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## 2009 Commission Summary

71 Platte

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 895 | COD | 11.16 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 89,717,393$ | PRD | 103.23 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 99,593,393$ | COV | 23.58 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 92,178,475$ | STD | 22.53 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 111,278$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 10.68 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 102,993$ | Average Assessed Value <br> of the Base | $\$ 97,663$ |
| Median | 96 | Wgt. Mean | 93 |
| Mean | 96 | Max | 520 |
| Min | 7.62 |  | 5 |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 94.90 to 96.23 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 94.07 to 97.02 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 91.03 to 94.08 |

$\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 41.23
$\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period 7.85
$\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period 8.28

## Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 866 | 93 | 12.45 | 101.52 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 970 | 95 | 9.56 | 100.93 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 965 | 97 | 9.28 | 101.2 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 988 | 97 | 9.77 | 100.15 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

## 71 Platte

## Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 109 | COD | 18.00 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 26,533,556$ | PRD | 107.66 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 26,329,556$ | COV | 44.53 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 23,311,205$ | STD | 42.45 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 241,556$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 17.31 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 213,864$ | Average Assessed Value |  |
|  |  | of the Base | $\$ 360,900$ |
| Median | 96 | Wgt. Mean | 89 |
| Mean | 95 | Max | 470 |
| Min | 28 |  | 8 |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 94.13 to 98.00 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 87.35 to 103.29 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 83.22 to 93.85 |

$\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 19.72
$\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period 7.38
$\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period 4.38

## Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 115 | 97 | 11.89 | 103.53 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 119 | 97 | 14.36 | 99.48 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 110 | 97 | 16.51 | 99.34 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 100 | 95 | 19.17 | 98.97 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

## 71 Platte

Agricultural Land - Current

| Number of Sales | 72 | COD | 22.52 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 17,632,403$ | PRD | 103.42 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 17,398,323$ | COV | 31.52 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 12,822,420$ | STD | 24.02 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 241,643$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation |  |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 178,089$ | Average Assessed Value <br> of the Base | 15.95 |
| Median | 71 | Wgt. Mean | $\$ 209,730$ |
| Mean | 76 | Max | 74 |
| Min | 21.14 |  | 176.74 |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 67.13 to 78.97 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 70.67 to 81.77 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 69.11 to 78.29 |

\% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 39.05
$\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period 1.43
\% of Value Sold in the Study Period1.69

| Agricultural Land - History |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD

Opinions

# 2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Platte 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 Platte County is $96.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Platte County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.
In order to move the level of value of Assessor Location of Platte Center with-in the acceptable range, I have recommended an adjustment of $6.00 \%$.

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Platte County is $96.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Platte 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 Platte County is $70.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Platte County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrato
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## Platte County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

## Residential

For 2009, the county conducted a market study of the residential class of real property. Market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the level of value for the residential class was at 91 percent of market value.

To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis and to complete the cyclical valuation process, Platte County completed the following assessment actions:
$>$ A sales review was conducted of two large neighborhoods in the town of Columbus. These properties were physically reviewed and the neighborhoods were revalued as a result.
> Properties in the town of Duncan where physically reviewed resulting in new depreciation schedules and new values.
$>$ Rural Residential townships of Grandville, Humphrey, Creston, Sherman, and the West half of Columbus Township were reviewed as part of the cycle and because of market indication. Physical inspections were completed of these parcels, and the county took new photos these properties. Cost updates and the implementation of new depreciation tables resulted in new values for this subclass.

Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new and omitted construction.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Platte County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Appraiser, and Appraiser Assistant |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor and Appraiser |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Appraiser, and Appraiser Assistant |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | 2006 |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | New depreciation is developed for each neighborhood during a reappraisal. |
| 6. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties? |
|  | Cost approach |
| 7. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
|  | Approximately 25 |
| 8. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |
|  | Based on locational characteristics as evidenced in the market |
| 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.) |
|  | No |
| 11. | Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain? |
|  | Yes. Both areas are valued using the same costing and depreciation schedule. |

Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 8 1}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{1 8 1}$ |

PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified

NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009
95\% Median C.I.: 94.90 to 96.23
(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

$$
\begin{array}{r}
89,717,393 \\
99,593,393 \\
92,178,475 \\
111,277
\end{array}
$$

95\% Mean C.I.: 94.07 to 97.02

| MEAN : 96 | STD: | 22.53 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 10.68 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 111,277 \\
& 102,992 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

| DATE OF SALE * |
| :---: |
| RANGE |
| Qrtrs |
| 07/01/06 то 09/30/06 |
| 10/01/06 то 12/31/06 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 |
| 04/01/07 то 06/30/07 |
| 07/01/07 то 09/30/07 |
| 10/01/07 тO 12/31/07 |
| 01/01/08 тO 03/31/08 |
| 04/01/08 T0 06/30/08 |
|  |
| 07/01/06 тO 06/30/07 |
| 07/01/07 TO 06/30/08 |
| Calendar Yrs |
| 01/01/07 TO 12/31/07 |
|  |


|  | 895 | 95.67 | 95.54 | 92.55 | 11.16 | 103.23 | 7.62 | 520.00 | 94.90 to 96.23 | 111,277 | 102,992 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ASSESSOR LOCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | Count | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| COLUMBUS | 684 | 95.68 | 95.05 | 92.46 | 9.63 | 102.80 | 7.62 | 193.49 | 94.84 to 96.51 | 112,169 | 103,712 |
| CRESTON | 5 | 111.17 | 199.15 | 105.68 | 92.77 | 188.44 | 84.72 | 520.00 | N/A | 37,200 | 39,313 |
| DUNCAN | 13 | 98.49 | 98.64 | 97.18 | 3.90 | 101.50 | 86.51 | 105.56 | 95.66 to 103.70 | 82,746 | 80,416 |
| HUMP HREY | 23 | 95.39 | 97.21 | 94.41 | 11.08 | 102.97 | 75.70 | 131.58 | 89.62 to 99.00 | 92,043 | 86,896 |
| LINDSAY | 9 | 100.68 | 101.61 | 99.04 | 9.59 | 102.59 | 77.53 | 139.03 | 89.93 to 107.15 | 65,777 | 65,147 |
| MONROE | 6 | 90.16 | 92.58 | 92.61 | 6.99 | 99.98 | 82.35 | 108.56 | 82.35 to 108.56 | 62,783 | 58,140 |
| PLATTE CENTER | 14 | 90.67 | 92.05 | 91.98 | 16.92 | 100.09 | 46.67 | 166.10 | 77.92 to 99.23 | 74,457 | 68,482 |
| RURAL | 57 | 94.75 | 95.48 | 91.62 | 21.89 | 104.21 | 27.43 | 277.27 | 86.15 to 99.21 | 105,033 | 96,235 |
| SUBDIVISION | 83 | 94.73 | 91.72 | 92.37 | 9.90 | 99.30 | 47.71 | 124.26 | 91.32 to 96.26 | 138,403 | 127,837 |
| tarnov | 1 | 168.80 | 168.80 | 168.80 |  |  | 168.80 | 168.80 | N/A | 5,000 | 8,440 |
|  | 895 | 95.67 | 95.54 | 92.55 | 11.16 | 103.23 | 7.62 | 520.00 | 94.90 to 96.23 | 111,277 | 102,992 |
| LOCATIONS: URBAN, | URBAN | \& RURAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1 | 748 | 95.76 | 96.20 | 92.91 | 10.34 | 103.54 | 8.86 | 520.00 | 95.12 to 96.51 | 107,408 | 99,796 |
| 2 | 62 | 95.97 | 94.74 | 94.80 | 8.74 | 99.94 | 61.54 | 145.94 | 93.64 to 97.77 | 163,343 | 154,842 |
| 3 | 85 | 92.37 | 90.32 | 86.91 | 20.44 | 103.92 | 7.62 | 277.27 | 85.07 to 96.35 | 107,343 | 93,296 |
| _ ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 895 | 95.67 | 95.54 | 92.55 | 11.16 | 103.23 | 7.62 | 520.00 | 94.90 to 96.23 | 111,277 | 102,992 |



PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009
$89,717,393$
$99,593,393$
$92,178,475$ 92,178,475 111,277

95\% Median C.I.: 94.90 to 96.23
WGT. MEAN: 93 STD: 22.53 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 91.03 to 94.08
95\% Mean C.I.: 94.07 to 97.02

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:30:25

| YEAR BUILT * |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| 0 OR Blank | 71 |
| Prior TO 1860 | 1 |
| 1860 TO 1899 | 19 |
| 1900 TO 1919 | 97 |
| 1920 TO 1939 | 61 |
| 1940 TO 1949 | 38 |
| 1950 TO 1959 | 151 |
| 1960 TO 1969 | 121 |
| 1970 TO 1979 | 128 |
| 1980 TO 1989 | 80 |
| 1990 TO 1994 | 38 |
| 1995 TO 1999 | 35 |
| 2000 TO Present | 55 |
| ALL_ | 895 |

MEDIAN
88.31
94.21
98.88
98.62
98.19
97.69
96.24
92.25
92.78
93.88
96.69
95.33
95.76


|  |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| 86.65 | 86.63 |
| 94.21 | 94.21 |
| 108.59 | 101.87 |
| 102.52 | 96.04 |
| 98.80 | 96.68 |
| 97.42 | 96.38 |
| 95.18 | 90.39 |
| 95.62 | 90.91 |
| 93.96 | 91.45 |
| 93.17 | 92.24 |
| 95.50 | 94.82 |
| 93.95 | 94.07 |
| 94.32 | 92.39 |
| 95.54 | 92.55 |
|  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | Ra | e: $07 /$ | 006 to 06/3 | 08 Posted | fore: 01/23 | 009 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | f Sale |  | 895 | MEDIAN: | 96 |  | COV: | 23.58 | 95\% | dian C.I.: 94.9 | to 96.23 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | s Pric |  | , 393 | WGT. MEAN: | 93 |  | STD: | 22.53 | 95\% Wg | Mean C.I.: 91. | to 94.08 |  |
|  | L Adj. S | s Pric |  | , 393 | MEAN : | 96 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 10.68 |  | Mean C.I.: 94 | 7 to 97.02 |  |
|  | AL Asse | d Valu |  | , 475 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | S Pric |  | , 277 | COD : | 11.16 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 520.00 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | , 992 | PRD : | 103.23 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 7.62 |  |  | Printed: 03/13 | 16:30:25 |
| ASSESSED VA | UE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 6 | 52.34 | 58.31 | 54.70 | 27.76 |  | 106.60 | 40.63 | 100.00 | 40.63 to 100.00 | 6,608 | 3,615 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 15 | 79.65 | 106.44 | 49.45 | 67.54 |  | 215.25 | 7.62 | 520.00 | 52.94 to 99.00 | 15,393 | 7,612 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 21 | 78.57 | 92.69 | 50.22 | 59.02 |  | 184.57 | 7.62 | 520.00 | 47.71 to 93.95 | 12,883 | 6,470 |
| 10000 то | 29999 | 42 | 93.79 | 95.82 | 88.66 | 20.68 |  | 108.08 | 41.05 | 180.11 | 88.31 to 99.98 | 24,609 | 21,817 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 94 | 98.53 | 101.21 | 98.14 | 10.66 |  | 103.13 | 66.95 | 193.49 | 96.11 to 99.41 | 48,516 | 47,615 |
| 60000 тO | 99999 | 393 | 96.19 | 95.99 | 91.72 | 10.66 |  | 104.65 | 8.86 | 277.27 | 94.91 to 96.92 | 88,649 | 81,309 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 198 | 93.91 | 93.07 | 91.92 | 8.51 |  | 101.25 | 60.75 | 134.31 | 91.91 to 94.91 | 131,027 | 120,441 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 120 | 95.69 | 94.27 | 93.26 | 7.02 |  | 101.09 | 45.32 | 115.93 | 94.09 to 97.12 | 197,592 | 184,269 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 26 | 97.53 | 94.57 | 93.89 | 6.00 |  | 100.73 | 69.76 | 108.16 | 92.88 to 98.51 | 327,302 | 307,290 |
| $500000+$ |  | 1 | 102.97 | 102.97 | 102.97 |  |  |  | 102.97 | 102.97 | N/A | 725,000 | 746,530 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 895 | 95.67 | 95.54 | 92.55 | 11.16 |  | 103.23 | 7.62 | 520.00 | 94.90 to 96.23 | 111,277 | 102,992 |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 71 | 88.31 | 86.65 | 86.63 | 22.58 |  | 100.02 | 7.62 | 277.27 | 82.46 to 96.00 | 43,049 | 37,293 |
| 10 |  | 1 | 97.69 | 97.69 | 97.69 |  |  |  | 97.69 | 97.69 | N/A | 68,000 | 66,430 |
| 20 |  | 45 | 98.19 | 103.36 | 98.43 | 13.85 |  | 105.01 | 67.54 | 180.11 | 93.64 to 100.99 | 48,940 | 48,172 |
| 25 |  | 28 | 98.29 | 106.54 | 102.66 | 12.67 |  | 103.77 | 74.75 | 184.59 | 96.04 to 105.90 | 59,671 | 61,260 |
| 30 |  | 586 | 95.54 | 95.79 | 91.61 | 10.64 |  | 104.56 | 8.86 | 520.00 | 94.52 to 96.19 | 100,848 | 92,389 |
| 35 |  | 100 | 94.82 | 93.63 | 92.54 | 7.21 |  | 101.18 | 69.22 | 122.27 | 91.92 to 96.99 | 171,750 | 158,931 |
| 40 |  | 46 | 96.24 | 95.10 | 94.22 | 7.43 |  | 100.94 | 69.76 | 113.29 | 93.58 to 99.62 | 232,232 | 218,805 |
| 45 |  | 8 | 97.47 | 94.98 | 93.27 | 7.12 |  | 101.83 | 73.04 | 108.16 | 73.04 to 108.16 | 271,812 | 253,524 |
| 50 |  | 7 | 99.09 | 100.32 | 99.95 | 3.69 |  | 100.37 | 94.15 | 109.81 | 94.15 to 109.81 | 295,142 | 294,996 |
| 55 |  | 1 | 97.53 | 97.53 | 97.53 |  |  |  | 97.53 | 97.53 | N/A | 350,000 | 341,340 |
| 60 |  | 2 | 97.93 | 97.93 | 99.85 | 5.15 |  | 98.07 | 92.88 | 102.97 | N/A | 525,000 | 524,200 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 895 | 95.67 | 95.54 | 92.55 | 11.16 |  | 103.23 | 7.62 | 520.00 | 94.90 to 96.23 | 111,277 | 102,992 |

PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics

NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:

Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009
State Stat Run

95\% Median C.I.: 94.90 to 96.23
(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

$$
\begin{array}{r}
89,717,393 \\
99,593,393 \\
92,178,475 \\
111,277
\end{array}
$$

96
93
COV
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 91.03 to 94.08

102,992

95\% Mean C.I.: 94.07 to 97.02

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:30:25

| STYLE |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| (blank) | 72 |
| 100 | 20 |
| 101 | 509 |
| 102 | 61 |
| 103 | 39 |
| 104 | 132 |
| 106 | 2 |
| 111 | 43 |
| 301 | 6 |
| 302 | 2 |
| 304 | 5 |
| 305 | 2 |
| 307 | 2 |


|  |  | PRD: |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
|  | 88.50 | 87.31 | 87.54 |
|  | 101.60 | 129.08 | 102.47 |
|  | 94.76 | 94.28 | 91.78 |
|  | 98.38 | 101.39 | 96.89 |
|  | 91.92 | 92.34 | 92.16 |
|  | 98.63 | 100.61 | 95.62 |
| 2 | 91.50 | 91.50 | 95.55 |
| 43 | 86.13 | 86.81 | 86.43 |
| 6 | 98.96 | 101.77 | 99.47 |
| 2 | 98.13 | 98.13 | 98.13 |
| 5 | 96.83 | 96.78 | 96.72 |
| 2 | 95.83 | 95.83 | 95.71 |
| 2 | 93.73 | 93.73 | 93.74 |
| 895 | 95.67 | 95.54 | 92.55 |

COD PRD MIN

## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

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

Platte County's assessment practices are considered by the Division to be in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal practices because of the County's systematic and necessary assessment efforts. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential calculated in this property class confirm this determination.

Review of the subclass statistics indicates that all valuation groupings with a sufficient number of sales are valued within the acceptable range except the town of Platte Center. The county indicated that Platte Center is scheduled to be reviewed and revalued in the next assessment year. However, for assessment year 2009 the Platte Center subclass does not have a median within the acceptable range.

An equalization adjustment to the town of Platte Center in the amount of $+6 \%$ would bring the median to the midpoint of the acceptable range.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | $\mathbf{1 , 3 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 . 3 0}$ |
| 2008 | $\mathbf{1 , 3 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{8 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 . 6 8}$ |
| 2007 | $\mathbf{1 , 2 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 3 1}$ |
| 2006 | $\mathbf{1 , 2 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 . 5 1}$ |
| 2005 | $\mathbf{1 , 2 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 8 9}$ |

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

## 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 | 91 | 3.02 | 94 | 96 |
| 2008 | 91.12 | 2.93 | 94 | 92.91 |
| 2007 | 95 | 0.20 | 95 | 95 |
| 2006 | 96 | 1.98 | 98 | 97 |
| 2005 | 95 | 3.73 | 98 | 97 |

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

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

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

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

## 2009 Correlation Section

for Platte County
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued
\% Change in Total \% Change in Total Assessed
Assessed Value in the Sales File

| 2.25 | 2009 | 3.02 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 5.83 | 2008 | 2.93 |
| 0.66 | 2007 | 0.20 |
| 2.64 | 2006 | 1.98 |
| 5.24 | 2005 | 3.73 |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 96 | 93 | 96 |

RESIDENTIAL:The three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the median is a reliable measure of the level of value in this class of 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 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 2 3}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ | 0.23 |

RESIDENTIAL:The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential both round within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 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 | 954 | 895 | -59 |
| Median | 91 | 96 | 5 |
| Wgt. Mean | 91 | 93 | 2 |
| Mean | 95 | 96 | 1 |
| COD | 17.44 | 11.16 | -6.28 |
| PRD | 104.83 | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 2 3}$ | -1.60 |
| Minimum | 4.44 | 7.62 | 3.18 |
| Maximum | $1,367.35$ | 520.00 | -847.35 |

RESIDENTIAL:The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property by the county. The change in the number of sales is attributable to the removal of those sales that experienced significant physical or economic changes after the sale occurred. The removal was a combined effort of the division and the county assessor.

## 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 | 895 | 242 | 653 |
| Median | 96 | 95 | 1 |
| Wgt. Mean | 93 | 89 | 4 |
| Mean | 96 | 95 | 1 |
| COD | 11.16 | 17.71 | -6.55 |
| PRD | 103.23 | 107.20 | -3.97 |
| Minimum | 7.62 | 3.55 | 4.07 |
| Maximum | 520.00 | 194.80 | 325.20 |

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

In Platte County the measures of central tendency are similar suggesting the sales file is representative of the population. This analysis also suggests sold properties are treated similarly to the unsold properties and the assessor has no bias in the assignment of residential assessments.

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

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

State Stat Run



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



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


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

## Commercial

For the 2009 tax year the county conducted a market study of the commercial class of property. Market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the level of value for the class and all assessor locations with sufficient market representation to be within the statutory range. Those without sufficient market representation were assumed to be at the statutory level.

Platte County completed the following assessment actions:
> The county reviewed larger apartments in the City of Columbus. When possible the county gathered income and expense information to formulate an income approach. This resulted in many valuation changes for properties in this sub grouping.
$>$ The county reviewed and revalued the commercial property in the town of Duncan. This did not consist of a large amount of parcels however the updating of the commercial class accompanied the update of the residential class in Duncan.

After completing the assessment actions for 2009 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level. Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new and omitted construction.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Platte County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Appraiser |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Appraiser and Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Appraiser |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | 2006 |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | N/A |
| 6. | When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | The income approach is used any time income information can be gathered for the commercial property |
| 7. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties? |
|  | Reconciles all 3 approaches to value |
| 8. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
|  | 3 |
| 9. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |
|  | Columbus and Humphrey are analyzed separately, while all other commercial properties are analyzed together. |
| 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? |
|  | Properties in the same market area will have a similar land value. |
| 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 3 5}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{1 3 5}$ |
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# PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics <br> Type: Qualified <br> 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


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


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

NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: TOTAL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price: AVG. Assessed Value:

## 26,533,556 <br> 23,311,205 241,555

 213, 864| PROPERTY TYPE * |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN |
| 02 | 8 | 96.79 |
| 03 | 98 | 96.21 |
| 04 | 3 | 88.89 |
|  |  | 109 |
|  |  | 96.15 |

96 COV
סדדב

$$
42.45
$$

95\% Median C.I.: 94.13 to 98.00
95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 83.22 to 93.85

$$
17.31
$$

95\% Mean C.I.: 87.35 to 103.29

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:30:45
Avg. Adj. Avg.

| Assd Val |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 207,137 | 198,949 |
| 243,048 | 213,955 |
| 284,566 | 250,668 |
|  |  |
| 241,555 | 213,864 |

## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

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

The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, but the price related differential is slightly above the acceptable range. Based on the assessment practices demonstrated by the county, this class of property is considered to have been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 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 | 226 | 109 | 48.23 |
| 2008 | 231 | 115 | 49.78 |
| 2007 | 210 | 119 | 56.67 |
| 2006 | 213 | 110 | 51.64 |
| 2005 | 196 | 100 | 51.02 |

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

## 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 | -1.61 | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 6}$ |
| 2008 | 95.5 | 0.30 | $\mathbf{9 6}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 . 5 5}$ |
| 2007 | 97 | -0.09 | 96 | 97 |
| 2006 | 87 | 9.26 | 95 | 97 |
| 2005 | 91 | 0.88 | 92 | 95 |

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

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

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

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

# 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)

| 10.26 | 2009 | -1.61 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -1.40 | 2008 | 0.30 |
| 5.94 | 2007 | -0.09 |
| 21.43 | 2006 | 9.26 |
| 5.86 | 2005 | 0.88 |

COMMERCIAL:Analysis of Table IV displays a relatively large percent change in the sales file and a slight reduction in the overall assessment base. This typically indicates sold parcels are assessed differently than unsold properties. A further review of the commercial class however, shows a 3.4 percent increase in the weighted mean between the preliminary statistics and the final. The relatively large percent increase is attributable to the removal of sales that were significantly changed after the sales occurred. Based on the findings of this additional analysis, it is concluded that the sold parcels and unsold parcels are treated similarly in Platte County.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 96 | 89 | 95 |

COMMERCIAL:The median and mean are within the acceptable range, but the weighted mean is below the acceptable range. The disparity between the weighted mean and mean is enough to suggest assessment regressivity, but does not disprove the median as being the best measure of central tendency.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 18.00 | 107.66 |
| Difference | 0.00 | 4.66 |

COMMERCIAL:The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, but the price related differential is above the acceptable range. Based on the assessment practices demonstrated by the county, this class of property is considered to have been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 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 | 122 | 109 | -13 |
| Median | 94 | 96 | 2 |
| Wgt. Mean | 86 | 89 | 3 |
| Mean | 90 | 95 | 5 |
| COD | 22.91 | 18.00 | -4.91 |
| PRD | 104.75 | 107.66 | 2.91 |
| Minimum | 0.00 | 28.05 | 28.05 |
| Maximum | 470.30 | 470.30 | 0.00 |

COMMERCIAL:The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property by the county. The change in the number of sales is attributable to the removal of those sales that experienced significant physical or economic changes after the sale occurred. The removal was a combined effort of the division and the county assessor.
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# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics 

Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 $\quad$ Posted Before: 01/22/2009
NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price: TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
AVG. Assessed Value:

## MINIMAL NON-AG

|  | NUMBE | f Sales: |  | 78 | MEDIAN: |  |  | COV: | 36.06 | 95\% Median C.I.: 53.04 to 63.43 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL S | s Price: | 20,423,330 |  | WGT. MEAN: | 59 |  | STD: | 22.53 | 95\% W | Mean C.I.: 55.4 | : 55.41 to 63.17 |  |
|  | L Adj.S | s Price: | 20,189,250 |  |  | 62 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 14.97 |  | Mean C.I.: 57.49 to 67.49 |  | $(!: \text { land }+N A T=0)$ |
|  | AL Asse | d Value: | 11,969,685 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Adj. S | s Price: | 258,836 |  | COD : | 26.32 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 173.22 |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Value | 153,457 |  | PRD : | 105.41 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 17.63 | Printed: 01/22/2009 22:59:02 |  |  |  |
| ASSESSED VA <br> RANGE | UE * | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 3 | 50.14 | 44.27 | 40.13 | 13.95 |  | 110.31 | 30.84 | 51.83 | N/A | 46,470 | 18,650 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 6 | 50.82 | 56.55 | 49.20 | 33.16 |  | 114.92 | 31.52 | 103.06 | 31.52 to 103.06 | 98,309 | 48,373 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 14 | 53.40 | 63.24 | 51.87 | 38.17 |  | 121.93 | 17.63 | 173.22 | 44.58 to 69.50 | 142,534 | 73,928 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 24 | 62.00 | 64.58 | 60.34 | 22.19 |  | 107.03 | 31.24 | 129.76 | 53.77 to 73.62 | 218,119 | 131,608 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 17 | 55.55 | 59.01 | 56.80 | 18.49 |  | 103.89 | 33.39 | 90.06 | 50.74 to 69.12 | 318,689 | 181,010 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 14 | 67.32 | 68.85 | 63.90 | 21.30 |  | 107.75 | 45.98 | 118.45 | 52.88 to 84.52 | 486,564 | 310,908 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 78 | 56.87 | 62.49 | 59.29 | 26.32 |  | 105.41 | 17.63 | 173.22 | 53.04 to 63.43 | 258,836 | 153,457 |

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

## Agricultural

For the 2009 assessment year the county conducted a market study of the agricultural class of property. Using unimproved agricultural sales and sales with minimal improvements, the market information displayed in the preliminary statistics indicated the median ratio for the class to be well below the statutory range at $57 \%$. The assessor analyzed the agricultural land based on the market indication for dry crop, irrigated, and grass use in each of the three market areas.

To address the deficiencies identified in the market analysis, Platte County completed the following assessment actions:
> In Market Area Three the irrigated land capability groupings increased between 13 and 18 percent, and the average dry and grass values increased slightly.
> In Market Area Five the irrigated land capability groupings also increased between 13 and 18 percent. The average dry values increased slightly and the upper classes of grass increased 50 dollars per acre. The lowest three grass capability groupings increased to 1,500 dollars per acre.
$>$ In the largest market area, Area Six, the irrigated land capability groupings increased between 25 to 36 percent, and the dry land LCGs increased between 13 and 19 percent. Grass land did not change.

After completing the assessment actions for 2008 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level. Other assessed value changes were made to properties in the county based on pick-up of new construction.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Platte County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Appraiser and Assistant Appraiser |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Assessor |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Appraiser and Assistant Appraiser |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | Yes |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | Agricultural is defined in the county consistent with the State Statues. The land must be used for the production of an agricultural or horticultural product. |
| 5. | When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | The county does not conduct an income approach for agricultural land. |
| 6. | If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used? |
| 7. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 2008 |
| 8. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | Reviewed continually with GIS |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | GIS and NRD certifications |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | Appraiser Assistant, Deputy Assessor |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | 50\% |
| 9. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class: |
|  | 3 |
| 10. | How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods developed? |
|  | Market Area 3 is the sandier soil in the county. <br> Market Area 5 is the land along the two rivers with different market characteristics. Market Area 6 is the remainder of the county. |
| 11. | In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation? <br> Yes or No |
|  | No |
| a. | If yes, list. |

12. In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $* *$ |  |  |  |

**No ag permits are filed in the county.

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

|  | NUMBER of Sales: | 72 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $17,632,403$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $17,398,323$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $12,822,420$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 241,643 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 178,089 |


| 71 | COV: | 31.52 | $95 \%$ Median C.I.: 67.13 to 78.97 | (!: Derived) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 74 | STD: | 24.02 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I.: 69.11 to 78.29 | (!: land + NAT=0) |



| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| 71.57 | 71.57 | 72.04 |
| 99.50 | 106.27 | 100.63 |
| 81.77 | 92.45 | 84.00 |
| 85.16 | 82.35 | 83.83 |
| 66.77 | 66.77 | 66.15 |
| 75.00 | 77.99 | 81.00 |
| 66.50 | 65.09 | 66.10 |
| 68.53 | 70.99 | 70.07 |
| 67.13 | 73.84 | 75.82 |
| 60.84 | 62.78 | 60.61 |
| 61.24 | 60.49 | 60.51 |
| 37.76 | 37.76 | 31.58 |
|  |  |  |
| 87.15 | 94.54 | 90.42 |
| 68.95 | 69.43 | 69.27 |
| 62.97 | 62.47 | 62.33 |
|  |  |  |
| 80.95 | 84.50 | 81.82 |
| 67.13 | 66.67 | 67.38 |
| 70.82 | 76.22 | 73.70 |


| COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.20 | 99.33 | 67.13 | 76.00 | N/A | 113,680 | 81,900 |
| 14.85 | 105.60 | 77.39 | 170.78 | 87.15 to 112.20 | 249,682 | 251,263 |
| 20.72 | 110.07 | 66.74 | 176.74 | 68.50 to 106.07 | 229,062 | 192,405 |
| 23.14 | 98.24 | 51.39 | 110.50 | N/A | 132,158 | 110,786 |
| 8.57 | 100.93 | 61.04 | 72.49 | N/A | 171,500 | 113,442 |
| 10.73 | 96.29 | 62.93 | 88.73 | 62.93 to 88.73 | 157,029 | 127,192 |
| 14.10 | 98.48 | 29.81 | 83.36 | 57.93 to 78.97 | 287,618 | 190,105 |
| 4.23 | 101.32 | 67.92 | 78.99 | N/A | 303,518 | 212,661 |
| 13.70 | 97.38 | 62.87 | 90.50 | N/A | 324,321 | 245,903 |
| 15.00 | 103.59 | 49.24 | 84.93 | 49.24 to 84.93 | 217,440 | 131,790 |
| 5.39 | 99.96 | 53.44 | 65.78 | N/A | 287,000 | 173,666 |
| 44.01 | 119.58 | 21.14 | 54.38 | N/A | 264,300 | 83,457 |
| 22.28 | 104.57 | 51.39 | 176.74 | 79.86 to 102.71 | 215,626 | 194,959 |
| 12.60 | 100.24 | 29.81 | 88.73 | 63.86 to 75.00 | 247,516 | 171,457 |
| 15.58 | 100.22 | 21.14 | 90.50 | 57.31 to 67.13 | 266,236 | 165,954 |
| 18.32 | 103.27 | 51.39 | 176.74 | 72.49 to 87.66 | 189,494 | 155,045 |
| 13.14 | 98.94 | 29.81 | 90.50 | 62.87 to 70.02 | 277,479 | 186,966 |
| 22.52 | 103.42 | 21.14 | 176.74 | 67.13 to 78.97 | 241,643 | 178,089 |


|  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/0 | 1/2005 to 06/30/2 | 008 Posted | fore: 01/23/2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBER of Sales: |  | 72 | MEDIAN: | 71 |  | cov: | 31.52 | 95\% Me | dian | C.I.: 67.1 | to 78.97 | (!: Derived) |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: |  | , 403 | WGT. MEAN: | 74 |  | STD: | 24.02 | 95\% Wgt. | Mean | C.I.: 69.1 | to 78.29 | (! : land+NAT=0) |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: |  | , 323 | MEAN : | 76 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 15.95 | 95\% | Mean | C.I.: 70 | 7 to 81.77 |  |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: |  | , 420 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: |  | , 643 | COD: | 22.52 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 176.74 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: |  | , 089 | PRD : | 103.42 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 21.14 |  |  |  | Printed: 03/13/ | 2009 16:31:27 |
| GEO COD | / TOWNSHIP \# |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | count | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 2059 | 8 | 75.38 | 82.31 | 84.94 | 22.30 |  | 96.89 | 57.31 | 112.20 | 57.31 | 1 to 112.20 | 320,346 | 272,116 |
| 2061 | 2 | 82.82 | 82.82 | 80.68 | 19.41 |  | 102.64 | 66.74 | 98.89 |  | N/A | 249,000 | 200,897 |
| 2063 | 5 | 76.00 | 74.07 | 78.40 | 11.42 |  | 94.48 | 54.38 | 90.50 |  | N/A | 230,671 | 180,843 |
| 2065 | 3 | 110.50 | 119.56 | 99.80 | 28.17 |  | 119.80 | 77.39 | 170.78 |  | N/A | 176,905 | 176,543 |
| 2067 | 7 | 80.95 | 81.56 | 80.88 | 12.67 |  | 100.84 | 59.33 | 106.07 | 59.33 | 3 to 106.07 | 172,925 | 139,865 |
| 2117 | 3 | 63.70 | 61.83 | 62.79 | 3.10 |  | 98.47 | 57.93 | 63.86 |  | N/A | 260,000 | 163,256 |
| 2119 | 5 | 66.34 | 57.08 | 55.92 | 17.78 |  | 102.08 | 21.14 | 70.02 |  | N/A | 342,720 | 191,644 |
| 2121 | 2 | 68.04 | 68.04 | 68.74 | 1.34 |  | 98.98 | 67.13 | 68.95 |  | N/A | 438,134 | 301,187 |
| 2123 | 4 | 69.66 | 71.44 | 72.29 | 10.17 |  | 98.83 | 62.93 | 83.52 |  | N/A | 200,717 | 145,090 |
| 2125 | 5 | 79.86 | 78.88 | 77.95 | 16.51 |  | 101.19 | 61.24 | 102.98 |  | N/A | 309,200 | 241,020 |
| 2343 | 1 | 102.71 | 102.71 | 102.71 |  |  |  | 102.71 | 102.71 |  | N/A | 227,811 | 233,975 |
| 2345 | 4 | 58.16 | 61.16 | 62.21 | 33.60 |  | 98.32 | 29.81 | 98.53 |  | N/A | 237,000 | 147,431 |
| 2347 | 2 | 67.20 | 67.20 | 63.17 | 26.73 |  | 106.38 | 49.24 | 85.16 |  | N/A | 309,500 | 195,502 |
| 2349 | 1 | 61.04 | 61.04 | 61.04 |  |  |  | 61.04 | 61.04 |  | N/A | 190,000 | 115,975 |
| 2351 | 8 | 66.15 | 70.61 | 68.32 | 21.27 |  | 103.36 | 50.10 | 99.50 | 50.10 | 10 to 99.50 | 207,966 | 142,077 |
| 2409 | 4 | 74.21 | 73.29 | 69.26 | 13.56 |  | 105.82 | 59.81 | 84.93 |  | N/A | 287,750 | 199,295 |
| 2411 | 5 | 75.00 | 94.57 | 85.35 | 31.62 |  | 110.80 | 68.79 | 176.74 |  | N/A | 97,316 | 83,062 |
| 2637 | 1 | 78.99 | 78.99 | 78.99 |  |  |  | 78.99 | 78.99 |  | N/A | 209,139 | 165,205 |
| 2639 | 2 | 61.94 | 61.94 | 65.49 | 17.03 |  | 94.58 | 51.39 | 72.49 |  | N/A | 114,500 | 74,985 |
| ALI | 72 | 70.82 | 76.22 | 73.70 | 22.52 |  | 103.42 | 21.14 | 176.74 | 67.13 | 3 to 78.97 | 241,643 | 178,089 |
| AREA (M | ARKET) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 3 | 4 | 74.21 | 96.24 | 72.01 | 44.49 |  | 133.66 | 59.81 | 176.74 |  | N/A | 258,037 | 185,800 |
| 5 | 7 | 75.00 | 73.59 | 75.82 | 9.65 |  | 97.06 | 51.39 | 84.93 | 51.39 | 39 to 84.93 | 135,367 | 102,632 |
| 6 | 61 | 68.99 | 75.21 | 73.68 | 22.69 |  | 102.07 | 21.14 | 170.78 | 66.7 | 74 to 78.97 | 252,764 | 186,242 |
| _ALI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 72 | 70.82 | 76.22 | 73.70 | 22.52 |  | 103.42 | 21.14 | 176.74 | 67.1 | 3 to 78.97 | 241,643 | 178,089 |
| Status: | IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED <br> COUNT | $\& \text { IOLI }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | $\begin{gathered} \text { Avg. } \\ \text { Assd Val } \end{gathered}$ |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% | Median C.I. |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 87.24 | 87.24 | 87.24 |  |  |  | 87.24 | 87.24 |  | N/A | 340,000 | 296,630 |
| 2 | 71 | 70.80 | 76.06 | 73.43 | 22.52 |  | 103.59 | 21.14 | 176.74 | 67.13 | 3 to 78.97 | 240,258 | 176,419 |
| _ ALI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 72 | 70.82 | 76.22 | 73.70 | 22.52 |  | 103.42 | 21.14 | 176.74 | 67.13 | 3 to 78.97 | 241,643 | 178,089 |

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

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

|  |  | 72 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (AgLand) | NUMBER of Sales: | $7,632,403$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $17,6,3$, Sales Price: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $17,398,323$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 241,643 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 178,089 |


| MEDIAN: | 71 |  | COV: | 31.52 | 95\% Median C.I.: | 67.13 to 78.97 | (!: Derived) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GT. MEAN: | 74 |  | STD: | 24.02 | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I. | 69.11 to 78.29 | (!: land $+N A T=0$ ) |
| MEAN : | 76 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 15.95 | 95\% Mean C.I. | 70.67 to 81.77 |  |
| COD : | 22.52 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 176.74 |  |  |  |
| PRD : | 103.42 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 21.14 |  | Printed: | 2009 16:31:27 |

Printed: 03/13/2009 16:31:27


|  |  | 72 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| (AgLand) | NUMBER of Sales: | $17,632,403$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $17,398,323$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $12,822,420$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 241,643 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 178,089 |


| MAJORITY LAND USE > 80\% |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| DRY | 22 |
| DRY-N/A | 11 |
| GRASS |  |
| GRASS-N/A | 5 |
| IRRGTD | 26 |
| IRRGTD-N/A | 4 |
| $\quad$ ALL |  |


|  | MEDIAN |
| ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 73.55 |
| 1 | 68.79 |
| 4 | 72.93 |
| 5 | 62.93 |
| 6 | 68.97 |
| 4 | 81.18 |

MAJORITY LAND USE $>50 \%$
RANGE
RANGE
DRY
DRY-N/A
GRASS
GRASS-N/A
IRRGTD
IRRGTD-N/A
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## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Considering the analyses in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency of the Minimal Non-Ag sample.

Unimproved sales, along with sales where the non-agricultural assessed value calculated to be less than $5 \%$ of the adjusted sale price, were used to establish land values in Platte County for tax year 2009. The assessor and the Division agree on the premise that generally, sales with minimal improvements sell on the open market without regard to the improvements. Furthermore, the addition of these sales broadens the sample for assessment and measurement purposes by creating a better representation of the population.

The agricultural market in Platte County has been determined by the assessor to have three distinct market areas. In areas where an insignificant number of sales existed, the county expanded the sample by looking at sales outside the county lines, and by expanding the period from which sales are drawn. The systematic valuation methodology the County uses to analyze sales and determine a schedule of values assures that the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar manner. The assessment practices employed by the County are considered by the Division to be in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal 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 | 240 | $\mathbf{7 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 0 0}$ |
| 2008 | 219 | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 5 9}$ |
| 2007 | 253 | $\mathbf{8 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 7 8}$ |
| 2006 | 251 | $\mathbf{8 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 . 0 6}$ |
| 2005 | $\mathbf{2 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 . 5 0}$ |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The percentage of sales used chart displays that 30 percent of the available sales were used for the development of the qualified unimproved agricultural sales file. This percentage is relatively low compared to most counties in the state, but consistent with counties surrounding Platte County. A majority of the disqualified sales are family transactions and are appropriately coded as non-qualified. It is assumed that the County has used all available arm's length sales 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 | 58 | 22.37 | 71 | 71 |
| 2008 | 60.91 | 13.10 | 69 | 69.5 |
| 2007 | 71 | 2.59 | 72 | 72 |
| 2006 | 68 | 9.64 | 74 | 74 |
| 2005 | 72 | 2.81 | 74 | 74 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The relationship between the trended preliminary median ratio and the $\mathrm{R} \mathrm{\& O}$ median ratio is similar especially for the large percentage increase in assessed value. Table III is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county, and suggests that sold parcels and unsold parcels are addressed in the same manner.

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

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

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

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

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales File | \% Change in Total Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16.98 | 2009 | 22.37 |
| 7.65 | 2008 | 13.10 |
| 2.46 | 2007 | 2.59 |
| 15.29 | 2006 | 9.64 |
| 3.90 | 2005 | 2.81 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The difference between the percent change in the sales file and in the base is five percentage points. This large of an amount is generally considered to suggest disparate treatment between the sold parcels and the unsold parcels. Further analysis however confirmed that Platte County values agricultural land using a common methodology of establishing per acre value schedules based on the sales, and applying the schedules of values uniformly to the population. The difference displayed in the table may have been a result of a slightly under-representative sales file. Information such as the trended preliminary median ratio, historical results displayed in this table, and the methodology used by Platte County, indicates that the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar fashion for assessment purposes.

## 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 | 71 | 74 | 76 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Of the three measures of central tendency, the median and weighted mean are within the acceptable parameters and the mean is slightly above the acceptable parameters.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 22.52 | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 4 2}$ |
| Difference | 2.52 | 0.42 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both slightly above the acceptable range. Based on the assessment practices demonstrated by the county however, this class of property is considered to have been valued uniformly and proportionately.

## 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 | 71 | 72 | 1 |
| Median | 58 | 71 | 13 |
| Wgt. Mean | 60 | 74 | 14 |
| Mean | 63 | 76 | 13 |
| COD | 24.93 | 22.52 | -2.41 |
| PRD | 104.42 | 103.42 | -1.00 |
| Minimum | 17.63 | 21.14 | 3.51 |
| Maximum | 173.22 | 176.74 | 3.52 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property. Several per acre value increases were implemented in the agricultural class of property for 2009.

| Total Real Property | Records : 17,909 | Value : 2,701,277,020 | Growth 95,458,912 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 30 |  |  |  |


|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 01. Res UnImp Land | 623 | 8,886,330 | 203 | 3,924,920 | 200 | 2,976,630 | 1,026 | 15,787,880 |  |
| 02. Res Improve Land | 8,256 | 118,716,100 | 612 | 12,787,990 | 967 | 15,672,010 | 9,835 | 147,176,100 |  |
| 03. Res Improvements | 8,487 | 741,724,105 | 845 | 98,067,090 | 1,013 | 109,309,485 | 10,345 | 949,100,680 |  |
| 04. Res Total | 9,110 | 869,326,535 | 1,048 | 114,780,000 | 1,213 | 127,958,125 | 11,371 | 1,112,064,660 | 27,710,278 |
| \% of Res Total | 80.12 | 78.17 | 9.22 | 10.32 | 10.67 | 11.51 | 63.49 | 41.17 | 29.03 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05. Com UnImp Land | 234 | 11,632,400 | 40 | 2,280,990 | 12 | 211,225 | 286 | 14,124,615 |  |
| 06. Com Improve Land | 962 | 63,587,930 | 94 | 5,679,675 | 65 | 2,229,415 | 1,121 | 71,497,020 |  |
| 07. Com Improvements | 962 | 188,919,170 | 94 | 15,876,745 | 65 | 20,517,085 | 1,121 | 225,313,000 |  |
| 08. Com Total | 1,196 | 264,139,500 | 134 | 23,837,410 | 77 | 22,957,725 | 1,407 | 310,934,635 | 54,332,300 |
| \% of Com Total | 85.00 | 84.95 | 9.52 | 7.67 | 5.47 | 7.38 | 7.86 | 11.51 | 56.92 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. Ind UnImp Land | 2 | 186,785 | 9 | 2,197,350 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2,384,135 |  |
| 10. Ind Improve Land | 5 | 507,380 | 50 | 15,056,075 | 3 | 1,376,440 | 58 | 16,939,895 |  |
| 11. Ind Improvements | 5 | 14,752,380 | 50 | 184,917,625 | 3 | 2,759,565 | 58 | 202,429,570 |  |
| 12. Ind Total | 7 | 15,446,545 | 59 | 202,171,050 | 3 | 4,136,005 | 69 | 221,753,600 | 8,524,720 |
| \% of Ind Total | 10.14 | 6.97 | 85.51 | 91.17 | 4.35 | 1.87 | 0.39 | 8.21 | 8.93 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Rec UnImp Land | 4 | 262,890 | 7 | 201,230 | 9 | 417,580 | 20 | 881,700 |  |
| 14. Rec Improve Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 92,515 | 12 | 92,515 |  |
| 15. Rec Improvements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 607,530 | 12 | 607,530 |  |
| 16. Rec Total | 4 | 262,890 | 7 | 201,230 | 21 | 1,117,625 | 32 | 1,581,745 | 0 |
| \% of Rec Total | 12.50 | 16.62 | 21.88 | 12.72 | 65.63 | 70.66 | 0.18 | 0.06 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Res \& Rec Total\% of Res \& Rec Total | 9,114 | 869,589,425 | 1,055 | 114,981,230 | 1,234 | 129,075,750 | 11,403 | 1,113,646,405 | 27,710,278 |
|  | 79.93 | 78.08 | 9.25 | 10.32 | 10.82 | 11.59 | 63.67 | 41.23 | 29.03 |
| Com \& Ind Total\% of Com \& Ind Total | 1,203 | 279,586,045 | 193 | 226,008,460 | 80 | 27,093,730 | 1,476 | 532,688,235 | 62,857,020 |
|  | 81.50 | 52.49 | 13.08 | 42.43 | 5.42 | 5.09 | 8.24 | 19.72 | 65.85 |
| 17. Taxable Total | 10,317 | 1,149,175,470 | 1,248 | 340,989,690 | 1,314 | 156,169,480 | 12,879 | 1,646,334,640 | 90,567,298 |
| \% of Taxable Total | 80.11 | 69.80 | 9.69 | 20.71 | 10.20 | 9.49 | 71.91 | 60.95 | 94.88 |
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Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

|  | Records | Urban Value Base |  | Value Excess | Records SubUrban <br> Value Base |  |  | Value Excess |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18. Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19. Commercial | 21 | 3,020,765 |  | 25,424,175 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 20. Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21. Other | Records | Rural <br> Value Base |  | Value Excess | Records |  | Total Value Base | Value Excess |  |  |
| 18. Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 21 |  | 3,020,765 |  | ,175 |  |
| 20. Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21. Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  |  | 21 |  | 3,020,765 |  | 4,175 |  |
| Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mineral Interest | Records Urban | Value | Records | SubUrban Value | Records Rural | Value | Records | Total | Value | Growth |
| 23. Producing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24. Non-Producing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25. Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| 26. Producing | 424 | 80 | 157 | 661 |


| Schedule V : Agricultural Records |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land | 0 | 0 | 167 | 19,646,445 | 3,282 | 562,560,710 | 3,449 | 582,207,155 |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 0 | 0 | 95 | 18,128,745 | 1,486 | 291,328,495 | 1,581 | 309,457,240 |
| 29. Ag Improvements | 0 | 0 | 95 | 9,234,755 | 1,486 | 154,043,230 | 1,581 | 163,277,985 |
| 30. Ag Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,030 | 1,054,942,380 |
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|  | Urban |  |  | SubUrban |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 1 | 6.00 | 18,000 |
|  | Records | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Records | Total <br> Acres | Value |
| 42. Game \& Parks | 13 | 1,931.47 | 2,434,070 | 14 | 1,937.47 | 2,452,070 |



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


## County 71 Platte

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 3

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 1,348.69 | 8.50\% | 3,587,500 | 10.67\% | 2,659.99 |
| 46. 1A |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |
| 47. 2A1 | 2,902.76 | 18.30\% | 6,908,495 | 20.54\% | 2,379.97 |
| 48. 2A | 2,415.54 | 15.23\% | 5,531,425 | 16.44\% | 2,289.93 |
| 49.3A1 | 3,327.09 | 20.97\% | 7,286,265 | 21.66\% | 2,189.98 |
| 50.3A | 2,262.81 | 14.26\% | 4,638,585 | 13.79\% | 2,049.92 |
| 51.4A1 | 2,893.96 | 18.24\% | 4,847,400 | 14.41\% | 1,675.01 |
| 52. 4A | 712.91 | 4.49\% | 837,665 | 2.49\% | 1,174.99 |
| 53. Total | 15,863.76 | 100.00\% | 33,637,335 | 100.00\% | 2,120.39 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 88.05 | 3.72\% | 188,350 | 5.25\% | 2,139.13 |
| 55. 1D |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |
| 56. 2D1 | 231.55 | 9.79\% | 439,945 | 12.25\% | 1,900.00 |
| 57. 2D | 169.81 | 7.18\% | 305,590 | 8.51\% | 1,799.60 |
| 58.3D1 | 305.39 | 12.92\% | 519,125 | 14.46\% | 1,699.88 |
| 59.3D | 438.00 | 18.52\% | 700,680 | 19.52\% | 1,599.73 |
| 60.4D1 | 762.15 | 32.23\% | 1,067,025 | 29.72\% | 1,400.02 |
| 61.4D | 369.51 | 15.63\% | 369,510 | 10.29\% | 1,000.00 |
| 62. Total | 2,364.46 | 100.00\% | 3,590,225 | 100.00\% | 1,518.41 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 37.79 | 0.00\% | 33,800 | 0.63\% | 894.42 |
| 64. 1G |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |
| 65. 2G1 | 89.77 | 0.87\% | 59,010 | 1.10\% | 657.35 |
| 66. 2G | 259.90 | 2.50\% | 142,800 | 2.66\% | 549.44 |
| 67.3G1 | 902.46 | 8.70\% | 483,635 | 8.99\% | 535.91 |
| 68. 3G | 2,437.21 | 23.49\% | 1,270,420 | 23.62\% | 521.26 |
| 69.4G1 | 2,795.34 | 26.94\% | 1,511,465 | 28.10\% | 540.71 |
| 70.4G | 3,853.19 | 37.14\% | 1,876,970 | 34.90\% | 487.12 |
| 71. Total | 10,375.66 | 100.00\% | 5,378,100 | 100.00\% | 518.34 |
| Irrigated Total | 15,863.76 | 54.97\% | 33,637,335 | 78.91\% | 2,120.39 |
| Dry Total | 2,364.46 | 8.19\% | 3,590,225 | 8.42\% | 1,518.41 |
| Grass Total | 10,375.66 | 35.95\% | 5,378,100 | 12.62\% | 518.34 |
| Waste | 28.32 | 0.10\% | 2,550 | 0.01\% | 90.04 |
| Other | 227.30 | 0.79\% | 20,600 | 0.05\% | 90.63 |
| Exempt |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |
| Market Area Total | 28,859.50 | 100.00\% | 42,628,810 | 100.00\% | 1,477.12 |

## County 71 Platte

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 5

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 2,451.56 | 20.32\% | 6,521,030 | 23.96\% | 2,659.95 |
| 46. 1A |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |
| 47. 2A1 | 949.49 | 7.87\% | 2,259,750 | 8.30\% | 2,379.96 |
| 48. 2A | 3,776.83 | 31.30\% | 8,648,825 | 31.77\% | 2,289.97 |
| 49.3A1 | 435.20 | 3.61\% | 953,090 | 3.50\% | 2,190.00 |
| 50.3A | 3,812.03 | 31.59\% | 7,814,480 | 28.71\% | 2,049.95 |
| 51.4A1 | 538.78 | 4.47\% | 902,370 | 3.32\% | 1,674.84 |
| 52. 4A | 102.14 | 0.85\% | 120,045 | 0.44\% | 1,175.30 |
| 53. Total | 12,066.03 | 100.00\% | 27,219,590 | 100.00\% | 2,255.89 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 429.03 | 17.35\% | 918,085 | 21.31\% | 2,139.91 |
| 55. 1D |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |
| 56. 2D1 | 144.93 | 5.86\% | 275,390 | 6.39\% | 1,900.16 |
| 57. 2D | 538.47 | 21.77\% | 969,150 | 22.49\% | 1,799.82 |
| 58.3D1 | 98.38 | 3.98\% | 167,210 | 3.88\% | 1,699.63 |
| 59.3D | 1,105.77 | 44.72\% | 1,769,240 | 41.06\% | 1,600.01 |
| 60.4D1 | 133.24 | 5.39\% | 186,515 | 4.33\% | 1,399.84 |
| 61.4D | 23.08 | 0.93\% | 23,070 | 0.54\% | 999.57 |
| 62. Total | 2,472.90 | 100.00\% | 4,308,660 | 100.00\% | 1,742.35 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 126.73 | 0.00\% | 103,940 | 0.67\% | 820.17 |
| 64. 1G |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |
| 65. 2G1 | 51.24 | 0.48\% | 48,645 | 0.31\% | 949.36 |
| 66. 2G | 560.48 | 5.21\% | 426,065 | 2.74\% | 760.18 |
| 67.3G1 | 84.32 | 0.78\% | 63,825 | 0.41\% | 756.94 |
| 68. 3G | 5,951.63 | 55.31\% | 8,932,595 | 57.48\% | 1,500.87 |
| 69.4G1 | 940.85 | 8.74\% | 1,403,345 | 9.03\% | 1,491.57 |
| 70.4G | 3,044.35 | 28.29\% | 4,562,195 | 29.36\% | 1,498.58 |
| 71. Total | 10,759.60 | 100.00\% | 15,540,610 | 100.00\% | 1,444.35 |
| Irrigated Total | 12,066.03 | 43.42\% | 27,219,590 | 57.40\% | 2,255.89 |
| Dry Total | 2,472.90 | 8.90\% | 4,308,660 | 9.09\% | 1,742.35 |
| Grass Total | 10,759.60 | 38.72\% | 15,540,610 | 32.77\% | 1,444.35 |
| Waste | 2,200.34 | 7.92\% | 198,035 | 0.42\% | 90.00 |
| Other | 287.63 | 1.04\% | 156,645 | 0.33\% | 544.61 |
| Exempt |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |
| Market Area Total | 27,786.50 | 100.00\% | 47,423,540 | 100.00\% | 1,706.71 |

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail $\quad$ Market Area 6

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 31,990.28 | 18.43\% | 99,971,630 | 21.10\% | 3,125.06 |
| 46. 1A | 32,322.94 | 18.62\% | 97,772,930 | 20.64\% | 3,024.88 |
| 47. 2A1 | 17,628.88 | 10.15\% | 49,262,805 | 10.40\% | 2,794.44 |
| 48. 2A | 4,947.64 | 2.85\% | 13,188,300 | 2.78\% | 2,665.57 |
| 49.3A1 | 21,310.42 | 12.28\% | 55,617,135 | 11.74\% | 2,609.86 |
| 50.3A | 45,124.75 | 25.99\% | 113,938,080 | 24.05\% | 2,524.96 |
| 51.4A1 | 19,247.97 | 11.09\% | 42,393,050 | 8.95\% | 2,202.47 |
| 52. 4A | 1,032.44 | 0.59\% | 1,651,730 | 0.35\% | 1,599.83 |
| 53. Total | 173,605.32 | 100.00\% | 473,795,660 | 100.00\% | 2,729.15 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 16,664.39 | 12.85\% | 44,349,970 | 15.49\% | 2,661.36 |
| 55. 1D | 24,217.32 | 18.68\% | 61,990,960 | 21.65\% | 2,559.78 |
| 56. 2D1 | 11,251.76 | 8.68\% | 25,396,575 | 8.87\% | 2,257.12 |
| 57. 2D | 2,699.49 | 2.08\% | 5,806,735 | 2.03\% | 2,151.05 |
| 58.3D1 | 16,468.78 | 12.70\% | 36,048,475 | 12.59\% | 2,188.90 |
| 59.3D | 43,249.92 | 33.36\% | 88,634,030 | 30.95\% | 2,049.35 |
| 60.4D1 | 13,446.96 | 10.37\% | 22,162,670 | 7.74\% | 1,648.15 |
| 61. 4D | 1,654.20 | 1.28\% | 1,943,410 | 0.68\% | 1,174.83 |
| 62. Total | 129,652.82 | 100.00\% | 286,332,825 | 100.00\% | 2,208.46 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 728.24 | 0.00\% | 620,330 | 3.25\% | 851.82 |
| 64. 1G | 1,889.69 | 7.27\% | 1,583,620 | 8.30\% | 838.03 |
| 65. 2G1 | 3,168.98 | 12.18\% | 2,638,310 | 13.82\% | 832.54 |
| 66. 2G | 2,411.34 | 9.27\% | 1,899,930 | 9.95\% | 787.91 |
| 67.3G1 | 2,139.61 | 8.23\% | 1,717,925 | 9.00\% | 802.92 |
| 68.3G | 5,562.49 | 21.39\% | 4,082,340 | 21.38\% | 733.91 |
| 69.4G1 | 5,347.07 | 20.56\% | 3,660,555 | 19.17\% | 684.59 |
| 70.4G | 4,761.19 | 18.31\% | 2,888,070 | 15.13\% | 606.59 |
| 71. Total | 26,008.61 | 100.00\% | 19,091,080 | 100.00\% | 734.03 |
| Irrigated Total | 173,605.32 | 52.18\% | 473,795,660 | 60.77\% | 2,729.15 |
| Dry Total | 129,652.82 | 38.97\% | 286,332,825 | 36.72\% | 2,208.46 |
| Grass Total | 26,008.61 | 7.82\% | 19,091,080 | 2.45\% | 734.03 |
| Waste | 2,583.89 | 0.78\% | 232,425 | 0.03\% | 89.95 |
| Other | 822.55 | 0.25\% | 233,215 | 0.03\% | 283.53 |
| Exempt |  | 0.00\% |  | 0.00\% |  |
| Market Area Total | 332,673.19 | 100.00\% | 779,685,205 | 100.00\% | 2,343.70 |
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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 | 9,921.53 | 27,113,855 | 191,613.58 | 507,538,730 | 201,535.11 | 534,652,585 |
| 77. Dry Land | 0.00 | 0 | 2,200.45 | 4,968,820 | 132,289.73 | 289,262,890 | 134,490.18 | 294,231,710 |
| 78. Grass | 0.00 | 0 | 3,292.54 | 3,742,155 | 43,851.33 | 36,267,635 | 47,143.87 | 40,009,790 |
| 79. Waste | 0.00 | 0 | 712.34 | 64,105 | 4,100.21 | 368,905 | 4,812.55 | 433,010 |
| 80. Other | 0.00 | 0 | 108.32 | 67,020 | 1,229.16 | 343,440 | 1,337.48 | 410,460 |
| 81. Exempt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 82. Total | 0.00 | 0 | 16,235.18 | 35,955,955 | 373,084.01 | 833,781,600 | 389,319.19 | 869,737,555 |


|  | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | $201,535.11$ | $51.77 \%$ | $534,652,585$ | $61.47 \%$ | $2,652.90$ |
| Dry Land | $134,490.18$ | $34.54 \%$ | $294,231,710$ | $33.83 \%$ | $2,187.76$ |
| Grass | $47,143.87$ | $12.11 \%$ | $40,009,790$ | $4.60 \%$ | 848.67 |
| Waste | $4,812.55$ | $1.24 \%$ | 433,010 | $0.05 \%$ | 89.98 |
| Other | $1,337.48$ | $0.34 \%$ | 410,460 | $0.05 \%$ | 306.89 |

Exempt

| Total | $\mathbf{3 8 9}, \mathbf{3 1 9 . 1 9}$ | $100.00 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 6 9 , 7 3 7 , 5 5 5}$ | $100.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

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

| $71 \quad$ Platte | 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 | 1,052,859,070 | 1,112,064,660 | 59,205,590 | 5.62\% | 27,710,278 | 2.99\% |
| 02. Recreational | 1,234,990 | 1,581,745 | 346,755 | 28.08\% | 0 | 28.08\% |
| 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling | 99,963,370 | 105,413,001 | 5,449,631 | 5.45\% | 1,744,560 | 3.71\% |
| 04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 1,154,057,430 | 1,219,059,406 | 65,001,976 | 5.63\% | 29,454,838 | 3.08\% |
| 05. Commercial | 300,418,600 | 310,934,635 | 10,516,035 | 3.50\% | 54,332,300 | -14.59\% |
| 06. Industrial | 177,086,340 | 221,753,600 | 44,667,260 | 25.22\% | 8,524,720 | 20.41\% |
| 07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 76,649,195 | 79,791,824 | 3,142,629 | 4.10\% | 3,147,054 | -0.01\% |
| 08. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 554,154,135 | 612,480,059 | 58,325,924 | 10.53\% | 66,004,074 | -1.39\% |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 1,708,211,565 | 1,831,539,465 | 123,327,900 | 7.22\% | 95,458,912 | 1.63\% |
| 11. Irrigated | 417,351,250 | 534,652,585 | 117,301,335 | 28.11\% |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 258,488,070 | 294,231,710 | 35,743,640 | 13.83\% |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 34,227,905 | 40,009,790 | 5,781,885 | 16.89\% |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 369,005 | 433,010 | 64,005 | 17.35\% |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 333,090 | 410,460 | 77,370 | 23.23\% |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 710,769,320 | 869,737,555 | 158,968,235 | 22.37\% |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of all Real Property | 2,418,980,885 | 2,701,277,020 | 282,296,135 | 11.67\% | 95,458,912 | 7.72\% |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# PLATTE COUNTY <br> PLAN OF ASSESSMENT <br> Vanora Mulligan <br> PLATTE COUNTY ASSESSOR <br> 3 Year Plan <br> Introduction 

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9.

## County Description of Real Property in Platte County:

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

|  | Parcels | \%of Total Parcels | \% of Taxable | Value Base |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Residential | 11224 | $63 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $1,055,107,980$ |
| Commercial | 1,405 | $8 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $301,927,515$ |
| Industrial | 67 | $.004 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $177,086,340$ |
| Recreational | 26 | $.002 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1,237,450$ |
| Agricultural | 5017 | $29 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $886,389,810$ |
| Special Value | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}}$ |
|  | 17,739 | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $2,421,749,095$ |

Agricultural land-taxable acres 408,688.989
New Property: For assessment year 2009, an estimated 251 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

## Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

Staff
1 Assessor
1 Deputy Assessor
3 Fulltime Clerks
1 Appraiser
1Appraiser Assistants
1 Part time Clerk
Assessor prints and checks all reports. Helps with the sales review process for residential, Ag, and commercial properties. Tax corrections are written by the Assessor /Deputy Assessor.

Assessor, Deputy Assessor and 3.5 Clerks work on Personal Property\& Homestead Exemptions, answers the phone.

Deputy Assessor- Updates the cadastral maps. Helps with implementing GIS entering land use. Reviews ag land sales.

Clerks in the assessor's office assist in all the general duties in the office. Personal property, homestead exemptions, entering date in the cama real estate system.

Appraiser and Appraiser Assistant- Sales review and appraisal review and pickup work for residential, commercial and ag properties.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property-
A. Real Estate Transfers Statements are updated within a few weeks of when received from the Register of Deeds Office. The Assessor and Appraiser review the sales. Once reviewed the transfer statements are passed to a clerk, she will update the computer with the new information and green sheets are filled out for the Department of Assessment and Taxation. Information statements are filled out either by making phone calls or mail. We also send letters for appointments so the Appraiser or Appraiser Assistant can make a physical review of the property.
B. Internal sales ratio studies are done by neighborhoods and Platte County works well with State of Nebraska Field Liaison and review results.

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

| Property Class | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 93 | 12.45 | 101.52 |
| Commercial | 97 | 11.89 | 103.53 |
| Agricultural Land | 69 | 22.35 | 103.56 |

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

## Residential

Sales Review of neighborhoods. Plan to review Rural residential, Original Columbus. Aprox (3100 parcels).

## Commercial

Sales review checking the statistics. Commercial review of Sand Subdiv 70 parcels.
Review the Columbus Downtown Area.
REVIEW WORKING SAND PITS previously used Ag Values.

## Agricultural

Rural improvement review including acreages and farmsteads. Review ag land sales. Review market areas. Review W1/2 Columbus, Granville, Humphrey, \& Creston, Sherman, Townships. Review Floodway Areas....along rivers and creeks.

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010:

## Residential

Review some neighborhoods in Columbus. Sales review. Duncan, Monroe, Platte Center.

## Commercial

Review sales and sales statistics.

## Agricultural

Review Ag land sales. Continue GIS. Review Butler, Grand Prairie, Burrows, Joliet Townships.

## Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011

Residential- Sales review of all neighborhoods. Continue with the review using up dated cost tables \& Pick-up work. Review towns Creston, Humphrey \& Lindsay.

Commercial- Sales review of Commercial and Industrial. Pick-up work
Agricultural- Sales review on all land classes in each area. Review Monroe, Lost Creek, Shell Creek, Oconee, Loup Townships.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Platte County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | 1 |
| 3. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
|  | Other full-time employees |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 1 |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
| 7. | P293,315 |
|  | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
| 8. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
|  | \$293,315 |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
| 10. | N/A |
|  | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | N/A |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | None |
| 13. | Total budget |
|  | \$293,315 |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
|  | Yes, a minimal amount |
|  |  |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | County Solutions |
|  | CAMA software |
|  | County Solutions |


| 3. | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4. | Yes |
| 5. | Dho maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
|  | Deputy and Staff |
| 6. | Yes |
| 7. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
| 7. | Peputy and Staff |
|  | County Solutions |

## C. Zoning Information

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

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Large commercial is contracted as needed |
|  | Other services |
|  | None |

## Certification

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

Four copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.
One copy to the Platte County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

