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## 2009 Commission Summary

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 235 | COD | 7.31 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 23,197,379$ | PRD | 101.30 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 23,199,179$ | COV | 12.20 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 22,040,080$ | STD | 11.74 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 98,720$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 7.02 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 93,788$ | Average Assessed Value <br> of the Base | $\$ 71,682$ |
| Median | 96 | Wgt. Mean | 95 |
| Mean | 96 | Max | 163 |
| Min | 37.36 |  |  |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 95.18 to 96.89 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 94.74 to 97.74 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 93.76 to 96.24 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 33.86 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period | 4.50 |
| $\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period | 5.89 |

## Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 296 | 98 | 9.83 | 102.15 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 343 | 99 | 13.3 | 104.03 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 428 | 95 | 18.23 | 105.49 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 415 | 94 | 16.81 | 104.9 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

76 Saline

## Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 32 | COD | 12.35 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 4,514,200$ | PRD | 93.89 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 4,068,765$ | COV | 24.29 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 4,401,530$ | STD | 24.67 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 127,149$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 12.20 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 137,548$ | Average Assessed Value |  |
| of the Base | $\$ 211,483$ |  |  |
| Median |  | Wgt. Mean | 108 |
| Mean | 102 | Max | 171 |
| Min | 44 |  |  |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 95.48 to 100.44 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 93.02 to 110.11 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 90.53 to 125.83 |

$\%$ of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 12.98
$\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period 4.72
$\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period 3.07

## Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 38 | 99 | 14.98 | 96.32 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 44 | 99 | 19.44 | 96.52 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 43 | 99 | 21.5 | 87.68 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 46 | 99 | 16.02 | 90.28 |

## 2009 Commission Summary

Agricultural Land - Current

| Number of Sales | 59 | COD | 16.91 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 11,470,823$ | PRD | 104.71 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 11,771,863$ | COV | 23.08 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 8,177,980$ | STD | 16.79 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 199,523$ | Avg. Absolute Deviation | 12.31 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 138,610$ | Average Assessed Value |  |
| of the Base | $\$ 154,643$ |  |  |
| Median | 73 | Wgt. Mean |  |
| Mean | 73 | Max | 69 |
| Min | 40.31 |  | 134.67 |

## Confidenence Interval - Current

| $95 \%$ Median C.I | 67.56 to 76.34 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $95 \%$ Mean C.I | 68.46 to 77.03 |
| $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I | 64.00 to 74.94 |

\% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 53.15
$\%$ of Records Sold in the Study Period 1.55
$\%$ of Value Sold in the Study Period 2.36

| Agricultural Land - History |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 59 | 72 | 13.3 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 49 | 72 | 16.38 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 60 | 75 | 16.21 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 64 | 77 | 14.02 |

Opinions

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

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Saline County is $99.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Saline 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 Saline County is $73.00 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Saline County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.


Ruth A. Sorensen<br>Property Tax Administrato
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Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009


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


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

Residential: For 2009 the county completed a review of the village of Friend, and the Blue River Lodge assessor locations along with updating the subclass of Crete mobile homes. The review in the Friend and the Blue River Lodge assessor locations consisted of new photos, check of measurements along with a review of the property record cards. Interior inspections were completed on as many properties as allowed. The County estimated a compliance of $25 \%$ on interior inspections. Door hangars were used when no one was home. The County completed new property record cards. For the Crete mobile homes the County equalized values in the subclass.
The county installed an update from Marshall and Swift which affected the pricing on attached garages that were of low and fair quality in the CAMA system which affected improvement values in the locations of Dorchester, Swanton and Western.
The county completed a sales analysis and adjusted the improvement values in the assessor location of Crete where they decreased the improvements by $3 \%$. In the location of Wilber the improvements received a $4 \%$ decrease. The County also completed their permit work and pick up work for the year.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Saline County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Appraiser and office staff |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
| Contracted Appraiser |  |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Office and Contracted personnel |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are <br> used to value this property class? |
|  | 2004- Tobias, Wilber and Dewitt <br> 2006- Crete <br> 2008-Friend, Dorchester, Swanton, and Western |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was <br> developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2004- Tobias, Wilber and Dewitt <br> 2006- Crete <br> 2008-Friend, Dorchester, Swanton and Western |
| 6. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the <br> market value of properties? |
|  | RCNLD based on market based depreciation |
| 7. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
| 69 neighborhoods |  |
| 8. | How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |
|  | The neighborhoods are defined by location and property characteristics. <br> 9.Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable <br> valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping? |
| Yes | Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. <br> $\mathbf{1 0 - 0 0 1 . 0 7 B ? ~ ( S u b u r b a n ~ s h a l l ~ m e a n ~ a ~ p a r c e l ~ o f ~ r e a l ~ e s t a t e ~ p r o p e r t y ~ l o c a t e d ~ o u t s i d e ~}$ <br> of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> 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, They are valued by the same method and during the same assessment cycle

Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 1}$ |

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


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


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



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


## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL:Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The quality statistics along with the measures of central tendency are all within the acceptable range. While the county has utilized an adequate portion of the available sales the percent used is lower than past years. The County is progressive in their approach to utilize the electronic transfer of sales information to the state and is aggressive in the review of sales to gather as much information to establish the usability of transactions. They are developing a consistent approach to valuing properties in the County. There has been an active market and the County is watching a downward trend and adjusting for it in a few assessor locations. There are no indications that would suggest that the qualified median is not the best indication of the level of value in the residential property class.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2009 | 495 | 235 | 47.47 |
| 2008 | 528 | 296 | 56.06 |
| 2007 | 558 | 343 | 61.47 |
| 2006 | 589 | 428 | 72.67 |
| 2005 | 582 | 415 | 71.31 |

RESIDENTIAL:A review of the utilization grid indicates the county has utilized an adequate portion of the available residential sales for the development of the qualified statistics.

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ 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 | 97 | -0.90 | 96 | 96 |
| 2008 | 97.15 | 0.54 | 98 | 97.5 |
| 2007 | 91 | 5.85 | 96 | 99 |
| 2006 | 89 | 7.24 | 95 | 95 |
| 2005 | 92 | 4.22 | 96 | 94 |

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

## 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 Saline 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

| -1.04 | 2009 | -0.90 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.36 | 2008 | 0.54 |
| 7.94 | 2007 | 5.85 |
| 8.63 | 2006 | 7.24 |
| 2.40 | 2005 | 4.22 |

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 | 95 | 96 |

RESIDENTIAL:In reviewing the three measures of central tendency they are similar and supportive of the assessment actions in the county. All three measures are within the acceptable range and support the median as the level of value for the residential class.

## 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 | 7.31 | 101.30 |
| Difference | 0.00 | 0.00 |

RESIDENTIAL:Table VI shows that the qualitative measures for the residential class of property are both in the acceptable range.

## 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 | 250 | 235 | -15 |
| Median | 97 | 96 | -1 |
| Wgt. Mean | 96 | 95 | -1 |
| Mean | 97 | 96 | -1 |
| COD | 10.05 | 7.31 | -2.74 |
| PRD | 101.36 | 101.30 | -0.06 |
| Minimum | 37.36 | 37.36 | 0.00 |
| Maximum | 177.38 | 162.86 | -14.52 |

RESIDENTIAL:The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The difference in the number of qualified sales is a result of sales sustaining substantial physical changes and being removed from the qualified sales roster.

## VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

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

|  | R\&O Statistics | Trended Ratio | Difference |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 235 | 235 | 0 |
| Median | 96 | 96 | 0 |
| Wgt. Mean | 95 | 105 | -10 |
| Mean | 96 | 98 | -2 |
| COD | 7.31 | 17.18 | -9.87 |
| PRD | 101.30 | 0.94 | 100.36 |
| Minimum | 37.36 | 34.18 | 3.18 |
| Maximum | 162.86 | 176.90 | -14.04 |

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 Saline County the measures of central tendency are similar suggesting the sales file is representative of the population.

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics




## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics



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


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


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

## Commercial:

Saline County conducted a statistical analysis in the class and completed their permit and pick up work in the class. The permit work included work on several large commercial properties which affect the overall change in the class.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Saline County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Contractor and Appraiser |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Contractor and Appraiser |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Contractor and Appraiser |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are <br> used to value this property class? |
|  | 2000 \& 2004-Commercial <br> 2004-Industrial (The 2006 appraisal used 2004 pricing data) <br> 2007 Crete |
| 5. | What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was <br> developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2005- Wilber and Friend <br> $2006-$ Crete |
| 6. | When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or <br> establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | Income approach was used only in Crete for 2008 |
| 7. | What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the <br> market value of properties? |
|  | A correlation of Market, RCNLD, and Cost |
| 8. | Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations? |
|  | 38 market areas <br> 9. |
| How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined? |  |


|  | limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
| :--- | :--- |
| There is no market significance to the location suburban, it is used only for <br> classification. |  |

## Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 0}$ |



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



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


## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. Of the two qualitative statistics, the price related differential is below the acceptable range while the coefficient of dispersion is in the range. The changes between the preliminary statistical reports and the final R\&O reports are consistent with the assessment actions for the class. For the commercial class of property the median is a reliable measure of the level of value.

## 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 | $\mathbf{8 9}$ | 32 | $\mathbf{3 5 . 9 6}$ |
| 2008 | 91 | 38 | 41.76 |
| 2007 | 87 | 44 | 50.57 |
| 2006 | 70 | 43 | 61.43 |
| 2005 | 69 | 46 | 66.67 |

COMMERCIAL:The county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and the measurement of the class of property was done with all arms length sales. When reviewing the history this trend has dipped compared to the last few years but still represents an adequate sample of qualified 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 | 99 | -0.10 | 99 | 99 |
| 2008 | 98.26 | 8.70 | 107 | 98.76 |
| 2007 | 99 | -0.48 | 99 | 99 |
| 2006 | 97 | -0.20 | 97 | 99 |
| 2005 | 95 | 0.53 | 95 | 99 |

COMMERCIAL:The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ ratio 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 Saline County

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

\% Change in Total
Assessed Value in the Sales File
\% Change in Total Assessed
Value (excl. growth)

| 1.1 | 2009 | -0.10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -2.32 | 2008 | 8.70 |
| 0.00 | 2007 | -0.48 |
| 0.11 | 2006 | -0.20 |
| -1.63 | 2005 | 0.53 |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# 2009 Correlation Section 

for Saline County

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 99 | 108 | 102 |

COMMERCIAL:The table above shows that two of the three measures of central tendency are outside the acceptable range. The weighted mean is 9 points above the median and the mean is over 3 points above the median.

## 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 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 8 9}$ |
| Difference | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ | -4.11 |

COMMERCIAL:The coefficient of dispersion is in the range while the price related differential is below the range. This could mean that the high value properties are relatively over-assessed. This does not support vertical uniformity.

## VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 34 | 32 | -2 |
| Median | 99 | 99 | 0 |
| Wgt. Mean | 107 | 108 | 1 |
| Mean | 105 | 102 | -3 |
| COD | 17.74 | 12.35 | -5.39 |
| PRD | 97.54 | 93.89 | -3.65 |
| Minimum | 43.80 | 43.80 | 0.00 |
| Maximum | 244.50 | 170.85 | -73.65 |

COMMERCIAL:The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The difference in the number of qualified sales is a result of sales sustaining substantial physical changes and being removed from the qualified sales roster.

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

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


## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

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


## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

## AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

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



NonValid School
$\qquad$

|  |  | 59 | 63.87 | 63.02 | 60.60 | 18.94 | 104.00 | 33.29 | 99.13 | 58.63 to 69.09 | 199,523 | 120,913 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACRES IN SALERANGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
|  |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 0.01 TO | 10.00 | 1 | 70.03 | 70.03 | 70.03 |  |  | 70.03 | 70.03 | N/A | 16,000 | 11,205 |
| 10.01 TO | 30.00 | 1 | 53.35 | 53.35 | 53.35 |  |  | 53.35 | 53.35 | N/A | 37,500 | 20,005 |
| 30.01 TO | 50.00 | 7 | 61.14 | 58.26 | 56.62 | 14.41 | 102.90 | 38.57 | 76.14 | 38.57 to 76.14 | 62,336 | 35,296 |
| 50.01 TO | 100.00 | 31 | 62.83 | 63.08 | 60.28 | 21.27 | 104.64 | 33.29 | 99.13 | 52.75 to 71.50 | 158,476 | 95,536 |
| 100.01 TO | 180.00 | 16 | 65.26 | 65.56 | 63.71 | 16.31 | 102.90 | 41.42 | 94.85 | 56.19 to 75.45 | 309,076 | 196,911 |
| 180.01 TO | 330.00 | 3 | 64.36 | 60.90 | 52.20 | 23.62 | 116.67 | 36.37 | 81.98 | N/A | 474,667 | 247,786 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 59 | 63.87 | 63.02 | 60.60 | 18.94 | 104.00 | 33.29 | 99.13 | 58.63 to 69.09 | 199,523 | 120,913 |
| MAJORITY LAND USE > 95\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price |  |
| DRY |  | 10 | 65.40 | 66.58 | 62.24 | 19.40 | 106.97 | 37.51 | 99.13 | 52.72 to 80.24 | 115,922 | 72,152 |
| DRY-N/A |  | 25 | 66.21 | 64.57 | 60.14 | 13.86 | 107.38 | 36.37 | 81.98 | 61.46 to 72.45 | 184,175 | 110,754 |
| GRASS |  | 1 | 55.05 | 55.05 | 55.05 |  |  | 55.05 | 55.05 | N/A | 110,000 | 60,560 |
| GRASS-N/A |  | 8 | 53.29 | 56.87 | 58.64 | 26.62 | 96.97 | 38.57 | 94.85 | 38.57 to 94.85 | 157,479 | 92,352 |
| IRRGTD |  | 2 | 39.49 | 39.49 | 39.47 | 11.00 | 100.04 | 35.14 | 43.83 | N/A | 283,195 | 111,775 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { IRRGTD-N } / A \\ \text { ALL_ } \end{gathered}$ |  | 13 | 64.30 | 65.33 | 64.36 | 21.23 | 101.52 | 33.29 | 93.49 | 52.75 to 75.58 | 313,232 | 201,582 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 59 | 63.87 | 63.02 | 60.60 | 18.94 | 104.00 | 33.29 | 99.13 | 58.63 to 69.09 | 199,523 | 120,913 |

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009
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## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics




## ype: Qualified

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


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

Agricultural: A market study was conducted for the entire county. Adjustments were made to classes and subclasses as needed. The market areas in the county were reviewed. The County completed the permit and pick up work for the class.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Saline County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Appraiser and office personnel |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Appraiser |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Appraiser and office personnel |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | Yes. The County does currently have a policy defining rural residential acreages that discusses both predominant use of the parcel and acre size. This policy is still being revised and perfected for the county's continued use. |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | It is defined by predominant use of the parcel. The County sends out a survey to aid in this determination. |
| 5. | When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | The income approach was not used. |
| 6. | If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used? |
|  | NA |
| 7. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 2008 |
| 8. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | 1988, The county is continually working on updating land use. |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | FSA maps, physical inspections and NRD information |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | Office staff. |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | The County has updated to the new soil codes as regulated, but not completed a total recount of the county. |


|  | 9.Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the <br> agricultural property class: <br> There are 3 market areas. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 10. | How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed? <br> The market areas are defined by topography and accessibility of water. |
| 11. | In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other <br> than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation? |
|  | No |
| a. | If yes, list. |
| 12. | In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings? |
|  | N/A |
| 13. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special <br> valuation for agricultural land within the county? |
|  | No, but the county continues to study to see if there are influences other than Ag in <br> the County. |

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{3 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 2}$ |
|  |  |  |  |

76 - SALINE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED
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## PAD 2009 R\&O Statistics

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

|  | NUMBER of Sales: |  | 59 | MEDIAN: | 73 |  | COV: | 23.08 | $\begin{array}{rrrr}\text { 95\% Median C.I.: } & 67.56 \text { to } 76.34 & \text { (! }: \text { Derived) } \\ \text { 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: } & 64.00 \text { to } 74.94 & \text { (!: land+NAT=0) }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: |  | 11,470,823 | WGT. MEAN: | 69 |  | STD: | 16.79 |  |  |  |  |
| (AgLand) | total Adj. Sales Price: |  | 11,771,863 | MEAN : | 73 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 12.31 | Mean C.I.: 68.46 to 77.03 |  |  |  |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: |  | 8,177,980 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: |  | 199,523 | COD : | 16.91 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 134.67 |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: |  | 138,609 | PRD : | 104.71 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 40.31 | Printed: 03/19/2009 14:30:20 |  |  |  |
| SCHOOL | DISTRICT * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | M MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30-0001 | 2 | 80.00 | 080.00 | 77.50 | 26.69 |  | 103.22 | 58.65 | 101.35 | N/A | 252,122 | 195,405 |
| 48-0300 | 8 | 66.83 | 368.96 | 72.36 | 13.28 |  | 95.30 | 47.36 | 88.07 | 47.36 to 88.07 | 157,458 | 113,931 |
| 48-0303 | 8 | 71.40 | - 71.85 | 72.68 | 12.41 |  | 98.85 | 52.23 | 89.18 | 52.23 to 89.18 | 112,403 | 81,696 |
| 76-0002 | 1 | 84.60 | 084.60 | 84.60 |  |  |  | 84.60 | 84.60 | N/A | 150,000 | 126,895 |
| 76-0044 | 7 | 75.91 | 170.96 | 72.80 | 14.26 |  | 97.47 | 41.31 | 93.92 | 41.31 to 93.92 | 198,228 | 144,312 |
| 76-0068 | 17 | 75.01 | 176.63 | 71.99 | 12.77 |  | 106.44 | 56.84 | 134.67 | 64.30 to 80.98 | 248,472 | 178,884 |
| 76-0082 | 16 | 70.27 | $7 \quad 70.09$ | 61.07 | 23.81 |  | 114.77 | 40.31 | 108.66 | 53.10 to 88.74 | 209,192 | 127,751 |

NonValid School
$\qquad$

|  |  | 59 | 72.78 | 72.74 | 69.47 | 16.91 | 104.71 | 40.31 | 134.67 | 67.56 to 76.34 | 199,523 | 138,609 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACRES IN | SALE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 0.01 TO | 10.00 | 1 | 71.28 | 71.28 | 71.28 |  |  | 71.28 | 71.28 | N/A | 16,000 | 11,405 |
| 10.01 TO | 30.00 | 1 | 61.75 | 61.75 | 61.75 |  |  | 61.75 | 61.75 | N/A | 37,500 | 23,155 |
| 30.01 TO | 50.00 | 7 | 70.41 | 66.19 | 63.99 | 15.53 | 103.44 | 41.31 | 85.61 | 41.31 to 85.61 | 62,336 | 39,887 |
| 50.01 TO | 100.00 | 31 | 74.45 | 74.76 | 72.16 | 17.69 | 103.60 | 42.13 | 134.67 | 66.09 to 81.94 | 158,476 | 114,349 |
| 100.01 TO | 180.00 | 16 | 75.29 | 73.58 | 70.79 | 14.09 | 103.95 | 53.10 | 101.35 | 58.65 to 84.60 | 309,076 | 218,782 |
| 180.01 TO | 330.00 | 3 | 72.39 | 66.92 | 57.50 | 21.99 | 116.38 | 40.31 | 88.07 | N/A | 474,667 | 272,951 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 59 | 72.78 | 72.74 | 69.47 | 16.91 | 104.71 | 40.31 | 134.67 | 67.56 to 76.34 | 199,523 | 138,609 |
| MAJORITY LAND USE > 95\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| DRY |  | 10 | 70.98 | 75.00 | 70.96 | 19.14 | 105.69 | 45.75 | 108.66 | 58.20 to 89.18 | 115,922 | 82,256 |
| DRY-N/A |  | 25 | 75.00 | 72.83 | 67.66 | 12.37 | 107.64 | 40.31 | 93.50 | 66.09 to 80.98 | 184,175 | 124,617 |
| GRASS |  | 1 | 134.67 | 134.67 | 134.67 |  |  | 134.67 | 134.67 | N/A | 110,000 | 148,135 |
| GRASS-N/A |  | 8 | 71.40 | 66.82 | 74.41 | 19.60 | 89.80 | 41.31 | 101.35 | 41.31 to 101.35 | 157,479 | 117,181 |
| IRRGTD |  | 2 | 64.04 | 64.04 | 64.05 | 5.50 | 99.98 | 60.52 | 67.56 | N/A | 283,195 | 181,387 |
| IRRGTD-N/A |  | 13 | 75.01 | 71.07 | 68.56 | 15.69 | 103.66 | 42.13 | 93.92 | 57.24 to 88.74 | 313,232 | 214,740 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 59 | 72.78 | 72.74 | 69.47 | 16.91 | 104.71 | 40.31 | 134.67 | 67.56 to 76.34 | 199,523 | 138,609 |

76 - SALINE COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | NUMBER of Sales: | 59 |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Sales Price: | $11,470,823$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | $11,771,863$ |
| (AgLand) | TOTAL Assessed Value: | $8,177,980$ |
|  | AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 199,523 |
|  | AVG. Assessed Value: | 138,609 |

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

| MAJORITY LAND USE > | 80\% <br> RANGE |
| :--- | ---: |
| DRY | 21 |
| DRY-N/A | 14 |
| GRASS | 1 |
| GRASS-N/A | 8 |
| IRRGTD | 11 |
| IRRGTD-N/A | 4 |


| MEDIAN |
| ---: |
| 72.74 |
| 74.72 |
| 134.67 |
| 71.40 |
| 67.56 |
| 4 |


| PRD: |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| 74.04 | 71.72 |
| 72.57 | 64.26 |
| 134.67 | 134.67 |
| 66.82 | 74.41 |
| 71.56 | 69.51 |
| 66.20 | 63.15 |

- 
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## Agricultural Land

## I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The County relied on the unimproved statistics in their statistical analysis for class and subclass adjustments. In reviewing both statistics the overall measures of central tendency are in the range with the only difference being the weighted mean.
The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately. 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.

## 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 | 159 | 59 | $\mathbf{3 7 . 1 1}$ |
| 2008 | 162 | 59 | 36.42 |
| 2007 | 160 | 49 | 30.63 |
| 2006 | 144 | 60 | 41.67 |
| 2005 | 150 | 64 | 42.67 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:A review of the utilization grid indicates the county has utilized an adequate portion of the available agricultural sales for the development of the qualified statistics. For 2009 the number of qualified sales is consistent with the average for the past 8 years.

## 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 | 64 | 10.07 | 70 | 73 |
| 2008 | 66.92 | 13.95 | 76 | 71.5 |
| 2007 | 70 | 4.80 | 73 | 72 |
| 2006 | 63 | 13.80 | 72 | 75 |
| 2005 | 73 | 4.31 | 76 | 77 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R\&O Median level of value 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 Saline County

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

\% Change in Total
Assessed Value in the Sales File
\% Change in Total Assessed
Value (excl. growth)

| 28.26 | 2009 | 10.07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14.93 | 2008 | 13.95 |
| 6.05 | 2007 | 4.80 |
| 25.53 | 2006 | 13.80 |
| 4.97 | 2005 | 4.31 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:There is a substantial difference in the percent change in the sales file when compared to the assessed base. This calls into question the representativeness of the sales file. The changes reported by the county had a larger effect on the sales file than the base.

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

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

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

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

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

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

# 2009 Correlation Section 

for Saline County

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

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 73 | 69 | 73 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The three measures of central tendency are all within the acceptable range.

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 16.91 | 104.71 |
| Difference | 0.00 | 1.71 |

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:This table shows that the COD is in the acceptable range while the PRD is slightly above the range.

## 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 | 59 | 59 | 0 |
| Median | 64 | 73 | 9 |
| Wgt. Mean | 61 | 69 | 8 |
| Mean | 63 | 73 | 10 |
| COD | 18.94 | 16.91 | -2.03 |
| PRD | 33.29 | $\mathbf{1 0 4 . 7 1}$ | 0.71 |
| Minimum | 99.13 | 134.67 | 7.02 |
| Maximum |  | 35.54 |  |

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

| Total Real Property <br> Sum Lines 17, 25, \& 30 | Records : 9,691 | Value : 1,104,378,486 | Growth $9,517,840$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  | Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |  |
| 01. Res UnImp Land | 522 | 5,155,905 | 57 | 654,100 | 12 | 317,140 | 591 | 6,127,145 |  |
| 02. Res Improve Land | 3,749 | 46,069,100 | 203 | 4,964,705 | 342 | 8,717,885 | 4,294 | 59,751,690 |  |
| 03. Res Improvements | 3,927 | 256,438,796 | 235 | 19,313,240 | 366 | 29,192,275 | 4,528 | 304,944,311 |  |
| 04. Res Total | 4,449 | 307,663,801 | 292 | 24,932,045 | 378 | 38,227,300 | 5,119 | 370,823,146 | 3,551,555 |
| \% of Res Total | 86.91 | 82.97 | 5.70 | 6.72 | 7.38 | 10.31 | 52.82 | 33.58 | 37.31 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05. Com UnImp Land | 81 | 993,730 | 10 | 695,520 | 3 | 34,770 | 94 | 1,724,020 |  |
| 06. Com Improve Land | 499 | 10,937,405 | 27 | 1,404,925 | 6 | 114,765 | 532 | 12,457,095 |  |
| 07. Com Improvements | 529 | 58,201,620 | 34 | 28,294,495 | 8 | 1,427,360 | 571 | 87,923,475 |  |
| 08. Com Total | 610 | 70,132,755 | 44 | 30,394,940 | 11 | 1,576,895 | 665 | 102,104,590 | 2,427,525 |
| \% of Com Total | 91.73 | 68.69 | 6.62 | 29.77 | 1.65 | 1.54 | 6.86 | 9.25 | 25.50 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09. Ind UnImp Land | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21,500 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21,500 |  |
| 10. Ind Improve Land | 6 | 659,620 | 3 | 813,400 | 1 | 615,000 | 10 | 2,088,020 |  |
| 11. Ind Improvements | 6 | 14,584,835 | 3 | 10,701,600 | 1 | 13,885,000 | 10 | 39,171,435 |  |
| 12. Ind Total | 6 | 15,244,455 | 6 | 11,536,500 | 1 | 14,500,000 | 13 | 41,280,955 | 2,500,000 |
| \% of Ind Total | 46.15 | 36.93 | 46.15 | 27.95 | 7.69 | 35.13 | 0.13 | 3.74 | 26.27 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. Rec UnImp Land | 1 | 8,380 | 9 | 69,775 | 11 | 459,290 | 21 | 537,445 |  |
| 14. Rec Improve Land | 4 | 130,260 | 5 | 297,355 | 5 | 282,275 | 14 | 709,890 |  |
| 15. Rec Improvements | 5 | 238,305 | 45 | 1,372,560 | 27 | 285,395 | 77 | 1,896,260 |  |
| 16. Rec Total | 6 | 376,945 | 54 | 1,739,690 | 38 | 1,026,960 | 98 | 3,143,595 | 0 |
| \% of Rec Total | 6.12 | 11.99 | 55.10 | 55.34 | 38.78 | 32.67 | 1.01 | 0.28 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Res \& Rec Total } \\ & \text { \% of Res \& Rec Total } \end{aligned}$ | 4,455 | 308,040,746 | 346 | 26,671,735 | 416 | 39,254,260 | 5,217 | 373,966,741 | 3,551,555 |
|  | 85.39 | 82.37 | 6.63 | 7.13 | 7.97 | 10.50 | 53.83 | 33.86 | 37.31 |
| Com \& Ind Total | 616 | 85,377,210 | 50 | 41,931,440 | 12 | 16,076,895 | 678 | 143,385,545 | 4,927,525 |
| \% of Com \& Ind Total | 90.86 | 59.54 | 7.37 | 29.24 | 1.77 | 11.21 | 7.00 | 12.98 | 51.77 |
| 17. Taxable Total | 5,071 | 393,417,956 | 396 | 68,603,175 | 428 | 55,331,155 | 5,895 | 517,352,286 | 8,479,080 |
| \% of Taxable Total | 86.02 | 76.04 | 6.72 | 13.26 | 7.26 | 10.70 | 60.83 | 46.85 | 89.09 |
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Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

|  | Records | Urban <br> Value Base | Value Excess | Records | SubUrban <br> Value Base | Value Excess |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18. Residential | 4 | 108,955 | 36,610 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19. Commercial | 1 | 13,115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other |  | 0 <br> Rural <br> Value Base | 0 <br> Value Excess | $0$ <br> Records | 0 <br> Total Value Base | 0 <br> Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 108,955 | 36,610 |
| 19. Commercial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13,115 | 0 |
| 20. Industrial | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21. Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Total Sch II |  |  |  | 5 | 122,070 | 36,610 |

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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


| Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| 26. Producing | 428 | 143 | 343 | 914 |
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| Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Records | Urban <br> Acres | Value | Records | SubUrban <br> Acres | Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Value N/A | 0 Records |  | 0 Value | 0 Records |  | 0 Value |
| 43. Special Value | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 44. Recapture Value | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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


## County 76 Saline

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

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 802.82 | 15.26\% | 1,384,110 | 16.78\% | 1,724.06 |
| 46. 1A | 2,173.13 | 41.32\% | 3,473,520 | 42.11\% | 1,598.39 |
| 47. 2A1 | 590.14 | 11.22\% | 899,240 | 10.90\% | 1,523.77 |
| 48. 2A | 621.18 | 11.81\% | 947,185 | 11.48\% | 1,524.82 |
| 49.3A1 | 395.98 | 7.53\% | 593,070 | 7.19\% | 1,497.73 |
| 50.3A | 51.04 | 0.97\% | 76,560 | 0.93\% | 1,500.00 |
| 51.4A1 | 507.79 | 9.65\% | 710,910 | 8.62\% | 1,400.01 |
| 52. 4A | 117.49 | 2.23\% | 164,485 | 1.99\% | 1,399.99 |
| 53. Total | 5,259.57 | 100.00\% | 8,249,080 | 100.00\% | 1,568.39 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 2,797.37 | 2.51\% | 3,635,780 | 2.72\% | 1,299.71 |
| 55. 1D | 48,925.33 | 43.82\% | 63,525,265 | 47.58\% | 1,298.41 |
| 56. 2D1 | 4,516.74 | 4.05\% | 5,637,025 | 4.22\% | 1,248.03 |
| 57. 2D | 26,290.93 | 23.55\% | 29,573,270 | 22.15\% | 1,124.85 |
| 58.3D1 | 10,057.58 | 9.01\% | 11,053,245 | 8.28\% | 1,099.00 |
| 59.3D | 1,362.50 | 1.22\% | 1,497,905 | 1.12\% | 1,099.38 |
| 60.4D1 | 15,882.44 | 14.22\% | 16,676,790 | 12.49\% | 1,050.01 |
| 61. 4D | 1,820.51 | 1.63\% | 1,906,675 | 1.43\% | 1,047.33 |
| 62. Total | 111,653.40 | 100.00\% | 133,505,955 | 100.00\% | 1,195.72 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 367.03 | 0.00\% | 290,650 | 0.99\% | 791.90 |
| 64. 1G | 3,386.56 | 9.31\% | 3,432,590 | 11.73\% | 1,013.59 |
| 65. 2G1 | 1,226.49 | 3.37\% | 1,006,945 | 3.44\% | 821.00 |
| 66. 2G | 7,336.55 | 20.17\% | 6,869,025 | 23.48\% | 936.27 |
| 67.3G1 | 2,370.26 | 6.52\% | 2,058,920 | 7.04\% | 868.65 |
| 68.3G | 1,959.18 | 5.39\% | 1,701,710 | 5.82\% | 868.58 |
| 69.4G1 | 9,521.71 | 26.18\% | 7,431,240 | 25.40\% | 780.45 |
| 70.4G | 10,198.88 | 28.04\% | 6,463,575 | 22.09\% | 633.75 |
| 71. Total | 36,366.66 | 100.00\% | 29,254,655 | 100.00\% | 804.44 |
| Irrigated Total | 5,259.57 | 3.41\% | 8,249,080 | 4.82\% | 1,568.39 |
| Dry Total | 111,653.40 | 72.48\% | 133,505,955 | 78.05\% | 1,195.72 |
| Grass Total | 36,366.66 | 23.61\% | 29,254,655 | 17.10\% | 804.44 |
| Waste | 758.16 | 0.49\% | 41,710 | 0.02\% | 55.01 |
| Other | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Exempt | 20.03 | 0.01\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 154,037.79 | 100.00\% | 171,051,400 | 100.00\% | 1,110.45 |
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## County 76 Saline

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail Market Area 2

| Irrigated | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. 1A1 | 2,740.99 | 11.95\% | 7,103,225 | 13.38\% | 2,591.48 |
| 46. 1A | 9,598.22 | 41.86\% | 23,969,750 | 45.14\% | 2,497.31 |
| 47. 2A1 | 2,962.38 | 12.92\% | 7,068,475 | 13.31\% | 2,386.08 |
| 48. 2A | 2,675.99 | 11.67\% | 5,878,380 | 11.07\% | 2,196.71 |
| 49.3A1 | 2,444.77 | 10.66\% | 4,874,085 | 9.18\% | 1,993.68 |
| 50.3A | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| 51.4A1 | 1,865.66 | 8.14\% | 3,165,565 | 5.96\% | 1,696.75 |
| 52.4A | 640.71 | 2.79\% | 1,039,720 | 1.96\% | 1,622.76 |
| 53. Total | 22,928.72 | 100.00\% | 53,099,200 | 100.00\% | 2,315.84 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 1,953.10 | 8.22\% | 3,123,465 | 9.08\% | 1,599.23 |
| 55. 1D | 8,640.23 | 36.38\% | 13,804,785 | 40.13\% | 1,597.73 |
| 56. 2D1 | 2,625.36 | 11.05\% | 3,934,520 | 11.44\% | 1,498.66 |
| 57. 2D | 3,626.94 | 15.27\% | 5,069,835 | 14.74\% | 1,397.83 |
| 58.3D1 | 3,174.79 | 13.37\% | 4,420,905 | 12.85\% | 1,392.50 |
| 59.3D | 13.00 | 0.05\% | 15,600 | 0.05\% | 1,200.00 |
| 60. 4D1 | 2,812.24 | 11.84\% | 3,086,770 | 8.97\% | 1,097.62 |
| 61. 4D | 907.27 | 3.82\% | 948,065 | 2.76\% | 1,044.96 |
| 62. Total | 23,752.93 | 100.00\% | 34,403,945 | 100.00\% | 1,448.41 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 196.97 | 0.00\% | 177,070 | 2.62\% | 898.97 |
| 64. 1G | 786.52 | 9.10\% | 751,945 | 11.11\% | 956.04 |
| 65. 2G1 | 671.11 | 7.76\% | 573,995 | 8.48\% | 855.29 |
| 66. 2G | 1,006.65 | 11.64\% | 946,010 | 13.98\% | 939.76 |
| 67.3G1 | 534.26 | 6.18\% | 472,175 | 6.98\% | 883.79 |
| 68.3G | 5.00 | 0.06\% | 4,500 | 0.07\% | 900.00 |
| 69.4G1 | 1,483.51 | 17.16\% | 1,302,455 | 19.25\% | 877.95 |
| 70. 4G | 3,963.21 | 45.83\% | 2,538,630 | 37.52\% | 640.55 |
| 71. Total | 8,647.23 | 100.00\% | 6,766,780 | 100.00\% | 782.54 |
| Irrigated Total | 22,928.72 | 41.10\% | 53,099,200 | 56.31\% | 2,315.84 |
| Dry Total | 23,752.93 | 42.58\% | 34,403,945 | 36.48\% | 1,448.41 |
| Grass Total | 8,647.23 | 15.50\% | 6,766,780 | 7.18\% | 782.54 |
| Waste | 456.06 | 0.82\% | 29,445 | 0.03\% | 64.56 |
| Other | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Exempt | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 55,784.94 | 100.00\% | 94,299,370 | 100.00\% | 1,690.41 |

## County 76 Saline

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 | 11,105.84 | 15.66\% | 28,791,910 | 16.95\% | 2,592.50 |
| 46. 1A | 33,102.51 | 46.69\% | 82,715,775 | 48.71\% | 2,498.78 |
| 47. 2A1 | 10,117.27 | 14.27\% | 24,258,260 | 14.28\% | 2,397.71 |
| 48. 2A | 3,441.75 | 4.85\% | 8,247,185 | 4.86\% | 2,396.22 |
| 49.3A1 | 6,302.66 | 8.89\% | 13,854,740 | 8.16\% | 2,198.24 |
| 50.3A | 13.00 | 0.02\% | 24,700 | 0.01\% | 1,900.00 |
| 51.4A1 | 5,652.84 | 7.97\% | 9,892,600 | 5.83\% | 1,750.02 |
| 52. 4A | 1,166.88 | 1.65\% | 2,042,095 | 1.20\% | 1,750.05 |
| 53. Total | 70,902.75 | 100.00\% | 169,827,265 | 100.00\% | 2,395.21 |
| Dry |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 4,149.65 | 10.02\% | 7,245,565 | 11.85\% | 1,746.07 |
| 55. 1D | 14,692.42 | 35.46\% | 25,226,290 | 41.27\% | 1,716.96 |
| 56. 2D1 | 5,091.52 | 12.29\% | 7,626,480 | 12.48\% | 1,497.88 |
| 57. 2D | 5,178.18 | 12.50\% | 6,970,830 | 11.40\% | 1,346.19 |
| 58.3D1 | 5,090.16 | 12.28\% | 6,103,495 | 9.98\% | 1,199.08 |
| 59.3D | 433.72 | 1.05\% | 477,095 | 0.78\% | 1,100.01 |
| 60.4D1 | 5,605.02 | 13.53\% | 6,165,540 | 10.09\% | 1,100.00 |
| 61. 4D | 1,193.64 | 2.88\% | 1,313,000 | 2.15\% | 1,100.00 |
| 62. Total | 41,434.31 | 100.00\% | 61,128,295 | 100.00\% | 1,475.31 |
| Grass |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63. 1G1 | 625.92 | 0.00\% | 587,775 | 3.69\% | 939.06 |
| 64. 1G | 1,534.61 | 8.09\% | 1,652,185 | 10.38\% | 1,076.62 |
| 65. 2G1 | 1,389.79 | 7.33\% | 1,190,090 | 7.48\% | 856.31 |
| 66. 2G | 2,171.94 | 11.45\% | 2,255,625 | 14.17\% | 1,038.53 |
| 67.3G1 | 1,874.17 | 9.88\% | 1,848,325 | 11.61\% | 986.21 |
| 68. 3G | 407.33 | 2.15\% | 365,450 | 2.30\% | 897.18 |
| 69.4G1 | 4,572.82 | 24.11\% | 4,050,950 | 25.45\% | 885.88 |
| 70.4G | 6,389.75 | 33.69\% | 3,969,440 | 24.93\% | 621.22 |
| 71. Total | 18,966.33 | 100.00\% | 15,919,840 | 100.00\% | 839.37 |
| Irrigated Total | 70,902.75 | 53.66\% | 169,827,265 | 68.78\% | 2,395.21 |
| Dry Total | 41,434.31 | 31.36\% | 61,128,295 | 24.76\% | 1,475.31 |
| Grass Total | 18,966.33 | 14.35\% | 15,919,840 | 6.45\% | 839.37 |
| Waste | 832.63 | 0.63\% | 44,895 | 0.02\% | 53.92 |
| Other | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Exempt | 0.00 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.00 |
| Market Area Total | 132,136.02 | 100.00\% | 246,920,295 | 100.00\% | 1,868.68 |

Exhibit 76 Page 91

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76. Irrigated | 27.19 | 66,875 | 16,255.43 | 38,560,465 | 82,808.42 | 192,548,205 | 99,091.04 | 231,175,545 |
| 77. Dry Land | 109.98 | 155,105 | 17,924.92 | 24,570,920 | 158,805.74 | 204,312,170 | 176,840.64 | 229,038,195 |
| 78. Grass | 53.58 | 47,145 | 6,254.45 | 5,216,625 | 57,672.19 | 46,677,505 | 63,980.22 | 51,941,275 |
| 79. Waste | 0.00 | 0 | 396.44 | 22,725 | 1,650.41 | 93,325 | 2,046.85 | 116,050 |
| 80. Other | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 81. Exempt | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 20.03 | 0 | 20.03 | 0 |
| 82. Total | 190.75 | 269,125 | 40,831.24 | 68,370,735 | 300,936.76 | 443,631,205 | 341,958.75 | 512,271,065 |


|  | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irrigated | $99,091.04$ | $28.98 \%$ | $231,175,545$ | $45.13 \%$ | $2,332.96$ |
| Dry Land | $176,840.64$ | $51.71 \%$ | $229,038,195$ | $44.71 \%$ | $1,295.17$ |
| Grass | $63,980.22$ | $18.71 \%$ | $51,941,275$ | $10.14 \%$ | 811.83 |
| Waste | $2,046.85$ | $0.60 \%$ | 116,050 | $0.02 \%$ | 56.70 |
| Other | 0.00 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Exempt | 20.03 | $0.01 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.00 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 1 , 9 5 8 . 7 5}$ | $100.00 \%$ | $\mathbf{5 1 2 , 2 7 1 , 0 6 5}$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,498.05$ |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

# Saline County Assessor <br> 3-Year Plan <br> Revised October 2008 <br> (Originally submitted June 2008) 

The following is the amended 3 year plan for Saline County.
Total Parcels $=10,647$

## Staff:

1 Assessor
1 Deputy Assessor
2 Full-time Clerk's
1 Full-time Appraiser

## Contracted Appraiser:

Saline County contracts with Jon Fritz, a Certified General appraiser, who is responsible for a majority of the commercial properties, pick up work and sales analysis. He also updates the Terra Scan tables with the new pricing.

## Completed Work Load for Tax Year 2007-2008:

Homestead Applications: 602
Personal Property schedules: 1460
Real Property transfers: 1092
Sales Reviews: approximately 407
Building permits/information sheets: approximately 600
Reappraised Dorchester, Swanton and Western's residential properties
Reappraised Crete commercial properties
Continued work on updating agland records using FSA records in conjunction with GIS Contracted with a company to attain new oblique photos of rural properties
Established parcel use in Saline County and sent out questionnaires to eight precincts regarding the parcel usage.

## $\underline{2008-2009}$

In 2008-2009, we will reappraise the residential properties in Friend, Blue River Lodge and the mobile homes throughout the county. It is planned to begin the commercial review and conversion of properties located in Swanton, Tobias and Western. The rest of the county will be reviewed for their use of parcel.

## 3 Year Plan

## 2010

## Residential

In 2009-2010, we will review DeWitt and Wilber residential properties for any adjustments that need to be made. We will reappraise rural acreages and farm buildings in Market area 4510 to be made effective January 1, 2011. Sales reviews and pick up work/building permits will continue to be reviewed.

## Commercial

DeWitt, Dorchester, Swanton, Tobias and Western commercial properties will be reappraised. Sales reviews and pick up work/building permits will continue to be reviewed.

## Agricultural

In 2009-2010, we will continue to work on updating agland records using the new soil conversion. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group and market area will be conducted to determine if any possible value adjustments are needed to comply with State mandated statistical measures of value. If supported by current sales, market areas will be adjusted. Sales reviews and pick up work/ building permits will also be completed for agricultural properties. A policy will be completed for determining if a parcel qualifies as an agricultural or horticultural parcel.

## 2011

## Residential

In 2010-2011, we will review Crete and Tobias residential properties for any adjustments that need to be made. We will reappraise rural acreages and farm buildings in Market Area 4505. Sales reviews and pick up work/building permits will continue to be reviewed.

## Commercial

Wilber and Friend commercial properties will be reviewed. Sales reviews and pick up work/building permits will continue to be reviewed.

## Agricultural

In 2010-2011, we will continue to work on updating agland records using the new soil conversion, if needed. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group and market area will be conducted to determine if any possible value adjustments are needed to comply with State mandated statistical measures of value. If supported by current sales, market areas will be adjusted. Sales reviews and pick up work/ building permits will also be completed for agricultural properties.

## $\underline{2012}$

## Residential

In 2011-2012, we will review Dorchester, Swanton and Western residential properties for any adjustments to need to be made. We will review rural acreages and farm buildings in Market area 4500. Sales reviews and pick up work/building permits will continue to be reviewed.

## Commercial

Crete commercial properties will be reviewed. Sales reviews and pick up work/building permits will continue to be reviewed.

## Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group and market area will be conducted to determine if any possible value adjustments are needed to comply with State mandated statistical measures of value. If supported by current sales, market areas will be adjusted. Sales reviews and pick up work/ building permits will also be completed for agricultural properties.

## Comments

The preceding narrative of the Saline County reappraisal is subject to change depending on appraisal needs determined by the Assessor's office staff. During a 6 year reappraisal cycle, there may be years when a class or subclass of property will need appraisal adjustments to comply with statistical measurements as required by law. The appraisal adjustments would be a percentage increase or decrease applied to all properties within a subclass.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Saline County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
| 3. | 1 |
|  | Other full-time employees |
| 4. | 2 |
|  | Other part-time employees |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
| 7. | $\$ 224,782$ |
|  | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
| 8. | $\$ 5,500$ |
|  | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
|  | $\$ 43,122$ is for the salary of the staff appraiser |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | $\$ 3,500$ |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | $\$ 90,000$ |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
|  | 0 |
| 13. | Total budget |
|  | $\$ 314,782$ |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
|  | $\$ 5,890.27$ |
|  |  |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3. | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
|  | Yes |
| 4. | Who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
| 5. | Office personnel |
|  | Does the county have GIS software? |
| 6. | Yes, GIS WorkShop |
| 7. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
| 7. | Personal Property software: |
|  | TerraScan |

## C. Zoning Information

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

## D. Contracted Services

1. Appraisal Services

Fritz Appraisal Inc.,
2. Other services

GIS workshop and Automated Systems, Inc

## 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 Saline County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



