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

66 Otoe

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	467	COD	20.09
Total Sales Price	\$50,243,160	PRD	106.56
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$50,243,160	COV	50.73
Total Assessed Value	\$45,159,100	STD	48.58
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$107,587	Avg. Absolute Deviation	18.83
Avg. Assessed Value	\$96,700	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$83,018
Median	94	Wgt. Mean	90
Mean	96	Max	916
Min	28.89		

Confidenence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.69 to 95.39
95% Mean C.I	91.37 to 100.18
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.18 to 91.58
% of Value of the Class of all Re	al Property Value in t
% of Records Sold in the Study	Period

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	501	94	18.68	104.81
2007	519	95	20.6	104.41
2006	592	97	21.37	105.89
2005	637	94	19.56	104.57

2009 Commission Summary

66 Otoe

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	76	COD	40.19
Total Sales Price	\$11,218,747	PRD	116.78
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$11,868,747	COV	76.67
Total Assessed Value	\$11,106,890	STD	83.79
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$156,168	Avg. Absolute Deviation	39.76
Avg. Assessed Value	\$146,143	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$167,851
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	94
Mean	109	Max	560
Min	18		

Confidenence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	86.45 to 103.25
95% Mean C.I	90.45 to 128.12
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	70.02 to 117.14

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

% of Records Sold in the Study Period

9.19

% of Value Sold in the Study Period

8.00

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	87	98	33.35	104.2
2007	81	95	32.75	129.34
2006	71	96	19.25	120.38
2005	66	94	43.68	133.07

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Otoe 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 Otoe County is 94.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Otoe 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 Otoe County is 99.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Otoe County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Otoe County is 70.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Otoe County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.

PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR

Ruth A. Sorensen Property Tax Administrato

Kuth a. Sorensen

Base Stat PAGE:1 of 5 **PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics** 66 - OTOE COUNTY RESIDENTIAL

TAD 2007 I Tellimiary Statistics	Contract Design
Type: Qualified	State Stat Run
Type. Quantieu	

		Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008								(1 AT/T (0)	
NUMBER	of Sales	:	478	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	35.68	95%	Median C.I.: 89.55	i to 93.25	(!: AVTot=0) (!: Derived)
TOTAL Sal	les Price	: 50,	,784,660	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	32.78		. Mean C.I.: 83.90		(Deriveu)
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 50,	,784,660	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.92			93 to 94.81	
TOTAL Assess	sed Value	: 43,	,902,920			11/011251221	10.72			3 00 71.01	
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	106,244	COD:	20.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	335.60				
AVG. Assess	sed Value	:	91,847	PRD:	106.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.68			Printed: 01/22/2	009 22:53:23
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	82	92.96	91.88	87.54	17.2	5 104.95	28.89	305.45	86.67 to 94.93	107,941	94,497
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	52	95.68	94.74	88.98	15.0	6 106.48	49.17	146.25	86.08 to 99.11	102,462	91,168
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	48	96.78	93.62	90.33	17.0	7 103.64	42.39	149.11	87.07 to 100.21	94,457	85,323
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	63	90.98	96.58	88.95	23.8	0 108.57	30.38	335.60	88.13 to 95.58	110,841	98,591
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	66	93.68	91.23	88.56	16.3	9 103.02	33.30	153.87	88.99 to 97.56	102,594	90,855
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	60	87.38	87.91	84.46	23.2	5 104.08	21.07	331.33	77.08 to 93.25	112,810	95,280
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	40	89.75	88.39	83.91	26.5	6 105.34	10.68	236.47	81.92 to 97.05	92,448	77,572
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	67	86.25	90.20	80.13	26.4	4 112.57	16.43	207.55	78.66 to 97.33	117,173	93,886
Study Years											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	245	92.97	94.04	88.71	18.6	5 106.00	28.89	335.60	90.25 to 95.05	104,882	93,046
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	233	89.50	89.59	84.13	22.8	0 106.49	10.68	331.33	86.25 to 92.79	107,675	90,586
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	237	91.50	92.29	87.88	20.5	2 105.02	21.07	335.60	89.14 to 94.41	105,724	92,911
ALL											
	478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.6	106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
BURR	2	201.84	201.84	99.27	51.3	4 203.31	98.22	305.45	N/A	27,137	26,940
DOUGLAS	6	97.53	133.68	99.02	44.3	5 135.00	82.50	331.33	82.50 to 331.33	44,591	44,153
DUNBAR	2	132.83	132.83	116.58	24.4	7 113.94	100.33	165.33	N/A	6,000	6,995
LORTON	1	96.36	96.36	96.36			96.36	96.36	N/A	3,300	3,180
NEBRASKA CITY	262	91.08	93.44	89.37	20.0	1 104.56	22.73	335.60	87.98 to 93.95	100,248	89,588
OTOE	4	58.30	65.26	59.61	42.9	5 109.48	36.83	107.60	N/A	16,600	9,895
PALMYRA	13	92.97	95.22	91.62	14.2	9 103.93	65.73	131.97	76.96 to 109.57	101,407	92,908
PAUL	1	89.14	89.14	89.14			89.14	89.14	N/A	14,000	12,480
RURAL RES	94	89.19	82.05	77.87	22.3	3 105.37	10.68	150.30	79.91 to 94.38	139,693	108,774
SYRACUSE	66	91.90	90.43	90.03	14.1	8 100.45	35.30	140.63	88.76 to 97.91	105,088	94,612
TALMAGE	13	96.32	93.33	71.42	23.6	130.69	35.65	179.83	65.93 to 99.06	41,373	29,546
TIMBER LAKE	2	146.31	146.31	96.39	41.8	6 151.78	85.06	207.55	N/A	143,200	138,030
UNADILLA	6	84.13	81.61	78.62	27.3	9 103.81	33.30	120.62	33.30 to 120.62	83,583	65,715
WOODLAND HILLS 1	4	92.53	101.65	93.32	12.6	108.93	89.31	132.25	N/A	235,750	220,005
WOODLAND HILLS 2	2	96.72	96.72	96.28	4.8	8 100.46	92.00	101.45	N/A	224,000	215,670
ALL											
	478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.6	106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847

Base Stat

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Type: Qualified 66 - OTOE COUNTY RESIDENTIAL

State Stat Run

PAGE:2 of 5

RESIDENTIAL				,	Гуре: Qualifie	d		State Stat Kun				
					Date Rang	ge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009		(!: AVTot=0)	
NUMB	BER of Sales	3:	478	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	35.68	95%	Median C.I.: 89.5	5 to 93.25	(!: Derived)	
TOTAL	TOTAL Sales Price:		,784,660	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	32.78	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 83.9	0 to 89.00	(
TOTAL Adj.	Sales Price	e: 50	,784,660	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.92	95	% Mean C.I.: 88.	93 to 94.81		
TOTAL Ass	sessed Value	e: 43	,902,920									
AVG. Adj.	Sales Price	e:	106,244	COD:	20.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	335.60					
AVG. Ass	sessed Value	e:	91,847	PRD:	106.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.68			Printed: 01/22/2	2009 22:53:23	
LOCATIONS: URBAN,	SUBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI) PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	374	91.78	93.92	89.19	20.33	3 105.31	22.73	335.60	89.57 to 94.08	95,847	85,487	
2	25	84.49	76.82	77.36	21.68	99.30	21.07	110.36	62.97 to 94.69	112,404	86,957	
3	79	92.00	86.91	80.45	21.75	108.03	10.68	207.55	85.62 to 94.89	153,511	123,501	
ALL												
	478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.66	106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847	
STATUS: IMPROVED,	UNIMPROVE	ED & IOLL	ı							Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	429	91.20	92.25	87.04	19.07	105.97	16.43	335.60	89.48 to 93.25	112,719	98,116	
2	42	91.22	86.53	68.75	38.69	125.87	10.68	285.90	62.97 to 98.07	46,699	32,104	
3	7	102.34	100.84	99.12	11.95	101.73	80.86	128.73	80.86 to 128.73	66,662	66,075	
ALL												
	478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.66	106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847	
PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
01	472	91.35	91.36	87.38	19.90	104.56	10.68	335.60	89.50 to 93.25	105,852	92,489	
06	1	16.43	16.43	16.43			16.43	16.43	N/A	675,000	110,920	
07	5	106.54	155.04	93.00	66.39	166.71	55.72	331.33	N/A	29,500	27,434	
ALL												
	478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.66	106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847	
SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	3	96.35	96.34	96.33	0.01	100.02	96.32	96.36	N/A	22,333	21,513	
13-0056												
13-0097												
34-0034												
49-0033	5	100.00	133.76	83.49	48.99	160.21	64.89	305.45	N/A	52,305	43,668	
49-0050	18	93.50	90.11	73.76	28.71	122.16	35.65	179.83	65.93 to 99.00	49,981	36,866	
55-0145	10	92.51	90.35	89.21	13.00	101.27	53.37	132.25	69.45 to 95.77	188,850	168,478	
55-0160												
64-0023												
66-0027	109	90.87	87.40	83.09	18.05	105.19	16.43	165.33	86.13 to 94.69	108,598	90,233	
66-0111	298	91.08	92.51	88.61	20.07	7 104.41	21.07	335.60	88.73 to 93.76	104,580	92,667	
66-0501	35	92.00	95.28	81.90	28.63	3 116.34	10.68	331.33	82.50 to 98.04	133,305	109,176	
NonValid School	3	96.35	96.34	96.33	0.01		96.32	96.36	N/A	22,333	21,513	
ALL												
	478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.66	106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847	

Base Stat PAGE:3 of 5 PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics 66 - OTOE COUNTY

MEAN WGT. MEAN

68.58

87.83

RANGE

0 OR Blank

COUNT MEDIAN

89.35

68

ESIDENTIAL			State Stat Run					
	Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009							(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER of Sales:	478	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	35.68	95% Median C.I.:	89.55 to 93.25	(!: Av 10i=0) (!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	50,784,660	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	32.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.90 to 89.00	(** = *********************************
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	50,784,660	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.92	95% Mean C.I.:	88.93 to 94.81	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	43,902,920							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	106,244	COD:	20.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	335.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	91,847	PRD:	106.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.68		Printed: 01/22/	2009 22:53:24
EAR BUILT *							Avg. Adj.	Avg.

PRD

128.08

MIN

10.68

285.90

COD

38.31

Sale Price

80,927

MAX 95% Median C.I.

77.43 to 97.21

Assd Val

55,496

O OK DI	AIII.	0.0	07.33	07.03	00.50	30.31	120.00	10.00	203.90	11.43 60 31.21	00,521	33,490
Prior TO 186	50	1	73.83	73.83	73.83			73.83	73.83	N/A	84,000	62,020
1860 TO 189	99	44	86.69	84.85	76.95	25.25	110.26	33.30	148.65	75.33 to 98.50	68,201	52,480
1900 TO 191	19	69	88.61	98.36	84.62	32.22	116.24	30.38	335.60	80.87 to 98.45	76,092	64,389
1920 TO 193	39	49	91.20	88.50	85.05	16.48	104.05	36.83	165.33	81.40 to 96.92	82,099	69,823
1940 TO 194	19	23	87.28	85.15	82.67	12.48	103.00	59.35	112.55	75.52 to 94.33	86,991	71,916
1950 TO 195	59	40	93.86	91.46	88.99	13.94	102.77	51.38	149.11	84.82 to 98.37	90,791	80,796
1960 TO 196	59	45	92.87	94.81	92.50	11.21	102.49	67.41	153.87	89.50 to 97.17	108,503	100,369
1970 TO 197	79	46	92.97	96.44	89.35	17.01	107.94	55.72	331.33	89.08 to 95.65	121,624	108,667
1980 TO 198	39	14	96.22	96.31	91.08	14.62	105.75	71.15	179.83	79.14 to 100.21	143,564	130,755
1990 TO 199	94	18	96.46	95.60	93.56	11.39	102.18	74.37	128.73	84.27 to 104.16	158,424	148,218
1995 TO 199	99	24	95.83	96.89	96.14	8.24	100.78	81.25	115.54	90.20 to 102.91	206,840	198,859
2000 TO Pre	esent	37	88.76	89.09	89.03	10.19	100.07	64.04	109.25	85.06 to 95.05	188,862	168,145
ALL												
		478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.66	106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847
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	11	135.67	169.67	168.68	56.10	100.59	43.60	335.60	82.50 to 331.33	2,797	4,719
5000 TO	9999	7	115.57	136.73	133.06	31.44	102.76	91.50	218.20	91.50 to 218.20	7,285	9,694
Total \$	5											
1 TO	9999	18	130.73	156.86	146.46	47.25	107.10	43.60	335.60	98.50 to 191.50	4,543	6,653
10000 TO	29999	38	96.13	102.10	98.47	34.71	103.69	22.73	285.90	88.40 to 102.13	20,153	19,844
30000 TO	59999	75	98.22	99.25	99.09	20.92	100.17	21.07	205.61	96.32 to 101.39	44,675	44,267
60000 TO	99999	124	90.05	86.89	87.09	17.17	99.77	28.76	134.99	85.18 to 94.38	79,466	69,203
100000 TO	149999	119	84.89	82.95	82.70	14.65	100.30	35.65	119.17	81.12 to 88.37	122,667	101,441
150000 TO	249999	81	91.73	88.53	88.41	13.01	100.14	10.68	132.67	87.49 to 95.77	186,277	164,690
250000 TO	499999	22	90.10	87.92	87.97	11.07	99.94	64.04	110.25	77.43 to 95.60	289,620	254,786
500000 +		1	16.43	16.43	16.43			16.43	16.43	N/A	675,000	110,920
ALL												
		478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.66	106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847

66 - OTOE COUNTY

RESIDENTIAL

PAGE: 4 of 5

State Stat Run

RESIDENTIAL	ı				ŗ	Гуре: Qualifi	ed				State Stat Run	
						Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	478	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	35.68	95%	Median C.I.: 89.5	5 to 93.25	(!: Av 10i=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	50	,784,660	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	32.78		. Mean C.I.: 83.90		(11 2011,000)
TO	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	50	,784,660	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.92			93 to 94.81	
T	OTAL Asses	sed Value	43	,902,920								
AVO	G. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	106,244	COD:	20.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	335.60				
i	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	91,847	PRD:	106.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.68			Printed: 01/22/2	009 22:53:24
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	7	98.50	132.49	111.95	55.6	9 118.35	43.60	305.45	43.60 to 305.45	2,182	2,442
5000 TO	9999	19	75.33	88.60	58.49	55.8	7 151.47	21.07	335.60	46.86 to 101.76	13,632	7,973
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	26	91.30	100.41	61.47	51.2	8 163.36	21.07	335.60	57.40 to 101.76	10,550	6,484
10000 TO	29999	41	93.92	97.23	62.02	44.6	1 156.76	10.68	331.33	76.72 to 100.22	33,136	20,552
30000 TO	59999	93	90.25	92.46	83.65	24.1	5 110.54	35.65	236.47	85.18 to 97.21	54,887	45,911
60000 TO	99999	144	88.72	88.60	83.97	17.6	5 105.51	45.31	205.61	83.66 to 92.91	93,915	78,859
100000 TO	149999	94	91.26	89.75	84.48	12.3	3 106.23	16.43	134.99	86.08 to 93.15	139,265	117,657
150000 TO	249999	65	95.77	93.48	92.05	9.3	4 101.56	64.04	132.67	91.18 to 98.45	200,136	184,223
250000 TO	499999	15	95.60	96.48	95.67	7.4	7 100.85	74.37	111.40	90.64 to 102.69	294,900	282,124
ALL	_											
-		478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.6	6 106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847
QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		25	70.85	70.76	61.01	39.9		10.68	132.67	53.37 to 93.92	150,808	92,003
0		43	94.38	97.75	85.04	38.0		22.73	285.90	84.49 to 104.14	40,299	34,271
10		4	99.35	103.77	104.14	7.1		94.83	121.54	N/A	43,250	45,040
20		114	92.02	95.39	85.17	25.7	9 112.00	37.89	335.60	87.07 to 96.27	65,626	55,895
25		1	78.07	78.07	78.07			78.07	78.07	N/A	111,000	86,660
30		216	89.49	90.10	86.29	17.0		30.38	331.33	86.50 to 92.58	107,491	92,753
35		8	88.14	89.85	89.80	6.4		81.92	107.14	81.92 to 107.14	157,737	141,648
40		61	95.89	95.68	94.54	7.8		74.37	128.73	93.45 to 99.28	199,007	188,132
45		4	89.05	90.32	91.29	8.2		80.86	102.34	N/A	79,160	72,262
50		2	97.62	97.62	96.09	12.9	4 101.59	84.98	110.25	N/A	290,000	278,650
ALL	_											
		478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.6	6 106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847

Base Stat PAGE:5 of 5 **PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics** 66 - OTOE COUNTY

	E COUNTY	L		<u> PAD 2009</u>	Prelim	<u>unary Statistics</u>				a a	
RESIDENT	IAL			7	Type: Qualifi	ied		State Stat Run			
					Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales	:	478	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	35.68	95%	Median C.I.: 89.5	5 to 93.25	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price	: 50	,784,660	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	32.78	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 83.90	to 89.00	(Berreu)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	: 50	,784,660	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.92	95	% Mean C.I.: 88.	93 to 94.81	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	: 43	,902,920								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	106,244	COD:	20.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	335.60				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	91,847	PRD:	106.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.68			Printed: 01/22/2	009 22:53:24
STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	64	89.81	86.82	68.14	37.3	127.42	10.68	285.90	70.85 to 98.07	85,435	58,213
0	5	89.14	101.77	103.23	41.3	31 98.59	35.30	207.55	N/A	29,740	30,700
101	276	92.53	93.89	89.82	17.0	104.53	43.13	335.60	90.16 to 94.63	109,141	98,027
102	38	84.92	88.25	84.78	22.1		33.30	191.50	79.19 to 98.51	138,124	117,101
103	4	96.41	92.53	87.45	9.2		74.37	102.95	N/A	195,125	170,642
104	77	89.48	89.63	85.26	20.8		30.38	236.47	84.48 to 96.35	91,812	78,277
106	3	95.44	93.34	93.00	4.3		86.13	98.45	N/A	194,166	180,583
111	10	94.38	92.98	92.05	10.7	72 101.01	73.55	119.72	75.63 to 104.26	121,021	111,404
304	1	99.43	99.43	99.43			99.43	99.43	N/A	153,500	152,620
ALL											
	478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.6	106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847
CONDITIO										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	44	91.74	86.84	66.47	36.9		10.68	285.90	62.97 to 100.00	103,576	68,851
0	24	88.99	89.65	78.70	39.1		22.73	218.20	53.01 to 98.22	39,405	31,012
10	15	100.20	135.82	101.31	49.2		57.40	335.60	94.93 to 165.33	18,210	18,449
15	8	80.70	79.51	76.13	28.3		36.83	118.07	36.83 to 118.07	34,487	26,255
20	41	93.76	90.85	83.78	24.6		30.38	236.47	73.76 to 100.46	54,493	45,653
25	41	93.25	96.65	86.98	27.2		45.20	331.33	76.71 to 100.47	78,672	68,430
30	206	90.16	89.54	86.63	15.1		33.30	179.83	87.28 to 92.97	110,855	96,029
35	13	91.73	92.11	92.69	9.4		70.66	119.17	85.92 to 99.28	131,838	122,206
40	82	92.75	92.02	91.93	9.6		50.86	128.73	89.31 to 95.58	165,872	152,478
50	4	98.40	98.01	97.32	9.4	100.71	84.98	110.25	N/A	280,250	272,730
ALL		01 50	01 05	06.45	00.0	106.05	10 60	225 62	00 55 5- 02 05	106 044	01 045
	478	91.58	91.87	86.45	20.6	56 106.27	10.68	335.60	89.55 to 93.25	106,244	91,847

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

Residential

Nebraska City Residential Initial Ratio: 91.08% Number of Sales: 262

	Beginning Ratio	Number of Sales
NBHD 1195 (Prairie City) Ratio:	89.89%	34
NBHD 1230 (South NC) Ratio:	84.20%	15
NBHD 1075 (Elmwood) Ratio:	89.75%	10
NBHD 1085 (Hail & Co) Ratio:	82.76%	24

Action Taken:

NBHD 1195- Factor 1.05 326 Parcels

NBHD 1230- Factor 1.12 180 Parcels

NBHD 1075- Factor 1.05 63 Parcels

NBHD 1085- Factor 1.15 252 Parcels

After implementation of new improvement values:

Overall Nebraska City Residential Ratio: 93.25%

Syracuse Residential

	Beginning Ratio	Number of Sales
Syracuse Overall	91.90%	66
NBHD 3165 (Prairie View Addition) Ratio	91.50%	6

Action Taken:

NBHD 3165- Factor 1.03 All Parcels

After implementation of new improvement values:

Overall Syracuse Residential Ratio: 92.50%

Rural Residential

	Beginning Ratio	Number of Sales
Overall Rural Residential	89.19%	94
Overall Rural Location	92.34%	68
Overall Suburban Location	82.98%	24
Overall Recreation & Wetlands	85.59%	2
Overall Vacant Rural Residential	88.83%	25
Overall Rural Location- Vacant	90.84%	17
Overall Suburban Location- Vacant	73.73%	8

Action taken:

Conducted Rural Residential Site Value Study:

Adjusted rural residential sites to market value using same site values and implementing new subdivision site values for entire county.

After implementation of new rural residential land values:

	Ratios:	Sales		
Overall Rural Residential Values-	93.72%	94		
Rural Residential Vacant Lots-	93.52%	25		

2009 Assessment Survey for Otoe County

Residential Appraisal Information
(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Primarily completed by the appraisal assistant with additional help from the
	assessor, appraiser and office staff.
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor or Appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraisal Assistant, Assessor & Appraiser
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2008
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2008
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the
	market value of properties?
	RCNLD using market derived information
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	0 market areas, 70 neighborhoods in Nebraska City, and Syracuse, 15 assessor locations
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	The market areas are defined by geographical location.
9.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg.
	10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside
	of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
	There is no market significance of the suburban location.
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		
218	203		421		

Base Stat PAD 2009 R&O Statistics
Type: Qualified PAGE:1 of 5 66 - OTOE COUNTY State Stat Run RESIDENTIAL

yp	e:	Qu	alified					
	_			0-10-10-00-	0 - 10 0 10 0 0 0	_		0.4.40.00.00

RESIDENITAL				1	Гуре: Qualifie					Simic Simi Kun	
					Date Rang	ge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2	008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		(!: AVTot=0)
	of Sales		467	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	50.73	95%	Median C.I.: 91.69	9 to 95.39	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sa	les Price	: 50	,243,160	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	48.58	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 88.18	3 to 91.58	,
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 50	,243,160	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.83	95	% Mean C.I.: 91.3	7 to 100.18	
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	: 45	,159,100								
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	107,587	COD:	20.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	915.87				
AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	96,700	PRD:	106.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.89			Printed: 03/21/2	2009 13:20:48
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	82	94.10	93.75	89.17	17.16	5 105.13	28.89	305.45	90.38 to 96.55	107,941	96,253
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	50	95.47	96.59	92.10	13.83	3 104.88	64.46	146.33	89.96 to 100.42	102,091	94,024
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	48	98.47	96.14	92.85	15.82	2 103.54	50.35	149.11	90.15 to 102.34	94,457	87,707
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	62	93.10	98.65	90.93	23.66	5 108.49	33.42	335.60	89.88 to 98.93	111,878	101,730
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	64	95.95	92.30	91.27	13.95	5 101.13	33.30	153.87	91.74 to 97.94	104,487	95,367
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	57	89.05	91.76	86.81	21.10	105.70	33.60	331.33	84.27 to 94.44	117,020	101,586
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	38	92.88	111.20	89.84	41.90	123.78	30.07	915.87	82.50 to 100.02	95,669	85,945
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	66	90.20	92.67	88.03	19.97	7 105.27	50.93	205.61	84.93 to 99.28	118,547	104,361
Study Years											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	242	94.71	96.06	90.90	17.99	105.69	28.89	335.60	92.41 to 96.81	105,067	95,501
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	225	92.48	95.46	88.84	22.35	107.45	30.07	915.87	89.37 to 94.70	110,297	97,990
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	231	94.24	94.67	90.27	18.90	104.88	33.30	335.60	91.66 to 96.58	107,479	97,018
ALL											
	467	93.72	95.78	89.88	20.09	106.56	28.89	915.87	91.69 to 95.39	107,587	96,700
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
BURR	2	201.84	201.84	99.27	51.34	203.31	98.22	305.45	N/A	27,137	26,940
DOUGLAS	6	97.53	133.68	99.02	44.35	135.00	82.50	331.33	82.50 to 331.33	44,591	44,153
DUNBAR	2	132.83	132.83	116.58	24.4	7 113.94	100.33	165.33	N/A	6,000	6,995
LORTON	1	96.36	96.36	96.36			96.36	96.36	N/A	3,300	3,180
NEBRASKA CITY	261	93.48	98.40	91.58	22.00	107.45	28.89	915.87	90.61 to 96.79	100,527	92,060
OTOE	4	58.30	65.26	59.61	42.95	109.48	36.83	107.60	N/A	16,600	9,895
PALMYRA	12	92.09	94.68	91.55	14.84	103.41	65.73	131.97	76.96 to 109.57	109,150	99,930
PAUL	1	89.14	89.14	89.14			89.14	89.14	N/A	14,000	12,480
RURAL RES	86	93.79	88.43	85.94	14.58	3 102.90	30.07	136.89	89.65 to 96.55	147,118	126,436
SYRACUSE	66	93.38	91.46	91.24	14.53	3 100.24	39.67	140.63	89.26 to 99.30	105,088	95,888
TALMAGE	13	95.90	89.44	71.55	21.43	125.01	35.65	179.83	65.93 to 99.00	41,373	29,601
TIMBER LAKE	1	96.63	96.63	96.63			96.63	96.63	N/A	259,900	251,150
UNADILLA	6	84.19	81.71	78.70	27.49	103.82	33.30	120.62	33.30 to 120.62	83,583	65,780
WOODLAND HILLS 1	4	92.53	101.65	93.32	12.62	108.93	89.31	132.25	N/A	235,750	220,005
WOODLAND HILLS 2	2	96.72	96.72	96.28	4.88	3 100.46	92.00	101.45	N/A	224,000	215,670
ALL											
	467	93.72	95.78	89.88	20.09	106.56	28.89	915.87	91.69 to 95.39	107,587	96,700

Base Stat PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Type: Qualified 66 - OTOE COUNTY State Stat Run RESIDENTIAL

Type: Quanned	
D-4- D 07/01/2006 4- 06/20/2009	D = -4 = J D = f = 01/22/2000

PAGE:2 of 5

RESIDENTIAL				']	l'ype: Qualifi					State Stat Ran	
					Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		(!: AVTot=0)
	MBER of Sales		467	MEDIAN:	94	cov:	50.73	95%	Median C.I.: 91.69	9 to 95.39	(!: Derived)
TOTAL	L Sales Price	: 50	,243,160	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	48.58	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 88.1	8 to 91.58	, , ,
TOTAL Adj	j.Sales Price	: 50	,243,160	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.83	95	% Mean C.I.: 91.3	37 to 100.18	
TOTAL As	ssessed Value	: 45	,159,100								
AVG. Adj.	. Sales Price	:	107,587	COD:	20.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	915.87				
AVG. As	ssessed Value	:	96,700	PRD:	106.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.89			Printed: 03/21/2	2009 13:20:48
LOCATIONS: URBAN	, SUBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	372	93.39	97.42	91.04	21.7	4 107.01	28.89	915.87	91.20 to 96.32	96,266	87,638
2	22	94.43	87.02	84.88	13.1	6 102.53	54.01	110.69	76.36 to 96.67	123,300	104,653
3	73	93.01	90.02	87.51	14.2	0 102.87	30.07	136.89	89.79 to 96.75	160,540	140,482
ALL											
	467	93.72	95.78	89.88	20.0	9 106.56	28.89	915.87	91.69 to 95.39	107,587	96,700
STATUS: IMPROVED	, UNIMPROVE	D & IOLI								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	428	93.39	95.84	90.07	19.7	2 106.41	33.30	915.87	91.50 to 95.14	113,048	101,817
2	32	94.34	93.77	80.36	27.0	0 116.69	28.89	285.90	82.50 to 98.50	43,496	34,953
3	7	102.34	100.84	99.12	11.9	5 101.73	80.86	128.73	80.86 to 128.73	66,662	66,075
ALL											
	467	93.72	95.78	89.88	20.0	9 106.56	28.89	915.87	91.69 to 95.39	107,587	96,700
PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
01	462	93.60	95.18	89.96	19.4	5 105.81	28.89	915.87	91.69 to 95.14	106,989	96,243
06	1	84.24	84.24	84.24			84.24	84.24	N/A	675,000	568,650
07	4	141.84	167.26	90.61	62.2	7 184.58	54.01	331.33	N/A	34,750	31,487
ALL											
	467	93.72	95.78	89.88	20.0	9 106.56	28.89	915.87	91.69 to 95.39	107,587	96,700
SCHOOL DISTRICT	*									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	3	96.35	96.34	96.33	0.0	1 100.02	96.32	96.36	N/A	22,333	21,513
13-0056											
13-0097											
34-0034											
49-0033	5	101.43	134.22	83.91	48.6	4 159.96	64.46	305.45	N/A	52,305	43,888
49-0050	17	93.01	88.05	74.38	20.4	0 118.39	35.65	179.83	65.93 to 99.00	50,333	37,435
55-0145	9	93.86	93.41	90.72	16.7	8 102.96	50.93	132.25	71.65 to 117.35	205,388	186,326
55-0160											
64-0023											
66-0027	108	93.89	90.42	89.56	15.8	9 100.96	33.30	165.33	89.37 to 96.75	109,303	97,891
66-0111	292	93.60	97.80	91.26	20.8	7 107.17	28.89	915.87	90.98 to 96.58	105,393	96,177
66-0501	33	91.74	94.14	84.34	24.3	2 111.63	30.07	331.33	78.72 to 98.04	140,324	118,348
NonValid School	3	96.35	96.34	96.33	0.0	1 100.02	96.32	96.36	N/A	22,333	21,513
ALL											
	467	93.72	95.78	89.88	20.0	9 106.56	28.89	915.87	91.69 to 95.39	107,587	96,700

PAGE: 3 of 5

66 - OTOE COUNTY				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat						PAGE:3 of 5		
RESIDENT	IAL					Гуре: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
					•		nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/200	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009		
	NITI	MBER of Sales	:	467	MEDIAN:	94	g				60 . 05 00	(!: AVTot=0)
		L Sales Price		,243,160	WGT. MEAN:	9 4 90	COV:	50.73		Median C.I.: 91		(!: Derived)
		j.Sales Price		,243,160	MEAN:	96	STD:	48.58	_	. Mean C.I.: 88		
		ssessed Value		,159,100	PIEAN.	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.83	95	% Mean C.I.: 9	1.37 to 100.18	
		. Sales Price		107,587	COD:	20.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	915.87				
		ssessed Value		96,700	PRD:	106.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.89			Printed: 03/21/	2000 12,20,40
YEAR BUI		DECEDED VALUE				100.00	THE DATES HAVE	20.05			Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.		Assd Val
	Blank	58	91.82	93.67	82.49	28.0		28.89	285.90	84.93 to 97.2		70,689
Prior TO		1	74.95	74.95	74.95			74.95	74.95	N/A	84,000	62,960
1860 TO		44	88.68	86.04	78.57	24.2	28 109.51	33.30	148.65	75.33 to 98.5		53,585
1900 TO		69	90.98	110.61	88.93	41.3		33.42	915.87	84.46 to 99.0		67,665
1920 TO		49	95.11	91.28	87.66	15.0		36.83	165.33	85.92 to 97.9	•	71,968
1940 TO		23	89.05	88.63	86.49	13.9		59.35	112.55	75.85 to 99.1		75,236
1950 TO		40	96.54	93.64	91.32	13.5		51.38	149.11	90.50 to 100.4		82,909
1960 TO	1969	45	92.87	95.88	93.61	11.6		67.41	153.87	89.55 to 100.0		101,570
1970 TO		45	93.25	97.00	90.06	17.5		54.01	331.33	89.18 to 95.6		111,804
1980 TO	1989	14	96.22	97.16	91.85	14.3	105.78	71.15	179.83	78.29 to 100.	143,564	131,862
1990 TO	1994	18	99.07	96.62	94.86	10.8	101.85	76.45	128.73	84.27 to 104.9	90 158,424	150,281
1995 TO	1999	24	97.70	97.44	96.68	8.0	100.79	81.25	117.23	90.35 to 102.9	206,840	199,974
2000 TO	Present	37	93.82	92.62	92.21	9.9	99 100.44	64.04	129.39	87.07 to 96.8	1 188,862	174,156
ALL_												
		467	93.72	95.78	89.88	20.0	106.56	28.89	915.87	91.69 to 95.3	9 107,587	96,700
SALE PRI	CE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	XAM	95% Median C.	I. Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	v \$											
1 T	ro 49	99 11	125.78	164.82	163.48	63.6	100.82	43.60	335.60	82.33 to 331.3	33 2,797	4,573
5000 TC		9 6	126.92	142.56	139.32	31.5	102.33	91.50	218.20	91.50 to 218.2	7,083	9,868
Tota	-											
1 T		999 17	125.78	156.96	149.46	52.4		43.60	335.60	91.50 to 218.2		6,442
10000 T			97.78	122.37	114.05	49.1		28.89	915.87	90.06 to 101.9	•	22,551
30000 T			100.50	104.40	103.79	17.0		33.60	205.61	97.94 to 105.2		47,112
60000 Т			91.09	89.19	89.38	17.0		33.30	134.99	85.18 to 95.3		71,028
100000 T			88.78	85.76	85.54	13.7		35.65	119.17	84.46 to 92.4		104,923
150000 T			92.68	90.25	90.27	11.4		30.07	117.23	89.88 to 97.1		167,823
250000 T			92.18	90.22	90.18	9.3	100.05	64.04	110.25	84.98 to 96.7		261,184
500000 +		1	84.24	84.24	84.24			84.24	84.24	N/A	675,000	568,650
ALL_												

106.56

28.89

915.87

91.69 to 95.39

96,700

107,587

20.09

467

93.72

95.78

89.88

66 - OTO	66 - OTOE COUNTY		Γ	PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat								PAGE:4 of 5	
RESIDENT:	IAL			L			Type: Qualific					State Stat Run	
								rge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	008 Posted 1	Before: 01/23	3/2009		
	NI	IMBER of	f Sales:		467	MEDIAN:	94				Median C.I.: 91.69	2 05 20	(!: AVTot=0)
			s Price:		,243,160	WGT. MEAN:	90	COV: STD:	50.73 48.58		. Mean C.I.: 88.18		(!: Derived)
	TOTAL A				,243,160	MEAN:	96	·-	18.83	_		3 to 91.58 37 to 100.18	
		-	d Value:		,159,100	112121	, ,	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.83	93	6 Mean C.1 91.3	17 LO 100.18	
	AVG. Ad	j. Sales	s Price:		107,587	COD:	20.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	915.87				
		-	d Value:		96,700	PRD:	106.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.89			Printed: 03/21/2	2009 13:20:49
ASSESSED	VALUE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE			COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	v \$	_											
1 1	го 4	999	7	96.36	124.87	101.47	53.5	0 123.05	43.60	305.45	43.60 to 305.45	2,182	2,214
5000 TC	99	99	14	91.30	103.53	75.21	44.7	137.66	28.89	335.60	57.40 to 125.78	10,535	7,923
Tota	al \$												
1 1	го 9	999	21	91.50	110.64	77.67	48.8	2 142.45	28.89	335.60	73.00 to 115.57	7,751	6,020
10000 T	го 29	999	37	97.17	106.09	79.81	39.2	9 132.92	33.30	331.33	89.14 to 101.43	25,868	20,646
30000 T	го 59	999	84	95.63	91.69	83.16	20.9	0 110.25	30.07	153.87	87.98 to 98.22	55,643	46,273
00000 T	го 99	999	143	90.05	90.72	86.71	17.1	7 104.62	50.86	205.61	86.22 to 93.29	91,146	79,035
100000 T	го 149	999	99	92.87	100.04	90.52	19.7	6 110.53	53.27	915.87	90.15 to 94.97	131,296	118,843
150000 T	го 249	999	65	97.17	94.93	93.72	8.0	6 101.29	64.04	117.23	92.95 to 100.02	196,899	184,540
250000 T	го 499	999	17	96.63	96.76	96.10	6.4	4 100.69	78.72	111.40	90.64 to 102.69	290,788	279,435
500000 +	+		1	84.24	84.24	84.24			84.24	84.24	N/A	675,000	568,650
ALL_													
			467	93.72	95.78	89.88	20.0	9 106.56	28.89	915.87	91.69 to 95.39	107,587	96,700
QUALITY												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE			COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)			23	89.41	82.37	78.61	17.7		30.07	116.12	70.45 to 97.24	153,269	120,486
0			35	96.55	101.10	91.97	32.5		28.89	285.90	86.13 to 115.57	41,282	37,965
10			4	99.35	103.06	103.17	6.6		94.38	119.15	N/A	43,250	44,620
20			113	94.50	103.94	89.38	31.2	116.28	42.11	915.87	89.05 to 99.30	66,131	59,110
25			1	78.07	78.07	78.07	a.c. =	- 104.04	78.07	78.07	N/A	111,000	86,660
30			216	92.11	91.96	88.21	16.7		33.30	331.33	89.50 to 94.58	107,491	94,822
35			8	88.14	89.85	89.80	6.4		81.92	107.14	81.92 to 107.14	157,737	141,648
40			61	96.81	97.06	95.99	6.7		77.96	128.73	94.83 to 99.64	199,007	191,037
45			4	89.05	90.32	91.29	8.2	98.94	80.86	102.34	N/A	79,160	72,262

12.94

20.09

101.59

106.56

84.98

28.89

110.25

915.87

N/A

91.69 to 95.39

278,650

96,700

290,000

107,587

50

ALL

97.62

93.72

2

467

97.62

95.78

96.09

89.88

66 - OTOE COUNTY			PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat									PAGE:5 of 5
RESIDENT	IAL				Type: Qualifi						State Stat Run	
							//01/2006 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009		(4 . 4 . 7
	NUMBER of Sales	:	467	MEDIAN:	94		COV:	50.73	95% 1	Median C.I.: 91.6	9 to 95 39	(!: AVTot=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price	: 50	,243,160	WGT. MEAN:	90		STD:	48.58		. Mean C.I.: 88.1		(:: Deriveu)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	: 50	,243,160	MEAN:	96		AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.83	_		37 to 100.18	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	: 45	,159,100				AVG.ADD.DEV.	10.03	23	·	77 60 100.10	
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	107,587	COD:	20.09	MAX	Sales Ratio:	915.87				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	96,700	PRD:	106.56	MIN	Sales Ratio:	28.89			Printed: 03/21/2	2009 13:20:49
STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	55	92.87	94.50	82.38	27.4	14	114.70	28.89	285.90	84.93 to 97.50	90,207	74,315
0	4	85.82	82.16	96.61	24.5	6	85.05	39.67	117.35	N/A	30,550	29,515
101	275	93.86	95.84	91.68	16.9	5	104.53	43.13	335.60	91.66 to 96.72	109,507	100,401
102	38	91.22	91.00	87.26	19.3	32	104.29	33.30	191.50	84.46 to 99.11	138,124	120,522
103	4	96.41	93.62	89.50	8.1	.6	104.60	78.72	102.95	N/A	195,125	174,637
104	77	93.82	100.00	88.43	28.8	39	113.09	33.42	915.87	86.72 to 97.05	91,812	81,188
106	3	95.44	93.41	93.08	4.2	23	100.35	86.33	98.45	N/A	194,166	180,736
111	10	94.38	92.98	92.05	10.7	2	101.01	73.55	119.72	75.63 to 104.26	121,021	111,404
304	1	102.41	102.41	102.41				102.41	102.41	N/A	153,500	157,200
ALL_												
	467	93.72	95.78	89.88	20.0)9	106.56	28.89	915.87	91.69 to 95.39	107,587	96,700
CONDITIO	N										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	42	96.57	95.87	82.79	26.4	16	115.80	28.89	285.90	84.93 to 100.42	102,675	85,004
0	16	87.63	87.90	80.55	28.7	2	109.13	33.60	218.20	52.63 to 94.44	41,107	33,113
10	15	100.20	135.97	101.55	49.0	8	133.88	57.40	335.60	96.36 to 165.33	18,210	18,494
15	8	80.70	80.37	77.56	27.6	59	103.62	36.83	118.07	36.83 to 118.07	34,487	26,750
20	40	95.05	109.66	90.62	41.4	14	121.01	33.42	915.87	79.18 to 101.93	55,643	50,424

27.03

14.73

8.79

9.40

8.18

20.09

110.55

103.61

99.36

99.90

100.78

106.56

50.85

33.30

73.43

50.86

84.98

28.89

331.33

179.83

119.17

128.73

110.25

915.87

84.86 to 101.23

89.96 to 94.83

85.92 to 99.28

90.35 to 97.91

N/A

91.69 to 95.39

78,672

110,855

131,838

165,872

280,250

107,587

69,951

98,278

123,043

155,311

275,537

96,700

25

30

35

40

50

ALL

93.77

92.88

92.95

94.66

93.72

100.56

41

13

82

467

4

206

88.91

88.65

93.33

93.63

98.32

89.88

98.29

91.86

92.73

93.54

99.09

95.78

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL:Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The assessment practices in the County are applied to both the sold and the assessed base in a similar manner. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both slightly outside the acceptable range. These quality statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity. The measures of central tendency are relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of property.

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	753	467	62.02
2008	769	501	65.15
2007	796	519	65.20
2006	845	592	70.06
2005	790	637	80.63

RESIDENTIAL:A review of the utilization grid indicates the county has utilized all of the available arms length residential sales for the development of the qualified statistics.

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and 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.

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	92	1.22	93	94
2008	92.61	1.24	94	93.92
2007	91	4.30	95	95
2006	91	8.56	98	97
2005	92	2.75	95	94

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

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

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

Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

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

% Change in Total
Assessed Value in the Sales File

% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)

5.95	2009	1.22
1.88	2008	1.24
6.66	2007	4.30
9.32	2006	8.56
2.81	2005	2.75

RESIDENTIAL:After review of the percent change report, it appears that the county has appraised sold parcels similarly to unsold parcels. While the table shows an approximate 5 point difference between the sold and the assessed base the percent change in assessed base value is consistent with the reported assessment actions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	94	90	96

RESIDENTIAL: The median and mean are within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is two rounded points outside the acceptable range.

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	20.09	106.56
Difference	5.09	3.56

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

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	478	467	-11
Median	92	94	2
Wgt. Mean	86	90	4
Mean	92	96	4
COD	20.66	20.09	-0.57
PRD	106.27	106.56	0.29
Minimum	10.68	28.89	18.21
Maximum	335.60	915.87	580.27

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinions statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county. The change in the number of qualified sales is the result of sales sustaining substantial physical changes and being removed from the qualified sales roster.

VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

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

	R&O Statistics	Trended Ratio	Difference
Number of Sales	467	239	228
Median	94	94	0
Wgt. Mean	90	92	-2
Mean	96	105	-9
COD	20.09	29.08	-8.99
PRD	106.56	113.03	-6.47
Minimum	28.89	31.04	-2.15
Maximum	915.87	932.46	-16.59

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

The sample in Otoe County was randomly trimmed to 260 sales and was than trimmed to 239 sales used in the analysis. Some sales were eliminated due to the inability to acquire the prior year value which was necessary for this analysis. Parcel counts for the various assessor locations were gathered from the County to attempt to achieve representativeness in the smaller sample.

In Otoe County the trended median and R&O median are the same suggesting the sales file is representative of the population. This analysis suggests sold properties are treated similarly to the unsold properties and the assessor has no bias in the assignment of residential assessments.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 1 of 5

105

TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:

TOTAL Assessed Value:

14,315,247

11,999,570

MEAN:

• •	0101 000111		I AD ZUUS	r i emimai	v Stausucs			
COMMERCIAL		•	T	ype: Qualified	State Stat Run			
				Date Range: 07/0	1/2005 to 06/30/2008	Posted I	Before: 01/22/2009	(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales:	83	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	77.44	95% Median C.I.: 84.89 to 99.60	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price: 1	3,665,247	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	80 99	95% Wat. Mean C.T.: 60 64 to 107 01	(=,

AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 172,472 COD: 40.12 MAX Sales Ratio: 560.00

AVG. Assessed Value: 144,573 PRD: 124.76 MIN Sales Ratio: 16.18 Printed: 01/22/2009 22:53.

AVG.ABS.DEV:

38.46

95% Mean C.I.: 87.15 to 122.00

AVG. Assessed Value:		144,573	PRD:	124.76 M	16.18		Printed: 01/22/2009 22:53:35				
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	4	93.82	97.24	94.94	8.73	102.43	86.45	114.87	N/A	65,438	62,125
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	8	91.07	91.61	78.82	27.76	116.23	51.04	163.37	51.04 to 163.37	95,859	75,557
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	100.00	152.79	107.15	74.45	142.60	73.96	486.69	73.96 to 486.69	83,840	89,835
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	10	95.84	89.03	90.43	43.82	98.45	16.18	251.10	19.92 to 108.67	123,295	111,494
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	9	95.87	91.19	60.21	37.58	151.47	34.08	219.51	38.67 to 104.78	377,722	227,414
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	94.44	89.58	78.97	25.75	113.43	35.98	134.61	67.24 to 115.60	43,008	33,965
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	101.37	95.84	99.16	11.03	96.65	80.14	113.62	N/A	227,800	225,894
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	111.85	173.40	283.07	64.26	61.26	95.00	302.96	N/A	133,400	377,612
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	91.47	93.71	91.48	14.41	102.43	75.20	120.34	75.20 to 120.34	109,916	100,553
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	100.05	82.14	71.62	23.78	114.70	45.64	114.27	N/A	82,000	58,726
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	77.15	156.52	72.83	116.32	214.91	54.14	560.00	54.14 to 560.00	333,416	242,833
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	73.52	74.01	58.95	33.11	125.55	32.85	110.68	32.85 to 110.68	445,864	262,838
Study Years											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	29	93.81	106.27	91.16	43.51	116.57	16.18	486.69	74.98 to 100.63	98,222	89,543
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	31	99.60	104.58	95.63	34.20	109.35	34.08	302.96	80.14 to 104.78	184,567	176,510
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	23	84.89	102.44	68.42	46.51	149.72	32.85	560.00	71.58 to 100.05	249,790	170,912
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	38	96.87	101.46	73.20	42.41	138.62	16.18	486.69	74.98 to 100.63	150,932	110,476
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	100.53	110.44	136.13	30.11	81.13	45.64	302.96	81.50 to 111.85	136,928	186,403
ALL											
	83	95.87	104.58	83.82	40.12	124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472	144,573
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
BURR	2	104.21	104.21	101.46	7.89	102.71	95.99	112.43	N/A	42,126	42,740
DUNBAR	1	102.90	102.90	102.90			102.90	102.90	N/A	10,000	10,290
NEBRASKA CITY	43	89.00	93.89	70.10	35.00	133.92	16.18	486.69	74.98 to 98.90	196,919	138,046
OTOE	1	118.00	118.00	118.00			118.00	118.00	N/A	6,000	7,080
PALMYRA	1	74.62	74.62	74.62			74.62	74.62	N/A	530,000	395,470
RURAL 8000	7	108.67	133.32	125.99	67.99	105.82	32.85	302.96	32.85 to 302.96	372,669	469,530
RURAL 9000	1	84.89	84.89	84.89			84.89	84.89	N/A	100,000	84,890
SYRACUSE	15	93.81	132.20	86.10	71.53	153.54	19.92	560.00	71.34 to 158.03	145,191	125,016
TALMAGE	2	104.72	104.72	100.67	4.50	104.02	100.00	109.43	N/A	24,690	24,855
UNADILLA	10	99.55	92.83	95.45	18.52	97.26	38.67	134.61	46.34 to 115.60	28,150	26,868
ALL											
	83	95.87	104.58	83.82	40.12	124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472	144,573

Base Stat **PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics** PAGE:2 of 5 66 - OTOE COUNTY

COMMERCIA	AL			I AD 200	Type: Qualifi		9			State Stat Run	
					, i	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009		
	NUMBER of Sa	logi	83	MEDIAN.		3					(!: AVTot=0)
				MEDIAN:	96	COV:	77.44		Median C.I.: 84.89		(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Pr		13,665,247	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	80.99	_	. Mean C.I.: 60.64		
	TOTAL Adj. Sales Pr		14,315,247	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	38.46	95	% Mean C.I.: 87.1	.5 to 122.00	
	TOTAL Assessed Va		11,999,570	G0D.	40 10	MAN Galas Dabia.	560.00				
	AVG. Adj. Sales Pr		172,472	COD:	40.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	560.00				
	AVG. Assessed Va		144,573	PRD:	124.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.18			Printed: 01/22/2	
	IS: URBAN, SUBURB								050 w 1' a -	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COU			WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1		76 95.		72.18	37.0		16.18	560.00	80.84 to 99.60	162,912	117,587
2		6 96.		173.99	83.4	41 81.18	45.64	302.96	45.64 to 302.96	238,979	415,806
3		1 113.	62 113.62	113.62			113.62	113.62	N/A	500,000	568,090
ALL_			07 104 50	02.00	40.1	104 76	16 10	F.C.O. 0.0	04 00 +- 00 60	170 470	144 572
		83 95.		83.82	40.1	124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472 Avg. Adj.	144,573 Avg.
RANGE	IMPROVED, UNIMPR			LICE MEAN	a.	ממח מר	MIN	1471.37	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
	COU			WGT. MEAN		DD PRD	MIN	MAX			
1		77 97.		88.91	38.0		19.92	560.00	86.45 to 100.05	154,667	137,520
2		6 52.	59 64.16	58.63	54.8	39 109.44	16.18	163.37	16.18 to 163.37	400,979	235,076
ALL_		— 83 95.	87 104.58	83.82	40.1	124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472	144,573
SCHOOT, D	DISTRICT *		201100			121170	10.10	300.00	01.05 00 55.00	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COU	NT MEDI	AN MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		4 104.		101.17	6.1		95.99	112.43	N/A	33,408	33,797
13-0056									,		,
13-0097											
34-0034											
49-0033											
49-0050											
55-0145											
55-0160											
64-0023											
66-0027		29 99.	11 112.17	84.08	45.1	13 133.41	19.92	560.00	76.95 to 103.25	98,030	82,425
66-0111		49 91.		83.99	40.5		16.18	486.69	75.67 to 99.36	220,586	185,276
66-0501		1 74.					74.62	74.62	N/A	530,000	395,470
NonValid	School	4 104.	72 104.46	101.17	6.1	18 103.26	95.99	112.43	N/A	33,408	33,797
ALL_											
		83 95.	87 104.58	83.82	40.1	12 124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472	144,573

Base Stat PAGE:3 of 5 **PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics** 66 - OTOE COUNTY COMME

ERCIAL	•		T	ype: Qualified	•		State Stat Run	
				Date Range	: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008	Posted 1	Before: 01/22/2009	(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales:	83	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	77.44	95% Median C.I.: 84.89 to 99.60	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price:	13,665,247	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	80.99	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 60.64 to 107.01	(11 2 011 1 0 0)
Т	OTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,315,247	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	38.46	95% Mean C.I.: 87.15 to 122.00	
	TOTAL Assessed Value:	11.999.570						

TO	TAL Assesse	d Value	: 11	,999,570			AVG.ADB.DEV.	30.10	, ,	0,1.	15 00 122.00	
	G. Adi. Sale			172,472	COD:	40.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	560.00				
	VG. Assesse			144,573	PRD:	124.76	MIN Sales Ratio:				Printed: 01/22/2	2009 22:53:36
YEAR BUILT	*			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blan		10	66.91	84.34	63.42	64.3		16.18	254.31	38.67 to 115.60	137,487	87,192
Prior TO 186												0.,
1860 TO 189		1	100.63	100.63	100.63			100.63	100.63	N/A	40,000	40,250
1900 TO 191		21	97.87	109.65	79.50	38.8	36 137.92	35.98	560.00	75.67 to 100.53	30,856	24,530
1920 TO 193		4	87.24	88.67	78.19	18.8		69.51	110.68	N/A	75,625	59,127
1940 TO 194		3	93.13	85.45	65.98	14.3		61.57	101.65	N/A	481,666	317,790
1950 TO 195		7	111.85	154.24	103.05	65.8		59.61	486.69	59.61 to 486.69	84,785	87,374
1960 TO 196		11	93.81	89.34	89.25	27.0		19.92	163.37	54.59 to 112.43	102,818	91,768
1970 TO 197		7	103.25	106.70	99.63	13.3		75.20	158.03	75.20 to 158.03	175,028	174,388
1980 TO 198		6	80.49	83.08	77.32	19.2		45.64	114.87	45.64 to 114.87	158,333	122,423
1990 TO 199		6	160.09	172.39	150.32	53.3		74.62	302.96	74.62 to 302.96	366,250	550,538
1995 TO 199		5	55.79	65.60	48.71	49.5		32.85	113.62	N/A	704,537	343,168
2000 TO Pre		2	76.05	76.05	88.92	26.0		56.23	95.87	N/A	442,500	393,490
ALL		_	70.03	70.03	00.72	20.0	03.32	30.23	33.07	14/11	112,500	333, 130
11112	_	83	95.87	104.58	83.82	40.1	124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472	144,573
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	4	112.52	205.93	126.25	117.2	21 163.11	38.67	560.00	N/A	2,000	2,525
5000 TO	9999	3	111.85	109.82	110.46	5.4	48 99.42	99.60	118.00	N/A	5,833	6,443
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	7	111.85	164.74	115.41	69.7	72 142.74	38.67	560.00	38.67 to 560.00	3,642	4,204
10000 TO	29999	13	99.50	97.02	98.55	9.2	28 98.45	75.67	114.27	86.45 to 104.78	16,730	16,487
30000 TO	59999	20	99.07	117.25	109.57	47.7	79 107.00	19.92	486.69	75.27 to 114.87	43,486	47,649
60000 TO	99999	8	88.78	105.92	105.67	54.5	100.24	45.66	254.31	45.66 to 254.31	73,593	77,765
100000 TO	149999	8	95.60	108.89	106.20	29.5	102.53	69.51	251.10	69.51 to 251.10	112,525	119,503
150000 TO	249999	13	75.20	68.68	69.84	25.4	98.35	16.18	102.26	51.04 to 91.65	184,798	129,056
250000 TO	499999	5	99.11	90.80	93.67	12.8	96.93	71.58	108.67	N/A	360,200	337,390
500000 +		9	74.62	95.02	78.03	61.8	121.78	32.85	302.96	34.08 to 113.62	834,465	651,107
ALL	_											
		83	95.87	104.58	83.82	40.1	12 124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472	144,573

Base Stat PAGE:4 of 5 **PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics** 66 - OTOE COUNTY State Stat Run COMMERCIAL Type: Qualified Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009 (!: AVTot=0) NUMBER of Sales: 83 **MEDIAN:** 96 95% Median C.I.: 84.89 to 99.60 COV: 77.44 (!: Derived) TOTAL Sales Price: 13,665,247 WGT. MEAN: 84 STD: 80.99 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 60.64 to 107.01 TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 14,315,247 MEAN: 105 AVG.ABS.DEV: 38.46 95% Mean C.I.: 87.15 to 122.00 TOTAL Assessed Value: 11,999,570 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 172,472 COD: MAX Sales Ratio: 560.00 40.12 AVG. Assessed Value: 144,573 PRD: 124.76 MIN Sales Ratio: 16.18 Printed: 01/22/2009 22:53:36 Avg. Adj. Avg. ASSESSED VALUE *

ASSESSED VA	ATOR *										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	5	109.43	184.66	116.00	98.21	159.19	38.67	560.00	N/A	2,600	3,016
5000 TO	9999	5	99.50	101.95	99.62	9.94	102.34	81.50	118.00	N/A	8,500	8,468
Total \$	5											
1 TO	9999	10	104.52	143.31	103.46	57.09	138.51	38.67	560.00	81.50 to 118.00	5,550	5,742
10000 TO	29999	14	87.72	73.79	47.97	30.99	153.81	16.18	114.27	35.98 to 103.25	39,057	18,736
30000 TO	59999	18	97.06	95.17	90.06	19.85	105.67	50.22	158.03	75.27 to 110.68	46,912	42,251
60000 TO	99999	11	84.89	91.01	74.25	37.36	122.56	45.64	219.51	51.04 to 120.34	110,557	82,093
100000 TO	149999	8	94.86	95.31	89.36	20.98	106.66	59.61	163.37	59.61 to 163.37	136,775	122,217
150000 TO	249999	10	78.55	135.53	77.12	88.39	175.75	32.85	486.69	71.58 to 254.31	243,468	187,751
250000 TO	499999	7	99.11	110.54	88.80	35.49	124.49	54.14	251.10	54.14 to 251.10	446,571	396,534
500000 +		5	95.87	121.62	87.75	66.95	138.60	34.08	302.96	N/A	999,500	877,058
ALL	_											
		83	95.87	104.58	83.82	40.12	124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472	144,573
COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		13	89.38	87.17	66.78	40.60	130.53	16.18	254.31	46.34 to 100.00	117,770	78,650
10		48	96.44	113.90	84.35	49.28	135.02	19.92	560.00	76.95 to 102.90	169,786	143,220
15		1	100.63	100.63	100.63			100.63	100.63	N/A	40,000	40,250
20		19	99.36	96.94	89.92	19.04	107.81	45.64	219.51	74.62 to 103.25	223,921	201,346
30		2	68.54	68.54	69.62	17.95	98.44	56.23	80.84	N/A	170,000	118,350
ALL	_											
		83	95.87	104.58	83.82	40.12	124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472	144,573

PAGE: 5 of 5
COMMERCIAL

PAGE: 5 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

COMMERCIAL		TAD 2009	ype: Qualifi	State Stat Run			
			Date Ran	age: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008	Posted B	efore: 01/22/2009	(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER of Sales:	83	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	77.44	95% Median C.I.: 84.89 to 99.60	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,665,247	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	80.99	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 60.64 to 107.01	(=)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,315,247	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	38.46	95% Mean C.I.: 87.15 to 122.00	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,999,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	172,472	COD:	40.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	560.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	144,573	PRD:	124.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.18	Printed: 01/22/2	009 22:53:36

	AVG. Assessed Val	ue:	144,573	PRD:	124.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.18			Printed: 01/22/2	009 22:53:36
OCCUPANCY	CODE									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUN	r MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	0 66.91	84.34	63.42	64.36	132.99	16.18	254.31	38.67 to 115.60	137,487	87,192
297		2 102.42	102.42	100.81	2.31	101.59	100.05	104.78	N/A	71,500	72,080
300		2 68.49	68.49	34.43	50.24	198.91	34.08	102.90	N/A	980,000	337,445
304		1 118.00	118.00	118.00			118.00	118.00	N/A	6,000	7,080
311		2 73.24	73.24	65.09	55.14	112.52	32.85	113.62	N/A	626,342	407,670
323		1 101.65	101.65	101.65			101.65	101.65	N/A	80,000	81,320
325		1 93.13	93.13	93.13			93.13	93.13	N/A	100,000	93,130
340		2 101.13	101.13	101.81	1.12	99.33	100.00	102.26	N/A	115,190	117,275
343		3 85.47	82.57	75.05	15.25	110.01	61.57	100.66	N/A	748,333	561,633
344		2 90.38	90.38	83.17	11.33	108.67	80.14	100.63	N/A	135,000	112,285
349		3 93.81	71.03	79.86	28.23	88.94	19.92	99.36	N/A	76,400	61,013
350		1 59.61	59.61	59.61			59.61	59.61	N/A	175,000	104,310
352		4 89.97	88.61	88.27	12.46	100.39	73.96	100.53	N/A	241,500	213,165
353	1	9 86.45	87.63	83.54	28.26	104.89	35.98	158.03	67.24 to 111.85	97,228	81,228
384		2 87.29	87.29	76.10	14.10	114.70	74.98	99.60	N/A	55,000	41,855
406		4 137.03	235.87	145.60	91.82	162.00	109.43	560.00	N/A	31,375	45,682
419		1 74.62	74.62	74.62			74.62	74.62	N/A	530,000	395,470
442		3 95.99	81.45	77.20	16.64	105.50	50.22	98.13	N/A	50,751	39,180
459		1 75.67	75.67	75.67			75.67	75.67	N/A	18,000	13,620
468		1 71.34	71.34	71.34			71.34	71.34	N/A	50,000	35,670
470		1 45.64	45.64	45.64			45.64	45.64	N/A	160,000	73,020
471		2 103.26	103.26	95.32	11.24	108.33	91.65	114.87	N/A	95,000	90,550
472		2 103.25	103.25	103.25	0.00	100.00	103.25	103.25	N/A	24,000	24,780
478		1 84.89	84.89	84.89			84.89	84.89	N/A	100,000	84,890
494		4 179.89	179.74	204.94	54.08	87.70	56.23	302.96	N/A	294,625	603,817
526		2 96.95	96.95	95.91	2.01	101.09	95.00	98.90	N/A	21,500	20,620
528		6 106.90	178.69	110.96	88.11	161.05	75.20	486.69	75.20 to 486.69	121,750	135,090
ALL		_									
	8	3 95.87	104.58	83.82	40.12	124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472	144,573
PROPERTY I	TYPE *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUN	r MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02											
03	8	0 94.41	100.21	72.76	37.28	3 137.73	16.18	560.00	80.84 to 99.50	166,146	120,893
04		3 251.10	220.91	227.47	25.79	97.12	108.67	302.96	N/A	341,166	776,040
ALL		_									
	8	3 95.87	104.58	83.82	40.12	124.76	16.18	560.00	84.89 to 99.60	172,472	144,573

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

Commercial:

	Beginning Ratio	Number of Sales
Overall commercial ratio:	95.87%	83
Nebraska City commercial	89.00%	43

Action taken:

All Nebraska City commercial factored at 1.04.

After implementation of new values:

Overall Nebraska City commercial ratio: 92.57%

2009 Assessment Survey for Otoe County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Appraiser and Appraisal Assistant
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraiser
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2008
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	Small towns- 2008
	Nebraska City- 2008
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?
	2006
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	All three approaches to value are used with a final correlation of the different approaches.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	9 Assessor locations
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	By towns
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation
	grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes, but we also look at the occupancy codes.
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? (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.)

No
= '

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
36			36

Base Stat PAGE:1 of 5 PAD 2009 R&O Statistics 66 - OTOE COUNTY State Stat Run

COMMERCIAL

156,167

COD:

AVG. Adj. Sales Price:

IERCIAL		T	ype: Qualified			State Stat Kun	
			Date Range	: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008	Posted 1	Before: 01/23/2009	(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER of Sales	3: 76	MEDIAN:	99	cov:	76.67	95% Median C.I.: 86.45 to 103.25	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price	11,218,747	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	83.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 70.02 to 117.14	(,
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	11,868,747	MEAN:	109	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.76	95% Mean C.I.: 90.45 to 128.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value	11,106,890						

40.19 MAX Sales Ratio: 560.00

AVG. Assessed Value:		146,143 PRD:		116.78 M	116.78 MIN Sales Ratio: 17.67				Printed: 03/21/2009 13:21:00		
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	4	97.36	99.01	99.27	8.00	99.74	86.45	114.87	N/A	65,438	64,957
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	7	101.69	96.12	82.97	27.60	115.85	51.04	163.37	51.04 to 163.37	107,554	89,237
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	100.00	156.65	112.64	72.41	139.07	80.76	488.03	80.76 to 488.03	83,840	94,440
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	9	93.81	91.11	86.84	49.87	104.91	17.67	251.10	19.92 to 108.51	95,772	83,170
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	9	99.60	99.56	81.23	37.80	122.56	38.67	239.71	55.83 to 113.30	305,500	248,156
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	94.44	90.95	80.10	24.30	113.55	39.31	134.61	73.43 to 115.60	43,008	34,448
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	101.37	98.81	101.86	8.10	97.00	87.51	113.62	N/A	227,800	232,038
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	179.02	190.98	285.19	48.97	66.96	102.90	302.96	N/A	165,125	470,917
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	84.89	88.48	89.26	10.39	99.13	75.20	102.74	N/A	121,900	108,806
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	84.65	81.18	74.92	30.74	108.35	45.64	109.78	N/A	98,750	73,985
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	82.41	158.78	73.89	109.12	214.90	54.14	560.00	54.14 to 560.00	333,416	246,345
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	100.67	88.77	60.22	25.51	147.40	32.85	120.89	N/A	333,796	201,025
Study Years											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	98.73	110.57	93.13	43.69	118.73	17.67	488.03	80.76 to 108.51	91,239	84,966
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	30	102.14	108.18	112.35	33.26	96.29	38.67	302.96	87.51 to 109.93	168,836	189,688
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	19	87.01	109.20	71.94	48.71	151.81	32.85	560.00	74.62 to 104.62	228,430	164,323
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	37	99.50	105.51	86.04	42.06	122.63	17.67	488.03	80.76 to 106.88	127,417	109,632
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	102.06	112.50	138.51	31.07	81.22	45.64	302.96	84.89 to 104.62	155,777	215,768
ALL											
	76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.19	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
BURR	2	104.21	104.21	101.46	7.89	102.71	95.99	112.43	N/A	42,126	42,740
DUNBAR	1	102.90	102.90	102.90			102.90	102.90	N/A	10,000	10,290
NEBRASKA CITY	37	93.33	101.93	85.21	35.09	119.63	17.67	488.03	81.89 to 104.69	172,758	147,202
OTOE	1	118.00	118.00	118.00			118.00	118.00	N/A	6,000	7,080
PALMYRA	1	74.62	74.62	74.62			74.62	74.62	N/A	530,000	395,470
RURAL 8000	6	94.41	137.43	128.86	91.30	106.65	32.85	302.96	32.85 to 302.96	372,947	480,590
RURAL 9000	1	84.89	84.89	84.89			84.89	84.89	N/A	100,000	84,890
SYRACUSE	15	93.81	132.20	86.10	71.53	153.54	19.92	560.00	71.34 to 158.03	145,191	125,016
TALMAGE	2	104.72	104.72	100.67	4.50	104.02	100.00	109.43	N/A	24,690	24,855
UNADILLA	10	99.55	92.83	95.45	18.52	97.26	38.67	134.61	46.34 to 115.60	28,150	26,868
ALL											
	76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.19	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143

Base Stat PAGE:2 of 5 66 - OTOE COUNTY PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

COMMERCIAL						Type: Qualifi	eo biausues		State Stat Run			
	_						iea nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2	000 Posted	Before: 01/23	1/2000		
		-					nge: 07/01/2005 to 00/50/2					(!: AVTot=0)
		ER of Sales		76	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	76.67		Median C.I.: 86.45		(!: Derived)
		Sales Price		1,218,747	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	83.79		. Mean C.I.: 70.02		
	TOTAL Adj.			1,868,747	MEAN:	109	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.76	95	% Mean C.I.: 90.4	5 to 128.12	
		essed Value		1,106,890		40.40						
	AVG. Adj. S			156,167	COD:	40.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	560.00				
		essed Value		146,143	PRD:	116.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.67			Printed: 03/21/2	
	S: URBAN,										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1		70	98.92	106.47	81.96	36.5		17.67	560.00	87.01 to 103.25	147,226	120,673
2		5	84.89	147.77	196.79	108.5	75.09	45.64	302.96	N/A	212,575	418,334
3		1	113.62	113.62	113.62			113.62	113.62	N/A	500,000	568,090
ALL_												
		76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.1	L9 116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143
	IMPROVED,										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1		71	99.50	112.40	97.62	38.5		19.92	560.00	87.51 to 103.73	151,096	147,503
2		5	51.04	64.98	55.58	63.1	116.90	17.67	163.37	N/A	228,175	126,828
ALL_												
		76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.1	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143
	ISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		4	104.72	104.46	101.17	6.1	L8 103.26	95.99	112.43	N/A	33,408	33,797
13-0056												
13-0097												
34-0034												
49-0033												
49-0050												
55-0145												
55-0160												
64-0023												
66-0027		29	99.11	112.17	84.08	45.1	133.41	19.92	560.00	76.95 to 103.25	98,030	82,425
66-0111		42	96.03	108.57	97.89	41.4	15 110.91	17.67	488.03	82.18 to 105.65	199,100	194,902
66-0501		1	74.62	74.62	74.62			74.62	74.62	N/A	530,000	395,470
NonValid	School	4	104.72	104.46	101.17	6.1	103.26	95.99	112.43	N/A	33,408	33,797
ALL												
		76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.1	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143

Base Stat PAGE:3 of 5 PAD 2000 P&O Statistics 66 - OTOE COUNTY

MEAN WGT. MEAN

64.01

105.65

84.44

85.22

105.65

114.62

RANGE

0 OR Blank

Prior TO 1860 1860 TO 1899

1900 TO 1919

COUNT MEDIAN

1 105.65

70.58

99.60

10

19

OU - OIOE COUNTI		PAD Z	<u>uuy Ka</u>	<u>O Stausucs</u>			CAMAR CAMA Dave			
COMMERCIAL		Γ	Гуре: Qualifi	ed		State Stat Run				
			Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008	Posted I	Before: 01/23/2009		(!: AVTot=0)		
NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	76.67	95% Median C.I.: 86.4	5 to 103.25	(!: Derived)		
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,218,747	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	83.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 70.0	2 to 117.14	(112011104)		
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,868,747	MEAN:	109	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.76	95% Mean C.I.: 90.	45 to 128.12			
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,106,890									
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	156,167	COD:	40.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	560.00					
AVG. Assessed Value:	146,143	PRD:	116.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.67		Printed: 03/21/20	009 13:21:00		
YEAR BUILT *							Avg. Adj.	Avg.		

PRD

133.14

135.74

MIN

254.31

105.65

560.00

17.67

105.65

39.31

COD

61.85

40.48

Sale Price

137,487

40,000

32,578

95% Median C.I.

38.67 to 115.60

N/A

81.50 to 108.00

Assd Val

88,002

42,260

27,508

1920 TO 193	19	4	90.69	94.55	85.09	17.25	111.12	75.92	120.89	N/A	75,625	64,347
1940 TO 194	.9	2	106.34	106.34	105.82	4.37	100.49	101.69	110.99	N/A	90,000	95,240
1950 TO 195	9	5	103.73	173.85	106.65	92.50	163.02	65.09	488.03	N/A	107,400	114,540
1960 TO 196	19	10	97.59	94.39	93.82	24.85	100.61	19.92	163.37	71.34 to 113.30	105,600	99,074
1970 TO 197	'9	6	103.25	107.89	97.02	14.89	111.20	75.20	158.03	75.20 to 158.03	142,366	138,128
1980 TO 198	19	6	87.90	86.31	81.13	18.52	106.39	45.64	114.87	45.64 to 114.87	158,333	128,456
1990 TO 199	4	6	174.82	178.61	154.43	49.18	115.65	74.62	302.96	74.62 to 302.96	366,250	565,610
1995 TO 199	19	5	60.38	72.28	62.51	40.96	115.64	32.85	113.62	N/A	574,537	359,132
2000 TO Pre	sent	2	83.82	83.82	97.38	24.90	86.08	62.95	104.69	N/A	442,500	430,900
ALL	_											
		76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.19	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143
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	4	112.52	205.93	126.25	117.21	163.11	38.67	560.00	N/A	2,000	2,525
5000 TO	9999	2	108.80	108.80	109.64	8.46	99.24	99.60	118.00	N/A	5,500	6,030
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	6	112.52	173.55	116.63	80.86	148.80	38.67	560.00	38.67 to 560.00	3,166	3,693
10000 TO	29999	11	102.90	98.42	100.19	8.90	98.23	81.50	113.30	82.61 to 112.43	17,136	17,169
30000 TO	59999	19	103.73	121.30	112.82	48.53	107.52	19.92	488.03	73.43 to 120.89	43,143	48,676
60000 TO	99999	7	106.88	119.58	119.49	43.72	100.08	49.86	254.31	49.86 to 254.31	73,392	87,694
100000 TO	149999	8	99.88	113.34	110.85	28.18	102.25	75.92	251.10	75.92 to 251.10	112,525	124,728
150000 TO	249999	13	75.20	71.81	72.87	25.86	98.55	17.67	102.74	51.04 to 98.73	184,798	134,664
250000 TO	499999	4	89.94	91.90	95.13	14.03	96.60	77.81	109.93	N/A	357,500	340,105
500000 +		8	83.97	104.01	93.80	59.12	110.88	32.85	302.96	32.85 to 302.96	699,398	656,033
ALL	_											
		76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.19	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143

66 - OTOE	COUNTY				PAD 2	009 R&	O Statistics		Base S	tat		PAGE:4 of 5
COMMERCIAL						Гуре: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
							nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	76	MEDIAN:	99	cov:	76.67	95%	Median C.I.: 86.45	to 103.25	(!: Av 101=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	: 11	,218,747	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	83.79		. Mean C.I.: 70.02		(Derivea)
TO	OTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 11	,868,747	MEAN:	109	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.76	95	% Mean C.I.: 90.4	5 to 128.12	
7	TOTAL Asses	sed Value	: 11	,106,890								
/A	/G. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	156,167	COD:	40.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	560.00				
	AVG. Assess	sed Value	:	146,143	PRD:	116.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.67			Printed: 03/21/2	2009 13:21:00
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO	4999	5	109.43	184.66	116.00	98.2	21 159.19	38.67	560.00	N/A	2,600	3,016
5000 TO	9999	3	99.50	99.67	96.85	12.2	102.91	81.50	118.00	N/A	8,666	8,393
Total	\$											
1 TO	9999	8	104.52	152.79	103.23	69.8	148.01	38.67	560.00	38.67 to 560.00	4,875	5,032
10000 TO	29999	11	89.38	81.34	66.13	26.0	123.00	19.92	113.30	39.31 to 108.00	26,163	17,300
30000 TO	59999	18	101.87	95.34	80.83	22.8	117.95	17.67	158.03	73.43 to 112.43	51,912	41,961
60000 TO	99999	10	83.39	93.14	75.56	39.2	28 123.26	45.64	239.71	51.04 to 110.99	114,112	86,228
100000 TO	149999	7	101.69	102.47	96.42	19.3	106.27	65.09	163.37	65.09 to 163.37	121,314	116,975
150000 TO	249999	12	87.90	130.38	81.02	66.5	160.92	32.85	488.03	76.95 to 102.74	231,640	187,671
250000 TO	499999	6	96.22	113.71	89.14	41.2	23 127.55	54.14	251.10	54.14 to 251.10	459,166	409,321
500000 +		4	109.16	144.28	121.07	58.6	119.17	55.83	302.96	N/A	770,625	932,977
ALL												
		76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.1	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143

	76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.19	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143
COST RANK										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	13	89.38	87.85	67.31	39.84	130.51	17.67	254.31	46.34 to 100.00	117,770	79,273
10	42	102.22	121.00	100.90	48.94	119.93	19.92	560.00	82.18 to 108.00	144,624	145,920
15	1	105.65	105.65	105.65			105.65	105.65	N/A	40,000	42,260
20	18	99.55	101.37	93.85	20.37	108.01	45.64	239.71	80.76 to 108.51	215,750	202,473
30	2	75.62	75.62	76.73	16.75	98.54	62.95	88.28	N/A	170,000	130,445
ALL											
	76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.19	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143

Base Stat PAGE:5 of 5 PAD 2009 R&O Statistics 66 - OTOE COUNTY COMMER

			VVZ ALES	O DIMINION			α_{i} , α_{i} , α_{i}	
ERCIAL		7	Гуре: Qualifi	ed			State Stat Run	
			Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/200	8 Posted I	Before: 01/23/2009		(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER of Sales:	76	MEDIAN:	99	cov:	76.67	95% Median C.I.:	86.45 to 103.25	(!: Av Iot=0) (!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,218,747	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	83.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.02 to 117.14	(11 2 01 17 0 11)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,868,747	MEAN:	109	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.76	95% Mean C.I.:	90.45 to 128.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,106,890							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	156,167	COD:	40.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	560.00			
3770 3 7 77 - 7	146 142	DDD.	116 70	MIN Galas Dation	17 67			

P	AVG. Assessed Value	e:	146,143	PRD:	116.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.67			Printed: 03/21/2	009 13:21:00
OCCUPANCY C	ODE									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	10	70.58	85.22	64.01	61.85	133.14	17.67	254.31	38.67 to 115.60	137,487	88,002
297	2	108.96	108.96	106.01	3.98	102.78	104.62	113.30	N/A	71,500	75,800
300	2	79.37	79.37	56.19	29.65	141.25	55.83	102.90	N/A	655,000	368,020
304	1	118.00	118.00	118.00			118.00	118.00	N/A	6,000	7,080
311	2	73.24	73.24	65.09	55.14	112.52	32.85	113.62	N/A	626,342	407,670
323	1	110.99	110.99	110.99			110.99	110.99	N/A	80,000	88,790
325	1	101.69	101.69	101.69			101.69	101.69	N/A	100,000	101,690
340	2	101.37	101.37	102.19	1.35	99.20	100.00	102.74	N/A	115,190	117,715
343	2	101.63	101.63	100.95	8.17	100.67	93.33	109.93	N/A	490,000	494,670
344	2	96.58	96.58	90.20	9.39	107.07	87.51	105.65	N/A	135,000	121,770
349	3	93.81	74.08	84.76	31.48	87.40	19.92	108.51	N/A	76,400	64,753
350	1	65.09	65.09	65.09			65.09	65.09	N/A	175,000	113,910
352	4	93.69	94.48	92.19	10.63	102.49	80.76	109.78	N/A	241,500	222,632
353	14	81.84	87.90	90.11	27.42	97.54	39.31	158.03	60.38 to 106.88	120,489	108,576
384	2	90.75	90.75	82.69	9.76	109.74	81.89	99.60	N/A	55,000	45,480
406	4	142.13	238.42	149.06	86.73	159.95	109.43	560.00	N/A	31,375	46,767
419	1	74.62	74.62	74.62			74.62	74.62	N/A	530,000	395,470
442	3	95.99	89.26	85.17	14.74	104.81	64.67	107.13	N/A	50,751	43,223
459	1	82.61	82.61	82.61			82.61	82.61	N/A	18,000	14,870
468	1	71.34	71.34	71.34			71.34	71.34	N/A	50,000	35,670
470	1	45.64	45.64	45.64			45.64	45.64	N/A	160,000	73,020
471	2	106.80	106.80	101.28	7.56	105.45	98.73	114.87	N/A	95,000	96,215
472	2	103.25	103.25	103.25	0.00	100.00	103.25	103.25	N/A	24,000	24,780
478	1	84.89	84.89	84.89			84.89	84.89	N/A	100,000	84,890
494	3	251.10	205.67	250.47	31.86	82.11	62.95	302.96	N/A	269,166	674,176
526	2	105.87	105.87	104.72	2.02	101.09	103.73	108.00	N/A	21,500	22,515
528	6	106.90	182.28	111.99	91.46	162.77	75.20	488.03	75.20 to 488.03	121,750	136,346
ALL											
	76	98.92	109.28	93.58	40.19	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143
PROPERTY TY	PE *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02											
03	74	98.40	104.75	81.86	36.60	127.96	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 102.90	151,570	124,080
04	2	277.03	277.03	295.01	9.36	93.90	251.10	302.96	N/A	326,250	962,475
ALL											
		98.92	109.28	93.58	40.19	116.78	17.67	560.00	86.45 to 103.25	156,167	146,143
				-						,	.,

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. These quality statistics do not support assessment uniformity or proportionality. 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 qualified median is best indication of the level of value in the commercial property class.

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	129	76	58.91
2008	138	87	63.04
2007	125	81	64.80
2006	118	71	60.17
2005	98	66	67.35

COMMERCIAL:A review of the utilization grid indicates the county has utilized all of the available arms length residential sales for the development of the qualified statistics.

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and 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 x 1.063 = 0.982. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

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

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	96	4.61	100	99
2008	97.69	-0.48	97	97.52
2007	96	-1.05	94	95
2006	93	5.94	99	96
2005	94	3.91	98	94

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

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

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

Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

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

% Change in Total
Assessed Value in the Sales File

% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)

5.88	2009	4.61	
3.46	2008	-0.48	
-0.64	2007	-1.05	
3.95	2006	5.94	
7.43	2005	3.91	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	99	94	109

COMMERCIAL:A review of the three measures of central tendency for the commercial property class indicates that only the mean is outside the acceptable range.

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	40.19	116.78
Difference	20.19	13.78

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both well outside the range. The quality statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity. The diversity of the class in the county may reflect on the assessment quality.

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	83	76	-7
Median	96	99	3
Wgt. Mean	84	94	10
Mean	105	109	4
COD	40.12	40.19	0.07
PRD	124.76	116.78	-7.98
Minimum	16.18	17.67	1.49
Maximum	560.00	560.00	0.00

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

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

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

Agricultural

	Beginning Ratio	Number of Sales
Overall Unimproved Agricultural Ratio:	65.73%	77
NBHD 7000	64.76%	23
NBHD 8000	67.05%	24
NBHD 9000	63.46%	12
NBHD 9100	64.18%	18

Action taken:

NBHD 7000- Factor agland @ 1.08

NBHD 8000- Factor agland @ 1.05

NBHD 9000- Factor agland @ 1.10

NBHD 9100- Factor agland @ 1.09

After implementation of increase due to factoring:

	Overall Ratio	Number of Sales
NBHD 7000	70.84%	23
NBHD 8000	70.46%	24
NBHD 9000	69.79%	12
NBHD 9100	69.94%	18

Overall unimproved agricultural ratio after increase: 70.84%

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 1 of 4

	E COONII		l	\mathbf{P}	AD 2009 K	<u>xu Agr</u>	<u>iculturai Stausi</u>	ucs			0 (727	
AGRICULI	URAL UNIMPRO	VED			T	Гуре: Qualifi	ed				Query: 6727	
						Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		
	NUMBER	of Sales:		31	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	34.55	95%	Median C.I.:	60.58 to 78.08	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal	les Price:	6	,434,663	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	23.61			57.19 to 76.29	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sal	les Price:	6	,434,663	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.70	_	% Mean C.I.:	59.68 to 77.00	(** ***********************************
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	sed Value:	4	,294,270								
	AVG. Adj. Sal	les Price:		207,569	COD:	25.32	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.37				
	AVG. Assess	sed Value:		138,524	PRD:	102.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.92			Printed: 04/0	3/2009 13:24:31
DATE OF	SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median (C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrt	rs											
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05	2	77.90	77.90	78.39	12.3	6 99.37	68.27	87.53	N/A	161,27	4 126,425
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05	5	87.76	84.26	82.82	9.0	5 101.74	65.20	96.94	N/A	190,20	0 157,516
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	2	70.62	70.62	70.72	2.2	0 99.86	69.06	72.17	N/A	330,57	8 233,770
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	2	71.09	71.09	75.17	7.5	2 94.56	65.74	76.43	N/A	210,83	3 158,485
07/01/06	TO 09/30/06	3	74.09	70.92	72.29	7.8	7 98.10	60.58	78.08	N/A	266,40	0 192,586
10/01/06	TO 12/31/06	1	80.59	80.59	80.59			80.59	80.59	N/A	292,00	0 235,310
01/01/07	TO 03/31/07	2	76.06	76.06	76.04	0.1	5 100.02	75.94	76.17	N/A	166,00	0 126,230
04/01/07	TO 06/30/07	4	48.39	61.01	67.79	49.8	3 89.99	29.89	117.37	N/A	155,07	2 105,130
07/01/07	TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07	TO 12/31/07	2	42.11	42.11	42.15	0.4	2 99.89	41.93	42.28	N/A	242,80	0 102,340
01/01/08	TO 03/31/08	3	69.91	79.77	64.23	28.7	2 124.20	54.59	114.82	N/A	241,70	8 155,250
04/01/08	TO 06/30/08	5	45.88	49.02	37.96	50.3	8 129.12	14.92	89.47	N/A	164,81	5 62,570
Stu	dy Years											
	TO 06/30/06	11	76.43	78.23	77.45	12.2		65.20	96.94	65.74 to 89		
	TO 06/30/07	10	75.02	68.95	72.72	22.2		29.89	117.37	43.90 to 80	•	•
	TO 06/30/08	10	50.24	56.86	48.32	44.7	5 117.67	14.92	114.82	26.90 to 89	.47 203,48	0 98,328
	endar Yrs											
	TO 12/31/06	8	73.13	72.09	73.48	7.1		60.58	80.59	60.58 to 80		•
	TO 12/31/07	8	48.39	60.05	61.04	42.4	6 98.37	29.89	117.37	29.89 to 117	7.37 179,73	6 109,707
ALL												

25.32

102.41

14.92

117.37

60.58 to 78.08

207,569

138,524

31

69.91

68.34

66.74

Base Stat PAGE:2 of 4 PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics 66 - OTOE COUNTY

31

31

31

COUNT

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE

__ALL___

2

69.91

MEDIAN

69.91

69.91

68.34

MEAN

68.34

68.34

66.74

66.74

66.74

WGT. MEAN

99 - 010	DE COUNTY		PA	XD 2009 K&	XU Agr	<u>icultural Statis</u>	SUCS	Zuse s			
AGRICULI	TURAL UNIMPROVED				Гуре: Qualifi					Query: 6727	
						nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2	2008 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	31	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	34.55	95% 1	Median C.I.:	60.58 to 78.08	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price	: 6	5,434,663	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	23.61			57.19 to 76.29	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	: 6	5,434,663	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.70		% Mean C.I.:	59.68 to 77.00	(**************************************
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value	: 4	1,294,270								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	207,569	COD:	25.32	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.37				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	138,524	PRD:	102.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.92			Printed: 04/03	/2009 13:24:31
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median (C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
3491	1	81.70	81.70	81.70			81.70	81.70	N/A	325,000	265,540
3495	4	59.04	64.73	69.78	27.6	92.77	43.90	96.94	N/A	165,545	115,510
3497	1	89.69	89.69	89.69			89.69	89.69	N/A	72,000	64,580
3499	2	37.75	37.75	30.77	60.4	8 122.69	14.92	60.58	N/A	296,200	91,135
3699	2	50.50	50.50	62.91	46.7	3 80.27	26.90	74.09	N/A	168,800	106,185
3701	1	87.76	87.76	87.76			87.76	87.76	N/A	120,000	105,310
3703	1	114.82	114.82	114.82			114.82	114.82	N/A	76,000	87,260
3705	1	69.06	69.06	69.06			69.06	69.06	N/A	309,687	213,880
3707	1	41.93	41.93	41.93			41.93	41.93	N/A	181,600	76,150
3709	1	29.89	29.89	29.89			29.89	29.89	N/A	171,000	51,120
3719	1	76.43	76.43	76.43			76.43	76.43	N/A	372,000	284,320
3721	2	57.08	57.08	56.89	19.6	100.33	45.88	68.27	N/A	155,679	88,560
3723	2	77.01	77.01	77.32	1.3	9 99.60	75.94	78.08	N/A	260,000	201,040
3725	1	117.37	117.37	117.37			117.37	117.37	N/A	221,109	259,510
3727	4	68.96	70.49	65.37	14.9	8 107.84	54.59	89.47	N/A	253,196	165,515
3729	3	69.91	71.33	71.91	3.9	3 99.20	67.92	76.17	N/A	128,148	92,153
3731	3	80.59	70.13	66.91	18.7	2 104.82	42.28	87.53	N/A	255,166	170,733
ALL	<u> </u>										
	31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.3	2 102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78		138,524
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median (Assd Val
7000	11	72.17	74.89	71.74	18.9		42.28	117.37	54.59 to 89		155,475
8000	10	72.50	68.81	67.77	24.5		29.89	114.82	41.93 to 87		139,724
9000	5	65.20	68.12	73.70	25.1		43.90	96.94	N/A	197,436	145,516
9100	5	60.58	53.24	45.83	40.2	116.16	14.92	89.69	N/A	200,400	91,844

25.32

25.32

25.32

COD

102.41

102.41

102.41

PRD

14.92

14.92

14.92

MIN

117.37

117.37

117.37

MAX

60.58 to 78.08

95% Median C.I.

60.58 to 78.08

60.58 to 78.08

207,569

207,569

207,569

Avg. Adj.

Sale Price

138,524

138,524

138,524

Avg.

Assd Val

Base Stat PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics PAGE:3 of 4 66 - OTOE COUNTY

AGRICULTU	URAL UNIMPRO	OVED		A 4.		Type: Qualif	ied	ШВИСВ			Query: 6727	
							nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/	30/2008 Poste	d Before: 01/2	3/2009		
	NUMBER	R of Sales:	:	31	MEDIAN:	70	CC	ov: 34.55	95%	Median C.I.: 60.5	58 to 78.08	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sa	ales Price:	: (5,434,663	WGT. MEAN:	67	ST	D: 23.61		. Mean C.I.: 57.1		(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa	ales Price:	: (5,434,663	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DE				.68 to 77.00	(** ***********************************
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses	ssed Value:	: 4	4,294,270								
	AVG. Adj. Sa	ales Price:	:	207,569	COD:	25.32	MAX Sales Rati	o: 117.37	7			
	AVG. Asses	ssed Value:	:	138,524	PRD:	102.41	MIN Sales Rati	.o: 14.92	2		Printed: 04/03	/2009 13:24:31
SCHOOL D	DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		4	88.72	94.13	94.15	10.5	59 99.98	81.70	117.37	N/A	184,527	173,735
13-0056												
13-0097												
34-0034												
49-0033		2	84.06	84.06	83.14	4.1	13 101.11	80.59	87.53	N/A	230,750	191,835
49-0050		1	54.59	54.59	54.59			54.59	54.59	N/A	491,648	268,390
55-0145		1	14.92	14.92	14.92			14.92	14.92	N/A	386,800	57,710
55-0160		1	42.28	42.28	42.28			42.28	42.28	N/A	304,000	128,530
64-0023												
66-0027		12	69.49	73.68	73.37	18.5	100.42	43.90	114.82	65.20 to 89.47	162,787	119,442
66-0111		7	68.27	59.49	63.68	23.5	93.42	29.89	78.08	29.89 to 78.08	222,279	141,541
66-0501		3	60.58	53.86	62.03	25.9	97 86.83	26.90	74.09	N/A	181,066	112,310
NonValid	School	4	88.72	94.13	94.15	10.5	59 99.98	81.70	117.37	N/A	184,527	173,735
ALL_												
		31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.3	32 102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78.08	207,569	138,524
ACRES IN	N SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
10.01 T	0.00	2	46.32	46.32	41.78	41.9	93 110.88	26.90	65.74	N/A	64,833	27,085
30.01 T	ro 50.00	7	43.90	48.73	36.93	40.2	27 131.96	14.92	89.69	14.92 to 89.69	159,792	59,011
50.01 T	ro 100.00	10	72.93	75.40	71.83	18.4	104.98	45.88	114.82	60.58 to 89.47	153,843	110,500
100.01 T	ro 180.00	11	78.08	77.67	74.41	17.6	59 104.38	42.28	117.37	54.59 to 96.94	297,819	221,609
180.01 T	ro 330.00	1	76.43	76.43	76.43			76.43	76.43	N/A	372,000	284,320
ALL_												
		31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.3	32 102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78.08	207,569	138,524
MAJORITY	LAND USE >	95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		7	69.91	74.98	76.79	19.8	97.64	41.93	117.37	41.93 to 117.37	225,262	172,990
DRY-N/A		23	72.17	67.45	64.89	25.4	103.96	14.92	114.82	54.59 to 81.70	197,992	128,470
GRASS		1	42.28	42.28	42.28			42.28	42.28	N/A	304,000	128,530
ALL_												
		0.1										

102.41

14.92

117.37

60.58 to 78.08

25.32

69.91

68.34

66.74

31

138,524

207,569

Base Stat PAGE:4 of 4 PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics 66 - OTOE COUNTY

60000 TO

100000 TO

150000 TO

250000 TO

__ALL_

99999

149999

249999

499999

4

4

6

31

10

67.79

72.93

77.34

77.26

69.91

73.08

72.31

80.17

80.06

68.34

61.61

68.74

79.03

75.99

66.74

AGRICIIIT	URAL UNIMPR	OVED			XD ZUUJ KI	T O I''					Query: 6727	
1101112021	011111111	.0 122				Type: Qualifi	iea nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Postod	Before: 01/23	1/2000	2	
	MITIMOTEI	R of Sales		31	MIEDIANI.							
(A. T. D.					MEDIAN:	70	COV:	34.55		Median C.I.: 60.5		(!: Derived)
(AgLand)		ales Price		6,434,663	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	23.61	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 57.1	.9 to 76.29	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa			6,434,663	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.70	95	% Mean C.I.: 59	.68 to 77.00	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses			4,294,270								
	AVG. Adj. Sa			207,569	COD:	25.32	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.37				
	AVG. Asses	ssed Value	:	138,524	PRD:	102.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.92				/2009 13:24:31
MAJORITY	Y LAND USE	> 80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN		WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		21	72.17	71.21	71.80	18.6	99.18	26.90	117.37	65.20 to 80.59	220,162	158,077
DRY-N/A		9	65.74	64.55	56.14	39.2	22 114.99	14.92	114.82	29.89 to 96.94	167,471	94,012
GRASS		1	42.28	42.28	42.28			42.28	42.28	N/A	304,000	128,530
ALL_												
		31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.3	102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78.08	207,569	138,524
MAJORITY	Y LAND USE :	> 50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		30	71.04	69.21	67.95	24.4	101.86	14.92	117.37	65.20 to 78.08	204,355	138,858
GRASS		1	42.28	42.28	42.28			42.28	42.28	N/A	304,000	128,530
ALL_												
		31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.3	102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78.08	207,569	138,524
SALE PRI	ICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lov	w \$											
Tota	al \$											
30000	TO 59999	1	65.74	65.74	65.74			65.74	65.74	N/A	49,667	32,650
60000	TO 99999	4	78.81	74.83	73.95	34.8	101.20	26.90	114.82	N/A	76,741	56,747
100000	TO 149999	5	76.17	70.04	70.64	21.1	99.14	43.90	89.47	N/A	123,236	87,058
150000 7	TO 249999	11	68.27	69.04	70.68	27.1	97.68	29.89	117.37	41.93 to 96.94	185,058	130,800
250000	TO 499999	10	73.13	64.39	63.06	18.8	35 102.11	14.92	81.70	42.28 to 80.59	342,620	216,054
ALL_												
		31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.3	102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78.08	207,569	138,524
ASSESSEI	D VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lov	w \$											
Tota	al \$											
10000 7	TO 29999	1	26.90	26.90	26.90			26.90	26.90	N/A	80,000	21,520
30000		6	48.39		33.35	33.6	137.57	14.92	67.92	14.92 to 67.92	152,435	50,833

118.61

105.19

101.44

105.35

102.41

41.93

42.28

69.06

54.59

14.92

114.82

89.47

96.94

117.37

117.37

N/A

60.58 to 87.76

N/A

54.59 to 117.37

60.58 to 78.08

121,977

177,762

269,321

349,537

207,569

75,155

122,200

212,840

265,628

138,524

43.04

15.17

11.11

15.96

25.32

Base Stat PAGE:1 of 4 **PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics** 66 - OTOE COUNTY Ouery: 6727

ACRICIII.TIIRAI. IINTMPROVED

01/01/08 TO 03/31/08

04/01/08 TO 06/30/08

07/01/06 TO 06/30/07

07/01/07 TO 06/30/08

01/01/07 TO 12/31/07

____ALL___

Calendar Yrs 01/01/06 TO 12/31/06

Study Years 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06 3

5

11

10

10

8

8

31

69.91

45.88

76.43

75.02

50.24

73.13

48.39

69.91

79.77

49.02

78.23

68.95

56.86

72.09

60.05

68.34

64.23

37.96

77.45

72.72

48.32

73.48

61.04

66.74

AGRICUL'	TURAL UNIMPRO	OVED			7	Type: Qualifie	ed				Query: 0/2/	
						Date Rang	ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		
	NUMBER	of Sales:	:	31	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	34.55	95%	Median C.I.:	50.58 to 78.08	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sa	les Price:	: 6	,434,663	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	23.61	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.:	57.19 to 76.29	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price:	: 6	,434,663	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.70	95	% Mean C.I.:	59.68 to 77.00	(
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses	sed Value:	: 4	,294,270								
	AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price:	:	207,569	COD:	25.32	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.37				
	AVG. Asses	sed Value:	:	138,524	PRD:	102.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.92			Printed: 04/03	/2009 13:24:59
DATE OF	SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrt	rs											
07/01/05	5 TO 09/30/05	2	77.90	77.90	78.39	12.36	99.37	68.27	87.53	N/A	161,274	126,425
10/01/05	5 TO 12/31/05	5	87.76	84.26	82.82	9.09	5 101.74	65.20	96.94	N/A	190,200	157,516
01/01/06	5 TO 03/31/06	2	70.62	70.62	70.72	2.20	99.86	69.06	72.17	N/A	330,578	233,770
04/01/06	5 TO 06/30/06	2	71.09	71.09	75.17	7.52	94.56	65.74	76.43	N/A	210,833	158,485
07/01/06	5 TO 09/30/06	3	74.09	70.92	72.29	7.87	7 98.10	60.58	78.08	N/A	266,400	192,586
10/01/06	5 TO 12/31/06	1	80.59	80.59	80.59			80.59	80.59	N/A	292,000	235,310
01/01/07	7 TO 03/31/07	2	76.06	76.06	76.04	0.15	5 100.02	75.94	76.17	N/A	166,000	126,230
04/01/07	7 TO 06/30/07	4	48.39	61.01	67.79	49.83	89.99	29.89	117.37	N/A	155,072	105,130
07/01/07	7 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07	7 TO 12/31/07	2	42.11	42.11	42.15	0.42	99.89	41.93	42.28	N/A	242,800	102,340

124.20

129.12

101.01

94.81

98.11

98.37

102.41

117.67

54.59

14.92

65.20

29.89

14.92

60.58

29.89

14.92

114.82

89.47

96.94

117.37

114.82

80.59

117.37

117.37

N/A

N/A

65.74 to 89.69

43.90 to 80.59

26.90 to 89.47

60.58 to 80.59

29.89 to 117.37

60.58 to 78.08

241,708

164,815

214,215

204,348

203,480

271,753

179,736

207,569

155,250

165,903

148,605

199,697

109,707

138,524

98,328

62,570

28.72

50.38

12.27

22.24

44.75

7.12

42.46

25.32

Base Stat PAGE: 2 of 4 PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics 66 - OTOE COUNTY

	DE COUNTY			PAD 2009	Special	<u>Value Statisti</u>	<u>cs</u>	Dase S	·····	0 (727	
AGRICULI	TURAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Qualifi					Query: 6727	
					Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/	2008 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	31	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	34.55	95%	Median C.I.:	60.58 to 78.08	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price	: (5,434,663	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:		95% Wgt		57.19 to 76.29	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	: (5,434,663	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:			% Mean C.I.:	59.68 to 77.00	(**************************************
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value	: 4	1,294,270								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	207,569	COD:	25.32	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.37				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	138,524	PRD:	102.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.92			Printed: 04/03/	/2009 13:24:59
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
3491	1	81.70	81.70	81.70			81.70	81.70	N/A	325,000	265,540
3495	4	59.04	64.73	69.78	27.6	92.77	43.90	96.94	N/A	165,545	115,510
3497	1	89.69	89.69	89.69			89.69	89.69	N/A	72,000	64,580
3499	2	37.75	37.75	30.77	60.4	122.69	14.92	60.58	N/A	296,200	91,135
3699	2	50.50	50.50	62.91	46.7	73 80.27	26.90	74.09	N/A	168,800	106,185
3701	1	87.76	87.76	87.76			87.76	87.76	N/A	120,000	105,310
3703	1	114.82	114.82	114.82			114.82	114.82	N/A	76,000	87,260
3705	1	69.06	69.06	69.06			69.06	69.06	N/A	309,687	213,880
3707	1	41.93	41.93	41.93			41.93	41.93	N/A	181,600	76,150
3709	1	29.89	29.89	29.89			29.89	29.89	N/A	171,000	51,120
3719	1	76.43	76.43	76.43			76.43	76.43	N/A	372,000	284,320
3721	2	57.08	57.08	56.89	19.6	100.33	45.88	68.27	N/A	155,679	88,560
3723	2	77.01	77.01	77.32	1.3	99.60	75.94	78.08	N/A	260,000	201,040
3725	1	117.37	117.37	117.37			117.37	117.37	N/A	221,109	259,510
3727	4	68.96	70.49	65.37	14.9	107.84	54.59	89.47	N/A	253,196	165,515
3729	3	69.91	71.33	71.91	3.9	99.20	67.92	76.17	N/A	128,148	92,153
3731	3	80.59	70.13	66.91	18.7	104.82	42.28	87.53	N/A	255,166	170,733
ALL	<u> </u>										
	31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.3	102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78	.08 207,569	138,524
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
7000	11	72.17	74.89	71.74	18.9	104.38	42.28	117.37	54.59 to 89		155,475
8000	10	72.50	68.81	67.77	24.5	55 101.52	29.89	114.82	41.93 to 87	.76 206,164	139,724
9000	5	65.20	68.12	73.70	25.1	.1 92.43	43.90	96.94	N/A	197,436	145,516
9100	5	60.58	53.24	45.83	40.2	26 116.16	14.92	89.69	N/A	200,400	91,844
ALL	<u> </u>										
	31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.3	102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78	·	138,524
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED	D & IOL	L							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C		Assd Val
2	31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.3	102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78	.08 207,569	138,524
ALL											
	31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.3	102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78	.08 207,569	138,524

Base Stat PAGE: 3 of 4 66 - OTOE COUNTY PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics Query: 6727 AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED Type: Qualified Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009 NUMBER of Sales: 31 **MEDIAN:** 70 95% Median C.I.: 60.58 to 78.08 COV: 34.55 (!: Derived) TOTAL Sales Price: (AgLand) 6,434,663 WGT. MEAN: 67 STD: 23.61 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 57.19 to 76.29 (!: land+NAT=0)TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: 6,434,663 (AgLand) MEAN: 68 17.70 95% Mean C.I.: AVG.ABS.DEV: 59.68 to 77.00 TOTAL Assessed Value: 4,294,270 (AgLand) AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 207,569 COD: MAX Sales Ratio: 117.37 25.32 AVG. Assessed Value: 138,524 PRD: 102.41 MIN Sales Ratio: 14.92 Printed: 04/03/2009 13:24:59 Avg. Adj. SCHOOL DISTRICT * Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN 95% Median C.I. MEAN MAX 88.72 (blank) 4 94.13 94.15 10.59 99.98 81.70 117.37 N/A 184,527 173,735 13-0056 13-0097 34-0034 49-0033 2 84.06 84.06 83.14 4.13 101.11 80.59 87.53 N/A 230,750 191,835 49-0050 1 54.59 54.59 54.59 54.59 54.59 N/A 491,648 268,390 55-0145 1 14.92 14.92 14.92 14.92 14.92 N/A 386,800 57,710 55-0160 1 42.28 42.28 42.28 42.28 42.28 N/A 304,000 128,530 64-0023 66-0027 12 69.49 73.68 73.37 18.56 100.42 43.90 114.82 65.20 to 89.47 162,787 119,442 66-0111 7 68.27 59.49 63.68 23.59 93.42 29.89 78.08 29.89 to 78.08 222,279 141,541 66-0501 3 60.58 53.86 62.03 25.97 86.83 26.90 74.09 N/A 181,066 112,310 NonValid School 4 88.72 94.13 94.15 10.59 99.98 81.70 117.37 N/A 184,527 173,735 ALL 31 69.91 68.34 66.74 25.32 102.41 14.92 117.37 60.58 to 78.08 207,569 138,524 Avg. Adj. Avg. ACRES IN SALE RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val 10.01 TO 30.00 2 46.32 46.32 41.78 41.93 110.88 26.90 65.74 N/A 64,833 27,085 30.01 TO 50.00 7 43.90 48.73 36.93 40.27 131.96 14.92 89.69 14.92 to 89.69 159,792 59,011 50.01 TO 100.00 10 72.93 75.40 71.83 18.42 104.98 45.88 114.82 60.58 to 89.47 153,843 110,500 100.01 TO 180.00 11 78.08 77.67 74.41 17.69 104.38 42.28 117.37 54.59 to 96.94 297,819 221,609 180.01 TO 330.00 1 76.43 76.43 76.43 76.43 76.43 N/A 372,000 284,320 ALL 31 69.91 68.34 66.74 25.32 102.41 14.92 117.37 60.58 to 78.08 207,569 138,524 Avg. MAJORITY LAND USE > 95% Avg. Adj. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I.

19.85

25.41

25.32

97.64

103.96

102.41

41.93

14.92

42.28

14.92

117.37

114.82

117.37

42.28

41.93 to 117.37

54.59 to 81.70

N/A

60.58 to 78.08

225,262

197,992

304,000

207,569

172,990

128,470

128,530

138,524

7

23

1

31

69.91

72.17

42.28

69.91

74.98

67.45

42.28

68.34

76.79

64.89

42.28

66.74

DRY

DRY-N/A

ALL

GRASS

Base Stat PAGE:4 of 4 **PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics** 66 - OTOE COUNTY Query: 6727

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED Type: Qualified

100000 TO

150000 TO

250000 TO

ALL

149999

249999

499999

72.93

77.34

77.26

69.91

10

4

6

31

72.31

80.17

80.06

68.34

68.74

79.03

75.99

	re: 01/23/2009	Posted 1	//01/2005 to 06/30/2008	Date Range				
(!: Derived)	95% Median C.I.: 60.58 to 78.08	34.55	cov:	70	MEDIAN:	31	NUMBER of Sales:	
(!: land+NAT=0)	5% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 57.19 to 76.29	23.61	STD:	67	WGT. MEAN:	6,434,663	TOTAL Sales Price:	(AgLand)
(C 121 CC2	momar add delem pedere	(A T 1)

			~ -	MEDIAN.	70	COV	34.55	956	Median C.I	60.58 to /8.08	(!: Dei
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price	: 6	,434,663	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD	: 23.61	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.:	57.19 to 76.29	(!: land+NA
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	: 6	,434,663	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV	: 17.70	95	% Mean C.I.:	59.68 to 77.00	(
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value	: 4	,294,270								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	207,569	COD:	25.32	MAX Sales Ratio	: 117.37				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	138,524	PRD:	102.41	MIN Sales Ratio	: 14.92			Printed: 04/0	3/2009 13:2
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE > 80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd V
DRY	21	72.17	71.21	71.80	18.6	99.18	26.90	117.37	65.20 to 80	0.59 220,16	2 158,

	AVG. Asses	sed Value	e:	138,524	PRD:	102.41 I	MIN Sales Ratio:	14.92			Printed: 04/03/2	2009 13:24:59
MAJORITY L	AND USE >	80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		21	72.17	71.21	71.80	18.66	99.18	26.90	117.37	65.20 to 80.59	220,162	158,077
DRY-N/A		9	65.74	64.55	56.14	39.22	114.99	14.92	114.82	29.89 to 96.94	167,471	94,012
GRASS		1	42.28	42.28	42.28			42.28	42.28	N/A	304,000	128,530
ALL	_											
		31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.32	102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78.08	207,569	138,524
MAJORITY L	AND USE >	50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		30	71.04	69.21	67.95	24.45	101.86	14.92	117.37	65.20 to 78.08	204,355	138,858
GRASS		1	42.28	42.28	42.28			42.28	42.28	N/A	304,000	128,530
ALL	_											
		31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.32	102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78.08	207,569	138,524
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
Total \$	\$											
30000 TO	59999	1	65.74	65.74	65.74			65.74	65.74	N/A	49,667	32,650
60000 TO	99999	4	78.81	74.83	73.95	34.80	101.20	26.90	114.82	N/A	76,741	56,747
100000 TO	149999	5	76.17	70.04	70.64	21.12	99.14	43.90	89.47	N/A	123,236	87,058
150000 TO	249999	11	68.27	69.04	70.68	27.19	97.68	29.89	117.37	41.93 to 96.94	185,058	130,800
250000 TO	499999	10	73.13	64.39	63.06	18.85	102.11	14.92	81.70	42.28 to 80.59	342,620	216,054
ALL												
		31	69.91	68.34	66.74	25.32	102.41	14.92	117.37	60.58 to 78.08	207,569	138,524
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
Total \$	\$											
10000 TO	29999	1	26.90	26.90	26.90			26.90	26.90	N/A	80,000	21,520
30000 TO	59999	6	48.39	45.88	33.35	33.69	137.57	14.92	67.92	14.92 to 67.92	152,435	50,833
60000 TO	99999	4	67.79	73.08	61.61	43.04	118.61	41.93	114.82	N/A	121,977	75,155

89.47

96.94

117.37

60.58 to 87.76

N/A

54.59 to 117.37

177,762

269,321

349,537

122,200

212,840

265,628

105.19

101.44

105.35

42.28

69.06

54.59

15.17

11.11

15.96



County Assessor

Therese E. Trombino Christina M. Smallfoot

Deputy Assessor

Office of Otoe County Assessor

February 27, 2009

Ms. Ruth Sorenson Property Tax Administrator Nebraska Department of Revenue/Property Assessment Division 301 Centennial Mall South P.O. Box 98919 Lincoln, NE 68509

Re: Special Valuation Methodology – 2009

Introduction

From a geographic standpoint, Otoe County is located directly to the south of Cass County, east of Lancaster County, north of Nemaha and Johnson Counties, and west of the Missouri River. Two of the bordering counties, Lancaster and Cass have a high degree of real estate sales activity and have also implemented special valuation for their entire county agriculture base. Neither Nemaha nor Johnson Counties have the same degree of activity as Lancaster, Cass, or Otoe. Our county has a relatively high degree of activity in the agricultural market. Syracuse is an activity center due to its' location on the four-lane Highway #2 and it's proximity to the prison in Tecumseh. The villages of Unadilla and Palmyra are also seeing increases in activity, with this activity comes an increase in the acreage market surrounding these villages.

Market Areas in Otoe County

In 2007, Otoe County implemented four market areas for the valuation of agricultural land. These market areas were developed to account for the differences in sale price for comparable soil groups and uses. The four market areas are geographically based to determine value.

Recapture Values

Recapture values in Otoe County are determined by utilizing the sales comparison approach. All sales are reviewed and verified. LVG guidelines, soil classes, overall use, as well as location within the market area are considered. Unique sale factors are also

analyzed to further break down the differences in an agricultural sale versus an influenced sale. Each sale is recorded in a book and computer file and later plotted on a map. An impact analysis is done to see the influence each sale has within its neighborhood. Through this, the most appropriate value per acre is determined for each land capability group.

Special Values

The market analysis that has been performed over the past three years indicates an amount of "influence" in the northern areas of Otoe County. This area has a measurable non-agriculture influence, which is not apparent in the southern tier of Otoe County. According to current state policy, Otoe County's special values are constructed using the sales comparison approach. Greenbelt values were determined by using the agricultural market area on the southern edge of the county, bordering Johnson and Nemaha Counties. Starting in 2006 and continuing through 2009, Otoe County is continuing to use the sales comparison approach in order to determine greenbelt values; however, we are now using the following sales criteria to establish those values. First, a sale must include 80 or more acres and be completely unimproved. Second, extensive research is done with the buyer, seller, and any real estate agents involved in the sale to determine if it was influenced by commercial or rural residential factors (i.e. acreage or subdivision development, etc.) If the determination of the assessor and/or appraiser is that the sale is uninfluenced by factors other than agricultural use for the land, and the sale meets the first criteria, it is included in the sales analysis study to help determine greenbelt values. This analysis is done on all sales on a countywide basis, and is not restricted to a certain market area.

Certification

The previous narrative is a true and accurate representation of the methodology of the special valuation procedures in Otoe County.

Sincerely,

Therese E. Trombino Otoe County Assessor

1021 Central Avenue, Nebraska City, NE 68410 Phone (402) 873-9520 Fax (402) 873-9523 assessor@otoe.nacone.org http://www.co.otoe.ne.us http://www.otoe.gisworkshop.com

2009 CORRELATION SECTION

For Otoe County

AGRICULTURAL OR SPECIAL VALUATION

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL LAND: Previous to 2009 Otoe County has been measured by the 994 analysis. In review of the statistical reports for 2009 along with the sales trend in Otoe County as well as adjoining counties the measurement process is relying on sales where the recapture and the agricultural value are the same. The trend for Otoe County is that there has been a progressive reduction between the difference between the special value and that of the recapture or market value. The rising values of agricultural land coupled with the declining market for residential land and in this case the slowing of residential development in the county the nonagricultural influence has decreased. Otoe County is progressive in their approach to valuing agricultural land and is working towards implementation of the latest soil survey.

Refer to the following Statistical Analysis;

In Otoe County 35 sales are in the analysis for the minimally improved statistics. The median for this sample is 70 and the COD is 25.32 with a PRD of 102.41. The range for the measures of central tendency is from 67-70. The assessment practices in Otoe County are applied to both the sold and assessed base in a similar fashion. As referenced in the methodology for the special value the county relies on sales of 80 acres or more to aid in determining value. The county also relies on sales throughout the county if by the determination of the assessor and or appraiser that the sale is uninfluenced by factors other than agricultural use for the land. The actions of the assessor are supported by the statistics shown in the following agricultural statistics.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records: 11,379

Value: 1,271,363,850

Growth 11,223,120
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 4,024,440 778 58 1,310,150 214 5,819,150 1,050 11,153,740 02. Res Improve Land 4,203 29,468,240 202 6,084,380 932 32,857,770 5,337 68,410,390 204 936 03. Res Improvements 4,336 311,747,950 25,532,100 126,115,690 5,476 463,395,740 04. Res Total 345,240,630 262 164,792,610 7,561,000 5.114 32,926,630 1.150 6.526 542,959,870 % of Res Total 78.36 63.58 4.01 6.06 17.62 30.35 57.35 42.71 67.37 05. Com UnImp Land 151 2,600,380 16 947,180 10 342,740 177 3.890.300 554 11,922,270 41 3,477,630 23 826,060 618 16,225,960 06. Com Improve Land 41 24 637 07. Com Improvements 572 79,746,030 18,098,460 3,443,940 101,288,430 08. Com Total 723 94,268,680 57 22,523,270 34 4,612,740 814 121,404,690 780,380 4.18 % of Com Total 88.82 77.65 7.00 18.55 3.80 7.15 9.55 6.95 09. Ind UnImp Land 25.630 0 0 0 25.630 10. Ind Improve Land 7 424,700 5 487,280 0 0 12 911.980 5 12 11. Ind Improvements 7 8,763,550 7,706,580 0 16,470,130 12. Ind Total 8 9,213,880 5 8,193,860 0 0 13 17,407,740 281,560 0.11 2.51 % of Ind Total 61.54 52.93 38.46 47.07 0.00 0.00 1.37 226,930 13. Rec UnImp Land 0 0 223.200 5 3.730 14. Rec Improve Land 0 0 3 641,850 3 641,850 21 15. Rec Improvements 0 0 0 0 21 103.710 103.710 16. Rec Total 0 0 1 3,730 25 26 968,760 972,490 0 0.00 3.85 96.15 0.23 0.00 % of Rec Total 0.00 0.38 99.62 0.08 Res & Rec Total 5.114 345.240.630 263 32,930,360 165,761,370 6.552 543,932,360 7.561.000 1.175 % of Res & Rec Total 78.05 63.47 6.05 17.93 30.47 57.58 42.78 67.37 4.01 Com & Ind Total 62 34 731 103,482,560 30,717,130 4.612.740 827 138,812,430 1.061.940 74.55 7.50 22.13 3.32 10.92 9.46 % of Com & Ind Total 88.39 4.11 7.27 17. Taxable Total 5,845 448,723,190 325 63,647,490 1,209 170,374,110 7,379 682,744,790 8,622,940 % of Taxable Total 79.21 65.72 4.40 9.32 16.38 24.95 64.85 53.70 76.83

Exhibit 66 - Page 64

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

		Urban			SubUrban	
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	60,720	1,104,810	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	1	60,720	1,104,810
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II	_			1	60,720	1,104,810

Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records U1	ban Value	Records Sub	Urban _{Value}	Records Rura	al Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	3	29,620	1	46,470	11	84,240	15	160,330	0
25. Total	3	29,620	1	46,470	11	84,240	15	160,330	0

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

•	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Producing	591	88	332	1,011

Schedule V: Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban			Rural	Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	27,280	307	31,783,530	2,220	265,440,050	2,528	297,250,860
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	165	22,764,110	1,243	188,504,170	1,408	211,268,280
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	165	9,008,660	1,292	70,930,930	1,457	79,939,590
30. Ag Total							3,985	588,458,730

Schedule VI: Agricultural Red	cords :Non-Agric	ultural Detail					
		Urban			SubUrban		Y
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	3	2.14	13,410	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	102	104.00	1,068,720	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	95	94.00	7,179,200	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	18	61.80	95,940	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	146	328.73	406,380	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	160	0.00	1,829,460	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	592.52	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growt
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	12	26.50	105,460	15	28.64	118,870	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	791	815.50	8,410,900	893	919.50	9,479,620	
33. HomeSite Improvements	788	780.50	53,984,200	883	874.50	61,163,400	2,600,1
34. HomeSite Total				898	948.14	70,761,890	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	89	1,033.81	611,800	107	1,095.61	707,740	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,094	2,170.02	2,515,860	1,240	2,498.75	2,922,240	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,224	0.00	16,946,730	1,384	0.00	18,776,190	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,491	3,594.36	22,406,170	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,648.62	0	0	7,241.14	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	2.00	100	0	2.00	100	
41. Total Section VI				2,389	11,785.64	93,168,160	2,600,18

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	2	77.00	66,320	2	77.00	66,320	

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

		Urban			SubUrban	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	287	25,442.60	33,953,290
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	287	25,442.60	38,837,430
		Rural			Total	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	2,285	232,829.71	303,228,000	2,572	258,272.31	337,181,290
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

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry	0.00	0.0070	V	0.0070	0.00
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
70. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
71. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Irrigated Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	3.80	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00

Market Area	70

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	179.00	6.86%	401,380	9.92%	2,242.35
46. 1A	464.00	17.79%	989,280	24.45%	2,132.07
47. 2A1	317.28	12.16%	558,410	13.80%	1,759.99
48. 2A	791.00	30.32%	1,146,950	28.35%	1,450.00
49. 3A1	531.30	20.36%	664,130	16.41%	1,250.01
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	282.34	10.82%	259,750	6.42%	919.99
52. 4A	44.00	1.69%	26,400	0.65%	600.00
53. Total	2,608.92	100.00%	4,046,300	100.00%	1,550.95
Dry					
54. 1D1	954.50	1.42%	2,091,120	1.98%	2,190.80
55. 1D	7,035.27	10.45%	14,355,920	13.61%	2,040.56
56. 2D1	5,379.05	7.99%	10,254,130	9.72%	1,906.31
57. 2D	10,141.60	15.07%	15,579,810	14.77%	1,536.23
58. 3D1	30,854.59	45.84%	50,293,020	47.67%	1,630.00
59. 3D	11.00	0.02%	13,640	0.01%	1,240.00
60. 4D1	12,659.44	18.81%	12,732,290	12.07%	1,005.75
61. 4D	271.83	0.40%	172,700	0.16%	635.32
62. Total	67,307.28	100.00%	105,492,630	100.00%	1,567.33
Grass					
63. 1G1	50.03	0.00%	41,820	0.40%	835.90
64. 1G	996.40	6.83%	871,720	8.28%	874.87
65. 2G1	3,121.84	21.40%	2,471,570	23.46%	791.70
66. 2G	2,228.14	15.27%	1,900,580	18.04%	852.99
67. 3G1	2,526.61	17.32%	1,898,870	18.03%	751.55
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	4,576.82	31.37%	2,946,030	27.97%	643.68
70. 4G	1,089.05	7.46%	403,040	3.83%	370.08
71. Total	14,588.89	100.00%	10,533,630	100.00%	722.03
Irrigated Total	2,608.92	3.02%	4,046,300	3.37%	1,550.95
Dry Total	67,307.28	77.79%	105,492,630	87.78%	1,567.33
Grass Total	14,588.89	16.86%	10,533,630	8.77%	722.03
Waste	2,019.91	2.33%	101,080	0.08%	50.04
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	3.21	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	86,525.00	100.00%	120,173,640	100.00%	1,388.89

Schedule IX:	Agricultural	Records:	Ag Land N	Market Area I	Detail

Market Area	80

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	84.00	8.59%	204,330	13.47%	2,432.50
46. 1A	114.00	11.66%	243,990	16.08%	2,140.26
47. 2A1	100.00	10.22%	185,500	12.23%	1,855.00
48. 2A	284.00	29.04%	424,330	27.97%	1,494.12
49. 3A1	126.00	12.88%	169,950	11.20%	1,348.81
50. 3A	113.00	11.55%	138,990	9.16%	1,230.00
51. 4A1	157.00	16.05%	149,840	9.88%	954.39
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	978.00	100.00%	1,516,930	100.00%	1,551.05
Dry					
54. 1D1	633.17	0.56%	1,415,760	0.81%	2,235.99
55. 1D	14,813.50	13.15%	30,603,440	17.47%	2,065.92
56. 2D1	12,540.38	11.13%	24,327,280	13.89%	1,939.92
57. 2D	7,738.36	6.87%	12,038,780	6.87%	1,555.73
58. 3D1	34,771.28	30.86%	56,875,660	32.47%	1,635.71
59. 3D	24,924.93	22.12%	33,193,920	18.95%	1,331.76
60. 4D1	16,481.67	14.63%	16,204,490	9.25%	983.18
61. 4D	762.34	0.68%	489,150	0.28%	641.64
62. Total	112,665.63	100.00%	175,148,480	100.00%	1,554.59
Grass					
63. 1G1	18.00	0.00%	14,460	0.09%	803.33
64. 1G	1,691.52	6.70%	1,488,580	9.01%	880.03
65. 2G1	6,319.41	25.05%	5,308,720	32.14%	840.07
66. 2G	2,005.49	7.95%	1,716,620	10.39%	855.96
67. 3G1	2,483.74	9.84%	1,787,160	10.82%	719.54
68. 3G	1,698.90	6.73%	936,730	5.67%	551.37
69. 4G1	5,512.34	21.85%	3,314,820	20.07%	601.35
70. 4G	5,501.82	21.81%	1,950,180	11.81%	354.46
71. Total	25,231.22	100.00%	16,517,270	100.00%	654.64
Irrigated Total	978.00	0.69%	1,516,930	0.78%	1,551.05
Dry Total	112,665.63	79.88%	175,148,480	90.61%	1,554.59
Grass Total	25,231.22	17.89%	16,517,270	8.55%	654.64
Waste	2,139.73	1.52%	108,260	0.06%	50.60
Other	24.70	0.02%	1,240	0.00%	50.20
Exempt	120.94	0.09%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	141,039.28	100.00%	193,292,180	100.00%	1,370.48

Schedule IX:	Agricultural	Records:	Ag Land	Market Area Detail
	9		9	

Market Area 90

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	13.00	4.63%	26,130	6.52%	2,010.00
47. 2A1	80.00	28.47%	140,800	35.12%	1,760.00
48. 2A	59.00	21.00%	85,550	21.34%	1,450.00
49. 3A1	90.00	32.03%	112,500	28.06%	1,250.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	39.00	13.88%	35,880	8.95%	920.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	281.00	100.00%	400,860	100.00%	1,426.55
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,024.50	1.82%	2,291,640	2.50%	2,236.84
55. 1D	9,564.87	17.03%	19,600,770	21.36%	2,049.25
56. 2D1	5,818.47	10.36%	11,061,080	12.05%	1,901.03
57. 2D	2,376.73	4.23%	3,837,390	4.18%	1,614.57
58. 3D1	19,382.31	34.51%	33,048,540	36.01%	1,705.09
59. 3D	10,337.21	18.40%	13,988,550	15.24%	1,353.22
60. 4D1	7,475.48	13.31%	7,815,830	8.52%	1,045.53
61. 4D	188.86	0.34%	138,450	0.15%	733.08
62. Total	56,168.43	100.00%	91,782,250	100.00%	1,634.05
Grass					
63. 1G1	24.53	0.00%	21,640	0.31%	882.19
64. 1G	764.44	7.15%	675,520	9.58%	883.68
65. 2G1	2,733.31	25.58%	2,229,450	31.60%	815.66
66. 2G	733.16	6.86%	628,410	8.91%	857.13
67. 3G1	1,224.92	11.46%	848,350	12.03%	692.58
68. 3G	1,169.98	10.95%	625,190	8.86%	534.36
69. 4G1	2,174.24	20.35%	1,376,560	19.51%	633.12
70. 4G	1,859.76	17.41%	649,660	9.21%	349.32
71. Total	10,684.34	100.00%	7,054,780	100.00%	660.29
Irrigated Total	281.00	0.41%	400,860	0.40%	1,426.55
Dry Total	56,168.43	82.26%	91,782,250	92.43%	1,634.05
Grass Total	10,684.34	15.65%	7,054,780	7.10%	660.29
Waste	1,132.45	1.66%	56,710	0.06%	50.08
Other	17.22	0.03%	860	0.00%	49.94
Exempt	11.59	0.02%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	68,283.44	100.00%	99,295,460	100.00%	1,454.17

Market	Area	91

T ' / I		0/ 64 4	¥7.1	0/ CX7 1 ±	A A 1871 #
Irrigated 45. 1A1	Acres 0.00	% of Acres* 0.00%	Value 0	% of Value* 0.00%	Average Assessed Value* 0.00
	0.00	0.00%			0.00
46. 1A			0	0.00%	
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	193.00	0.41%	418,880	0.58%	2,170.36
55. 1D	3,984.74	8.50%	7,795,520	10.82%	1,956.34
56. 2D1	4,120.21	8.78%	7,513,430	10.43%	1,823.56
57. 2D	5,046.18	10.76%	7,630,340	10.59%	1,512.10
58. 3D1	24,169.62	51.53%	39,688,340	55.10%	1,642.08
59. 3D	15.00	0.03%	18,600	0.03%	1,240.00
60. 4D1	9,206.84	19.63%	8,858,730	12.30%	962.19
61. 4D	165.00	0.35%	110,440	0.15%	669.33
62. Total	46,900.59	100.00%	72,034,280	100.00%	1,535.89
Grass					
63. 1G1	18.00	0.00%	15,810	0.15%	878.33
64. 1G	870.61	6.02%	806,920	7.75%	926.84
65. 2G1	2,825.80	19.54%	2,283,920	21.95%	808.24
66. 2G	2,140.21	14.80%	1,836,940	17.65%	858.30
67. 3G1	2,029.72	14.04%	1,404,450	13.50%	691.94
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	5,351.73	37.01%	3,475,220	33.39%	649.36
70. 4G	1,224.70	8.47%	583,350	5.61%	476.32
71. Total	14,460.77	100.00%	10,406,610	100.00%	719.64
	- ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		20,100,000	2000000	, 3, 0
Irrigated Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry Total	46,900.59	74.29%	72,034,280	87.28%	1,535.89
Grass Total	14,460.77	22.91%	10,406,610	12.61%	719.64
Waste	1,763.30	2.79%	88,250	0.11%	50.05
Other	3.00	0.00%	150	0.00%	50.00
Exempt	23.61	0.04%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	63,127.66	100.00%	82,529,290	100.00%	1,307.34

Schedule X : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	838.00	1,320,320	3,029.92	4,643,770	3,867.92	5,964,090
77. Dry Land	12.60	25,450	30,022.72	47,679,270	253,006.61	396,752,920	283,041.93	444,457,640
78. Grass	1.89	1,830	5,772.97	3,907,340	59,190.36	40,603,120	64,965.22	44,512,290
79. Waste	0.00	0	1,099.09	55,020	5,956.30	299,280	7,055.39	354,300
80. Other	0.00	0	24.70	1,240	20.22	1,010	44.92	2,250
81. Exempt	0.00	0	88.51	0	74.64	0	163.15	0
82. Total	14.49	27,280	37,757.48	52,963,190	321,203.41	442,300,100	358,975.38	495,290,570
					人			

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	3,867.92	1.08%	5,964,090	1.20%	1,541.94
Dry Land	283,041.93	78.85%	444,457,640	89.74%	1,570.29
Grass	64,965.22	18.10%	44,512,290	8.99%	685.17
Waste	7,055.39	1.97%	354,300	0.07%	50.22
Other	44.92	0.01%	2,250	0.00%	50.09
Exempt	163.15	0.05%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	358,975.38	100.00%	495,290,570	100.00%	1,379.73

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

66 Otoe **Percent Change** 2008 CTL 2009 Form 45 Value Difference 2009 Growth Percent excl. Growth **County Total County Total** (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL) Change (New Construction Value) 01. Residential 529,588,570 542,959,870 13,371,300 2.52% 7,561,000 1.10% 02 Recreational 311,230 972,490 661,260 212.47% 0 212.47% 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling 70,061,180 70,761,890 700,710 1.00% 2,600,180 -2.71% 04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) 599,960,980 614,694,250 14,733,270 2.46% 10,161,180 0.76% 05. Commercial 114,525,970 121,404,690 6,878,720 6.01% 780,380 5.32% 17,154,080 17,407,740 06. Industrial 253,660 1.48% 281,560 -0.16% 07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings 21,692,350 22,406,170 713,820 3.29% 0 3.29% 08. Minerals 124,740 350.49 35,590 160,330 350.49 0 09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) 4.50% 153,407,990 161,378,930 7,970,940 5.20% 1,061,940 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property 753,368,970 776,073,280 22,704,310 3.01% 11,223,120 1.52% 5,471,960 5,964,090 492,130 8.99% 11. Irrigated 12. Dryland 408,013,380 8.93% 444,457,640 36,444,260 13. Grassland 41,328,620 3,183,670 7.70% 44,512,290 14. Wasteland 397,700 354,300 -10.91% -43,400 15. Other Agland 1,306.25% 160 2,250 2,090 16. Total Agricultural Land 455,211,820 495,290,570 40,078,750 8.80% 17. Total Value of all Real Property 1,208,580,790 62,783,060 5.19% 11,223,120 4.27% 1,271,363,850 (Locally Assessed)



Andrea L. Walters Assessor

Therese E. Trombino Deputy Assessor

Office of Otoe County Assessor

** Three Year Plan **

	# of Parcels
Residential	6535
Commercial	805
Industrial	13
Agriculture	3977
Special Value	2539

New property: For assessment year 2008, an estimated 680 building permits and 1850 information statements were filed for new property construction/additions/changes in Otoe County.

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

Residential – Adjust market value of cities reviewed in 2008 according to new depreciation schedules. Complete physical review of smaller cities of Palmyra, Unadilla, and Syracuse in our county. Begin review of rural residential properties in market areas 7000 and 8000 (approximately 1/3 of residences). Make any changes necessary to reflect current condition and dwelling information.

Commercial – Review all commercial sale properties. Construct new depreciation tables and occupancy codes to reflect current use and condition. Adjust to market value.

Agricultural –Begin building the soil & land use layers in our GIS system. With this we are verifying the soil types on each parcel. We will complete ¼ of the County this year. Make adjustments accordingly.

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2010:

Residential –Finish physical review of 3 remaining smaller villages. Continue review of rural residential properties in market areas 8000 and 9000 (approximately 1/3 of residences) Correct property record cards to show current condition and dwelling information. Adjust to market value.

Commercial – Begin our physical review of remaining 3 smaller villages. Adjust depreciation tables & occupancy codes to reflect current use & condition. Adjust to market value.

Agricultural – Begin our physical review of agricultural parcels. Finish building the soil & land use layers in our GIS system and implement it to assist researching land use studies.

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

Residential – Begin physical review of rural residential properties. Correct property record cards to show current condition & dwelling information. Adjust to market value.

Commercial – Begin physical review of rural commercial properties. Adjust depreciation tables & occupancy codes to reflect current use & condition. Adjust to market value.

Agricultural – Begin physical review of all larger acreages. Correct property record cards to show current condition & dwelling information. Adjust to market value.

Current Resources:

The Otoe County Assessor's Office has five full-time and one part-time staff; Assessor, Deputy Assessor, Administrative Assistant, Appraisal Assistant, GIS Specialist, and Appraiser 104 hours a month. We have a total of \$188,139 in our budget for staff salaries. And \$2,000 in our budget for training classes for our staff. Also have \$500 in our budget for convention or workshop fees.

The cadastral maps are current in our office and are continually maintained by the staff. We are also continually updating our GIS system. We had additional funds in our budget from staff turnover during the first half of the budget year: I hired a temporary GIS Specialist to complete our parcel layer. In addition to this duty, this staff member worked on verification and coordination of information in our cadastral, GIS, and TerraScan records. Our Specialist has been able to find several areas where new surveys have been filed since our initial implementation of GIS. The program had not been maintained previously and needed quite a bit of work. We have recently added the land use layer to our GIS system. There is a lot of work to get this layer completed. This layer will help us do a faster and more accurate review of the land use when we undertake our next study. This staff member was recently approved as a full-time permanent position in our office. She is also now reviewing the sales in our county and at times, assisting with the annual reviews.

Physical and electronic property record cards are maintained for all real property parcels in Otoe County. Our administrative assistant does an annual inventory on all the physical cards to match the electronic updated card.

Otoe County currently physically reviews 100% of all qualified sales in each class of property. We make an attempt to briefly interview either a buyer, seller, or real estate agent involved with the sale. We also conduct interviews on any questionable disqualified sales. After inclusion or exclusion from the sales files, we continually review sales in order to determine if a change in qualification occurs.

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

Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative reports required by law/regulation:

Abstracts (real & personal property)

Assessor Survey

Sales information to PAD rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/ Abstract

Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
School District Taxable Value Report
Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
Certificate of Taxes Levied Report

Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property

Annual Plan of Assessment Report

Personal Property: administer annual filing of approximately 1400 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for change of value, incomplete filings, failure to file and/or penalties applied, as required.

Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of approximately 150 applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.

Taxable Government Owned Property: annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax.

Homestead Exemptions: administer approximately 675 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance. We have also been holding small workshops in villages outside of the County Seat for those who need assistance with their applications.

Centrally assessed: review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

Tax increment Financing: management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax. We do not have any active in our county at this time, but have just received the paperwork to implement one for the new Commercial State Bank for 2008.

Tax Districts and Tax Rates: management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.

Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.

Tax List Corrections: prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

County Board of Equalization: attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.

TERC Appeals: prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.

TERC Statewide Equalization: attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.

Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend southeast district assessor's meetings once a month, workshops sponsored by NACO or PAD and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor/deputy certification. We are planning on attending at least one 15 or 30-hour course every year, plus any additional training we feel we would benefit from, dependent on the budget constraints. We are also asking for additional funds in our budget to allow for the Appraisal Assistant and the GIS Specialist to attend courses.

Conclusion:

We will continue to need a substantial amount in our budget for the increased mileage costs associated with completion of planned reviews, which are required by statute. We will also be increasing our budget to allow for the education of our staff to better serve the public.

This concludes my three-year plan of assessment at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea L. Walters Otoe County Assessor

2009 Assessment Survey for Otoe County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	1 contracted appraiser (104 hours a month)
3.	Other full-time employees
	1-administrative assistant and 1 appraisal assistant & 1 GIS technician
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	$\mid 0$
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$210,010
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	None. The annual fee for Terra Scan is calculated in the County General budget.
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$207,178
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$48,500
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$2,500
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	None
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	0
13.	Total budget
	\$207,178
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	No

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software
	Terra Scan

3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor's office staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor, Deputy Assessor, & GIS Technician
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

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?
	Nebraska City and Syracuse
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	April 2002

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Ron Elliot- contract appraiser establishes values for pick-up work; help maintain,
	cost/depreciation tables.
2.	Other services
	None

Certification

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

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

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.

PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR

Ruth A. Sorensen Property Tax Administrator

Ruth a. Sorensen