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## 2009 Commission Summary

68 Perkins

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 80 | COD | 13.47 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 5,043,610$ | PRD | 103.53 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 5,043,610$ | COV | 26.82 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 4,924,300$ | STD | 27.11 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 63,045$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 13.27 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 61,554$ | Average Assessed Value <br> of the Base | $\$ 50,708$ |
| Median |  | Wgt. Mean | 98 |
| Mean | 101 | Max | 273 |
| Min | 35.46 |  |  |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 96.07 to 100.00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 95.14 to 107.02 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 95.25 to 100.02 |

$\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 14.43
$\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period 6.63
\% of Value Sold in the Study Period 8.05

## Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 109 | 98 | 12.19 | 103.06 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 103 | 99 | 11.15 | 105.52 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 88 | 98 | 17.76 | 103.14 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 85 | 96 | 21.68 | 105.54 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

68 Perkins

Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 10 | COD | 9.04 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 530,005$ | PRD | 104.23 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 517,505$ | COV | 12.16 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 457,488$ | STD | 11.21 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 51,751$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 8.50 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 45,749$ | Average Assessed Value |  |
|  |  | of the Base | $\$ 156,398$ |
| Median | 94 | Wgt. Mean | 88 |
| Mean | 92 | Max | 102 |
| Min | 66 |  |  |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 84.40 to 101.95 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 84.13 to 100.16 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 83.39 to 93.41 |


| $\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 9.63 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 3.83 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 1.12 |

## Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 13 | 93 | 18.45 | 101.95 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 16 | 94 | 22.92 | 107.19 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 19 | 96 | 24.6 | 113.61 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 25 | 97 | 34.27 | 117.27 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

68 Perkins

Agricultural Land - Current

| Number of Sales | 111 | COD | 15.20 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 21,591,510$ | PRD | 102.48 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 20,674,623$ | COV | 19.53 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 14,558,976$ | STD | 14.09 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 186,258$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 11.29 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 131,162$ | Average Assessed Value |  |
| of the Base | $\$ 107,701$ |  |  |
| Median | 74 | Wgt. Mean |  |
| Mean | 72 | Max | 70 |
| Min | 43.10 |  | 116.88 |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 69.91 to 77.23 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 69.55 to 74.79 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 66.88 to 73.96 |

\% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 75.89
$\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period 3.72
$\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period 4.08

| Agricultural Land - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 120 | 74 | 12.5 | 101.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 108 | 72 | 10.41 | 100.9 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 111 | 75 | 10.01 | 100.59 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 109 | 75 | 9.43 | 103.55 |

Opinions

## 2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Perkins 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 Perkins County is $99.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Perkins 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 Perkins County is $100.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Perkins 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 Perkins County is $74.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Perkins County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.


Ruth A. Sorensen<br>Property Tax Administrato

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009
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|  |  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 01/2006 to 06/30/2 | 08 Posted | re: 01/ | 009 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | f Sale |  | 83 | MEDIAN: | 93 |  | COV: | 32.55 | 95\% | dian C.I.: 88.27 | to 97.50 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | s Pric |  | , 610 | WGT. MEAN: | 88 |  | STD: | 29.83 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 81 | to 93.66 |  |
| TOT | L Adj. Sal | s Pric |  | , 610 | MEAN : | 92 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 18.14 |  | Mean C.I.: 85 | 2 to 98.06 |  |
|  | AL Asse | d Valu |  | , 050 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | s Pric |  | , 477 | COD : | 19.55 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 272.73 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | , 868 | PRD : | 104.35 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 6.90 |  |  | Printed: 01/22 | 22:55:16 |
| ASSESSED VA | UE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 7 | 118.15 | 114.94 | 65.43 | 43.89 |  | 175.66 | 35.46 | 272.73 | 35.46 to 272.73 | 4,587 | 3,001 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 5 | 94.12 | 86.22 | 82.68 | 15.52 |  | 104.27 | 53.91 | 105.00 | N/A | 8,950 | 7,400 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 12 | 97.06 | 102.97 | 75.48 | 39.50 |  | 136.43 | 35.46 | 272.73 | 56.26 to 126.00 | 6,405 | 4,834 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 18 | 83.05 | 80.90 | 61.37 | 20.55 |  | 131.83 | 6.90 | 120.00 | 70.97 to 100.00 | 30,244 | 18,560 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 20 | 82.16 | 90.55 | 85.86 | 23.59 |  | 105.46 | 50.84 | 153.33 | 76.74 to 103.33 | 47,580 | 40,852 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 19 | 93.85 | 93.87 | 92.14 | 10.18 |  | 101.88 | 66.67 | 121.62 | 88.57 to 100.00 | 83,447 | 76,890 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 10 | 96.88 | 94.68 | 93.69 | 6.75 |  | 101.06 | 70.71 | 107.53 | 88.89 to 102.04 | 127,225 | 119,200 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 4 | 99.27 | 93.25 | 91.66 | 6.80 |  | 101.74 | 74.47 | 100.00 | N/A | 188,750 | 173,000 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 83 | 92.77 | 91.64 | 87.82 | 19.55 |  | 104.35 | 6.90 | 272.73 | 88.27 to 97.50 | 62,477 | 54,868 |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 1 | 102.27 | 102.27 | 102.27 |  |  |  | 102.27 | 102.27 | N/A | 15,000 | 15,340 |
| 0 |  | 8 | 111.58 | 119.02 | 86.82 | 37.37 |  | 137.09 | 56.26 | 272.73 | 56.26 to 272.73 | 4,420 | 3,837 |
| 10 |  | 6 | 82.55 | 72.53 | 44.31 | 34.65 |  | 163.69 | 6.90 | 109.26 | 6.90 to 109.26 | 43,333 | 19,200 |
| 15 |  | 3 | 80.00 | 77.19 | 77.37 | 13.51 |  | 99.76 | 59.57 | 92.00 | N/A | 22,833 | 17,666 |
| 20 |  | 20 | 89.13 | 89.05 | 85.82 | 25.64 |  | 103.77 | 35.46 | 153.33 | 73.58 to 100.00 | 37,370 | 32,069 |
| 25 |  | 11 | 82.76 | 85.17 | 85.28 | 14.07 |  | 99.88 | 63.64 | 105.00 | 66.67 to 102.04 | 63,963 | 54,545 |
| 30 |  | 28 | 93.47 | 93.48 | 92.74 | 9.64 |  | 100.80 | 69.60 | 121.62 | 88.89 to 98.53 | 90,651 | 84,068 |
| 35 |  | 5 | 100.00 | 94.60 | 91.87 | 5.40 |  | 102.98 | 74.47 | 100.00 | N/A | 154,900 | 142,300 |
| 40 |  | 1 | 76.74 | 76.74 | 76.74 |  |  |  | 76.74 | 76.74 | N/A | 43,000 | 33,000 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 83 | 92.77 | 91.64 | 87.82 | 19.55 |  | 104.35 | 6.90 | 272.73 | 88.27 to 97.50 | 62,477 | 54,868 |
| STYLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 1 | 102.27 | 102.27 | 102.27 |  |  |  | 102.27 | 102.27 | N/A | 15,000 | 15,340 |
| 0 |  | 12 | 94.13 | 102.49 | 75.88 | 41.25 |  | 135.07 | 35.46 | 272.73 | 56.26 to 126.00 | 6,946 | 5,270 |
| 100 |  | 2 | 86.29 | 86.29 | 83.58 | 11.06 |  | 103.23 | 76.74 | 95.83 | N/A | 33,500 | 28,000 |
| 101 |  | 58 | 92.16 | 87.26 | 86.09 | 15.77 |  | 101.37 | 6.90 | 133.33 | 82.50 to 95.88 | 71,129 | 61,232 |
| 102 |  | 1 | 90.00 | 90.00 | 90.00 |  |  |  | 90.00 | 90.00 | N/A | 50,000 | 45,000 |
| 104 |  | 9 | 99.80 | 105.61 | 97.43 | 15.12 |  | 108.40 | 70.71 | 153.33 | 90.70 to 125.00 | 93,861 | 91,444 |
| _ ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 83 | 92.77 | 91.64 | 87.82 | 19.55 |  | 104.35 | 6.90 | 272.73 | 88.27 to 97.50 | 62,477 | 54,868 |

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified

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


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

## Residential

The Perkins County Assessor took actions to complete a new appraisal in the assessor location of Grant after reviewing the market information for residential property. All properties in this town were reviewed for proper quality and condition and new digital photographs were taken. A new reappraisal for Grant included June/2007 costing tables and new lot values derived from market information. A new depreciation table was developed from the market. Properties were given a new effective age based on the quality and actual age. The 2009 values for Grant residential parcels were set using both the cost approach and market approach when available. The County continues to complete a sales review and all pickup work was completed in a timely manner countywide.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Perkins County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Assessor and staff |  |  |  |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |  |  |  |
|  | Assessor |  |  |  |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |  |  |  |
|  | Assessor and staff |  |  |  |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |  |  |  |
|  | June/2004 for all villages except Grant; June/2007 for Grant and Rural Residential |  |  |  |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |  |  |  |
|  | 2009 for Grant; 2008 for Rural Residential; and 2007 for all other villages |  |  |  |
| 6. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties? |  |  |  |
|  | Cost Approach and Sales Comparison through the TerraScan program. |  |  |  |
| 7. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |  |  |  |
|  | 5 |  |  |  |
| 8. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |  |  |  |
|  | Similar characteristics and locations. |  |  |  |
| 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.) |  |  |  |
|  | Suburban properties around Grant are similar to properties inside the village limits due to the same amenities and physical characteristics. |  |  |  |
| 11. | Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain? |  |  |  |
|  | Yes, the land is valued the same also using \$10,000 for the first acre. |  |  |  |
| Residential Permit Numbers: |  |  |  |  |
|  | Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
|  | 19 | 40 | 23 | 82 |

# PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics <br> Base Stat 



Exhibit 68 Page 12


# PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics 



# PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics 
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68 - PERKINS COUNTY RESIDENTIAL

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


## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL:In conjunction with the Three Year Plan of Assessment and a cyclical review of the residential property class in Perkins County, the assessor took actions to complete a new appraisal in the assessor location of Grant. All properties within Grant were included and June/2007 costing tables were applied with new depreciation tables and lot values. The cost approach and sales comparison approach were analyzed for the 2009 valuations. The assessor continues to conduct uniform and proportionate assessment practices as shown through the actions and the qualitative statistics. With Grant representing approximately $56 \%$ of the sold properties, Table III is supporting the equalization of sold and unsold properties. Less than one percent difference is shown between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R\&O Ratio. Through the residential R\&O statistics and the known assessment practices of Perkins County, the median at 99 best describes the level of value for this assessment year.

## 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 | 126 | 80 | 63.49 |
| 2008 | 155 | 109 | 70.32 |
| 2007 | 148 | 103 | 69.59 |
| 2006 | 121 | 88 | 72.73 |
| 2005 | 122 | 85 | 69.67 |

RESIDENTIAL:The total number of residential sales has declined for this study period; likewise the number of qualified sales have decreased also. The county has utilitzed over $63 \%$ of the available sales for measurement purposes. The assessor conducts a thorough review process in determining the qualified residential sales file. With the known assessment review practices and the history of the high percent used for the development of the statistics, the county continues to utilize every available transaction and has not excessively trimmed the sample.

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

 Continued|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended <br> Preliminary Ratio | R\&O <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 93 | 5.76 | 98 | 99 |
| 2008 | 96.47 | 3.19 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | 98.48 |
| 2007 | 96 | 2.59 | 99 | 99 |
| 2006 | 91 | 1.61 | 92 | 98 |
| 2005 | 92 | 0.88 | 93 | 96 |

RESIDENTIAL:Less than one percent difference is shown between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R\&O Ratio. This supports the assessment actions to apply a new appraisal to residential values in the Village of Grant. New improvement and lot values were applied to this assessor location. Grant sales are approximately $56 \%$ of the sold residential properties. These ratios are reflective of the fair treatment given to the sample and the base.

## 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)

| 18.75 | 2009 | 5.76 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 10.05 | 2008 | 3.19 |
| 1.98 | 2007 | 2.59 |
| 11.57 | 2006 | 1.61 |
| 1.55 | 2005 | 0.88 |

RESIDENTIAL:Comparing the percent change in the sales file to the percent change in the residential base (excl. growth) reflects an approximate 12.99 point spread. This is not unreasonable based on the new appraisal completed in the assessor location of Grant. Sales within Grant make up over $56 \%$ of the sample base.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 99 | 98 | 101 |

RESIDENTIAL:Less than one percent is shown between the median and weighted mean measures of central tendency. Both are acceptable and show strong support of each other. The mean falls slightly over the range. The Trended Preliminary Ratio of 98.36 shows support of the median with a slight difference of .18 points. For direct equalization purposes, the median best describes the level of value.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 13.47 | 103.53 |
| Difference | 0.00 | 0.53 |

RESIDENTIAL:The price related differential is slightly above the acceptable range for residential property. With the coefficient of dispersion and the known assessment practices of Perkins County, it is believed the county has attained uniform and proportionate assessment practices as shown by the history of the statistics.

## 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 | 80 | -3 |
| Median | 93 | 99 | 6 |
| Wgt. Mean | 88 | 98 | 10 |
| Mean | 92 | 101 | 9 |
| COD | 19.55 | 13.47 | -6.08 |
| PRD | 104.35 | 103.53 | -0.82 |
| Minimum | 6.90 | 35.46 | 28.56 |
| Maximum | 272.73 | 272.73 | 0.00 |

RESIDENTIAL:The improved R\&O statistics are the result of a complete new appraisal for residential property within the assessor location of Grant, where the majority of this class is located. The assessor continues to complete a thorough sales review, which eliminated 3 sales due to usability codes. Perkins County takes a proactive approach to each property class to equalize real property within the County.

## VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

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

|  | R\&O Statistics | Trended Ratio | Difference |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | 84 | -4 |
| Median | 99 | 94 | 5 |
| Wgt. Mean | 98 | 92 | 6 |
| Mean | 101 | 100 | 1 |
| COD | 13.47 | 30.09 | -16.62 |
| PRD | 103.53 | 109.42 | -5.89 |
| Minimum | 35.46 | 6.97 | 28.49 |
| Maximum | 272.73 | 312.84 | -40.11 |

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

The median, mean, and weighted mean for the trended ratios are somewhat supportive of the R\&O statistics for Perkins County. All three trended measurements of central tendency are still within the acceptable ranges. The mean is nearly identical with less than $1 \%$ spread. There is no reason to believe that sold and unsold properties are not being treated uniformly based on these statistics and the known assessment practices used by the county.

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

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

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



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


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

## Commercial

Perkins County contracted appraisal work for specific commercial properties that are special uses for 2009 with Stanard Appraisal Services. These 37 properties consisted of Scoular and Frenchman Valley facilities (wholesale fertilizer and grain storage properties), The Perkins County Retirement Association, Grant Housing, and Noble Energy. These properties were revalued using June/2008 Marshall and Swift costing and new 2009 depreciation tables. An Income Approach to value was completed for the grain storage facilities

Annual review and pickup work was completed along with contracted mineral appraisals by Pritchard \& Abbott, Inc.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Perkins County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Assessor and Staff |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor; Stanard Appraisal Service is contracted to assist in special properties and Pritchard and Abbott sets the values of oil and gas properties. |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Assessor and Staff |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | 2008 for the 37 parcels under the contracted appraiser; June/03 for the balance of the commercial properties |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2009 for 37 properties contracted by Stanard Appraisal Service |
| 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? |
|  | 2009 for the commercial appraisals done through Stanard Appraisal Service (when the information is available). |
| 7. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties? |
|  | Cost and income when data is available. |
| 8. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
|  | 5 |
| 9. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |
|  | Location |
| 10. | Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping? |
|  | Yes |
| 11. | Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics? |
|  | 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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# PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics 
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PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009


# PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics 



PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified

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



## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:Even though the commercial sales are typically not representative of the population, the assessor continues to keep current with valuations and contracts for appraisal work in special use properties when necessary. For 2009, the county contracted appraisal work for wholesale fertilizer and grain storage facilities, the Perkins Co. Retirement facility, Grant Housing property, and Noble Energy properties. The assessor remains proactive with appraisal work and the actions are shown through the statistics, although the sample included only 10 sales. A review of six sales in Grant, one in Madrid, and three in the rural assessor locations indicate the sample is not representative of the commercial base in each location. With no additional information available, and the nonrepresentative sample, it is believed the County has attained the acceptable level of value and has uniform and proportionate assessment practices.

## 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 | 32 | 10 | 31.25 |
| 2008 | 36 | 13 | 36.11 |
| 2007 | 32 | 16 | 50.00 |
| 2006 | 36 | 19 | 52.78 |
| 2005 | 38 | 25 | 65.79 |

COMMERCIAL:The total sales for 2009 are four less than the prior year; likewise the qualified sales are three less. The economy and a small commercial base in Perkins County all contribute to fewer commercial sales.

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

## Continued

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended <br> Preliminary Ratio | R\&O <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 94 | 7.74 | $\mathbf{1 0 1}$ | 94 |
| 2008 | $\mathbf{9 5 . 8 1}$ | -0.26 | 86 | 93.37 |
| 2007 | 94 | 0.28 | 94 | 94 |
| 2006 | 96 | -0.01 | 96 | 96 |
| 2005 | 97 | 22.20 | 118 | 97 |

COMMERCIAL:The overall increased assessed value in the commercial countywide includes the contracted appraisals completed for specific use commercials. The county contracted new appraisals for wholesale fertilizer, grain storage, retirement and housing properties and Noble Gas commercials. These increased values are represented in the Trended Preliminary Ratio whereas these are not all included in the sales base where the R\&O Ratio is calculated from. The R\&O Ratio may be more representative of the the class of property, although the small sample size is not a good representation of the overall county commercial base.

## 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)

| 0 | 2009 | 7.74 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.53 | 2008 | -0.26 |
| 0.00 | 2007 | 0.28 |
| 10.37 | 2006 | -0.01 |
| 0.00 | 2005 | 22.20 |

COMMERCIAL:No changes are shown in the percent difference of the sales file sample for this year. The $7.74 \%$ increase in assessed value (excl. growth) represents the reported assessors actions for 2009. The county contracted appraisal work for specific commercial special use properties that resulted in overall increases. None of the 37 properties that were appraisal are contained in the sales base. There is no indication that fair treatment was not given between sold and unsold properties.

## 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 | 88 | 92 |

COMMERCIAL:There are only ten qualified sales within the commercial sales file and a detailed review determines the sold properties are not representative of the population in this property class. There is no other information available to indicate that the county has not met the statutory level of $100 \%$ for the commercial class of real property.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 . 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 2 3}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2 3}$ |

COMMERCIAL:Although one qualitative measure is above the parameters the coefficient of dispersion is well within the acceptable range. The 10 sales represented is a small commercial sales base for this property class. Based on the known assessment practices of Perkins County, and no other information available, it is believed the county has attained uniform and proportionate practices.

## 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 | 10 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 0 |
| Median | 94 | 94 | 0 |
| Wgt. Mean | 88 | 88 | 0 |
| Mean | 92 | 92 | 0 |
| COD | 9.04 | $\mathbf{9 . 0 4}$ | 0.00 |
| PRD | $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ |
| Minimum | 102.00 | 66.32 | 0.00 |
| Maximum | 102.00 | 0.00 |  |

COMMERCIAL:No changes appear between the preliminary and R\&O statistics in this small sample size. The county did apply changes as listed in the assessment actions although the new values were not sold properties.
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# Perkins County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses: 

## Agricultural

The Perkins County Assessor analyzed the county agricultural sales and the steady number of sales has shown increased market values compared to 2008. Every land classification group experienced increases for 2009. Irrigated values increased $\$ 40-\$ 110$ per acre. Dry land and grass subclasses did not take as large of increase for 2009. Dry land values increased between $\$ 30-\$ 35$ and grass values increased $\$ 25-\$ 35$ per acre. Perkins County is located in the West Central County Official's District where the majority of the County Assessors compares the market across county lines and reviews any areas of concern. Water availability continues to be a large factor for increasing irrigated land values as shown through the market in Perkins County.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Perkins County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Assessor and Staff |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Assessor and Staff |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | No |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | It is the policy of Perkins County to assess the above referenced land in accordance with Nebraska Revised Statute 77-1359. |
| 5. | When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | N/A |
| 6. | If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used? |
|  | N/A |
| 7. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | The new 2008 soil survey was implemented for the 2009 valuation process. |
| 8. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | 2009 |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | GIS and physical inspections |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | Assessor and Staff |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | 100\% |
| 9. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class: |
|  | 1 |
| 10. | How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed? |
|  | Countywide |
| 11. | In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation? <br> Yes or No |
|  | No |
| a. | If yes, list. |

12. In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
$69-75 \%$ of market value
13. Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 35 | 50 | 85 |

PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
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PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
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## NUMBER of Sales:

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

AVG. Assessed Value:

| 111 | MEDIAN: | 74 |  | COV: | 19.53 | 95\% | Median C.I.: | 69. | to 77.23 | (!: Derived) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21,591,510 | WGT. MEAN: | 70 |  | STD: | 14.09 | 95\% Wgt | Mean C.I.: | 66.8 | to 73.96 |  |
| 20,674,623 | MEAN : | 72 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 11.29 |  | Mean C.I.: |  | 5 to 74.79 |  |
| 14,558,976 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 186,257 | COD : | 15.20 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 116.88 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 131,161 | PRD: | 102.48 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 43.10 |  |  | Printed: 03/21/2009 13:23:36 |  |  |
| AN MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median | C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |


| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10000 то | 29999 | 2 | 77.78 | 77.78 | 77.78 | 2.89 | 100.00 | 75.53 | 80.03 | N/A | 20,000 | 15,555 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 21 | 75.88 | 71.34 | 68.83 | 14.65 | 103.65 | 47.93 | 93.45 | 61.27 to 81.95 | 74,871 | 51,533 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 28 | 72.04 | 70.92 | 67.69 | 14.44 | 104.77 | 43.46 | 97.76 | 66.48 to 78.31 | 101,494 | 68,699 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 24 | 73.61 | 71.87 | 68.60 | 15.21 | 104.77 | 43.10 | 90.70 | 64.12 to 84.21 | 181,655 | 124,612 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 24 | 74.59 | 71.32 | 67.80 | 16.23 | 105.19 | 48.66 | 95.24 | 60.20 to 81.48 | 269,760 | 182,899 |
| 250000 то | 499999 | 11 | 70.42 | 77.31 | 75.52 | 18.08 | 102.37 | 54.70 | 116.88 | 61.91 to 93.42 | 413,318 | 312,126 |
| 500000 + |  | 1 | 84.34 | 84.34 | 84.34 |  |  | 84.34 | 84.34 | N/A | 840,000 | 708,422 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 111 | 74.25 | 72.17 | 70.42 | 15.20 | 102.48 | 43.10 | 116.88 | 69.91 to 77.23 | 186,257 | 131,161 |

PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified

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


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


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


## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The Perkins County Assessor analyzed the 111 qualified unimproved agricultural sales and the sample of 124 minimal agricultural sales to determine new increased agricultural land values. As shown through the statistics for each of the three study years, the market is increasing similar to all surrounding counties in the western part of Nebraska. Water availability continues to be a driving force behind increased irrigated land values. The assessor equalized the property class with the application of increases of \$40-\$110 for irrigated subclasses, $\$ 30-\$ 35$ increases per acre for dry, and $\$ 25-\$ 35$ for grass acres. This has been consistent with the area market across county lines. The $100 \%$ unimproved agricultural sample supports the minimal agricultural statistics with the identical calculations for both central tendency and qualitative statistics. Based on both sets of data, the median best represents the level of value in Perkins County at 74. Through the qualitative statistics and actions taken by the county, it is apparent that the County has uniform and proportionate assessment practices.

## 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 | 182 | 111 | $\mathbf{6 0 . 9 9}$ |
| 2008 | 188 | 120 | 63.83 |
| 2007 | 163 | 108 | 66.26 |
| 2006 | 171 | 111 | 64.91 |
| 2005 | 185 | 109 | 58.92 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The total and qualified number of agricultural unimproved sales has decreased for this assessment year. The county continues to conduct a review practice to ensure each arm's length sale. Nearly $61 \%$ of the total sales were used to determine the statistical measurements and remains higher than three years shown on the history chart.

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

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

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

 Continued|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended <br> Preliminary Ratio | R\&O <br> Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 68 | 9.38 | 74 | 74 |
| 2008 | 67.77 | 8.97 | 74 | 74.08 |
| 2007 | 72 | -0.46 | 72 | 72 |
| 2006 | 74 | 4.18 | 77 | 75 |
| 2005 | 74 | 4.59 | 78 | 75 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:There is less than one point (.38) difference in the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R\&O Ratio. Both calculations support the acceptable level of value at $74 \%$ for the agricultural unimproved class of property. The 9.38 percent change in assessed value (excluding growth) represents the increased land values to every land class.

## 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)

| 9.43 | 2009 | 9.38 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9.76 | 2008 | 8.97 |
| 0.00 | 2007 | -0.46 |
| 4.86 | 2006 | 4.18 |
| 4.03 | 2005 | 4.59 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Both percent changes are nearly identical and support the increased agricultural land values for 2009 in Perkins County. The Table supports fair and equitable treatment between sold and unsold agricultural properties.

## 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 | 74 | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 2}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The three measures of central tendency are all within the acceptable range and strongly support the same measures for the minimal agricultural property class. The assessors actions to increase agricultural land values for equalization purposes is shown through these measures. For direct equalization purposes the median measure best describes the level of value for agricultural land in Perkins County.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{1 5 . 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 2 . 4 8}$ |
| Difference | 0.00 | 0.00 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Both qualitative measures have met the prescribed standards in the unimproved agricultural class. Because of the known assessment practices and the qualitative statistics, it is believed that the county is treating the class of property in a uniform and proportionate manner.

## 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 | 111 | 111 | 0 |
| Median | 68 | 74 | 6 |
| Wgt. Mean | 64 | 70 | 6 |
| Mean | 66 | 72 | 6 |
| COD | 15.76 | 15.20 | -0.56 |
| PRD | 101.84 | 102.48 | 0.64 |
| Minimum | 33.35 | 43.10 | 9.75 |
| Maximum | 106.10 | 116.88 | 10.78 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Increased agricultural land values for 2009 is the contributing factor to the improved R\&O statistics. Each land classification group increased to bring the property class equalization for this assessment year by the assessor.

| Total Real Property | Records : 4,504 | Value : 423,780,102 | Growth 7,120,854 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 30 |  |  |  |
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Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

|  | Records | Urban <br> Value Base | Value Excess | Records | SubUrban <br> Value Base | Value Excess |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 1 | 66,998 | 15,511,684 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other |  | 0 <br> Rural <br> Value Base | 0 <br> Value Excess | $0$ <br> Records | 0 <br> Total <br> Value Base | 0 Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 66,998 | 15,511,684 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  | 1 | 66,998 | 15,511,684 |

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

| Mineral Interest | Records | Urban | Value | Records | SubUrban | Value | Records | Rural | Value | Records | Total | Value | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23. Producing | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 14 |  | 205,480 | 14 |  | 205,480 | 81,200 |
| 24. Non-Producing | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 37 |  | 6,408 | 37 |  | 6,408 | 0 |
| 25. Total | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 51 |  | 211,888 | 51 |  | 211,888 | 81,200 |


| Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| 26. Producing | 77 | 1 | 155 | 233 |
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|  | Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
|  | Records | ${ }_{\text {Acres }} \quad \text { Rural }$ | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Records | Urban Acres | Value | Records | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SubL } \\ & \text { Acres } \end{aligned}$ | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Value N/A |  | 0.00 <br> Rural <br> Acres | Value | 0 Records | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ \text { Total } \\ \text { Acres } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Value | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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


## County 68 Perkins

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 1

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 46. 1A | 41,732.98 | 30.34\% | 46,354,269 | 33.43\% | 1,110.73 |
| 47. 2A1 | 22,244.12 | 16.17\% | 24,583,998 | 17.73\% | 1,105.19 |
| 48. 2A | 19,298.69 | 14.03\% | 19,210,712 | 13.86\% | 995.44 |
| 49.3A1 | 18,103.02 | 13.16\% | 18,104,199 | 13.06\% | 1,000.07 |
| 50.3A | 7,041.66 | 5.12\% | 6,496,468 | 4.69\% | 922.58 |
| 51.4A1 | 28,900.61 | 21.01\% | 23,706,402 | 17.10\% | 820.27 |
| 52. 4A | 223.47 | 0.16\% | 185,526 | 0.13\% | 830.21 |
| 53. Total | 137,544.55 | 100.00\% | 138,641,574 | 100.00\% | 1,007.98 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 55. 1D | 139,228.94 | 43.17\% | 55,691,578 | 45.75\% | 400.00 |
| 56. 2D1 | 41,480.17 | 12.86\% | 16,592,069 | 13.63\% | 400.00 |
| 57. 2D | 50,093.35 | 15.53\% | 19,035,466 | 15.64\% | 380.00 |
| 58.3D1 | 40,829.49 | 12.66\% | 15,515,208 | 12.75\% | 380.00 |
| 59.3D | 15,482.91 | 4.80\% | 4,799,753 | 3.94\% | 310.00 |
| 60.4D1 | 31,683.22 | 9.82\% | 9,029,765 | 7.42\% | 285.00 |
| 61. 4D | 3,741.40 | 1.16\% | 1,066,305 | 0.88\% | 285.00 |
| 62. Total | 322,539.48 | 100.00\% | 121,730,144 | 100.00\% | 377.41 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 64. 1G | 3,225.81 | 3.80\% | 887,149 | 3.80\% | 275.02 |
| 65.2G1 | 3,081.54 | 3.63\% | 847,465 | 3.63\% | 275.01 |
| 66. 2G | 3,027.41 | 3.56\% | 832,569 | 3.56\% | 275.01 |
| 67.3G1 | 5,431.47 | 6.39\% | 1,493,713 | 6.39\% | 275.01 |
| 68.3G | 5,076.47 | 5.97\% | 1,396,071 | 5.97\% | 275.01 |
| 69.4G1 | 52,322.22 | 61.58\% | 14,388,781 | 61.58\% | 275.00 |
| 70.4G | 12,806.83 | 15.07\% | 3,521,908 | 15.07\% | 275.00 |
| 71. Total | 84,971.75 | 100.00\% | 23,367,656 | 100.00\% | 275.00 |
| Irrigated Total | 137,544.55 | 25.08\% | 138,641,574 | 48.76\% | 1,007.98 |
| Dry Total | 322,539.48 | 58.82\% | 121,730,144 | 42.81\% | 377.41 |
| Grass Total | 84,971.75 | 15.50\% | 23,367,656 | 8.22\% | 275.00 |
| Waste | 1,651.57 | 0.30\% | 132,130 | 0.05\% | 80.00 |
| Other | 1,655.29 | 0.30\% | 455,250 | 0.16\% | 275.03 |
| Exempt | 297.89 | 0.05\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 548,362.64 | 100.00\% | 284,326,754 | 100.00\% | 518.50 |
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## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76. Irrigated | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 137,544.55 | 138,641,574 | 137,544.55 | 138,641,574 |
| 77. Dry Land | 0.00 | 0 | 60.99 | 23,653 | 322,478.49 | 121,706,491 | 322,539.48 | 121,730,144 |
| 78. Grass | 0.00 | 0 | 43.24 | 11,894 | 84,928.51 | 23,355,762 | 84,971.75 | 23,367,656 |
| 79. Waste | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1,651.57 | 132,130 | 1,651.57 | 132,130 |
| 80. Other | 0.00 | 0 | 0.87 | 239 | 1,654.42 | 455,011 | 1,655.29 | 455,250 |
| 81. Exempt | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 297.89 | 0 | 297.89 | 0 |
| 82. Total | 0.00 | 0 | 105.10 | 35,786 | 548,257.54 | 284,290,968 | 548,362.64 | 284,326,754 |


|  | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | $137,544.55$ | $25.08 \%$ | $138,641,574$ | $48.76 \%$ | $1,007.98$ |
| Dry Land | $322,539.48$ | $58.82 \%$ | $121,730,144$ | $42.81 \%$ | 377.41 |
| Grass | $84,971.75$ | $15.50 \%$ | $23,367,656$ | $8.22 \%$ | 275.00 |
| Waste | $1,651.57$ | $0.30 \%$ | 132,130 | $0.05 \%$ | 80.00 |
| Other | $1,655.29$ | $0.30 \%$ | 455,250 | $0.16 \%$ | 275.03 |
| Exempt | 297.89 | $0.05 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 4 8 , 3 6 2 . 6 4}$ | $100.00 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 8 4 , 3 2 6 , 7 5 4}$ | $100.00 \%$ | 518.5 |

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

| 68 Perkins |  |  |  | E3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2008 \text { CTL } \\ & \text { County Total } \end{aligned}$ | 2009 Form 45 <br> County Total | Value Difference <br> (2009 form 45-2008 CTL) | Percent <br> Change | 2009 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | Percent Change excl. Growth |
| 01. Residential | 57,133,377 | 61,154,369 | 4,020,992 | 7.04\% | 728,503 | 5.76\% |
| 02. Recreational | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling | 26,445,666 | 26,543,029 | 97,363 | 0.37\% | 1,539,821 | -5.45\% |
| 04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 83,579,043 | 87,697,398 | 4,118,355 | 4.93\% | 2,268,324 | 2.21\% |
| 05. Commercial | 33,392,008 | 40,752,822 | 7,360,814 | 22.04\% | 4,771,330 | 7.75\% |
| 06. Industrial | 66,998 | 66,998 | 0 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |
| 07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 8,679,369 | 10,724,242 | 2,044,873 | 23.56\% | 0 | 23.56\% |
| 08. Minerals | 540,638 | 211,888 | -328,750 | -60.81 | 81,200 | -75.83 |
| 09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 42,679,013 | 51,755,950 | 9,076,937 | 21.27\% | 4,852,530 | 9.90\% |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 126,258,056 | 139,453,348 | 13,195,292 | 10.45\% | 7,120,854 | 4.81\% |
| 11. Irrigated | 127,578,651 | 138,641,574 | 11,062,923 | 8.67\% |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 110,903,686 | 121,730,144 | 10,826,458 | 9.76\% |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 20,852,044 | 23,367,656 | 2,515,612 | 12.06\% |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 372,619 | 132,130 | -240,489 | -64.54\% |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 247,277 | 455,250 | 207,973 | 84.11\% |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 259,954,277 | 284,326,754 | 24,372,477 | 9.38\% |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of all Real Property | 386,212,333 | 423,780,102 | 37,567,769 | 9.73\% | 7,120,854 | 7.88\% |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# 2008 Plan of Assessment for Perkins County 

Assessment Years 2009, 2010, and 2011
Date: June 15, 2008

## Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the "plan"), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

## Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as "the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade." Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-112(Reissue 2006).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1) $100 \%$ of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land:
2) $75 \%$ of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-5023(2), 77-1344.

## General Description of Real Property in Perkins County*

|  | Parcels | \% of <br> Total <br> Parcels | Total Value | \% of Taxable <br> Value Base |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential | 1206 | $25.4 \%$ | $\$ 92,048,926$ | $23.9 \%$ |  |
| Commercial <br> \& Industrial | 267 | $5.6 \%$ | $\$ 33,465,530$ | $8.7 \%$ |  |


| Agricultural | 2994 | $63 \%$ | $\$ 258,940,658$ | $67.3 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tax Exempt | 234 | $5 \%$ | 0 |  |  |
| TIF | 1 |  | $\$ 17,856,478$ | 0 |  |
| Mineral | 47 | $1 \%$ | $\$ 540,668$ | $.1 \%$ |  |
| Total | 4749 | $100 \%$ | $\$ 384,995,782$ | $100 \%$ |  |

*2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property
Agricultural land - taxable acres - 548,934 acres
Other pertinent facts: $67.3 \%$ of Perkins County Valuation is agricultural and of that $67.3 \%$, the primary land use is dry but the greatest amount of valuation is in irrigated land with $\$ 126$ million of value.

New Property: For assessment year 2008, an estimated 125 building or improvement statements or zoning permits were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2008 Reports \& Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

## Current Resources

A. Staff/Budget/Training

Staff
1 Assessor
1 Deputy Assessor
Temporary or Seasonal employees as needed and budget allows

## Contract Appraiser

Knoche Appraisal and Consulting will be contracted for 2009 to review all large commercial facilities including elevators, hog farms and landfill. Pritchett \& Abbott of Fort Worth, Texas will be contracted to value our mineral interests in Perkins County.
Budget Request
2008-09 Assessor $=\$ 83,453$
2008-09 Reappraisal $=\$ 16,000$
The $\$ 16,000$ in the reappraisal fund will be used to revalue all large commercial facilities along with the appraisal of the mineral interests in the county. All other work is done in office by the staff available and the budget available in the Assessor's budget.

## Training

The Assessor holds a current Assessor Certification dated September 21, 1995. The Deputy Assessor holds a current Assessor Certification dated February 7, 2002.
B. Cadastral Maps - Cadastral maps of agricultural land used in the Assessor's office have been scanned by GIS Workshop as part of the upgrade to a GIS system. The new soil conversion will be implemented during the summer of 2008.
C. Property Record Cards - Hard copies and electronic copies of the property record cards are maintained. The information contained within these property record cards meets the requirements of the law. Property record cards are available to the public on our website, perkins.gisworkshop.com.
D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS- Computer services are contracted through ASI/Terra Scan. The Assessor's office has both the administrative and CAMA package in operation. We have been with Terra Scan since June, 1998. GIS was implemented in summer, 2006 and our website came on line February, 2007. The website is updated nightly by GIS Workshop.

## Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

A. Discover, List \& Inventory all property - Building permits are provided from the city of Grant on a monthly basis, and by the village of Madrid at the end of each year. No building permits are provided to the assessor's office from Elsie or Venango. Zoning permits are provided to the assessor's office by the Zoning Administrator. These building and zoning permits help us to list new construction in the incorporated areas. Zoning permits are not required for agricultural buildings. Improvement statements are filed by the office personnel whenever new construction is observed or reported. Notice is published at the end of each year to remind the taxpayers that an improvement statement must be filed with the County Assessor on all improvements to real property amounting to a value of two thousand five hundred dollars or more.
B. Data Collection - Data collection in done yearly on different parts of the county. For the 2005 appraisal year, complete data collection was done on the rural residential. For 2006, data collection was done on Grant, Grant Suburban and Kenton Heights consisting of a questionnaire to all residential property owners, and new pictures and measurements when needed. For 2007, data collection consisting of a questionnaire to all residential property owners and new pictures and measurement when needed was done on Madrid, Elsie, Venango, Grainton, and Brandon.
C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions Assessment sales ratios are reviewed yearly to determine what areas need to be adjusted.
D. Approaches to Value

1) Market Approach; sales comparisons- Residential and Commercial sales books are kept updated when new sales are processed.
2) Cost Approach; cost manual used \& date of manual and latest depreciation study. The 06/07 Marshall and Swift costs were used for the rural residential revaluation done in 2008. A current depreciation study is done yearly and implemented on whatever part of the county that is being revalued.
3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market. An income approach to value is done by the contracted appraiser when they appraise our commercial facilities.
4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas- Sales Books are kept updated on all vacant land sales. Agricultural sales books are kept updated as are maps of sales of specific land use.
5) Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation
E. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions-A complete review of sales ratios is done after the yearly assessment actions to determine the new ratios.
F. Notices and Public Relations - Notices are published timely to notify the public.

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

| Property Class | Median |  | COD | PRD |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 98.0 |  | 12.19 |  | 103.06 |  |  |
| Commercial | 93.0 |  | 18.45 |  | 101.95 |  |  |
| Agricultural | 74.0 |  | 12.50 |  | 101.30 |  |  |

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009

## Residential

Appraisal maintenance will be done on residential properties for 2009. Sales review and pick-up work will be completed for residential properties.

Commercial Knoche Appraisal \& Consulting will be contracted to appraise all large commercial facilities including elevators, hog farms and landfill and ethanol plant. Pritchett \& Abbott of Fort Worth, Texas will be contracted to value our mineral interests in Perkins County. All commercial property will be updated and revalued in 2009. There are approximately 265 commercial parcels in Perkins County and this review will include an exterior physical inspection of the property with new digital pictures if needed and interior inspections if possible. An analysis will be done on land values associated with commercial parcels, and all commercial land will be updated where needed. Sales review and pick-up work will be done. Sales Review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of commercial lots and sites will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

## Agricultural

The Web Soil Survey will be implemented for 2009. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on maps for the 3 year sales period, by land classification group. A review of sales will be done to determine if the adjustment on irrigated parcels with a low pumping well is still justified. A sales review on all sales that are deemed to be arms length transactions, and pick-up work which is physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits and improvement statements, will be completed. Sales review includes
a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and interview with the buyer if necessary. Sales books will be updated as sales are received. Satellite pivot sale books will continue to be updated, along with a sale book trying to determine value of the pivot in an irrigated land sale.

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010

## Residential

For 2010, all residential property in Grant, Grant suburbs and Kenton Heights, including lot values, will be updated and revalued. This review will include an exterior physical inspection of the property along with verifying information located on the property record card. New digital pictures will be taken. Questionnaires will be mailed to all owners to verify information located on the property record card. There are approximately 500 parcels in Grant. These properties will be valued using the most recent $M \& S$ cost tables with a market derived depreciation table and sales approach to value. Appraisal maintenance will be done on all other residential property, which includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales Review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of lots in towns, and sales of rural properties will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

## Commercial

Appraisal maintenance will be done on commercial property. This appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of commercial lots and sites will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on maps for the 3 year sales period, by land classification group. A review of sales will be done to determine if the adjustment on irrigated parcels with a low pumping well is still justified. A sales review on all sales that are deemed to be arms length transactions, and pick-up work which is physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits and improvement statements, is completed. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and interview with the buyer if necessary. Sales books will be updated as sales are received. Satellite pivot sale books will continue to be updated, along with a sale book of pivots in irrigated land sales.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011

## Residential

For 2011, all residential property in Madrid, Elsie, Venango, Brandon and Grainton including lot values will be updated and revalued. This review will include an exterior physical inspection of the property along with verifying information located on the property record card. New digital
pictures will be taken and new measurements will be taken if needed. Questionnaires will be mailed to all owners to verify information located on the property record card. There are approximately 180 parcels in Madrid, 85 in Elsie, 115 in Venango and 20 in Brandon and Grainton. These properties will be valued using the most current M \& S cost tables and a market derived depreciation table and sales approach to value. The county also plans to review all single-wide manufactured homes in Perkins County. There are approximately 70 single-wide manufactured homes in Perkins County. These properties will be valued using the cost approach with a market derived depreciation table and the sales approach to value. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed for residential properties.

## Commercial

Appraisal maintenance will be done on commercial property. This appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of commercial lots and sites will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on maps for the 3 year sales period, by land classification group. A sales review on all sales that are deemed to be arms length transactions, and pick-up work which is physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits and improvement statements, is completed. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and interview with the buyer if necessary. Sales books will be updated as sales are received. Satellite pivot sale books will continue to be updated, along with a sale book trying to determine value of the pivot in an irrigated land sale.

The following is a time line table to give an overview of the narrative portion of the plan.

| Class |  | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Residential |  | Appraisal <br> Maintenance <br> of all <br> residential | Review of <br> Grant, Grant <br> suburbs and <br> Kenton Hts <br> Residential <br> Property(500) | Review of <br> Madrid(180) <br> Elsie(85) <br> Venango(115) <br> Brandon/ <br> Grainton(20) <br> Manufactured <br> Homes(70) |  |
| Commercial |  | Review of <br> All <br> Commercial <br> Properties in <br> County(265) | Appraisal <br> Maintenance <br> Of all <br> Commercial | Appraisal <br> Maintenance <br> Of all <br> Commercial |  |
| Agricultural |  | Market <br> analysis by | Market <br> analysis by | Market <br> analysis by |  |


|  |  | land <br> classification | land <br> classification | land <br> classification |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, \& Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
a. Abstracts (Real \& Personal Property)
b. Assessor Survey
c. Sales information to PA \& T, rosters \& annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
e. School District Taxable Value Report
f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
g. Certificate of Taxes Levied report
h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands \& Funds
i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property - administer annual filing of approximately 655 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions - administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property - annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions - administer approximately 130 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed - review of valuations as certified by PA \& T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. 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.
9. Tax Lists - prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
10. Tax List Corrections - prepare tax list corrections documents for county board approval.
11. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests, assemble and provide information.
12. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearing before TERC, defend valuation.
13. TERC Statewide Equalization - attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
14. Education/Assessor Education - attend meeting, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

## Conclusion:

For 2008, Perkins County has seen many changes affecting the valuation. On personal property, we had substantial growth with the completion of the new ethanol plant in 2007.

The market value for agricultural land continues to increase and consequently, our assessed real property values are up on all classifications of agricultural land for 2008. Another increase in valuation is due to our attempt to comply with the Natural Resource District's allocated acres on irrigated parcels. The valuation increase on the producing gas wells south of Grant was small for 2008, but there is ongoing exploration in the county.

At this time, we are still waiting to see how much growth we will have on centrally assessed with the new Rockies Express Pipeline that was completed at the end of 2007.

Respectfully submitted:
Assessor Signature: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$

Copy distribution: Submit the plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year.
Mail a copy of the plan and any amendments to Dept. of Property Assessment \& Taxation on or before October 31 of each year.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Perkins County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
| 3. | 0 |
|  | Other full-time employees |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
| 5. | 1 |
|  | Number of shared employees |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
| 7. | $\$ 83,453$ |
|  | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
| 8. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
| 9. | Same as above |
|  | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
| 10. | There is a separate appraisal budget. |
|  | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | $\$ 16,000$ |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | $\$ 72,153$ |
| 13. | Total budget |
| $\$ 99,453$ |  |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used:\$625 of the assessor's budget was unused and $\$ 8,542$ of the reappraisal budget was <br> turned back at the end of the fiscal year. |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | TerraScan |
| 2. | CAMA software |


|  | TerraScan |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3. | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
| 4. | Yes |
|  | Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
| 5. | Assessor and Staff |
|  | Does the county have GIS software? |
| 6. | Yes, it was implemented in 2006. |
|  | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
| 7. | Deputy Assessor |
|  | Personal Property software: |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Yes |
| 2. | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
| 3. | Yes |
|  | What municipalities in the county are zoned? |
| 4. | Grant and Madrid |
|  | When was zoning implemented? |

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Stanard Appraisal Service, Inc. for select Commercial properties and Pritchard and <br> Abbott for producing mineral valuations. |
| 2. | Other services |
|  | TerraScan |

## 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 Perkins County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



