been entered into the CAMA program and statistical reports can be generated within the system. The Appraiser verifies commercial sales.

In 2005 we completed a relisting and remeasuring of the Commercial Class of Property. All Commercial Improvements are currently valued using 06/04 cost and depreciation tables.

Income data for commercial property needs to be collected and analyzed. Currently more weight is given to the cost and market approaches to valuation. We are working on a notation within the record file referencing the correlation of the three approaches to value and the reconciliation of the approach carrying the most weight in determining the final estimate of value.

In 2007 an approximate 6% increase was given to the Commercial depreciation tables on improvements across the entire county. However, during the County Board of Equalization the Appraiser recommended a 15% discount to the depreciation tables on parcels that were protested in locations on the north side of Lake Mc Conaughy, Ogallala Commercial parcels not along the main corridors of Ogallala and Commercial parcels in Brule. The County Board of Equalization approved the decreased values for 2007. For 2008 this 15% discount recommended by the Appraiser and approved by the County Board of Equalization during the 2007 hearings was given to all Commercial parcels within the designated areas to allow equalization of these properties. Also, for 2008 the Appraiser adjusted the land tables around the I-80 interchange as well as adjusting depreciation tables for all Motels and Mobile Home Parks within the County.

Agricultural Real Property

Agricultural sales are entered into the CAMA program and statistical reports can be generated within the system. As of 2008 the Appraiser sets the Ag land Values. The Assessment Manager has verified agricultural sales prior to 2009. Along with the mailed reviews, the Assessment Manager attempted phone contact on all irrigated land sales to verify personal property or pivots, if any. It is found that often times the personal property is not deducted from the total sale price resulting in inflated land values. Reviews allow us the opportunity to obtain a more accurate analysis of the market value of vacant land.

Land use is currently updated annually from such sources as the well listing from the Department of Water Resources, taxpayer reporting, verifications as authorized from the Farm Service Agency, physical inspection and discoveries made during annual maintenance work. Information is difficult to obtain from the Farm Service Agency (FSA) due their privacy policy of releasing information only with the land owner's signed release form. The FSA has had several versions of the signed release form over the past five years. Their newest version of the land owner's signed release form is now only honored by the FSA office the day the form is signed. The property owners tire of constantly having to sign a new release form. Therefore, verification of Use by utilizing FSA information is difficult. Due to this difficulty of obtaining information from the FSA we will utilize the Natural Resource District information as a main resource for verification of our irrigated land use. As of April 2008 we are able to utilize a computer program from Agri Data Inc to assist us with splits and counting Acre totals per use. It is a time consuming task as each use has to be outlined per parcel, however, Agri Data is far more accurate than counting dots. We will also be utilizing this Agri Data program to assist us with implementing the new Soil Conversion for 2009.

Agricultural Market Areas are allowed under Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1362, which allows differences based on geographic location. Statue does not state that valuations shall be by soil type, only that the classification is by soil type. The market varies despite the fact that the soils are uniform. As set forth by the Nebraska Department of Revenue, soils are taken into consideration as land class relates to soils. According to the Nebraska Department of Revenue Soil Conversion the Department states "The sole purpose of this conversion is to create an

accurate inventory of the soils in each county and a consistent classification of soils across the state. The classification will remain constant, but the values will move according to market forces.... The ranges of values for each classification are intended to recognize the differences in market value within each of the soil classification groupings within a county. It is our belief that assessors have the intimate knowledge of the local markets. As such, we will continue to encourage the assessors and county boards of equalization to assign values to the differing market areas within the county.”

State law authorized the use of Market Areas for the valuation of agricultural and horticultural land per Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-103.01 & 77-1363. Market Areas were challenged in Keith County with parcels being protested to the Tax Equalization & Review Commission No. 01A-268 thru 01A-289. The Commission noted that Market Areas in Keith County”demonstrates that greater intracounty equalization was promoted by the use of market areas for tax year 2001”. The Tax Equalization Review Commission ruled in favor of the Assessment Office Market Areas. Establishing the market areas allowed us to equalize all areas of the county. The East to West Market Areas not only addressed the Equalization issues across Keith County but also addressed issues with adjoining counties. Market areas allow us to equalize the East side of the county verses the West side of the county, the North side of the county verses the South side of the county as well as the equalization across county lines with the differing market of our bordering counties. Noting that location plays a major role in the valuation of all properties and locating boundary lines for market areas whether they are residential, commercial or agricultural. These Market Area boundary lines are reviewed annually like the other neighborhood lines of residential and commercial property to insure equality and uniformity of all agricultural land in Keith County by analyzing the use and restrictions applicable to the agricultural land; including analysis considering the full description of the physical, functional and location characteristics of the agricultural land and identification of the property rights being valued. This ensures equalization for all agricultural property not only countywide but also with all adjoining counties, Lincoln, McPherson, Arthur, Garden, Deuel, and Perkins. Irrigated, Dry and Grass have also been equalized in each area. These Market Area boundary lines need to be reviewed to bring our COD & PRD within acceptable Ranges.

Ag sales have been plotted on a vellum sheet and laid over various maps (roads, wells, pivots, hydrology, soils, topography, school districts, township, and section lines). Numerous “What-ifs” are compiled on a spreadsheet to analyze sales activity and what physical characteristic may have had a bearing on the market. Numerous hours are spent analyzing and reviewing all aspects that may possibly have influence on the agricultural market. Location, Location, Location appears to be the key. Just like a county line, the township lines running north and south on the east and west side of Keith County are predetermined location lines that allow us the opportunity to address the equalization issues that Deuel and Lincoln County present. When you view the County Map with irrigation wells it coincidentally runs along the township lines lying north of the South Platte River. This helps define the boundary line of Market Area 3. Again equalization and uniformity is our main goal.

We have been constantly vigilant of the south central location of the county due to water and well restrictions in the counties lying south of Keith County. Perkins, Chase and Dundy Counties all have had water or well restrictions for numerous years. Keith County had no water or well restriction prior to June 2004. As of July 16, 2004, a three phase Moratorium was initiated. There were two factors that triggered land surrounding the Platte Rivers into the first phase of the Moratorium. One factor was if the water level declined 10’. The other factor was if 25% of the area was currently developed with Irrigated acres. As of February 24, 2006 the second phase of the Moratorium developed as it encompassed our entire County. The Twin Platte NRD Moratorium restricted permits for high capacity wells. Excluding domestic and livestock wells, there was a stay or moratorium on any well pumping over 50 gallons per minute. This meant there could be no new high capacity wells with the exception of replacement wells if the proper paperwork was filed in the Natural Resource District Office. No increase on irrigated acres is allowed anywhere in the Twin Platte Natural Resource District. Currently, unlike Perkins, Chase and Dundy Counties which lie south of Keith County, there is not a depth or pumping restriction and no schedule of allocation for Keith County as of January 2008.

There are two different areas in the Twin Platte Resource District. One is the “Over Appropriated” Area which is usually 6-8 miles on each side of both of the Platte Rivers and the tributaries. This “Over Appropriated” Area has had no new wells and no new acres since July 16,

2004. The remaining area is considered “Fully Appropriated”. In this “Fully Appropriated” Area wells have not been allowed to be drilled since February 24, 2006 when the Second phase of the Moratorium was implemented. The Third Phase of the Moratorium was a window of time when property owners could have developed irrigated acres using an existing irrigation well; however, that deadline was June 18, 2007. Currently, no acres may be added, not even for adding end guns or transferring from pipe to pivot irrigation. Therefore, if you had 80 Acres of piped irrigation and you put in a pivot, you are not allowed to increase the Irrigated acres to 130 for the pivot as the Irrigated Acres must remain at the original certified 80 Acres. A variance may be requested if the property owner sells off a quarter with existing certified acres where no well previously was located on the sold property. Variances have been granted for the new property owner to sink a new well on the severed land if there were certified Irrigated acres prior to the sale due to water provided from a well on a different quarter that the seller owned. Variances have also been granted for property owners to pull the Irrigated Acres from one area to irrigate another area with the same number of Irrigated Acres.

There have been meetings explaining the different options other than a Moratorium. One option is no new wells or new irrigated acres on the land within the Moratorium Area. Work has been ongoing on an Integrated Management Plan, hereafter called the IMPlan, between the Irrigation District and the property owners to develop a plan to present to the State since the passage of LB 962 in July 2004. The first deadline in this law was September 2007. The Natural Resource District was uncertain that the IMPlan would be completed by then; so they requested an extension of 2 years on the deadline. This extension has been granted. It will be interesting to see how things will change within this time frame and how the water will be managed in the future, utilizing different tools; such as allocations, flow meters, rotational cropping, etc. Evaluations will be established on how well these tools may help producers, as well as the Twin Platte Natural Resource District, attain the goal of LB 962 and return water uses to the 1997 levels within the next ten years. Producers have been encouraged to provide input on how they think these different tools will work for the producers operations to attain the 1997 water use goal. This will be a tremendous task; however it must be perfected to ensure our water for the future.

This Moratorium could possibly be removed within 3 to 5 years depending on rain fall and other factors. The assumption was that the Moratorium would have an impact on the market. The greater percent of the dry land in Area 3 had been purchased as potentially irrigated and was converted to pivot irrigation by the new owner prior to the Moratorium in each area. If the use of our dry land sales was converted to irrigation, subsequent to the sale, then the sale was removed from the sales file as substantially changed. This had a tremendous impact on the number of Dry land sales in our Qualified Sales File, as most of the Dry land was purchased for its irrigation potential. There was a rush to buy the Dry land and convert it to irrigation prior to the third phase of the Moratorium. It has been interesting to see how this Moratorium has affected the price of not only dry land but also irrigated land. Factors other than the Moratorium appear to be having a greater effect on the Market of all uses of Agland. It appears that the escalating price of grain, grass and cattle, as well as ethanol, investors, etc are having a greater effect on the Market of all uses of Agland than the Moratorium did. The Sale Prices of Agland continue to escalate on all uses of land. In March 2008 we had a Dry land quarter sell for over \$900 an acre. This land was purchased by a farmer who has irrigated land in another location within Keith County. He has received a variance from the NRD to move the irrigated acres from another quarter to this newly purchased quarter. He has also been given a variance from the NRD to drill a new well at the new location and begin to irrigate this newly purchased quarter. The sale will have to be coded as substantially changed in our Sales File; however, it might give indication of what Dry land is worth to a farmer that owns other Irrigated land.

In 2006 a decision was handed down by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission on V Davidsons, LLC Case Nos 05A-0762 05A-077, 05A-078 & 05A-079 that caused us to specifically review our Area 4 location and values. This area is currently located south of the North Platte River and next to Lincoln County. Prior to 2006 this area was equalized with Lincoln County and served as a buffer area between Keith and Lincoln County. Also, unlike Perkins County, the Counties of Keith and Lincoln were not in a Moratorium. The V Davidson parcels contain dry land. Since there were no dry land sales in this market area the Tax Equalization and Review Commission utilized the values from Perkins County to set the values for the protested parcels. However, unlike Perkins County, Keith County still does not have a

depth or water restriction. For the 2007 tax year we only had one unimproved land sale in Market Area 4 and it had no dry land. Therefore, in order to provide equalization within Keith County, rather than utilizing Perkins County values, the dry land values for Area 3 were implemented in Area 4 for 2007. For the 2008 there were seven sales in Area 4. Three were mostly Irrigated, two were all Grass, one was all CRP and the other had almost as many Dry Acres as it did CRP. This Area 4 needs to be specifically looked at; keeping in mind that Keith County is now in the Moratorium; however, it has no water restrictions.

Accretion

In 1988 Sall Engineering was hired to fly Keith County and provide new aerials for the county. When the new maps were completed acres were digitized by a computer system for more accuracy. Prior to this time all sections were 640 acres and the accretion ran straight with the Section Lines. The accretion lines were drawn in perpendicular to the thread of the river at the time the new aerial was produced. Therefore, the way accretion was distributed between land owners was changed. The acres from the new aerials were utilized in 1994. Changes were implemented on all parcels with accretion. Some accretion changed by over 200 acres. Letters were sent out to all landowners explaining the change in methodology of Accretion Acres and sections no longer being exactly 640 acres. This letter requested property owners to come in to the assessment office if they had any questions. Very few property owners contacted the Assessor's Office.

The way accretion was implemented by Sall Engineering was the "Mathematical Computations of Accretion Surveys for the Great State of Nebraska" prepared by James L. Brown, State Surveyor February 11, 1989. This document explains "In the final analysis, the goals are to divide the accretions fairly and give each owner an equitable portion of the new boundary line of the shore." and "that the access to the water is the most important consideration." It goes on to state "The most common method and the one that will most nearly approximate the proportionate method is to project lines at right angles to the centerline or thread of the stream.....The boundary line between riparian owners on the same side of the stream runs

from the end of the shore line to, and along a line at right angles with, the shore line to, and along a line at right angles with, the center line of the stream.”

We have boundary disputes over accretion land now that it has become so valuable. There has been a District Court case between Lyons and Westerbuhr in an accretion boundary dispute that was appealed to a higher court. The Nebraska Court of Appeals reversed the District Court decision and ruled in favor of Westerbuhr. The Supreme Court upheld the decision of the District Court. Therefore, Accretion Acres are left as they have been valued and taxed since 1994.

Special Valuation

Thirty nine applications had been filed and accepted prior to the Appraiser's Implementation of Market Value on Accretion Acres in 2007. Special Valuation was studied by the Appraiser on Accretion Land Sales and Market Value was implemented in 2007 on all land with Accretion. For 2007 we had a total of 219 Special Valuation Applications on file. Most of these Accretion owners applied for Special Valuation and were approved by the Appraiser. Only a few of the land owners that had accretion did not apply for Special Valuation in 2007. For 2008 three more of the Accretion owners applied for Special Valuation and were approved by the Appraiser.

Other than the Accretion Acres, the parcels involved were being valued the same as our other agricultural land and may not have been affected by proposed development, whether it was recreational, hunting or gravel pits. Other than agricultural influences that need to be monitored for Special Valuation, are accretion land leased for hunting purposes, or gravel pits. Due to the implementation of valuing Accretion Acres at market value for 2007 applications were sent out to all agricultural property owners who had accretion. The additional 180 Special Valuation Applications for 2007 were approved by the Appraiser. Fifteen of the Special Valuation Applications were denied by the Appraiser in 2007. Nine of the Special Valuation Forms that were sent out to Agricultural Parcels that contained Accretion Acres had not been returned by the June 30 deadline. The parcels that were denied by the Appraiser were denied due to one the following facts: they were within the city limits and not in a Special Valuation Area, they were a

Residential Tract, they were less than 20 Acres without a dwelling on them and had no contiguous land of the same ownership. There were 8 Special Valuation Applications that were denied by the Appraiser that were protested to the Keith County Board of Equalization in 2007. Of those eight parcels protested; three of the parcels, upon further review, were recommended by the Appraiser for approval of the Special Valuation. The other five parcels the Appraiser recommended disapproval of the Special Valuation. The County Board of Equalization overturned the Appraisers decision and approved Special Valuation on all parcels protested.

For 2008 the Appraiser implemented Market Value on 33 parcels surrounding the southern boundary line of the I-80 interchange due to sales in the area. Of these 33 parcels sixteen parcels have Special Valuation Applications and all sixteen of the applications have been approved by the Appraiser. The other seventeen of the parcels surrounding the I-80 interchange have not filed timely for the year 2008.

Lake Mc Conaughy

The County Board adopted a comprehensive plan of development around the lake, using existing highways as the major corridors. Even though several parcels of land have been purchased for development on the south side of the lake over the past several years; there is still apprehension that such large projections will occur. Proposals for a marina, equine quarters, another golf course, etc have also been made. Several factors that will play a role in the development are financing, economic conditions and most of all the lake itself. Central Nebraska Public Power and the Natural Resources District are working on new ways to save our water resources. In hopes of protecting inflows at Lake Mc Conaughy from interference by groundwater pumping; this past summer Central's Board of Directors passed resolutions directed toward the Natural Resource Districts. These resolutions request the NRD's to exercise regulatory authority over hydrologically connected groundwater in their respective districts. As stated earlier the NRD's had requested extensions that were granted, however, the two year extension of the deadline is fast approaching for the Integrated Management Plan as required by LB 962. These extensions

are a concern to CNPP of possibly causing further harm to surface water appropriators.

Prior to 2008 Lake Mc Conaughy has reached its lowest level ever. The permanent boat ramps have not provided water access for several years. In some instances potable water for domestic use is difficult to locate for multiple reasons. The Groundwater Foundation has held a series of meetings to inform area residents on the importance of septic tanks due to the drilling problems in some lake locations. In 2005 Lemoyne Bay had been added to the list of lakes that are under a health alert for toxic blue-green algae due to stagnant water, warm weather and drought conditions. The lake was not built for recreation. It was built for Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District. The water level will always be a factor; most especially with the drought we have experienced. Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District has given its irrigation customers the option of taking the water the district expected it could deliver or leave the water for future irrigation years. In the past few years some customers have opted not to take the irrigation water. The water level of Lake Mc Conaughy has caused a lot of controversy, not just amongst recreational people verses agricultural people, but also among agricultural owners themselves. Some agricultural owners have considered alternate crops that need less water. A “Save Lake McConaughy” petition was started in an effort to promote the lake and make the public aware of the declining water levels in hope to save the reservoir for recreational use. However, with the snowfall in the mountains and the snowfall and rains in Keith County in the past two years, the lake level is up to over forty percent capacity, which is higher than it has been for the past four years. More water is coming in and less is being let out for Irrigation. It is still too early to state that the drought is over. Despite all the negativity of the press in Colorado and eastern Nebraska, the reality is; due the moisture we have received in the past two years we do have hope for the future and a possible end to the drought.

Equalization

Along with the equalization issues as noted earlier in the K-Areas the Assessment Manager had concerns about the 900 plus parcels that had adjustments by the County Board of Equalization differing from the valuations recommended by the Appraiser. Over the past four

years the protested valuations with values not recommended by the Appraiser had been left at the valuation set by the County Board of Equalization. These valuations did not receive any of the adjustments that the other parcels in their neighborhoods did on an annual basis as they were left at the valuations set by the County Board of Equalization. The 900 plus parcels amounted to approximately 10% of our parcels causing concern to the Assessment Manager about equalization. For 2008 the valuations on these parcels were set by the tables built by the Appraiser to provide equalization with other properties in each of their areas.

CONCLUSION

The main goal for Keith County is equalization and uniformity of valuation of all property in the county. The first step is to assure good record keeping and constant analysis of sales information. The continual development of our lake properties, aggressive market of rural residential tracts and our commercial sales in downtown Ogallala as well as I-80 keep us constantly diligent in our efforts for equalization.

Keith County is a diverse county with multiple attributes. We have Sandhill pasture land located in the northern region of our county and high quality farmland in the southern region of our county. Almost half of our cropland is irrigated, mostly by pivots. Not only do we have Lake Mc Conaughy in our county; we have two rivers spanning west to east across our entire county. Interstate 80 also passes through the entire east-west boundary lines of our county.

With our current Appraiser Staff and continued assistance of the Assessment Staff we are looking forward to accomplishing our goals. In conclusion this office has accomplished many goals that have been set in the past and we are always looking forward to continued accomplishments in the future to improve the valuation and equalization process.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessment Manager Signature: _____ Date: _____

Annual Copy distribution: Submit the plan to county board of equalization on or before July 31.

Mail a copy of the plan and any amendments to Dept. of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31.

2009 Assessment Survey for Keith County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	1- Appraiser II and 2- Appraiser Assistant II
3.	Other full-time employees
	3- Assessment Manager and 2 Clerks
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	Property Assessment Division operated county
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	TerraScan costs are included in the operating expenses of \$39,469.12
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	The total 2007-08 expenses for the Keith County Assessment office were \$168,161.05.
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	The total 2007-08 expenses for the Keith County Appraisal function were \$145,686.84.
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	This is included in the total budget expenses.
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	Same as no. 9
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None
13.	Total budget
	The total 2007-08 expenses were \$313,847.89
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	N/A

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	TerraScan

2.	CAMA software
	TerraScan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessment Manager and Clerk
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	No
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	N/A
7.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Ogallala, Paxton and Brule
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1975

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	TerraScan
2.	Other services
	None

Certification

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

Four copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

One copy to the Keith County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts