

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

58 Loup

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	36	COD	17.02
Total Sales Price	\$1,126,848	PRD	103.14
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,143,348	COV	26.77
Total Assessed Value	\$1,008,375	STD	24.35
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$31,760	Avg. Absolute Deviation	15.96
Avg. Assessed Value	\$28,010	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$30,693
Median	94	Wgt. Mean	88
Mean	91	Max	156
Min	16.80		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.55 to 100.00
95% Mean C.I	83.01 to 98.92
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.09 to 97.30

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	11.99
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.05
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.35

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	39	95	14.94	105.92
2007	47	93	17.75	113.46
2006	54	95	19.25	110.42
2005	39	98	17.72	105.96

2009 Commission Summary

58 Loup

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	3	COD	28.01
Total Sales Price	\$24,400	PRD	156.61
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$24,400	COV	47.27
Total Assessed Value	\$17,705	STD	53.72
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$8,133	Avg. Absolute Deviation	35.15
Avg. Assessed Value	\$5,902	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$31,581
Median	126	Wgt. Mean	73
Mean	114	Max	160
Min	55		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	-19.82 to 247.10
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 1.05

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 7.89

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 1.48

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	4	118	19.16	96.99
2007	3	86	13.19	116.06
2006	6	89	9.79	107.76
2005	6	95	12.86	108.3

2009 Commission Summary

58 Loup

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	7	COD	18.48
Total Sales Price	\$2,261,228	PRD	105.75
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,250,028	COV	23.15
Total Assessed Value	\$1,662,830	STD	18.09
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$321,433	Avg. Absolute Deviation	13.37
Avg. Assessed Value	\$237,547	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$64,168
Median	72	Wgt. Mean	74
Mean	78	Max	111.29
Min	60.15		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	60.15 to 111.29
95% Mean C.I	61.42 to 94.89
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	63.12 to 84.68

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	86.96
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	0.45
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	23.88

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	15	72	26.34	98.14
2007	16	72	26.2	100.9
2006	19	76	18.9	101.3
2005	19	76	21.36	96.62

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Loup 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 Loup County is 94.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Loup 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 Loup County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Loup County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	26.77	95% Median C.I.:	89.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,126,848	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	24.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.09 to 97.30	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,143,348	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.96	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 98.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,008,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,759	COD:	17.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	155.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,010	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.80			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:27

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	6	95.99	84.82	100.68	19.23	84.24	16.80	107.69	16.80 to 107.69	36,958	37,210
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	97.42	96.14	92.85	3.14	103.55	90.91	100.10	N/A	10,032	9,315
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	109.09	99.07	99.19	9.19	99.88	79.03	109.09	N/A	68,333	67,781
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	87.17	80.90	79.12	26.34	102.25	36.54	112.71	N/A	49,250	38,966
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	10	91.25	92.75	85.51	10.36	108.47	72.73	112.50	81.95 to 110.00	25,100	21,462
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	90.00	89.21	63.35	18.93	140.81	45.89	125.19	N/A	19,200	12,164
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	100.53	100.53	100.53			100.53	100.53	N/A	15,000	15,080
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	80.93	95.63	84.27	37.38	113.48	65.05	155.61	N/A	31,875	26,860
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	16	96.21	88.63	93.36	16.78	94.94	16.80	112.71	79.34 to 107.69	40,865	38,150
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	20	91.25	92.83	81.30	17.05	114.18	45.89	155.61	83.33 to 100.00	24,475	19,898
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	22	91.25	90.65	84.73	15.97	106.98	36.54	125.19	81.95 to 109.09	34,045	28,847
____ALL____											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CALAMUS LAKE SB	1	79.34	79.34	79.34			79.34	79.34	N/A	120,000	95,205
CALAMUS LAKE VACANT	21	95.42	96.25	97.27	7.76	98.95	72.73	112.50	90.30 to 100.10	28,361	27,586
RURAL	5	65.70	63.69	62.47	38.78	101.96	16.80	100.53	N/A	34,950	21,834
TAYLOR	9	97.42	95.07	88.81	26.58	107.05	36.54	155.61	65.05 to 125.19	28,111	24,964
____ALL____											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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	9	97.42	95.07	88.81	26.58	107.05	36.54	155.61	65.05 to 125.19	28,111	24,964
3	27	92.50	89.59	88.02	13.48	101.79	16.80	112.50	89.55 to 100.00	32,975	29,025
____ALL____											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	12	80.65	87.21	77.60	31.36	112.39	36.54	155.61	65.05 to 112.71	43,375	33,659
2	24	95.21	92.84	97.05	10.72	95.66	16.80	112.50	90.00 to 100.10	25,952	25,185
____ALL____											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	26.77	95% Median C.I.:	89.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,126,848	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	24.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.09 to 97.30	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,143,348	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.96	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 98.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,008,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,759	COD:	17.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	155.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,010	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.80			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:27

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010
06											
07											
ALL	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0084											
58-0025	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010
NonValid School											
ALL	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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	25	95.42	93.02	97.05	10.36	95.85	16.80	112.50	90.30 to 100.00	25,153	24,412
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	125.19	125.19	125.19			125.19	125.19	N/A	8,000	10,015
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939	6	65.38	80.25	68.10	47.56	117.85	36.54	155.61	36.54 to 155.61	36,083	24,571
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	79.03	79.03	79.03			79.03	79.03	N/A	67,500	53,345
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	1	81.95	81.95	81.95			81.95	81.95	N/A	62,500	51,220
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	102.14	102.14	102.14			102.14	102.14	N/A	40,000	40,855
2000 TO Present	1	79.34	79.34	79.34			79.34	79.34	N/A	120,000	95,205
ALL	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	26.77	95% Median C.I.:	89.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,126,848	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	24.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.09 to 97.30	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,143,348	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.96	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 98.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,008,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,759	COD:	17.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	155.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,010	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.80			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:27

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	2	58.45	58.45	69.00	71.26	84.71	16.80	100.10	N/A	1,674	1,155
5000 TO 9999	6	96.42	101.76	103.46	10.32	98.35	90.00	125.19	90.00 to 125.19	6,666	6,897
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	96.42	90.93	100.80	18.54	90.21	16.80	125.19	16.80 to 125.19	5,418	5,461
10000 TO 29999	15	96.15	96.21	96.29	15.87	99.92	36.54	155.61	89.55 to 109.09	16,466	15,855
30000 TO 59999	6	91.13	89.25	87.92	7.82	101.50	72.73	102.14	72.73 to 102.14	41,333	36,341
60000 TO 99999	5	79.03	76.05	78.29	19.75	97.14	45.89	107.69	N/A	75,000	58,719
100000 TO 149999	2	94.22	94.22	93.57	15.79	100.69	79.34	109.09	N/A	115,000	107,602
ALL											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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	58.45	58.45	69.00	71.26	84.71	16.80	100.10	N/A	1,674	1,155
5000 TO 9999	8	90.00	84.56	72.90	15.86	116.00	36.54	112.50	36.54 to 112.50	9,750	7,107
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	90.00	79.34	72.74	21.94	109.08	16.80	112.50	36.54 to 100.10	8,134	5,917
10000 TO 29999	13	96.15	96.18	84.69	11.42	113.56	45.89	125.19	90.91 to 110.00	19,576	16,580
30000 TO 59999	10	86.82	93.49	86.14	19.51	108.53	65.70	155.61	72.73 to 109.09	48,000	41,346
60000 TO 99999	1	79.34	79.34	79.34			79.34	79.34	N/A	120,000	95,205
100000 TO 149999	2	108.39	108.39	108.43	0.65	99.96	107.69	109.09	N/A	103,750	112,500
ALL											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	25	95.42	93.02	97.05	10.36	95.85	16.80	112.50	90.30 to 100.00	25,153	24,412
20	7	102.14	94.71	84.45	31.64	112.15	36.54	155.61	36.54 to 155.61	28,500	24,067
30	3	79.34	69.06	71.21	15.15	96.98	45.89	81.95	N/A	82,500	58,751
35	1	79.03	79.03	79.03			79.03	79.03	N/A	67,500	53,345
ALL											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	26.77	95% Median C.I.:	89.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,126,848	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	24.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.09 to 97.30	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,143,348	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.96	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 98.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,008,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,759	COD:	17.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	155.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,010	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.80			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:27

										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
STYLE										Sale Price	Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
(blank)	25	95.42	93.02	97.05	10.36	95.85	16.80	112.50	90.30 to 100.00	25,153	24,412
101	9	79.34	84.25	78.74	31.64	107.00	36.54	155.61	45.89 to 112.71	47,111	37,095
104	2	95.44	95.44	70.96	31.16	134.51	65.70	125.19	N/A	45,250	32,107
ALL											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010
CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	25	95.42	93.02	97.05	10.36	95.85	16.80	112.50	90.30 to 100.00	25,153	24,412
20	3	65.05	85.73	87.50	61.01	97.98	36.54	155.61	N/A	19,000	16,625
30	8	80.65	86.49	76.11	23.56	113.65	45.89	125.19	45.89 to 125.19	57,187	43,524
ALL											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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

Residential Residential values within the Village of Taylor were not changed for 2009 due to lack of sufficient numbers of sales to justify any changes. The only changes in the Village will be through pickup work of new improvements or changes found due to sales verifications.

Residential properties within the market area defined as “Calamus Lake Area (V, SB, and MH) were not changed for 2009 due to lack of sales and the changes which were implemented in 2007 that significantly raised this area’s values. Improved and unimproved, sold and unsold lots values were adjusted based on a study by Kaiser Appraisal Service. Lots which were previously unimproved but became improved for 2009 were increased in value by \$5000 to allow for water and sewer installations. This raise is consistent with the changes implemented in 2007. New improvements will be added and/or changes made per findings during the annual pickup work.

The Loup County Assessor sends questionnaires on sales needing additional information to establish the reason for the price given for said property. Some sales are self-explanatory and due to the small size and sparse population of the county; the assessor sometimes has talked to both the buyer and seller prior to and/or after the sales and knows many details surrounding the sale. The assessor feels the local people are much more willing to visit personally than to commit anything in writing. All questionnaires received by the assessor’s office are filed with the appropriate property record card for easy access and future reference.

2009 Assessment Survey for Loup County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract Appraiser, Bill Kaiser
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	December 1998 Marshall-Swift
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2000
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Contract appraiser, Bill Kaiser, utilized the Market or Sales Comparison Approach, by separating each sale of residential property into comparable groups to further analyze sales of similar recently sold properties. Said information is not contained within the property record card, but is readily available and accessible to anyone requesting such information. The sales comparison approach as it pertains to the use of plus or minus adjustments to comparable properties to arrive at a value for a subject property is not utilized.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	6- Taylor, Loup River, Rural, Calamus Lake Area MH (mobile home), Calamus Lake Area SB (stick built homes), Calamus Lake Area V (vacant lots)
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	These market areas are defined by location and by the information contained in parenthesis following the Calamus Lake Area designations.
9.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes, most definitely, the market areas defined above are probably more "assessor location" than true delineated "market areas".
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.)
	No
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.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
17	0	0	17

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	26.77	95% Median C.I.:	89.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,126,848	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	24.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.09 to 97.30	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,143,348	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.96	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 98.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,008,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,759	COD:	17.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	155.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,010	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.80			

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:21:29

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	6	95.99	84.82	100.68	19.23	84.24	16.80	107.69	16.80 to 107.69	36,958	37,210
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	97.42	96.14	92.85	3.14	103.55	90.91	100.10	N/A	10,032	9,315
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	109.09	99.07	99.19	9.19	99.88	79.03	109.09	N/A	68,333	67,781
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	87.17	80.90	79.12	26.34	102.25	36.54	112.71	N/A	49,250	38,966
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	10	91.25	92.75	85.51	10.36	108.47	72.73	112.50	81.95 to 110.00	25,100	21,462
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	90.00	89.21	63.35	18.93	140.81	45.89	125.19	N/A	19,200	12,164
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	100.53	100.53	100.53			100.53	100.53	N/A	15,000	15,080
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	80.93	95.63	84.27	37.38	113.48	65.05	155.61	N/A	31,875	26,860
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	16	96.21	88.63	93.36	16.78	94.94	16.80	112.71	79.34 to 107.69	40,865	38,150
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	20	91.25	92.83	81.30	17.05	114.18	45.89	155.61	83.33 to 100.00	24,475	19,898
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	22	91.25	90.65	84.73	15.97	106.98	36.54	125.19	81.95 to 109.09	34,045	28,847
____ALL____											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CALAMUS LAKE SB	1	79.34	79.34	79.34			79.34	79.34	N/A	120,000	95,205
CALAMUS LAKE VACANT	21	95.42	96.25	97.27	7.76	98.95	72.73	112.50	90.30 to 100.10	28,361	27,586
RURAL	5	65.70	63.69	62.47	38.78	101.96	16.80	100.53	N/A	34,950	21,834
TAYLOR	9	97.42	95.07	88.81	26.58	107.05	36.54	155.61	65.05 to 125.19	28,111	24,964
____ALL____											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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	9	97.42	95.07	88.81	26.58	107.05	36.54	155.61	65.05 to 125.19	28,111	24,964
3	27	92.50	89.59	88.02	13.48	101.79	16.80	112.50	89.55 to 100.00	32,975	29,025
____ALL____											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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	12	80.65	87.21	77.60	31.36	112.39	36.54	155.61	65.05 to 112.71	43,375	33,659
2	24	95.21	92.84	97.05	10.72	95.66	16.80	112.50	90.00 to 100.10	25,952	25,185
____ALL____											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	26.77	95% Median C.I.:	89.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,126,848	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	24.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.09 to 97.30	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,143,348	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.96	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 98.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,008,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,759	COD:	17.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	155.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,010	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.80			

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:21:29

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010
06											
07											
ALL	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0084											
58-0025	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010
NonValid School											
ALL	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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	25	95.42	93.02	97.05	10.36	95.85	16.80	112.50	90.30 to 100.00	25,153	24,412
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	125.19	125.19	125.19			125.19	125.19	N/A	8,000	10,015
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939	6	65.38	80.25	68.10	47.56	117.85	36.54	155.61	36.54 to 155.61	36,083	24,571
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	79.03	79.03	79.03			79.03	79.03	N/A	67,500	53,345
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	1	81.95	81.95	81.95			81.95	81.95	N/A	62,500	51,220
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	102.14	102.14	102.14			102.14	102.14	N/A	40,000	40,855
2000 TO Present	1	79.34	79.34	79.34			79.34	79.34	N/A	120,000	95,205
ALL	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

PAD 2009 R&O 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:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	26.77	95% Median C.I.:	89.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,126,848	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	24.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.09 to 97.30	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,143,348	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.96	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 98.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,008,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,759	COD:	17.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	155.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,010	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.80			

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:21:29

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	2	58.45	58.45	69.00	71.26	84.71	16.80	100.10	N/A	1,674	1,155
5000 TO 9999	6	96.42	101.76	103.46	10.32	98.35	90.00	125.19	90.00 to 125.19	6,666	6,897
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	96.42	90.93	100.80	18.54	90.21	16.80	125.19	16.80 to 125.19	5,418	5,461
10000 TO 29999	15	96.15	96.21	96.29	15.87	99.92	36.54	155.61	89.55 to 109.09	16,466	15,855
30000 TO 59999	6	91.13	89.25	87.92	7.82	101.50	72.73	102.14	72.73 to 102.14	41,333	36,341
60000 TO 99999	5	79.03	76.05	78.29	19.75	97.14	45.89	107.69	N/A	75,000	58,719
100000 TO 149999	2	94.22	94.22	93.57	15.79	100.69	79.34	109.09	N/A	115,000	107,602
ALL											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

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	58.45	58.45	69.00	71.26	84.71	16.80	100.10	N/A	1,674	1,155
5000 TO 9999	8	90.00	84.56	72.90	15.86	116.00	36.54	112.50	36.54 to 112.50	9,750	7,107
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	90.00	79.34	72.74	21.94	109.08	16.80	112.50	36.54 to 100.10	8,134	5,917
10000 TO 29999	13	96.15	96.18	84.69	11.42	113.56	45.89	125.19	90.91 to 110.00	19,576	16,580
30000 TO 59999	10	86.82	93.49	86.14	19.51	108.53	65.70	155.61	72.73 to 109.09	48,000	41,346
60000 TO 99999	1	79.34	79.34	79.34			79.34	79.34	N/A	120,000	95,205
100000 TO 149999	2	108.39	108.39	108.43	0.65	99.96	107.69	109.09	N/A	103,750	112,500
ALL											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	25	95.42	93.02	97.05	10.36	95.85	16.80	112.50	90.30 to 100.00	25,153	24,412
20	7	102.14	94.71	84.45	31.64	112.15	36.54	155.61	36.54 to 155.61	28,500	24,067
30	3	79.34	69.06	71.21	15.15	96.98	45.89	81.95	N/A	82,500	58,751
35	1	79.03	79.03	79.03			79.03	79.03	N/A	67,500	53,345
ALL											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

PAD 2009 R&O 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:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	26.77	95% Median C.I.:	89.55 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,126,848	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	24.35	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.09 to 97.30	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,143,348	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.96	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 98.92	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,008,375							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,759	COD:	17.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	155.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,010	PRD:	103.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.80			

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:21:29

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	25	95.42	93.02	97.05	10.36	95.85	16.80	112.50	90.30 to 100.00	25,153	24,412
101	9	79.34	84.25	78.74	31.64	107.00	36.54	155.61	45.89 to 112.71	47,111	37,095
104	2	95.44	95.44	70.96	31.16	134.51	65.70	125.19	N/A	45,250	32,107
ALL											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010
CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	25	95.42	93.02	97.05	10.36	95.85	16.80	112.50	90.30 to 100.00	25,153	24,412
20	3	65.05	85.73	87.50	61.01	97.98	36.54	155.61	N/A	19,000	16,625
30	8	80.65	86.49	76.11	23.56	113.65	45.89	125.19	45.89 to 125.19	57,187	43,524
ALL											
	36	93.75	90.96	88.19	17.02	103.14	16.80	155.61	89.55 to 100.00	31,759	28,010

2009 Correlation Section
for Loup County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The opinion of the Division is that the level of value for the residential class is within the acceptable range, and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency.

The County has used an acceptable portion of the available sales. The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O ratio suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner. The coefficient of dispersion is slightly above the acceptable range while the price related differential rounds to within the range. There is no reason to believe the sales file statistics are not meaningful in regard to the level of value for residential properties in Loup County. Based on the known assessment practices of the County, it is also determined that the County is in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal techniques in the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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	53	36	67.92
2008	46	39	84.78
2007	56	47	83.93
2006	61	54	88.52
2005	48	39	81.25

RESIDENTIAL: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized a reasonable proportion of the available sales for the development of the qualified statistics. This indicates that the measurement of the class of property was done using all available sales.

The Loup County Assessor sends questionnaires on sales needing additional information to establish the reason for the price given for said property. Some sales are self-explanatory and due to the small size and sparse population of the county; the assessor sometimes has talked to both the buyer and seller prior to and/or after the sales and knows many details surrounding the sale. The assessor feels the local people are much more willing to visit personally than to commit anything in writing. All questionnaires received by the assessor's office are filed with the appropriate property record card for easy access and future reference.

2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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 Loup 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	94	-0.90	93	94
2008	94.74	1.79	96	95
2007	92	34.57	123	93
2006	93	4.58	97	95
2005	94	4.38	99	98

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

2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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 Loup 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)
0	2009	-0.90
0.41	2008	1.79
67.53	2007	34.57
1.46	2006	4.58
-0.75	2005	4.38

RESIDENTIAL: Comparison of the percent change in the sales file with the percent change in the residential base is statistically insignificant, and demonstrates that there is no significant difference in the valuation practices applied to the sold versus the unsold residential property.

2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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 Loup County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	94	88	91

RESIDENTIAL: The median measure of central tendency is the only measure falling within the acceptable level of value while the weighted mean and mean measures are just below the range. With the hypothetical removal of two outlying sales both the weighted mean and mean measures fall into the acceptable level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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	17.02	103.14
Difference	2.02	0.14

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is slightly above the range and the price related differential rounds to within the acceptable range. However with the hypothetical removal of one outlier sale the coefficient of dispersion measure falls into the acceptable range for quality of assessment.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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	36	36	0
Median	94	94	0
Wgt. Mean	88	88	0
Mean	91	91	0
COD	17.02	17.02	0.00
PRD	103.14	103.14	0.00
Minimum	16.80	16.80	0.00
Maximum	155.61	155.61	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: The above table is reflective of the reported assessment actions of the Loup County Assessor.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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	36	30	6
Median	94	89	5
Wgt. Mean	88	86	2
Mean	91	94	-3
COD	17.02	41.99	-24.97
PRD	103.14	108.77	-5.63
Minimum	16.80	23.85	-7.05
Maximum	155.61	294.23	-138.62

In comparing the two sets of statistics in the above table you will notice the Trended Statistics have six less sales than the R&O Statistics. The six sales were removed from the analysis as they were sales that involved being split off from the original parcel. These sales did not have a prior year value, thus the reason for not figuring them into the Trended Statistics.

In comparing the median measure of central tendency between the two sets of statistics there is a difference of 4.34 percentage points if the measures are carried out to two decimal places to the right of the decimal. It appears the two sets of statistics are fairly similar with regard to the median, mean and weighted mean measures of central tendency.

There is no reason to believe the sales file is not representative of the population, or have the sold properties been treated differently than the unsold properties.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	3	MEDIAN:	126	COV:	47.27	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,400	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	53.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,400	MEAN:	114	AVG.ABS.DEV:	35.15	95% Mean C.I.:	-19.82 to 247.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,705						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	8,133	COD:	28.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.44		
AVG. Assessed Value:	5,901	PRD:	156.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.98		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:33

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												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05												
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	160.44	160.44	160.44			160.44	160.44	N/A		3,400	5,455
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07												
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A		1,000	1,255
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A		20,000	10,995
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08												
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	142.97	142.97	152.50	12.22	93.75	125.50	160.44	N/A		2,200	3,355
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A		20,000	10,995
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	160.44	160.44	160.44			160.44	160.44	N/A		3,400	5,455
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A		1,000	1,255
____ALL____	_____											
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A		8,133	5,901

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
TAYLOR	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A		8,133	5,901
____ALL____	_____											
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A		8,133	5,901

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	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A		8,133	5,901
____ALL____	_____											
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A		8,133	5,901

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	3	MEDIAN:	126	COV:	47.27	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,400	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	53.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,400	MEAN:	114	AVG.ABS.DEV:	35.15	95% Mean C.I.:	-19.82 to 247.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,705						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	8,133	COD:	28.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.44		
AVG. Assessed Value:	5,901	PRD:	156.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.98		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:33

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	107.71	107.71	70.30	48.96	153.22	54.98	160.44	N/A	11,700	8,225
2	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
____ALL____	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0084											
58-0025	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901
NonValid School											
____ALL____	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

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	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A	20,000	10,995
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949	1	160.44	160.44	160.44			160.44	160.44	N/A	3,400	5,455
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	3	MEDIAN:	126	COV:	47.27	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,400	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	53.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,400	MEAN:	114	AVG.ABS.DEV:	35.15	95% Mean C.I.:	-19.82 to 247.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,705						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	8,133	COD:	28.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.44		
AVG. Assessed Value:	5,901	PRD:	156.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.98		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:33

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	142.97	142.97	152.50	12.22	93.75	125.50	160.44	N/A	2,200	3,355
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	142.97	142.97	152.50	12.22	93.75	125.50	160.44	N/A	2,200	3,355
10000 TO 29999	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A	20,000	10,995
ALL	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

ASSESSED VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
5000 TO 9999	1	160.44	160.44	160.44			160.44	160.44	N/A	3,400	5,455
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	142.97	142.97	152.50	12.22	93.75	125.50	160.44	N/A	2,200	3,355
10000 TO 29999	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A	20,000	10,995
ALL	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

COST RANK										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
10	2	107.71	107.71	70.30	48.96	153.22	54.98	160.44	N/A	11,700	8,225
ALL	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
244	1	160.44	160.44	160.44			160.44	160.44	N/A	3,400	5,455
528	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A	20,000	10,995
ALL	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02											
03	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901
04											
ALL	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

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

Commercial Commercial values were not changed in 2009, due to the lack of sales data. This is a recurring problem in a small county. Most commercial sales in reality involve a use change, as the commercial property is sold for storage. Any changes found through pickup work and/or sales verifications were updated.

2009 Assessment Survey for Loup County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract Appraiser, Bill Kaiser
2.	Valuation done by:
	Contract Appraiser, Bill Kaiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contract Appraiser, Bill Kaiser
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	January 2000 Marshall-Swift
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2002
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?
	2002. The contract appraiser Bill Kaiser completed an income and expense analysis on properties where rents and income data could be obtained from the market. This was completed at the time of the last appraisal. All the information and data used to compile this study is in computer format, available for inspection.
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Contract appraiser Bill Kaiser utilized the Market or Sales Comparison Approach to value by separating each sale of commercial property (very limited number in this small county) into comparable groups to further analyze sales of similar recently sold properties. Said information is not contained in the property record card, but is readily available and accessible to anyone who has need for and/or would request such information. The sales comparison approach as it pertains to the use of plus or minus adjustments to comparable properties to arrive at a value for a subject property is not utilized.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	2- Taylor, Calamus Lake Area
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	These are defined strictly by location.
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	In Loup County, market area and "Assessor Location" are one and the same and therefore a useable valuation identity.
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>
	No

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	0	0	0

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	3	MEDIAN:	126	COV:	47.27	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,400	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	53.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,400	MEAN:	114	AVG.ABS.DEV:	35.15	95% Mean C.I.:	-19.82 to 247.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,705						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	8,133	COD:	28.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.44		
AVG. Assessed Value:	5,901	PRD:	156.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.98		

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:21:37

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	160.44	160.44	160.44			160.44	160.44	N/A	3,400	5,455
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A	20,000	10,995
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	142.97	142.97	152.50	12.22	93.75	125.50	160.44	N/A	2,200	3,355
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A	20,000	10,995
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	160.44	160.44	160.44			160.44	160.44	N/A	3,400	5,455
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
____ALL____	_____										
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
TAYLOR	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901
____ALL____	_____										
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

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	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901
____ALL____	_____										
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	3	MEDIAN:	126	COV:	47.27	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,400	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	53.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,400	MEAN:	114	AVG.ABS.DEV:	35.15	95% Mean C.I.:	-19.82 to 247.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,705						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	8,133	COD:	28.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.44		
AVG. Assessed Value:	5,901	PRD:	156.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.98		

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:21:37

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	107.71	107.71	70.30	48.96	153.22	54.98	160.44	N/A	11,700	8,225
2	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
____ALL____	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0084											
58-0025	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901
NonValid School											
____ALL____	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

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	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A	20,000	10,995
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949	1	160.44	160.44	160.44			160.44	160.44	N/A	3,400	5,455
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	3	MEDIAN:	126	COV:	47.27	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,400	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	53.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,400	MEAN:	114	AVG.ABS.DEV:	35.15	95% Mean C.I.:	-19.82 to 247.10
TOTAL Assessed Value:	17,705						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	8,133	COD:	28.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	160.44		
AVG. Assessed Value:	5,901	PRD:	156.61	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.98		

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:21:37

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	2	142.97	142.97	152.50	12.22	93.75	125.50	160.44	N/A	2,200	3,355
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	2	142.97	142.97	152.50	12.22	93.75	125.50	160.44	N/A	2,200	3,355
10000 TO 29999	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A	20,000	10,995
ALL _____											
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

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	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
5000 TO 9999	1	160.44	160.44	160.44			160.44	160.44	N/A	3,400	5,455
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	2	142.97	142.97	152.50	12.22	93.75	125.50	160.44	N/A	2,200	3,355
10000 TO 29999	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A	20,000	10,995
ALL _____											
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
10	2	107.71	107.71	70.30	48.96	153.22	54.98	160.44	N/A	11,700	8,225
ALL _____											
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	125.50	125.50	125.50			125.50	125.50	N/A	1,000	1,255
244	1	160.44	160.44	160.44			160.44	160.44	N/A	3,400	5,455
528	1	54.98	54.98	54.97			54.98	54.98	N/A	20,000	10,995
ALL _____											
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901
04											
ALL _____											
	3	125.50	113.64	72.56	28.01	156.61	54.98	160.44	N/A	8,133	5,901

2009 Correlation Section
for Loup County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: There was no action taken in this class of property for assessment year 2009. With only three sales in which to measure the statistics may not be reliable. With no further information available it is believed that for 2009, the level of value is in compliance but the quality of assessment is outside the range.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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	5	3	60.00
2008	4	4	100.00
2007	3	3	100.00
2006	7	6	85.71
2005	7	6	85.71

COMMERCIAL: The assessor used 60% of all commercial sales qualified for the sales study period. All sales are reviewed to determine if they are indeed arms-length transactions.

2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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 Loup 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	126	0.00	126	126
2008	117.83	-2.47	115	117.83
2007	86	0.00	86	86
2006	89	6.01	94	89
2005	95	-7.68	87	95

COMMERCIAL: The Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio are the same and support the fact that there was no action taken in the commercial class for the 2009 assessment year.

2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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 Loup 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)
0	2009	0.00
0.00	2008	-2.47
0.00	2007	0.00
0.00	2006	6.01
0.00	2005	-7.68

COMMERCIAL:As shown in the above table there is no statistical difference between the percent changes in the sales file versus the percent change in assessed value.

2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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 Loup County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	126	73	114

COMMERCIAL: All three measures are outside the range; however the commercial class is limited to three qualified sales.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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	28.01	156.61
Difference	8.01	53.61

COMMERCIAL: Both quality measures of assessment are outside the respectable range based on three qualified commercial sales.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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	3	3	0
Median	126	126	0
Wgt. Mean	73	73	0
Mean	114	114	0
COD	28.01	28.01	0.00
PRD	156.61	156.61	0.00
Minimum	54.98	54.98	0.00
Maximum	160.44	160.44	0.00

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

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	23.15	95% Median C.I.:	60.15 to 111.29
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,261,228	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.12 to 84.68
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,250,028	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.42 to 94.89
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,662,830						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	321,432	COD:	18.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	237,547	PRD:	105.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:48

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	111.29	111.29	111.29			111.29	111.29	N/A	159,400	177,390
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A	694,628	502,560
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	69.24	69.24	69.24			69.24	69.24	N/A	600,000	415,450
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	60.15	60.15	60.15			60.15	60.15	N/A	400,000	240,585
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	86.43	89.13	81.53	12.06	109.31	72.35	111.29	N/A	297,307	242,400
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	64.69	64.69	65.60	7.03	98.62	60.15	69.24	N/A	500,000	328,017
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	64.69	64.69	65.60	7.03	98.62	60.15	69.24	N/A	500,000	328,017
____ALL____											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1467	1	85.05	85.05	85.05			85.05	85.05	N/A	170,000	144,585
1585	1	69.24	69.24	69.24			69.24	69.24	N/A	600,000	415,450
1587	2	80.08	80.08	75.32	9.65	106.32	72.35	87.81	N/A	429,914	323,812
1747	2	85.72	85.72	74.72	29.83	114.72	60.15	111.29	N/A	279,700	208,987
1869	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
____ALL____											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

AREA (MARKET)	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
____ALL____											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	23.15	95% Median C.I.:	60.15 to 111.29
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,261,228	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.12 to 84.68
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,250,028	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.42 to 94.89
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,662,830						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	321,432	COD:	18.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	237,547	PRD:	105.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:49

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
2	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A	694,628	502,560
21-0084											
58-0025	6	77.15	79.12	74.60	20.22	106.06	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	259,233	193,378
NonValid School											
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
330.01 TO 650.00	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
650.01 +	4	70.79	78.26	72.06	19.16	108.60	60.15	111.29	N/A	463,507	333,996
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

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
GRASS	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

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
GRASS	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

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
GRASS	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	23.15	95% Median C.I.:	60.15 to 111.29
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,261,228	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.12 to 84.68
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,250,028	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.42 to 94.89
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,662,830						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	321,432	COD:	18.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	237,547	PRD:	105.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:49

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
60000 TO 99999	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
150000 TO 249999	3	87.81	94.72	94.43	9.96	100.31	85.05	111.29	N/A	164,866	155,680
250000 TO 499999	1	60.15	60.15	60.15			60.15	60.15	N/A	400,000	240,585
500000 +	2	70.79	70.79	70.91	2.20	99.84	69.24	72.35	N/A	647,314	459,005
ALL _____	_____										
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
30000 TO 59999	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
100000 TO 149999	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
150000 TO 249999	2	85.72	85.72	74.72	29.83	114.72	60.15	111.29	N/A	279,700	208,987
250000 TO 499999	1	69.24	69.24	69.24			69.24	69.24	N/A	600,000	415,450
500000 +	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A	694,628	502,560
ALL _____	_____										
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	21.41	95% Median C.I.:	61.18 to 87.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,618,083	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	16.26	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.07 to 73.45
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,606,883	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.96	95% Mean C.I.:	63.47 to 88.47
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,750,080						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	1,067,431	COD:	15.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	750,008	PRD:	108.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:56

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	111.29	111.29	111.29			111.29	111.29	N/A	159,400	177,390
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A	694,628	502,560
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	68.28	68.28	68.69	1.41	99.40	67.32	69.24	N/A	3,046,172	2,092,560
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	60.15	60.15	60.15			60.15	60.15	N/A	400,000	240,585
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	69.35	69.35	70.67			69.35	69.35	N/A	1,864,510	1,317,580
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	86.43	89.13	81.53	12.06	109.31	72.35	111.29	N/A	297,307	242,400
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	3	67.32	65.57	68.17	4.50	96.19	60.15	69.24	N/A	2,164,115	1,475,235
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	2	65.27	65.27	70.37	6.26	92.75	61.18	69.35	N/A	962,655	677,387
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	68.28	66.51	68.73	4.07	96.78	60.15	69.35	N/A	2,089,213	1,435,821
____ALL____											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1467	2	77.20	77.20	71.87	10.17	107.42	69.35	85.05	N/A	1,017,255	731,082
1585	1	69.24	69.24	69.24			69.24	69.24	N/A	600,000	415,450
1587	2	80.08	80.08	75.32	9.65	106.32	72.35	87.81	N/A	429,914	323,812
1747	3	67.32	79.59	69.20	25.32	115.01	60.15	111.29	N/A	2,017,248	1,395,881
1869	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
____ALL____											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008
____ALL____											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	21.41	95% Median C.I.:	61.18 to 87.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,618,083	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	16.26	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.07 to 73.45
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,606,883	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.96	95% Mean C.I.:	63.47 to 88.47
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,750,080						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	1,067,431	COD:	15.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	750,008	PRD:	108.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:56

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	68.33	68.33	69.15	1.49	98.82	67.32	69.35	N/A	3,678,427	2,543,625
2	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
____ALL____											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A	694,628	502,560
21-0084											
58-0025	8	69.29	76.42	70.10	17.25	109.02	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	1,114,031	780,940
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
330.01 TO 650.00	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
650.01 +	6	69.29	74.95	69.74	13.54	107.48	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	1,535,147	1,070,539
____ALL____											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

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
GRASS	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008
____ALL____											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

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
GRASS	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008
____ALL____											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

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
GRASS	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008
____ALL____											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	21.41	95% Median C.I.:	61.18 to 87.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,618,083	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	16.26	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.07 to 73.45
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,606,883	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.96	95% Mean C.I.:	63.47 to 88.47
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,750,080						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	1,067,431	COD:	15.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	750,008	PRD:	108.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:56

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
60000 TO 99999	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
150000 TO 249999	3	87.81	94.72	94.43	9.96	100.31	85.05	111.29	N/A	164,866	155,680
250000 TO 499999	1	60.15	60.15	60.15			60.15	60.15	N/A	400,000	240,585
500000 +	4	69.29	69.57	69.41	1.85	100.22	67.32	72.35	N/A	2,162,870	1,501,315
ALL											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
100000 TO 149999	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
150000 TO 249999	2	85.72	85.72	74.72	29.83	114.72	60.15	111.29	N/A	279,700	208,987
250000 TO 499999	1	69.24	69.24	69.24			69.24	69.24	N/A	600,000	415,450
500000 +	3	69.35	69.67	69.43	2.42	100.36	67.32	72.35	N/A	2,683,827	1,863,270
ALL											
	9	69.35	75.97	70.26	15.80	108.12	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,067,431	750,008

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

Agricultural For the assessment year 2009, the Loup County Assessor reviewed the agricultural sales she felt needed additional information by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to establish any outside influences for the price given for the property. All questionnaires are filed with the applicable property record card for easy access and future reference.

Based on sales within the current study period the assessor determined that no values of any classes of agricultural land would need to be raised to reach statutory levels for said values.

The entire county has been physically inspected and all new findings from that review have been put on the tax rolls for 2008. New ground plans have been drawn on all record cards. Future physical inspections are being planned at this time.

The assessor has in her office a map with all agricultural sales for the last five years which the assessor notes is a very good valuation tool for educating the public about the reason for property value changes. A copy of this map is also included in each valuation notice mailing.

The assessor and her office clerk have completed the new aerial maps; with the assessor drawing all the section lines and the clerk transferring ownership and land use data on to same.

The assessor has completed the updating of irrigated acres for 2009 as the deadline for the Natural Resource District certifications has passed. The assessor kept a copy of the NRD certification, the certification she sent with the irrigator for the NRD and the FSA map with the fields marked for her records and future reference. To date, the certifications are done except for one large corporation which hasn't reached an agreement with the NRD on the number of acres they wish to certify. The county gained irrigated acres when the project was finished.

2009 Assessment Survey for Loup County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract Appraiser, Bill Kaiser
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No, I am waiting for more guidance from PAT and discussion with surrounding comparable counties before defining agricultural vs. rural residential acreages. I also want input from my county board.
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	Agricultural land is defined according to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359.
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	The income approach has not been utilized.
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1987
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2006
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Comparing old aerials to new aerials
b.	By whom?
	Office clerk
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	1
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Market areas are developed by looking at sales of agricultural land in various locations within Loup County. However, with a limited number of sales, I would feel very uncomfortable trying to establish any market areas in Loup County.
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

	No, the LCG groupings seem to work in Loup County.
a.	If yes, list.
	N/A
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	72%
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No.

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
5	0	0	5

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	23.15	95% Median C.I.:	60.15 to 111.29
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,261,228	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.12 to 84.68
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,250,028	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.42 to 94.89
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,662,830						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	321,432	COD:	18.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	237,547	PRD:	105.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:21:58

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	111.29	111.29	111.29			111.29	111.29	N/A		159,400	177,390
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A		694,628	502,560
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A		167,600	144,825
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	69.24	69.24	69.24			69.24	69.24	N/A		600,000	415,450
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	60.15	60.15	60.15			60.15	60.15	N/A		400,000	240,585
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A		60,800	37,195
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08												
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	86.43	89.13	81.53	12.06	109.31	72.35	111.29	N/A		297,307	242,400
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	64.69	64.69	65.60	7.03	98.62	60.15	69.24	N/A		500,000	328,017
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A		60,800	37,195
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A		167,600	144,825
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	64.69	64.69	65.60	7.03	98.62	60.15	69.24	N/A		500,000	328,017
____ALL____												
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29		321,432	237,547

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
1467	1	85.05	85.05	85.05			85.05	85.05	N/A		170,000	144,585
1585	1	69.24	69.24	69.24			69.24	69.24	N/A		600,000	415,450
1587	2	80.08	80.08	75.32	9.65	106.32	72.35	87.81	N/A		429,914	323,812
1747	2	85.72	85.72	74.72	29.83	114.72	60.15	111.29	N/A		279,700	208,987
1869	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A		60,800	37,195
____ALL____												
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29		321,432	237,547

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29		321,432	237,547
____ALL____												
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29		321,432	237,547

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	23.15	95% Median C.I.:	60.15 to 111.29
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,261,228	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.12 to 84.68
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,250,028	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.42 to 94.89
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,662,830						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	321,432	COD:	18.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	237,547	PRD:	105.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:21:58

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
2	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A	694,628	502,560
21-0084											
58-0025	6	77.15	79.12	74.60	20.22	106.06	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	259,233	193,378
NonValid School											
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
330.01 TO 650.00	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
650.01 +	4	70.79	78.26	72.06	19.16	108.60	60.15	111.29	N/A	463,507	333,996
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

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
GRASS	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

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
GRASS	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

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
GRASS	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
ALL											
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	7	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	23.15	95% Median C.I.:	60.15 to 111.29
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,261,228	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	18.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.12 to 84.68
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,250,028	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.42 to 94.89
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,662,830						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	321,432	COD:	18.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	237,547	PRD:	105.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:21:58

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
60000 TO 99999	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
150000 TO 249999	3	87.81	94.72	94.43	9.96	100.31	85.05	111.29	N/A	164,866	155,680
250000 TO 499999	1	60.15	60.15	60.15			60.15	60.15	N/A	400,000	240,585
500000 +	2	70.79	70.79	70.91	2.20	99.84	69.24	72.35	N/A	647,314	459,005
ALL _____	_____										
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
30000 TO 59999	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
100000 TO 149999	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
150000 TO 249999	2	85.72	85.72	74.72	29.83	114.72	60.15	111.29	N/A	279,700	208,987
250000 TO 499999	1	69.24	69.24	69.24			69.24	69.24	N/A	600,000	415,450
500000 +	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A	694,628	502,560
ALL _____	_____										
	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	21.14	95% Median C.I.:	61.18 to 87.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,761,228	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	16.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.47 to 74.22
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,750,028	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.97	95% Mean C.I.:	63.92 to 88.73
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,810,020						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	1,083,336	COD:	15.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	756,668	PRD:	109.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:22:06

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	111.29	111.29	111.29			111.29	111.29	N/A	159,400	177,390
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A	694,628	502,560
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	68.28	68.28	67.50	1.41	101.15	67.32	69.24	N/A	3,100,000	2,092,560
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	60.15	60.15	60.15			60.15	60.15	N/A	400,000	240,585
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	72.50	72.50	72.50			72.50	72.50	N/A	1,900,000	1,377,520
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	86.43	89.13	81.53	12.06	109.31	72.35	111.29	N/A	297,307	242,400
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	3	67.32	65.57	67.06	4.50	97.78	60.15	69.24	N/A	2,200,000	1,475,235
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	2	66.84	66.84	72.15	8.47	92.64	61.18	72.50	N/A	980,400	707,357
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	68.28	67.30	68.27	5.22	98.58	60.15	72.50	N/A	2,125,000	1,450,806
____ALL____											
	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1467	2	78.78	78.78	73.53	7.97	107.13	72.50	85.05	N/A	1,035,000	761,052
1585	1	69.24	69.24	69.24			69.24	69.24	N/A	600,000	415,450
1587	2	80.08	80.08	75.32	9.65	106.32	72.35	87.81	N/A	429,914	323,812
1747	3	67.32	79.59	67.99	25.32	117.06	60.15	111.29	N/A	2,053,133	1,395,881
1869	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
____ALL____											
	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668
____ALL____											
	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	21.14	95% Median C.I.:	61.18 to 87.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,761,228	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	16.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.47 to 74.22
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,750,028	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.97	95% Mean C.I.:	63.92 to 88.73
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,810,020						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	1,083,336	COD:	15.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	756,668	PRD:	109.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:22:06

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	69.91	69.91	68.63	3.70	101.87	67.32	72.50	N/A	3,750,000	2,573,595
2	7	72.35	78.15	73.90	18.48	105.75	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	321,432	237,547
ALL	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	1	72.35	72.35	72.35			72.35	72.35	N/A	694,628	502,560
21-0084											
58-0025	8	70.87	76.82	69.65	17.42	110.28	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	1,131,925	788,432
NonValid School											
ALL	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
330.01 TO 650.00	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
650.01 +	6	70.79	75.47	69.31	13.99	108.90	60.15	111.29	60.15 to 111.29	1,559,004	1,080,529
ALL	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

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
GRASS	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668
ALL	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

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
GRASS	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668
ALL	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

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
GRASS	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668
ALL	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	21.14	95% Median C.I.:	61.18 to 87.81
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,761,228	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	16.14	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.47 to 74.22
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,750,028	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.97	95% Mean C.I.:	63.92 to 88.73
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,810,020						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	1,083,336	COD:	15.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	756,668	PRD:	109.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.15		

Printed: 03/05/2009 16:22:06

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
60000 TO 99999	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
150000 TO 249999	3	87.81	94.72	94.43	9.96	100.31	85.05	111.29	N/A	164,866	155,680
250000 TO 499999	1	60.15	60.15	60.15			60.15	60.15	N/A	400,000	240,585
500000 + _____	4	70.79	70.35	68.96	2.93	102.01	67.32	72.50	N/A	2,198,657	1,516,300
ALL _____	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
30000 TO 59999	1	61.18	61.18	61.18			61.18	61.18	N/A	60,800	37,195
100000 TO 149999	2	86.43	86.43	86.41	1.60	100.02	85.05	87.81	N/A	167,600	144,825
150000 TO 249999	2	85.72	85.72	74.72	29.83	114.72	60.15	111.29	N/A	279,700	208,987
250000 TO 499999	1	69.24	69.24	69.24			69.24	69.24	N/A	600,000	415,450
500000 + _____	3	72.35	70.72	68.94	2.39	102.58	67.32	72.50	N/A	2,731,542	1,883,250
ALL _____	9	72.35	76.32	69.85	15.17	109.27	60.15	111.29	61.18 to 87.81	1,083,336	756,668

Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup County**

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the statistical profile reveals the median measure of central tendency is within the acceptable range for both the agricultural unimproved and minimal non-agricultural statistics based on seven and nine sales respectively. The county has used an acceptable portion of the available sales. There were no assessment actions in the agricultural class for assessment year 2009. Based on the information available it would indicate that Loup County has met an acceptable level of value for the agricultural class of property for assessment year 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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	10	7	70.00
2008	24	15	62.50
2007	26	16	61.54
2006	32	19	59.38
2005	29	19	65.52

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table II indicates the assessor used 70% of all unimproved agricultural sales qualified for the sales study period.

The Loup County Assessor reviewed the agricultural sales she felt needed additional information by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to establish any outside influences for the price given for the property. All questionnaires are filed with the applicable property record card for easy access and future reference.

2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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 Loup 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	72	0.13	72	72
2008	69.21	4.36	72	72.35
2007	65	9.50	72	72
2006	76	0.08	76	76
2005	76	-0.01	76	76

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

2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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 Loup 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)
0	2009	0.13
4.58	2008	4.36
9.06	2007	9.50
0.00	2006	0.08
0.00	2005	-0.01

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Comparison of the percent change in the sales file with the percent change in the agricultural unimproved base is statistically insignificant, and demonstrates that there is no significant difference in the valuation practices applied to the sold versus the unsold agricultural unimproved property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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 Loup County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	72	74	78

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median and weighted mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range for level of value while the mean is slightly above the range based on seven qualified sales.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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	18.48	105.75
Difference	0.00	2.75

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range while the price related differential is slightly above the range. Even though there are only seven qualified sales, with the hypothetical removal of one outlying sale the price related differential falls into the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Loup 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	7	7	0
Median	72	72	0
Wgt. Mean	74	74	0
Mean	78	78	0
COD	18.48	18.48	0.00
PRD	105.75	105.75	0.00
Minimum	60.15	60.15	0.00
Maximum	111.29	111.29	0.00

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The above table is reflective of the reported assessment actions of the Loup County Assessor.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 2,035

Value : 114,379,715

Growth 905,545

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	37	33,850	0	0	185	2,165,460	222	2,199,310	
02. Res Improve Land	115	207,110	0	0	108	1,636,080	223	1,843,190	
03. Res Improvements	117	2,117,955	0	0	108	7,559,180	225	9,677,135	
04. Res Total	154	2,358,915	0	0	293	11,360,720	447	13,719,635	817,155
% of Res Total	34.45	17.19	0.00	0.00	65.55	82.81	21.97	11.99	90.24
05. Com UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
06. Com Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
07. Com Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
08. Com Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Com Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
09. Ind UnImp Land	3	610	0	0	0	0	3	610	
10. Ind Improve Land	25	31,775	0	0	10	52,180	35	83,955	
11. Ind Improvements	25	377,545	0	0	10	737,975	35	1,115,520	
12. Ind Total	28	409,930	0	0	10	790,155	38	1,200,085	0
% of Ind Total	73.68	34.16	0.00	0.00	26.32	65.84	1.87	1.05	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	154	2,358,915	0	0	293	11,360,720	447	13,719,635	817,155
% of Res & Rec Total	34.45	17.19	0.00	0.00	65.55	82.81	21.97	11.99	90.24
Com & Ind Total	28	409,930	0	0	10	790,155	38	1,200,085	0
% of Com & Ind Total	73.68	34.16	0.00	0.00	26.32	65.84	1.87	1.05	0.00
17. Taxable Total	182	2,768,845	0	0	303	12,150,875	485	14,919,720	817,155
% of Taxable Total	37.53	18.56	0.00	0.00	62.47	81.44	23.83	13.04	90.24

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		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		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					0	0	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	31	0	15	46

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,126	89,500,360	1,126	89,500,360
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	400	1,394,020	400	1,394,020
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	424	8,565,615	424	8,565,615
30. Ag Total							1,550	99,459,995

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	171	185.00	1,017,500	171	185.00	1,017,500	
33. HomeSite Improvements	186	0.00	6,533,285	186	0.00	6,533,285	80,800
34. HomeSite Total				186	185.00	7,550,785	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	229	753.04	376,520	229	753.04	376,520	
37. FarmSite Improvements	238	0.00	2,032,330	238	0.00	2,032,330	7,590
38. FarmSite Total				238	753.04	2,408,850	
39. Road & Ditches	0	1,100.09	0	0	1,100.09	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				424	2,038.13	9,959,635	88,390

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	9	1,320.00	343,485	9	1,320.00	343,485

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	5,001.58	33.09%	5,626,810	44.22%	1,125.01
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	3,036.62	20.09%	2,717,825	21.36%	895.02
49. 3A1	503.17	3.33%	422,680	3.32%	840.03
50. 3A	2,426.25	16.05%	1,771,195	13.92%	730.01
51. 4A1	2,906.57	19.23%	1,802,160	14.16%	620.03
52. 4A	1,242.91	8.22%	385,300	3.03%	310.00
53. Total	15,117.10	100.00%	12,725,970	100.00%	841.83
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	481.62	5.38%	293,790	9.82%	610.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	3,664.97	40.96%	1,502,690	50.23%	410.01
58. 3D1	609.59	6.81%	240,790	8.05%	395.00
59. 3D	571.24	6.38%	194,225	6.49%	340.01
60. 4D1	2,708.61	30.27%	568,805	19.01%	210.00
61. 4D	910.75	10.18%	191,255	6.39%	210.00
62. Total	8,946.78	100.00%	2,991,555	100.00%	334.37
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	407.12	0.13%	193,380	0.26%	475.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	735.00	0.23%	271,955	0.37%	370.01
67. 3G1	2,207.07	0.69%	573,840	0.78%	260.00
68. 3G	9,430.64	2.94%	2,452,025	3.33%	260.01
69. 4G1	61,875.85	19.31%	14,850,495	20.17%	240.00
70. 4G	245,739.31	76.70%	55,291,785	75.09%	225.00
71. Total	320,394.99	100.00%	73,633,480	100.00%	229.82
Irrigated Total	15,117.10	4.33%	12,725,970	14.22%	841.83
Dry Total	8,946.78	2.56%	2,991,555	3.34%	334.37
Grass Total	320,394.99	91.69%	73,633,480	82.27%	229.82
Waste	3,484.47	1.00%	104,535	0.12%	30.00
Other	1,494.10	0.43%	44,820	0.05%	30.00
Exempt	11,422.23	3.27%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	349,437.44	100.00%	89,500,360	100.00%	256.13

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	15,117.10	12,725,970	15,117.10	12,725,970
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	8,946.78	2,991,555	8,946.78	2,991,555
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	320,394.99	73,633,480	320,394.99	73,633,480
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,484.47	104,535	3,484.47	104,535
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,494.10	44,820	1,494.10	44,820
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	11,422.23	0	11,422.23	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	349,437.44	89,500,360	349,437.44	89,500,360

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	15,117.10	4.33%	12,725,970	14.22%	841.83
Dry Land	8,946.78	2.56%	2,991,555	3.34%	334.37
Grass	320,394.99	91.69%	73,633,480	82.27%	229.82
Waste	3,484.47	1.00%	104,535	0.12%	30.00
Other	1,494.10	0.43%	44,820	0.05%	30.00
Exempt	11,422.23	3.27%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	349,437.44	100.00%	89,500,360	100.00%	256.13

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

58 Loup

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	13,020,020	13,719,635	699,615	5.37%	817,155	-0.90%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	7,287,310	7,550,785	263,475	3.62%	80,800	2.51%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	20,307,330	21,270,420	963,090	4.74%	897,955	0.32%
05. Commercial	1,200,085	0	-1,200,085	-100.00%	0	-100.00%
06. Industrial	0	1,200,085	1,200,085		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	2,385,925	2,408,850	22,925	0.96%	7,590	0.64%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	3,586,010	3,608,935	22,925	0.64%	7,590	0.43%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	23,893,340	24,879,355	986,015	4.13%	905,545	0.34%
11. Irrigated	12,515,000	12,725,970	210,970	1.69%		
12. Dryland	3,068,675	2,991,555	-77,120	-2.51%		
13. Grassland	73,648,600	73,633,480	-15,120	-0.02%		
14. Wasteland	104,715	104,535	-180	-0.17%		
15. Other Agland	44,860	44,820	-40	-0.09%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	89,381,850	89,500,360	118,510	0.13%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	113,275,190	114,379,715	1,104,525	0.98%	905,545	0.18%

2008 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT
for
LOUP COUNTY
Assessment Years 2009, 2010, and 2011
Date: June 15, 2008

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 of each year, the assessor 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 county assessor 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, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation 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) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land for 2008; and
- 3) 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.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION of REAL PROPERTY in LOUP COUNTY

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential 11.49%	445	21.88%	
Commercial 1.05%	36	1.77%	
Industrial	0	0	0
Recreational	0	0	0
Agricultural 87.46%	1558	76.35%	
Special Value	0	0	0
TOTAL	2039	100%	100%

	Acres	% of Agland Total
Agricultural taxable acres:	349,453.45	100%
Grass	320,452.90	91.70%
Irrigated	14,797.85	4.23%
Dryland	9,216.78	2.64%
Waste	3,490.47	1.00%
Shelterbelts	1,495.45	.43%

Loup County is mainly an agricultural county. However, the construction of the Calamus Dam and subsequent Calamus Lake resulted in the loss of close to 8,000 acres of farm and ranch land. This has been replaced with fourteen rural residential developments and numerous small rural residential sites, with the possibility of the subdividing and creation of several more developments. These subdivisions have more than replaced the agricultural valuation lost to the lake. The northern half of the county consists of mainly large cattle operations containing many acres of grassland with some acres of cropland. The southern half of the county is a mix of smaller owned operations combining livestock and farming, with a mix of grassland, dry and irrigated cropland. The Village of Taylor, the only incorporated village in the county, lies in the southeast portion of the county and serves as the county seat.

New Property

The County had an estimated twenty-one (21) zoning permits for new construction/additions for 2008.

CURRENT RESOURCES

STAFFING, BUDGET AND TRAINING

Staffing

The office is staffed by one full-time clerk and the County Clerk, who also serves as Register of Deeds, Clerk of the District Court, Assessor and Election Commissioner. The office lost the part-time clerk when she retired on February 29, 2008 and there are no plans to replace her position at this time. Loup County does not have a Deputy Assessor, the County Clerk, ex-officio Assessor, hereafter referred to as assessor, is the only employee in the office holding the necessary certificate. The assessor does all the Assessor duties with regards to real estate records, maintenance and valuations, personal property filings, administrative reports and processing of Homestead Exemption Applications.

Training

The assessor is required to obtain sixty hours of continuing education within a four year period. Her current certificate expired on December 31, 2006. The assessor has completed thirty-two (32) hours of continuing education as of January 29, 2008. She received an additional two hours for taking the on-line Assessor Assistant training early in 2008. Her plans are to take the following offered classes for 2008: IAAO Workshop 650 Cadastral Mapping (15 hours) and Residential Data Collection (14 hours). This will be a total of sixty-three (63) hours of continuing education.

Budget

As she serves as ex-officio Assessor, most of the budget is contained within the County Clerk budget. Beginning in the year 2007, the County Clerk started receiving compensation for the ex-

ex-officio Assessor position in the amount of \$3000.00 additional salary per year with an annual cost of living increase on same. The County Clerk's 2007-2008 budget is \$56,000.00 and her clerk salary plus the ex-officio salary is covered in this budget. Her one full-time clerk's salary comes from the County Clerk budget. However, she does maintain a small Assessor office budget in the amount of \$6,000.00. This budget covers education and travel expense, supplies and postage required by the Assessor's office. No salaries are taken from the Assessor budget. The appraisal budget for 2007-2008 is \$6,500.00. This budget is used to pay for the annual pickup work and for the ongoing review of all improved properties per the scheduled list found in this plan.

CADASTRAL AND AERIAL MAPS

The cadastral maps are kept current by the assessor with new ownership lines, acres, and property owner's names being done as changes occur. If only an ownership change has occurred the office clerk makes that change. However, the maps are from 1969 and new maps are desperately needed due to the many changes over the years to keep them up to date. The assessor has contacted various companies to obtain a price and at this time new cadastrals are simply not within the budget means of Loup County. One quote was for \$150,000.00 for a new cadastral book. If the assessor were to obtain just the maps and blank lined sheets, and do the mapping and ownership lines herself, the cost would be around \$15,000.00. However, with the other office duties of an ex-officio, it would be difficult to complete the work in a timely manner. As new subdivisions have been added, the assessor has added sheets to the cadastral map book. She has plans to create a separate cadastral book for the lake subdivisions so they can be maintained in a more accessible and neat manner.

Land use, as well as ownership lines, are kept on the aerial maps. The assessor does all the record maintenance of the aerial maps including but not limited to mapping, ownership changes, land splits, land use changes, etc.. The assessor has obtained 1998 aerial maps at a cost of \$2720.00. She has drawn in the section lines and her clerk has completed the process of transferring ownership and land use lines. The new aerial maps are now in use. The assessor draws in ownership lines when irregular tracts have sold. She first enters the description into

Deed Plotter+ for Windows, and then prints the resulting map to any scale desired and transfers the resulting information onto the cadastral and aerial maps.

Property Record Cards

The assessor maintains the record cards with ownership and splits kept up to date. We have converted to new folder type color coded record cards, using green folders for agricultural, white for village and commercial, blue for exempt and yellow for rural subdivisions. Said cards contain current pictures of the house and any other major improvements, ownership and mailing addresses, physical addresses, classification, school and tax district codes, as well as land classifications and values for improvements and land. The county's communication center has established E911 addresses for all residences in Loup County. The communication director finally allowed the assessor access to those addresses after numerous requests. All property record cards now contain physical addresses. New residences are assigned an E911 address by the communication director and a monthly update is emailed to the assessor. Prior to receiving those addresses from the communications director, the assessor was able to obtain some E911 addresses through the Secretary of State's office (voter registration records) and those rural location addresses were added to the property record cards. Also, in an attempt to get physical addresses for lake subdivision properties, (most of which did not have a mailing address which eliminated the use of the post office for obtaining this information) she contacted each owner with a letter containing a self-addressed and stamped postcard. She asked the owner to fill in the E911 address assigned to that dwelling and return the postcard to her office.

All properties with more than one improvement contain a ground sketch for the locations of each improvement. Scale drawings of all houses can be found on the cards. Pricing information is

contained within the folder for ease in identifying how the value was established. Value information for at least the previous five years can be found on the front of each property record card.

SOFTWARE

At this time, the assessor is using MIPS/County Solutions for the pricing of agricultural land record keeping only. All notices, tax receipts, etc. are still done by hand. No web based access exists for records in Loup County.

CURRENT ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES for REAL PROPERTY

Discovery, Listing and Inventory of All Property

As the County Clerk is also the ex-officio Assessor, the Real Estate Transfer Statement starts and stops in her office. She uses the information obtained from the Form 521 to ascertain the selling price of the property, whether any personal property was included in the sale, and characteristics of the sale based on the information at hand. From this information, it is determined if further investigation of the sale need occur. If deemed so, the assessor will talk with the buyer and/or seller, the real estate agent, or if this is not possible, will resort to the sending of questionnaires. The zoning administrator is also the full-time clerk in the assessor's office and willingly shares all zoning permit applications with the assessor, which is of great benefit in tracking new construction.

Data Collection

Data collection is done by a local person who has done extensive work with a Nebraska appraisal company in the listing of properties for reappraisal. She lists the necessary data to price all new improvements, measures the improvement and places the improvement location on the current ground sketch. All market and income data is collected and processed by Kaiser Appraisal Service of Omaha, Nebraska. The assessor then prices all new improvements with computer programs using Marshall Swift data. She also enters all information concerning

the new improvement on the appropriate record card including but not limited to sketches, reasons for change, etc..

Loup County has implemented a complete appraisal of all properties. The appraisal was done by Kaiser Appraisal Service. The resulting value changes for the lake properties and Village of Taylor were placed on the tax rolls for 2000 and rural properties were put on in 2001. Commercial properties were put on in 2002. This reappraisal included a physical inspection of all properties and included re-measuring when there was an obvious discrepancy with the previous information in hand. An exterior inspection was done unless the taxpayer was willing to allow the appraiser inside. New pictures were taken of all improvements and attached to the real estate property cards. Square footage was figured based on the drawings and appraiser's notes and figures.

In order to keep the new appraisal up to date, the county will be divided into fifths with a complete inspection of all improved properties done on a rotating basis with current information in hand. Following is the breakdown of the timeline for the yearly review.

Lake Subdivisions: 2008

Village of Taylor: 2009

Townships/Ranges 24-17 thru 24-20, Townships/Ranges 23-17 thru 23-20, North side of Calamus Lake included in the above Townships/Ranges: 2010

Townships/Ranges 22-17 thru 22-18, Townships/Ranges 21-17 thru 21-18, South side of Calamus Lake included in the above Townships/Ranges: 2011

Townships/Ranges 22-19 thru 22-20, 21-19 thru 21-20: 2012

The Assessor also has a map in her office showing the scheduled areas. The year 2006 completed a four year cycle of a complete physical review of the entire county. A quarterly review of the county will begin again in the summer of 2008 (refer to above schedule). This review has cost the Loup County taxpayers approximately \$5000.00 per year.

Review assessment of sales ratio studies before assessment actions

I do my own Assessment/Ratio studies beginning in July by removing the sales which will be out of the current study period and adding in the newest available year's sales for each study group, residential, commercial and agricultural. I have spread sheets on my computer listing the sales and the necessary information so I can then process the data for P.R.D., C.O.D., median, etc.. for each class of property. I share this information, which lists sales, buyer/seller, selling price, and value for assessment, as well as statistics, with my County Board prior to deciding on any action necessary to bring the statistics into compliance for the next assessment year. I also review all preliminary data provided by my field liaison and discuss necessary actions with him. I also discuss what, if any, changes need to be made to residential and commercial with Bill Kaiser of Kaiser Appraisal Service.

Approaches to Value

All three approaches to value are done by Kaiser Appraisal Service.

- 1) He does a market approach using sales comparisons. If not enough sales are available for Loup County, he has borrowed from other counties.
- 2) The cost approach is from the 1998 Marshall Swift manual, in computer format, and the latest depreciation study was completed by Kaiser Appraisal Service in 2000 and is being used to date, as a yearly analysis, so far, does not indicate a change.
- 3) Kaiser Appraisal Service also completed an income and expense analysis at the time of the reappraisal. He has all information and data used to compile this study in a computer format, available for inspection.
- 4) The ex-officio assessor conducts all land valuation studies by reviewing the current data available and borrowing sales from neighboring counties when too few have occurred in Loup County. At this time no market areas have been established and Loup County has no special value on any agricultural land. Both market areas and special value may be established in the future if a need is shown.

Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation

Reconciliation of final value is done by the assessor using acceptable assessment practices. Documentation of pricing is contained in the Real Property card folders, while depreciation factors can be found in the reappraisal file available for public inspection.

Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions

Once the assessment process has been completed the assessor puts the new information into her sales file data and redoes the ratio statistics.

Notices and Public Relations

Once the above assessment processes are complete, the assessor mails evaluation notices to all taxpayers whose value has changed. Such notices contain all information as prescribed by state statute, including but not limited to, level of assessment, prior and current year's values, ownership and legal description, date for filing protests, and dates during which the Board of Equalization will be in session. She also includes a review of assessment actions to each class of property for the current year. If agricultural land values are changed, she includes a numbered map indicating where sales have occurred. These numbers correspond to a sheet detailing each sale as to address of buyer/seller, date of sale, number of acres, percentage of acres to each land class (irrigated, dry and grass), and the sale price per acre.

Once the notices have been mailed, she publishes a Notice in the legal newspaper notifying the public that the annual revision of the assessment rolls is complete and on file. Said notice also

contains the dates during which protests may be filed and the meeting dates of the Board of Equalization.

LEVEL OF VALUE, QUALITY, AND UNIFORMITY FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2008

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>C.O.D.</u>	<u>P.R.D.</u>
Residential	95.00	14.94	105.92
Commercial	117.83	19.16	96.99
Agricultural	72.35	26.34	98.14

RESIDENTIAL: The median and the Coefficient of Dispersion (C.O.D.) are within the acceptable range, however, Price Related Differential (P.R.D.) is above the range. If two high dollar sales are removed, the P.R.D. also falls into line.

COMMERCIAL: Loup County has only four sales within the sales for this class. It is very hard to establish or justify changes to value based on the small number of sales. Also, commercial sales in this county involve use changes as businesses close and the property is subsequently purchased for storage.

AGRICULTURAL: The median and the P.R.D. are within the accepted range while the C.O.D., at +6.34, is above the accepted range. Said difference for P.R.D. is not enough to weigh considerably upon the quality of assessment and does tend to indicate that agricultural properties are being assessed in a manner both uniform and proportional. As always, the small number of sales, with some outliers, can tend to skew the statistics unfavorably.

ASSESSMENT ACTIONS PLANNED FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2009

RESIDENTIAL: Annual pickup work will be done and statistics reviewed for any needed changed to depreciations and values. E911 addresses will be added to new property cards as they become available to the assessor.

RESIDENTIAL/Lake Properties and Subdivisions: Annual pickup work will be done and statistics reviewed for any needed changes in depreciation factors and valuations. The sales data from this area will be watched closely and data analyzed by Kaiser Appraisal as more improved sales occur in the area. Kaiser Appraisal Service will work with the assessor to establish more accurate values of improved and unimproved properties within the lake subdivisions as more sales occur to make this study possible.

COMMERCIAL: Annual pickup work completed and priced by Kaiser Appraisal Service as needed. If more sales begin to occur in this class, a new study may need to be done by said appraisal company to determine if current depreciations are acceptable.

AGRICULTURAL: Land use changes made as discovered. On agricultural home sites and farm sites, pickup work will be done and new value added. As many pivots have been placed on previously gravity irrigated land, through use of the local Farm Service Agency (F.S.A.) information and drawings, changes have been made to correct the type of irrigation and the resulting changes in irrigated acres. Sales ratio and statistical studies are done annually to discover necessary changes in land values.

The assessor has added any new irrigated acres that were found through the N.R.D. required review with irrigators. She has copied the FSA maps provided by the irrigators for her records as she has been unable to obtain these herself from the local F.S.A. office.

The assessor also plans to implement the new soil survey by making the following changes. All alpha soil symbols will be converted to numerical symbols on all record cards. Some new land classes (additional slopes) were added from adjacent counties for joining purposes and these will be counted and applied to the appropriate record cards. Three soils changed capability groups and a new soil was added and measures will be taken to apply these changes. All of the above will be done by using the online Web Soil Survey. Ethel Skinner, Technical Supervisor with the

Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, has offered to help identify the location of the new soil classes which have been added from adjacent counties.

ASSESSMENT ACTIONS PLANNED FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2010

RESIDENTIAL: Annual pickup work will be done and new value added where necessary. Statistical studies will be done to determine any changes that may need to be made to depreciation and valuation.

RESIDENTIAL/Lake Properties and Subdivisions: Any new subdivisions will be added with a study done by Kaiser Appraisal Service to determine value of the lots. Annual pickup work will be done and statistics reviewed for any needed changes in depreciation factors and valuations. The sales data from this area will be watched closely and data analyzed by Kaiser Appraisal as more improved sales occur in the area.

COMMERCIAL: Annual pickup work completed and priced by Kaiser Appraisal Service as needed. If more sales begin to occur in this class, a new study may need to be done by said appraisal company to determine if current depreciations and values are acceptable.

AGRICULTURAL: Land use changes made as discovered. On agricultural home sites and farm sites, pickup work will be done and new value added. Sales ratio and statistical studies are done annually to discover necessary changes in land values.

ASSESSMENT ACTIONS PLANNED FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2011

RESIDENTIAL: Annual pickup work will be done and new value added where necessary. Statistical studies will be done to determine any changes that may need to be made to depreciation and valuation.

RESIDENTIAL/Lake Properties and Subdivisions: Any new subdivisions will be added with a study done by Kaiser Appraisal Service to determine value of the lots. Annual pickup work will be done and statistics reviewed for any needed changes in depreciation factors and valuations. The sales data from this area will be watched closely and data analyzed by Kaiser Appraisal as more improved sales occur in the area.

COMMERCIAL: Annual pickup work completed and priced by Kaiser Appraisal Service as needed. If more sales begin to occur in this class, a new study may need to be done by said appraisal company to determine if current depreciations and values are acceptable.

AGRICULTURAL: Land use changes made as discovered. On agricultural home sites and farm sites, pickup work will be done and new value added. Sales ratio and statistical studies are done annually to discover necessary changes in land values.

OTHER FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY THE ASSESSOR'S OFFICE

RECORD MAINTENANCE, MAPPING UPDATES, OWNERSHIP CHANGES: The assessor does the records maintenance with regards to ownership changes, mapping updates required and record maintenance as needed. All changes are updated regularly and generally within two weeks of the change.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS: The assessor completes all reports including but not limited to the following and files same on a timely basis with the appropriate officials: the *Abstract (Real & Personal)*, *Assessor Survey*, and *Assessed Value Update* on or before March 19th, the *Certification of Values* on or before August 20th, the *School District Taxable Value Report* on or before August 25th, the *Average Assessed Value of Single-Family Residential Property* on or before September 1st, the *Annual Plan of Assessment* with the Board of Equalization on or before July 31st and PA & T on or before October 31st, the *Annual Tax Roll* on or before November 22nd, the *Homestead Exemption Summary Certificate Form 458S* on or before November 30th, the *Certificate of Taxes Levied* on or before December 1st, the *Legal Description and Owner of all property owned by the State or governmental subdivisions of the State* on or before December 1, 2004 and every fourth December thereafter, and the *Report of current values of properties owned by the Board of Educational Lands and Funds*.

PERSONAL PROPERTY: The assessor administers the timely filing of approximately one hundred fifty (150) personal property schedules each year. As a courtesy reminder, in the middle of February, she mails postcards to everyone who filed the previous year and those who will be new filers for the current year. Another reminder is sent the middle of April to those who haven't yet filed. Those who fail to file on or before May 1st are penalized according to state statute. She provides her Board of Equalization with a listing of personal property filers with the amount of personal property value attributed to each and separated into tax districts.

PERMISSIVE EXEMPTIONS: The assessor completes the basic information on the appropriate permissive exemption forms and mails those forms to the filers in November. Once the filings are returned she makes determinations as to their new and/or continued exempt use and advises the Board of Equalization of her recommendations. In 451 application years, notices

are sent to all filers ten days prior to the exemption hearing. Notices are also sent in the case of a continuation of exemption being denied.

TAXABLE GOVERNMENT OWNED PROPERTY: An annual review is made of government owned property not used for public purposes. At this time, Loup County has no such government property but reviews government owned property each year to find any that may qualify and be taxed.

HOMESTEAD EXEMPTIONS: The Nebraska Department of Revenue (DOR) sends pre-printed Homestead Exemption (HSE) Application Forms to the assessor. The assessor then prepares mailings to all those still qualifying, consisting of a brief letter from the office explaining the contents of the mailing and instructions, DOR instructions, pre-printed HSE Forms 458, Nebraska Schedule I (Income Statement) and instructions. The assessor also fills out the necessary information on HSE Form 458 for those persons requesting applications for the current year who were not eligible for exemption in prior years and sends them all necessary information. Approximately forty to forty-five applications are processed each year. The assessor assists all applicants who need help with completing the forms.

TAX DISTRICTS, TAX RATES, TAX LISTS, TAX LIST CORRECTIONS: The assessor checks that all tax districts and valuations are correct and balanced. As she also serves as the County Clerk she sets the tax rates and verifies that they are correct. The assessor prepares and certifies the annual tax roll to the treasurer for all real, centrally assessed, personal property and in-lieu of taxes. She also prepares all necessary tax list corrections and presents them to the County Board for action and to the Treasurer for collection or refund as the case may be.

COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, TERC APPEALS: The county assessor provides copies to the Board of Equalization members of all protests with her recommendation noted thereon and copies of all information she has concerning valuation of the protested property prior to the protest hearings. She defends values before the TERC board with written testimony.

EDUCATION: Please see *Training*, page 4 of this document.

CONCLUSION

The budget requests aforementioned (see ***Budget***, page 4 in this document) are sufficient to maintain the current assessment practices and cover the annual pickup work and annual physical inspection of one fifth of the county each year.

Respectfully submitted:

Debbie Postany, Loup County Assessor

2009 Assessment Survey for Loup County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	None. My full-time clerk is not certified and has no desire to become certified.
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	None
3.	Other full-time employees
	One
4.	Other part-time employees
	None
5.	Number of shared employees
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$6,000.00
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$1,250.00
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$0
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$1,050.00
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$5,000.00 (This budget has been repeatedly cut over the years. It has been sacrificed to keep allow other funds to make necessary increases. I am operating at the bare minimum and am going to ask that it be increased for 2009-10 as I can barely cover the quarterly review and the pickup work.)
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	\$0
13.	Total budget
	\$11,000.00
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$6,971.86 (\$2,571.78 of the Assessor's budget and \$4,400.00 of the Appraisal budget. However, I was current with the physical review and did not have any portion of the county reviewed in 2007. I have started the review for 2008 and have spent \$4,320.00 of my 2008-09 budget already.)

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	MIPS/County Solutions is used for the pricing of agricultural land record keeping only. All notices, tax receipts and administrative reports are done by hand.
2.	CAMA software
	None, the assessor prices all improvements with computer programs using Marshall Swift date.
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes.
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	No
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	N/A
7.	Personal Property software:
	None, this is done by hand.

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?
	Village of Taylor, the only municipality in Loup County.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	October 10, 2001.

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Contracted, Kaiser Appraisal Services of Omaha, NE
2.	Other services

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 Loup 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

