

Table of Contents

2011 Commission Summary

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

Residential Correlation

- Residential Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
 - III. Measure of Central Tendency
 - IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

Commercial Correlation

- Commercial Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
 - III. Measure of Central Tendency
 - IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Base Analysis Statistics
- Agricultural Random Inclusion Analysis Statistics
- Agricultural Random Exclusion Analysis Statistics

Special Valuation Statistics

- Special Valuation Methodology
- Special Valuation Base Analysis Statistics
- Special Valuation Random Inclusion Analysis Statistics
- Special Valuation Random Exclusion Analysis Statistics

Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

- Agricultural or Special Valuation Land
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
 - III. Measure of Central Tendency

IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

County Reports

- 2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2011 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2009 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
- Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification

Maps

- Market Areas
- Registered Wells > 500 GPM
- Geo Codes
- Soil Classes

Valuation History Charts

2011 Commission Summary for Dixon County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	101	Median	96.46
Total Sales Price	\$7,191,472	Mean	97.02
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,294,472	Wgt. Mean	92.54
Total Assessed Value	\$6,749,960	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$51,192
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$72,222	Avg. Assessed Value	\$66,831

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.70 to 98.75
95% Mean C.I	88.48 to 96.59
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.54 to 101.50
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	17.45
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.46
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.83

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	91	98	98
2009	101	97	97
2008	118	96	96
2007	157	96	96

2011 Commission Summary for Dixon County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	27	Median	95.82
Total Sales Price	\$770,000	Mean	101.69
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$824,000	Wgt. Mean	94.83
Total Assessed Value	\$781,400	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$117,453
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$30,519	Avg. Assessed Value	\$28,941

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	83.00 to 108.45
95% Mean C.I	87.35 to 116.03
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	6.08
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.85
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.93

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	38	95	95
2009	43	96	96
2008	45	97	97
2007	35	96	96

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Dixon 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. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	66	The qualitative measures calculated in the random include sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	Market Area # 01 , an adjustment of 7% and # 02 , an adjustment of 15%.

***A level of value displayed as NEI, not enough information, represents a class of property with insufficient information to determine a level of value.*

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Dixon County

Rural

We had GIS Workshop fly the county in 2010. We did not receive the flights until later in the year due to the amount of snow we received last year. We are currently reviewing flights and our property records cards, along with physical review of properties, to ensure we have all the improvements correct. We are planning to have the work done & Areas revalued with new pricing for 2012.

Wakefield

In Wakefield we increased our 1 ½ story larger homes of average condition 10%. The market continues to show these homes are selling higher than both the fair quality homes and the smaller 1/1/2 stories. We also increased the ranch style homes with two car attached garages. Many ranch style homes in Wakefield were built with one car attached garages on smaller lots and the garages cannot be added on to, therefore selling for less than homes with attached two car garages.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Dixon County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor & Deputy	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Ponca
	5	Wakefield
	10	Emerson
	15	Allen
	20	Newcastle
	25	Concord, Dixon, Maskell, Martinsburg, Waterbury
	30	Rural
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Cost approach is used. The Depreciation is gathered from the market in each location.	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	Each town had lot value studies done when they were reviewed. So each one has different years. All residential lots in towns/cities have been valued using the sq. ft. method.	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	Sales & square foot.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Physical = Marshall & Swift, Economic = depreciation study in the county, functional = factors studied in the county.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	We update the tables when we review each of the locations.	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	Substantially changed is only used when the property is no longer reflective of what	

	was sold. EXAMPLE: House has been completely/or largely remodeled or partially razed. We use for our purposes homes which have had garages added, small additions, kitchen remodeling. We simply use the value of the property minus the modifications in our county ratio study, if in fact the sales was reflective of the market prior to modifications.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.

26 Dixon
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 101
Total Sales Price : 7,191,472
Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,294,472
Total Assessed Value : 6,749,960
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 72,222
Avg. Assessed Value : 66,831

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 97
COD : 16.18
PRD : 104.84

COV : 23.70
STD : 22.99
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.61
MAX Sales Ratio : 163.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 13.90

95% Median C.I. : 92.70 to 98.75
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.48 to 96.59
95% Mean C.I. : 92.54 to 101.50

Printed:3/30/2011 1:25:54PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08											
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	18	96.60	99.29	91.12	16.44	108.97	42.51	159.17	87.40 to 101.11	74,650	68,018
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	97.18	101.83	100.94	09.91	100.88	87.00	138.93	91.70 to 111.78	52,170	52,660
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	98.81	105.57	102.23	09.67	103.27	93.29	131.37	N/A	85,500	87,406
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	14	99.26	103.12	97.37	19.92	105.91	63.75	163.00	78.44 to 128.54	69,429	67,600
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	20	96.57	95.24	93.35	17.96	102.02	13.90	152.57	91.49 to 106.96	65,288	60,943
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	92.88	89.95	92.86	10.83	96.87	68.62	107.36	68.62 to 107.36	89,604	83,203
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	9	92.93	91.29	84.04	14.25	108.63	59.32	122.14	66.08 to 103.02	102,522	86,160
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	20	94.44	93.09	89.66	17.73	103.83	52.83	153.05	77.31 to 100.58	67,450	60,475
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	46	98.43	101.56	95.83	15.52	105.98	42.51	163.00	92.54 to 101.11	69,117	66,238
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	55	94.61	93.23	89.99	16.65	103.60	13.90	153.05	91.49 to 98.50	74,819	67,327
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	28	96.60	100.20	93.86	14.13	106.75	42.51	159.17	91.70 to 101.11	66,621	62,533
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	44	97.42	97.96	95.46	17.14	102.62	13.90	163.00	91.73 to 100.69	71,758	68,502
<u>ALL</u>	101	96.46	97.02	92.54	16.18	104.84	13.90	163.00	92.70 to 98.75	72,222	66,831

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	23	100.58	104.40	95.98	20.15	108.77	52.83	163.00	87.63 to 116.20	82,354	79,041
05	21	95.98	99.62	97.15	13.42	102.54	76.41	145.74	87.40 to 103.02	72,957	70,881
10	5	108.34	108.74	94.12	19.67	115.53	75.04	159.17	N/A	49,400	46,493
15	18	98.84	99.15	98.19	09.52	100.98	68.62	137.01	96.74 to 102.56	52,706	51,752
20	8	84.57	85.14	87.57	11.01	97.23	67.37	108.53	67.37 to 108.53	60,750	53,200
25	7	93.67	96.80	94.41	07.48	102.53	84.00	122.14	84.00 to 122.14	32,214	30,414
30	19	93.01	85.23	83.68	18.80	101.85	13.90	130.83	66.08 to 97.99	103,212	86,370
<u>ALL</u>	101	96.46	97.02	92.54	16.18	104.84	13.90	163.00	92.70 to 98.75	72,222	66,831

26 Dixon
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 101
Total Sales Price : 7,191,472
Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,294,472
Total Assessed Value : 6,749,960
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 72,222
Avg. Assessed Value : 66,831

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 97
COD : 16.18
PRD : 104.84

COV : 23.70
STD : 22.99
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.61
MAX Sales Ratio : 163.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 13.90

95% Median C.I. : 92.70 to 98.75
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.48 to 96.59
95% Mean C.I. : 92.54 to 101.50

Printed:3/30/2011 1:25:54PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	98	96.72	97.31	92.64	16.35	105.04	13.90	163.00	92.93 to 98.87	73,648	68,230
06											
07	3	91.70	87.64	82.33	04.46	106.45	79.47	91.75	N/A	25,667	21,132
<u>ALL</u>	101	96.46	97.02	92.54	16.18	104.84	13.90	163.00	92.70 to 98.75	72,222	66,831

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$</u>											
1 TO 4999	2	103.07	103.07	113.67	18.50	90.67	84.00	122.14	N/A	2,250	2,558
5000 TO 9999	4	111.50	118.48	116.07	17.23	102.08	91.75	159.17	N/A	7,125	8,270
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	6	111.50	113.34	115.74	17.18	97.93	84.00	159.17	84.00 to 159.17	5,500	6,366
10000 TO 29999	13	98.96	105.20	108.80	23.12	96.69	13.90	163.00	91.70 to 131.41	19,865	21,614
30000 TO 59999	24	90.75	96.66	94.71	21.65	102.06	52.83	153.05	79.47 to 102.35	45,496	43,091
60000 TO 99999	31	97.91	97.84	97.77	11.17	100.07	63.75	131.37	91.73 to 100.69	73,300	71,668
100000 TO 149999	15	96.70	91.93	91.16	08.23	100.84	42.51	105.49	91.59 to 98.87	120,935	110,243
150000 TO 249999	10	86.04	81.46	82.09	14.03	99.23	59.32	103.02	62.03 to 93.29	172,200	141,360
250000 TO 499999											
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	101	96.46	97.02	92.54	16.18	104.84	13.90	163.00	92.70 to 98.75	72,222	66,831

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

A. Residential Real Property

The residential statistical sample for Dixon County includes 101 qualified sales. The sample is considered reliable for the measurement of the county. The relationship between the median, weighted mean and mean are all within the acceptable level of 92-100 percent. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are also acceptable.

The sales verification is primarily handled by sending a verification form to the buyer in a self-addressed stamped envelope. They have also contacted the seller, realtor, or physically inspected the property sold if more information is needed about the transaction. The county estimates that they have approximately a 75% rate of return of the form.

The assessor reported that the village of Wakefield was reviewed and adjustments made where necessary.

Based on the consideration of all the available information, the level of value is determined to be 96% of market value for the residential class of real property. All the subclasses are within the acceptable range with the exception of the Valuation Group 20, Newcastle. This sample of 8 sales is small and does not represent the real property in that valuation group.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms 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 state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2007), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms 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 real property.

The Division frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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. 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.

2011 Correlation Section for Dixon County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The International Association of Assessing Officers recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers,

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

July, 2007, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

2011 Commercial Assessment Actions for Dixon County

The commercial property in Dixon County still has very few sales only 27 in the study period. Not one town or city had more than 7 sales occur in the study period. We continue to monitor the commercial sales in the county and consistently we see the businesses close and the buildings sell for storage. We took no action in the county on commercial buildings for 2011.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Dixon County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Deputy & Assessor	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Ponca
	5	Wakefield
	10	Emerson
	15	Allen
	20	Newcastle
	25	Concord, Dixon, Maskell, Martinsburg, Waterbury
	30	Rural
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Cost approach	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	Currently reviewed and not enough market activity to determine a change is necessary.	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	We are currently using front foot to value commercial property. We have so few commercial sales & relatively no vacant lot sales.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	Costing is the same for each grouping, unless changes have been made to the property. The valuation groupings do not all have the same costing, it is based on when they were last updated.	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Physical = Marshall & Swift, Economic = County, Functional = County.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes.	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	Deprecation tables have been updated when towns have been reviewed, if necessary.	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	Parcels are considered substantially changed if the structure has been added on to, extensively remodeled.	
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.	

26 Dixon
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 27
Total Sales Price : 770,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 824,000
Total Assessed Value : 781,400
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 30,519
Avg. Assessed Value : 28,941

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 95
MEAN : 102
COD : 25.50
PRD : 107.23

COV : 35.63
STD : 36.23
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.43
MAX Sales Ratio : 214.88
MIN Sales Ratio : 50.00

95% Median C.I. : 83.00 to 108.45
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
95% Mean C.I. : 87.35 to 116.03

Printed:3/28/2011 5:35:19PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	95.22	95.22	95.26	00.63	99.96	94.62	95.82	N/A	70,000	66,683
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	7	96.59	94.10	90.07	20.36	104.47	55.28	142.00	55.28 to 142.00	22,286	20,073
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	91.75	91.75	91.75	00.00	100.00	91.75	91.75	N/A	120,000	110,100
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	76.40	76.40	76.40	00.00	100.00	76.40	76.40	N/A	100,000	76,400
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	105.63	105.63	105.63	00.00	100.00	105.63	105.63	N/A	4,000	4,225
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	91.20	89.57	94.02	04.21	95.27	83.00	94.52	N/A	18,667	17,550
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	119.26	114.56	101.10	32.06	113.31	55.16	164.57	N/A	18,375	18,576
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	151.33	151.33	151.33	00.00	100.00	151.33	151.33	N/A	15,000	22,700
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	116.08	137.01	129.93	27.07	105.45	101.00	214.88	N/A	25,125	32,644
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	70.48	70.48	70.48	00.00	100.00	70.48	70.48	N/A	32,000	22,555
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	62.88	62.88	51.91	20.48	121.13	50.00	75.75	N/A	13,500	7,008
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	11	94.62	92.48	89.22	15.56	103.65	55.28	142.00	72.34 to 108.45	46,909	41,852
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	9	97.50	109.33	103.62	27.20	105.51	55.16	164.57	83.00 to 151.33	16,500	17,098
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	101.00	106.32	104.79	35.48	101.46	50.00	214.88	50.00 to 214.88	22,786	23,878
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	6	91.48	90.42	86.92	07.52	104.03	76.40	105.63	76.40 to 105.63	46,667	40,563
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	116.08	122.81	113.18	30.97	108.51	55.16	214.88	70.48 to 164.57	22,100	25,014
<u>ALL</u>	27	95.82	101.69	94.83	25.50	107.23	50.00	214.88	83.00 to 108.45	30,519	28,941

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	7	108.45	98.08	100.75	22.16	97.35	55.16	141.02	55.16 to 141.02	34,571	34,829
05	7	94.62	93.92	89.18	19.10	105.32	50.00	151.33	50.00 to 151.33	60,000	53,509
10	1	84.59	84.59	84.59	00.00	100.00	84.59	84.59	N/A	22,000	18,610
15	4	98.03	125.54	118.17	32.28	106.24	91.20	214.88	N/A	18,000	21,271
20	6	88.38	94.53	83.06	24.53	113.81	70.48	142.00	70.48 to 142.00	10,583	8,791
25	2	123.79	123.79	146.44	32.95	84.53	83.00	164.57	N/A	2,250	3,295
<u>ALL</u>	27	95.82	101.69	94.83	25.50	107.23	50.00	214.88	83.00 to 108.45	30,519	28,941

26 Dixon
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 27
Total Sales Price : 770,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 824,000
Total Assessed Value : 781,400
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 30,519
Avg. Assessed Value : 28,941

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 95
MEAN : 102
COD : 25.50
PRD : 107.23

COV : 35.63
STD : 36.23
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.43
MAX Sales Ratio : 214.88
MIN Sales Ratio : 50.00

95% Median C.I. : 83.00 to 108.45
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
95% Mean C.I. : 87.35 to 116.03

Printed:3/28/2011 5:35:19PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	27	95.82	101.69	94.83	25.50	107.23	50.00	214.88	83.00 to 108.45	30,519	28,941
04											
<u>ALL</u>	27	95.82	101.69	94.83	25.50	107.23	50.00	214.88	83.00 to 108.45	30,519	28,941

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$</u>											
1 TO 4999	5	101.00	105.99	115.38	22.07	91.86	75.75	164.57	N/A	2,400	2,769
5000 TO 9999	2	116.60	116.60	122.46	21.78	95.21	91.20	142.00	N/A	6,500	7,960
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	7	101.00	109.02	119.06	22.95	91.57	75.75	164.57	75.75 to 164.57	3,571	4,252
10000 TO 29999	11	97.50	102.73	96.19	37.09	106.80	50.00	214.88	55.16 to 151.33	21,091	20,287
30000 TO 59999	4	95.56	92.94	93.29	10.93	99.62	70.48	110.17	N/A	38,250	35,685
60000 TO 99999	2	95.22	95.22	95.26	00.63	99.96	94.62	95.82	N/A	70,000	66,683
100000 TO 149999	2	84.08	84.08	84.77	09.13	99.19	76.40	91.75	N/A	110,000	93,250
150000 TO 249999											
250000 TO 499999											
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	27	95.82	101.69	94.83	25.50	107.23	50.00	214.88	83.00 to 108.45	30,519	28,941

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	5	101.00	123.10	117.21	31.53	105.03	83.00	214.88	N/A	26,900	31,530
339	1	72.34	72.34	72.34	00.00	100.00	72.34	72.34	N/A	16,000	11,575
344	4	98.49	88.15	79.91	14.62	110.31	50.00	105.63	N/A	16,000	12,786
350	1	95.82	95.82	95.82	00.00	100.00	95.82	95.82	N/A	75,000	71,865
352	3	110.17	114.31	102.04	14.90	112.02	91.75	141.02	N/A	59,000	60,203
353	2	113.87	113.87	86.17	32.91	132.15	76.40	151.33	N/A	57,500	49,550
383	1	55.28	55.28	55.28	00.00	100.00	55.28	55.28	N/A	27,000	14,925
384	1	108.45	108.45	108.45	00.00	100.00	108.45	108.45	N/A	29,000	31,450
406	6	87.90	97.20	87.60	23.05	110.96	70.48	164.57	70.48 to 164.57	17,250	15,112
477	1	94.52	94.52	94.52	00.00	100.00	94.52	94.52	N/A	50,000	47,260
528	2	98.58	98.58	76.21	44.05	129.35	55.16	142.00	N/A	16,500	12,575
<u>ALL</u>	27	95.82	101.69	94.83	25.50	107.23	50.00	214.88	83.00 to 108.45	30,519	28,941

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

A. Commerical Real Property

The commercial statistical sample for Dixon County includes 27 qualified sales. Of this sample the median and mean measure are the only measures within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are above the acceptable level.

The sales verification is primarily handled by sending a verification form to the buyer in a self-addressed stamped envelope. They have also contacted the seller, realtor, or physically inspected the property sold if more information is needed about the transaction. The county estimates that they have approximately a 75% rate of return of the form.

The county reported that the commercial class was monitored and that little action in the valuation process was completed in the commercial real property. The county noted that they consistently see business close and the building be used only for storage

Based on the consideration of all the available information, the level of value is determined to be 96% of market value for the commercial class of real property.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms 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 state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2007), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms 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 real property.

The Division frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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. 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.

2011 Correlation Section for Dixon County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The International Association of Assessing Officers recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers,

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

July, 2007, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Dixon County

Area 1 agland in Dixon County had increases in irrigated land of 8%, dryland was increased 15% and grassland was increased very little.

Area 2 agland in Dixon County did not increase this year. We studied the market and this market area is within the range and no increase was necessary for 2011.

While Dixon County land values may be less than the surrounding counties, they are representative of the land which sells in Dixon County. Historically land sales in the Dixon County have taken longer to catch up to the sales of the counties that surround us. We will see border townships have sales which are higher than the sales which occur several sections into the county. I understand that borrowed sales will be used to measure my agland; however, as an elected official I do not believe I can tell the tax payers of this county that in the latest study period we only had 6 land sales and so we “borrowed” 6 land sales from surrounding counties to set your value. When we use the sales which occurred in the county our average with the increase is 75%, but when we use the borrowed sales we are at 67% with the increase. The COD & PRD do not improve using the borrowed sales. The land sales which occur in Dixon County are representative of the land that was sold and the price per acre that those sales brought in this county. Next year when we using a new study period, land values will have to increase I am sure to be in line with the newer sales.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Dixon County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	County Assessor & Deputy	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Generally more flat land larger fields. Areas of hills are more rolling than steep, soil types are typically better. More irrigation is used in this area as topography makes irrigation easier.
	2	Hills are steep, tree cover in northern areas is becoming more dense in many hilly areas allow the river bluffs. Soils are of lesser quality & the northern area has more pasture land than southern areas. Field sizes are typically smaller in Area 2.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Sales verification is used to monitor land uses, FSA maps & GIS are used as well as physical inspection.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	We currently have no recreational land split out for valuation purposes. Most of the land used for rec, has multi use which included majority ag.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	Yes they carry the same value and currently no differences are being seen in our market.	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	Area, soil types, tree cover	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	Physical inspections, FSA, GIS, and land owner information are all used to update land use.	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	We send sales verifications to buyers to find out what their intent for the property is. We see very few sales that include influences of non-ag, unless it is a secondary use.	
9.	Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	NA	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?	
	Yes	

11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.
	If an improvement is made which makes the property no longer an ag it a residential rural property it will be moved as substantially changed,
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.

26 Dixon
AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 47
Total Sales Price : 12,485,658
Total Adj. Sales Price : 12,485,658
Total Assessed Value : 8,554,730
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 265,652
Avg. Assessed Value : 182,016

MEDIAN : 75
WGT. MEAN : 69
MEAN : 75
COD : 18.50
PRD : 108.74

COV : 24.86
STD : 18.52
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.91
MAX Sales Ratio : 128.78
MIN Sales Ratio : 42.82

95% Median C.I. : 66.43 to 77.48
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.30 to 73.73
95% Mean C.I. : 69.22 to 79.80

Printed:3/28/2011 5:35:22PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	1	104.06	104.06	104.06	00.00	100.00	104.06	104.06	N/A	175,000	182,105
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	7	76.28	81.61	78.30	11.60	104.23	66.43	102.43	66.43 to 102.43	189,133	148,098
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	8	75.37	74.53	76.30	09.69	97.68	59.64	87.20	59.64 to 87.20	278,045	212,149
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	8	61.54	71.71	60.84	29.53	117.87	45.50	128.78	45.50 to 128.78	365,508	222,369
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	75.19	75.72	74.71	07.46	101.35	67.57	84.40	N/A	224,363	167,617
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	64.60	69.25	61.51	31.63	112.58	42.82	110.18	42.82 to 110.18	353,474	217,429
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	64.76	64.76	64.76	00.00	100.00	64.76	64.76	N/A	140,000	90,665
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	5	74.61	70.02	66.34	15.68	105.55	46.36	89.50	N/A	214,600	142,364
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	66.25	66.25	66.25	00.00	100.00	66.25	66.25	N/A	264,000	174,895
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	90.90	80.05	72.04	19.68	111.12	47.79	101.46	N/A	149,800	107,912
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	76.67	76.67	76.67	00.00	100.00	76.67	76.67	N/A	288,000	220,815
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	77.69	77.69	77.69	00.00	100.00	77.69	77.69	N/A	123,020	95,580
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	24	75.05	76.89	70.63	17.87	108.86	45.50	128.78	64.60 to 82.38	276,973	195,622
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	17	74.61	70.36	64.59	19.65	108.93	42.82	110.18	50.46 to 84.40	277,287	179,104
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	6	77.18	76.79	72.48	17.13	105.95	47.79	101.46	47.79 to 101.46	187,403	135,838
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	27	73.66	72.26	66.11	20.31	109.30	42.82	128.78	58.47 to 80.82	320,345	211,794
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	70.43	72.13	67.54	20.83	106.80	46.36	101.46	47.79 to 90.90	192,640	130,112
<u>ALL</u>	47	75.19	74.51	68.52	18.50	108.74	42.82	128.78	66.43 to 77.48	265,652	182,016

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	19	75.30	76.25	70.33	15.06	108.42	53.11	104.06	64.76 to 87.20	250,548	176,207
2	28	74.56	73.33	67.40	21.00	108.80	42.82	128.78	62.67 to 77.69	275,902	185,957
<u>ALL</u>	47	75.19	74.51	68.52	18.50	108.74	42.82	128.78	66.43 to 77.48	265,652	182,016

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Dry</u>											
County	23	73.66	72.19	68.03	18.00	106.11	46.36	104.06	62.14 to 77.69	238,927	162,549
1	12	70.69	76.69	74.19	19.49	103.37	57.09	104.06	62.14 to 90.90	208,908	154,995
2	11	73.66	67.28	62.87	17.23	107.01	46.36	96.53	48.11 to 77.69	271,676	170,790
<u>ALL</u>	47	75.19	74.51	68.52	18.50	108.74	42.82	128.78	66.43 to 77.48	265,652	182,016

26 Dixon
AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 47
 Total Sales Price : 12,485,658
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 12,485,658
 Total Assessed Value : 8,554,730
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 265,652
 Avg. Assessed Value : 182,016

MEDIAN : 75
 WGT. MEAN : 69
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 18.50
 PRD : 108.74

COV : 24.86
 STD : 18.52
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.91
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.78
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.82

95% Median C.I. : 66.43 to 77.48
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.30 to 73.73
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.22 to 79.80

Printed:3/28/2011 5:35:22PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	1	82.38	82.38	82.38	00.00	100.00	82.38	82.38	N/A	108,000	88,970
1	1	82.38	82.38	82.38	00.00	100.00	82.38	82.38	N/A	108,000	88,970
_____Dry_____											
County	30	74.50	73.61	67.08	18.28	109.73	46.36	104.06	64.60 to 77.69	262,532	176,120
1	14	70.69	75.92	68.58	20.38	110.70	53.11	104.06	59.64 to 90.90	264,958	181,718
2	16	75.68	71.59	65.75	16.85	108.88	46.36	101.46	53.89 to 77.69	260,410	171,222
_____Grass_____											
County	1	96.60	96.60	96.60	00.00	100.00	96.60	96.60	N/A	126,000	121,720
2	1	96.60	96.60	96.60	00.00	100.00	96.60	96.60	N/A	126,000	121,720
_____ALL_____	47	75.19	74.51	68.52	18.50	108.74	42.82	128.78	66.43 to 77.48	265,652	182,016

26 Dixon
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 67
 Total Sales Price : 19,682,805
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 19,682,805
 Total Assessed Value : 11,696,389
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 293,773
 Avg. Assessed Value : 174,573

MEDIAN : 66
 WGT. MEAN : 59
 MEAN : 67
 COD : 24.72
 PRD : 112.30

COV : 30.99
 STD : 20.68
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.41
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.78
 MIN Sales Ratio : 26.02

95% Median C.I. : 57.95 to 74.61
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.19 to 63.66
 95% Mean C.I. : 61.78 to 71.68

Printed:3/28/2011 5:35:26PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	1	104.06	104.06	104.06	00.00	100.00	104.06	104.06	N/A	175,000	182,105
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	7	76.28	81.61	78.30	11.60	104.23	66.43	102.43	66.43 to 102.43	189,133	148,098
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	8	75.37	74.53	76.30	09.69	97.68	59.64	87.20	59.64 to 87.20	278,045	212,149
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	8	61.54	71.71	60.84	29.53	117.87	45.50	128.78	45.50 to 128.78	365,508	222,369
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	71.38	67.38	58.26	17.40	115.65	42.35	84.40	N/A	342,273	199,400
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	57.53	64.52	54.57	33.84	118.23	29.97	110.18	42.82 to 96.60	385,400	210,316
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	51.67	50.41	47.75	15.31	105.57	33.53	64.76	N/A	190,094	90,763
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	5	74.61	70.02	66.34	15.68	105.55	46.36	89.50	N/A	214,600	142,364
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	44.97	48.03	43.55	24.88	110.29	35.93	66.25	N/A	344,913	150,226
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	60.93	67.61	59.73	30.74	113.19	43.67	101.46	43.67 to 101.46	206,704	123,464
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	52.51	52.12	47.61	22.95	109.47	26.02	76.67	26.02 to 76.67	373,261	177,722
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	72.20	72.20	70.33	07.60	102.66	66.71	77.69	N/A	186,510	131,180
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	24	75.05	76.89	70.63	17.87	108.86	45.50	128.78	64.60 to 82.38	276,973	195,622
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	23	62.14	63.76	56.34	26.60	113.17	29.97	110.18	50.46 to 75.30	306,803	172,854
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	20	55.42	57.96	50.61	26.49	114.52	26.02	101.46	47.62 to 66.67	298,949	151,291
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	30	70.19	69.49	61.48	23.27	113.03	29.97	128.78	58.47 to 76.67	345,717	212,564
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	19	55.18	60.50	54.27	27.96	111.48	33.53	101.46	46.36 to 74.61	234,382	127,187
<u>ALL</u>	67	66.39	66.73	59.42	24.72	112.30	26.02	128.78	57.95 to 74.61	293,773	174,573

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	26	67.14	71.06	65.69	18.56	108.17	47.62	104.06	59.64 to 76.94	265,618	174,487
2	41	62.67	63.98	56.04	29.87	114.17	26.02	128.78	50.46 to 75.19	311,628	174,627
<u>ALL</u>	67	66.39	66.73	59.42	24.72	112.30	26.02	128.78	57.95 to 74.61	293,773	174,573

26 Dixon
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 67
 Total Sales Price : 19,682,805
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 19,682,805
 Total Assessed Value : 11,696,389
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 293,773
 Avg. Assessed Value : 174,573

MEDIAN : 66
 WGT. MEAN : 59
 MEAN : 67
 COD : 24.72
 PRD : 112.30

COV : 30.99
 STD : 20.68
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.41
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.78
 MIN Sales Ratio : 26.02

95% Median C.I. : 57.95 to 74.61
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.19 to 63.66
 95% Mean C.I. : 61.78 to 71.68

Printed:3/28/2011 5:35:26PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Dry_____											
County	32	66.32	67.84	63.32	18.97	107.14	37.27	104.06	57.95 to 75.19	250,670	158,735
1	17	66.39	71.89	69.06	17.58	104.10	55.18	104.06	57.95 to 87.20	225,038	155,409
2	15	64.60	63.26	58.10	20.90	108.88	37.27	96.53	48.11 to 76.16	279,721	162,505
_____Grass_____											
County	2	49.75	49.75	50.24	04.28	99.02	47.62	51.88	N/A	104,000	52,250
1	1	47.62	47.62	47.62	00.00	100.00	47.62	47.62	N/A	80,000	38,099
2	1	51.88	51.88	51.88	00.00	100.00	51.88	51.88	N/A	128,000	66,400
_____ALL_____	67	66.39	66.73	59.42	24.72	112.30	26.02	128.78	57.95 to 74.61	293,773	174,573

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	6	43.56	47.93	40.37	30.72	118.73	29.97	82.38	29.97 to 82.38	469,460	189,541
1	2	65.87	65.87	53.53	25.06	123.05	49.36	82.38	N/A	427,450	228,802
2	4	36.84	38.96	34.64	16.31	112.47	29.97	52.18	N/A	490,465	169,911
_____Dry_____											
County	41	66.39	68.60	62.13	20.85	110.41	37.27	104.06	58.47 to 76.16	276,246	171,623
1	19	66.39	71.83	66.15	18.62	108.59	53.11	104.06	57.95 to 87.20	264,640	175,056
2	22	65.64	65.82	58.92	23.02	111.71	37.27	101.46	50.46 to 76.67	286,270	168,659
_____Grass_____											
County	4	49.75	55.53	41.50	37.61	133.81	26.02	96.60	N/A	224,971	93,370
1	1	47.62	47.62	47.62	00.00	100.00	47.62	47.62	N/A	80,000	38,099
2	3	51.88	58.17	40.91	45.35	142.19	26.02	96.60	N/A	273,295	111,793
_____ALL_____	67	66.39	66.73	59.42	24.72	112.30	26.02	128.78	57.95 to 74.61	293,773	174,573

26 Dixon
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 76
 Total Sales Price : 24,173,239
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 24,173,239
 Total Assessed Value : 14,117,638
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 318,069
 Avg. Assessed Value : 185,758

MEDIAN : 64
 WGT. MEAN : 58
 MEAN : 65
 COD : 25.13
 PRD : 111.58

COV : 30.71
 STD : 20.01
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.99
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.78
 MIN Sales Ratio : 26.02

95% Median C.I. : 55.66 to 72.81
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.78 to 62.02
 95% Mean C.I. : 60.66 to 69.66

Printed:3/28/2011 5:35:30PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Qrtrs											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	1	104.06	104.06	104.06	00.00	100.00	104.06	104.06	N/A	175,000	182,105
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	7	76.28	81.61	78.30	11.60	104.23	66.43	102.43	66.43 to 102.43	189,133	148,098
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	8	75.37	74.53	76.30	09.69	97.68	59.64	87.20	59.64 to 87.20	278,045	212,149
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	12	56.40	65.31	56.95	24.59	114.68	45.50	128.78	50.50 to 73.66	453,575	258,334
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	6	66.99	65.57	59.80	15.15	109.65	42.35	84.40	42.35 to 84.40	339,240	202,874
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	52.18	62.10	54.24	32.33	114.49	29.97	110.18	48.11 to 76.67	346,500	187,952
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	51.67	50.41	47.75	15.31	105.57	33.53	64.76	N/A	190,094	90,763
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	72.12	69.95	67.34	14.67	103.88	46.36	89.50	46.36 to 89.50	256,833	172,940
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	44.97	48.03	43.55	24.88	110.29	35.93	66.25	N/A	344,913	150,226
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	60.93	67.61	59.73	30.74	113.19	43.67	101.46	43.67 to 101.46	206,704	123,464
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	49.36	50.08	46.70	22.97	107.24	26.02	76.67	26.02 to 76.67	406,762	189,951
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	66.71	62.75	53.30	16.91	117.73	43.84	77.69	N/A	348,340	185,650
Study Yrs											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	28	73.73	73.41	65.63	19.73	111.85	45.50	128.78	59.64 to 79.54	327,364	214,857
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	28	61.65	62.86	57.37	24.38	109.57	29.97	110.18	50.46 to 74.61	303,386	174,048
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	20	53.68	56.83	49.57	27.37	114.65	26.02	101.46	43.84 to 66.67	325,612	161,415
Calendar Yrs											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	38	61.92	66.28	59.66	24.58	111.10	29.97	128.78	54.01 to 73.80	364,755	217,628
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	20	58.66	60.96	55.73	26.22	109.38	33.53	101.46	47.79 to 69.62	246,063	137,119
ALL	76	63.64	65.16	58.40	25.13	111.58	26.02	128.78	55.66 to 72.81	318,069	185,758

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	35	64.76	66.53	61.05	19.66	108.98	43.84	104.06	55.71 to 73.80	325,614	198,798
2	41	62.67	63.98	56.04	29.87	114.17	26.02	128.78	50.46 to 75.19	311,628	174,627
ALL	76	63.64	65.16	58.40	25.13	111.58	26.02	128.78	55.66 to 72.81	318,069	185,758

26 Dixon
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 76
 Total Sales Price : 24,173,239
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 24,173,239
 Total Assessed Value : 14,117,638
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 318,069
 Avg. Assessed Value : 185,758

MEDIAN : 64
 WGT. MEAN : 58
 MEAN : 65
 COD : 25.13
 PRD : 111.58

COV : 30.71
 STD : 20.01
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.99
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.78
 MIN Sales Ratio : 26.02

95% Median C.I. : 55.66 to 72.81
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.78 to 62.02
 95% Mean C.I. : 60.66 to 69.66

Printed:3/28/2011 5:35:30PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Dry_____											
County	40	63.37	65.06	60.87	19.80	106.88	37.27	104.06	55.71 to 67.57	286,597	174,465
1	25	62.14	66.14	62.48	19.12	105.86	43.84	104.06	55.71 to 67.57	290,723	181,641
2	15	64.60	63.26	58.10	20.90	108.88	37.27	96.53	48.11 to 76.16	279,721	162,505
_____Grass_____											
County	2	49.75	49.75	50.24	04.28	99.02	47.62	51.88	N/A	104,000	52,250
1	1	47.62	47.62	47.62	00.00	100.00	47.62	47.62	N/A	80,000	38,099
2	1	51.88	51.88	51.88	00.00	100.00	51.88	51.88	N/A	128,000	66,400
_____ALL_____	76	63.64	65.16	58.40	25.13	111.58	26.02	128.78	55.66 to 72.81	318,069	185,758

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	7	49.36	48.20	42.94	23.36	112.25	29.97	82.38	29.97 to 82.38	552,109	237,061
1	3	49.83	60.52	51.49	22.10	117.54	49.36	82.38	N/A	634,300	326,593
2	4	36.84	38.96	34.64	16.31	112.47	29.97	52.18	N/A	490,465	169,911
_____Dry_____											
County	49	64.60	66.21	60.50	21.11	109.44	37.27	104.06	57.09 to 69.62	301,399	182,360
1	27	62.14	66.52	61.69	19.87	107.83	43.84	104.06	55.66 to 69.62	313,726	193,524
2	22	65.64	65.82	58.92	23.02	111.71	37.27	101.46	50.46 to 76.67	286,270	168,659
_____Grass_____											
County	4	49.75	55.53	41.50	37.61	133.81	26.02	96.60	N/A	224,971	93,370
1	1	47.62	47.62	47.62	00.00	100.00	47.62	47.62	N/A	80,000	38,099
2	3	51.88	58.17	40.91	45.35	142.19	26.02	96.60	N/A	273,295	111,793
_____ALL_____	76	63.64	65.16	58.40	25.13	111.58	26.02	128.78	55.66 to 72.81	318,069	185,758

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

A. Agricultural Land

Dixon County is divided into two market areas. Area 1 is the southern portion of the county and consists of flat larger fields and the hills are gently rolling as you move to the north border of the area. Area 1 is represented with 14% irrigated land, 77% dry land, 8% grass and 1% considered other land use. Area 2 is the northern portion of the county and has smaller farmable fields, hills that are rolling to steep. Area 2 is represented with 7% irrigated, 62% dry land, 27 % grass and 4% other land use. The surrounding counties are comparable in topography and have similar soil classifications. There appears to be no other influences that would suggest that the surrounding counties are not comparable with Dixon County.

The analyses of the base statistics reveals that the county is not proportionate in the distribution of time and sales are lacking in the most recent time frame. In Market Area 1 the oldest year study period has 9 sales, the middle year has 8 sales and the last year in the study period has 2 sales. Market Area 2 has 15 sales in the oldest year study period, 9 sales in the middle year and 4 in the last year of the study period. Market Area 2 dry land is slightly overrepresented in the sales file.

The base statistic was expanded to include comparable sales from common market areas adjoining Dixon County to proportionately represent the last year of the time frame. There were not enough sales in the surrounding six mile radius; therefore an analysis was completed expanding the sample beyond the six mile radius. All thresholds were met when expanding the sample. The two expanded samples indicate a broader coefficient of dispersion and price related differential and would be expected when increasing sales from the newest timeframe. The expanded samples are the most reliable indicators of level of value within Dixon County, and would suggest that the assessments are below the statutorily required range.

The counties surrounding Dixon County have all indicated increases in the market of agricultural land in the 2011 assessment year ranging from 8% to 15% increases. For example the weighted average per acre value of dry land as indicated on the Abstract of Average values indicates the value in Cedar County market area one is 1965 which adjoins Dixon Market area two, and Cedar County area two is 2764, Wayne County is 2449, and Dakota County is 2259 in area two which adjoins both market areas of Dixon. The Dixon county weighted average dry land value in comparison is 2153 in area one and 1573 in area two.

The assessor relied on and reacted to the statistical information within the boundaries of Dixon County and increased the irrigated and dry land values in area one. The qualitative statistics are reasonable within Dixon County. However this adjustment based on the analysis of a representative proportionate sample was inadequate to achieve a level of value within an acceptable range.

Based on the analysis, expanding the sample to randomly include sales and create a proportionate and uniform sample, the level of value in Dixon County is determined to be 66%. Market Area 1 is at 67% and Market Area 2 is at 63%. The conclusion based on the expansion of the sales file is to make a non-binding recommendation of a 7% increase to Area 1 and a 15% increase to Area 2 The increase would achieve an overall level of value at 72%.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

Market Area 1 would have a level of value at 72% and Market Area 2 would also have a level of value at 72%.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms 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 state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2007), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms 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 real property.

The Division frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

2011 Correlation Section for Dixon County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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. 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.

2011 Correlation Section for Dixon County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The International Association of Assessing Officers recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers,

**2011 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

July, 2007, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

AGRICULTURAL

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	67	Median :	72	COV :	31.02	95% Median C.I. :	62.01 to 82.33
Total Sales Price :	19,682,805	Wgt. Mean :	66	STD :	23.12	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	62.42 to 70.57
Total Adj. Sales Price :	19,682,805	Mean :	75	Avg. Abs. Dev :	18.34	95% Mean C.I. :	68.99 to 80.07
Total Assessed Value :	13,087,919						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	293,773	COD :	25.45	MAX Sales Ratio :	148.10		
Avg. Assessed Value :	195,342	PRD :	112.09	MIN Sales Ratio :	29.93		

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007	1	111.34	111.34	111.34		100.00	111.34	111.34	N/A	175,000	194,852
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	7	87.72	92.68	89.49	10.27	103.56	76.39	111.00	76.39 to 111.00	189,133	169,250
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008	8	83.03	81.91	85.61	09.18	95.68	63.81	93.30	63.81 to 93.30	278,045	238,041
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	8	70.77	81.36	67.96	31.09	119.72	52.32	148.10	52.32 to 148.10	365,508	248,403
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	4	79.39	74.44	64.76	17.56	114.95	48.70	90.30	N/A	342,273	221,659
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	10	66.16	72.98	61.55	32.00	118.57	34.47	126.70	49.24 to 111.09	385,400	237,227
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009	4	59.42	56.68	53.95	13.13	105.06	38.57	69.29	N/A	190,094	102,564
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009	5	79.84	76.9	73.77	16.30	104.24	53.32	95.77	N/A	214,600	158,309
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009	4	51.71	53.91	49.07	22.32	109.86	41.32	70.89	N/A	344,913	169,262
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	6	67.86	75.81	66.4	31.05	114.17	50.22	116.68	50.22 to 116.68	206,704	137,242
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	8	56.19	57.17	52.48	23.19	108.94	29.93	88.17	29.93 to 88.17	373,261	195,899
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	2	80.37	80.37	77.31	11.19	103.96	71.38	89.35	N/A	186,510	144,186
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	24	84.86	86.1	79.3	17.62	108.58	52.32	148.10	74.29 to 92.94	276,973	219,631
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	23	69.29	71.25	63.21	25.07	112.72	34.47	126.70	58.03 to 82.03	306,803	193,944
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	20	59.79	64.43	56.13	26.63	114.79	29.93	116.68	50.96 to 71.38	298,949	167,803
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	30	76.63	77.79	68.94	23.39	112.84	34.47	148.10	63.81 to 84.70	345,717	238,349
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	19	60.01	67.46	60.68	26.51	111.17	38.57	116.68	53.32 to 79.84	234,382	142,226

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
1	26	71.84	76.04	70.29	18.56	108.18	50.96	111.34	63.81 to 82.33	265,618	186,702
2	41	72.07	73.58	64.44	29.86	114.18	29.93	148.10	58.03 to 86.47	311,628	200,821

SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED PARAMETERS FOR CALCULATION FROM USER FILE

Strata Heading	Strata	Change Value	Change Type	Percent Change
AREA (MARKET)	1	Land	Increase	7%
AREA (MARKET)	2	Land	Increase	15%

What IF

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 5,507	Value : 664,003,720	Growth 3,898,895	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	180	634,185	80	246,025	11	39,900	271	920,110	
02. Res Improve Land	1,321	6,233,605	190	1,306,215	299	2,644,880	1,810	10,184,700	
03. Res Improvements	1,356	64,504,170	193	14,477,560	311	24,519,135	1,860	103,500,865	
04. Res Total	1,536	71,371,960	273	16,029,800	322	27,203,915	2,131	114,605,675	2,045,055
% of Res Total	72.08	62.28	12.81	13.99	15.11	23.74	38.70	17.26	52.45
05. Com UnImp Land	53	113,215	11	30,250	7	56,660	71	200,125	
06. Com Improve Land	204	695,770	29	153,855	14	120,085	247	969,710	
07. Com Improvements	210	7,401,515	31	4,077,245	19	1,104,500	260	12,583,260	
08. Com Total	263	8,210,500	42	4,261,350	26	1,281,245	331	13,753,095	996,830
% of Com Total	79.46	59.70	12.69	30.98	7.85	9.32	6.01	2.07	25.57
09. Ind UnImp Land	1	4,035	1	5,100	0	0	2	9,135	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	4	55,120	7	672,670	11	727,790	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	4	8,500,760	7	17,413,095	11	25,913,855	
12. Ind Total	1	4,035	5	8,560,980	7	18,085,765	13	26,650,780	0
% of Ind Total	7.69	0.02	38.46	32.12	53.85	67.86	0.24	4.01	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	2	7,625	2	7,625	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	132	1,233,690	132	1,233,690	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	132	1,241,315	132	1,241,315	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	2.40	0.19	0.00
Res & Rec Total	1,536	71,371,960	273	16,029,800	454	28,445,230	2,263	115,846,990	2,045,055
% of Res & Rec Total	67.87	61.61	12.06	13.84	20.06	24.55	41.09	17.45	52.45
Com & Ind Total	264	8,214,535	47	12,822,330	33	19,367,010	344	40,403,875	996,830
% of Com & Ind Total	76.74	20.33	13.66	31.74	9.59	47.93	6.25	6.08	25.57
17. Taxable Total	1,800	79,586,495	320	28,852,130	487	47,812,240	2,607	156,250,865	3,041,885
% of Taxable Total	69.04	50.94	12.27	18.47	18.68	30.60	47.34	23.53	78.02

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	53	901,880	297,155	7	119,655	1,655
19. Commercial	9	70,610	3,875	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	60	1,021,535	298,810
19. Commercial	0	0	0	9	70,610	3,875
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				69	1,092,145	302,685

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
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. Exempt	231	41	294	566

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	10	19,405	72	2,341,135	1,927	278,179,130	2,009	280,539,670
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	52	3,577,295	882	175,959,535	934	179,536,830
29. Ag Improvements	5	31,895	39	2,418,055	847	45,226,405	891	47,676,355
30. Ag Total							2,900	507,752,855

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	33	33.25	216,125	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	33	0.00	2,271,295	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	3.78	2,080	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	34	91.68	50,430	
37. FarmSite Improvements	5	0.00	31,895	25	0.00	146,760	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	44.81	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	3	3.00	19,500	3	3.00	19,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	551	555.03	3,607,695	584	588.28	3,823,820	
33. HomeSite Improvements	545	0.00	31,359,810	578	0.00	33,631,105	351,765
34. HomeSite Total				581	591.28	37,474,425	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	34	88.31	48,570	36	92.09	50,650	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	735	3,600.55	1,980,510	769	3,692.23	2,030,940	
37. FarmSite Improvements	730	0.00	13,866,595	760	0.00	14,045,250	505,245
38. FarmSite Total				796	3,784.32	16,126,840	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,476.45	0	0	5,521.26	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,377	9,896.86	53,601,265	857,010

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,296.53	15.61%	6,258,050	17.90%	2,725.00
46. 1A	2,413.71	16.40%	6,263,585	17.92%	2,595.00
47. 2A1	1,264.26	8.59%	3,141,680	8.99%	2,485.00
48. 2A	2,764.60	18.79%	6,538,315	18.71%	2,365.01
49. 3A1	2,849.65	19.37%	6,497,210	18.59%	2,280.00
50. 3A	1,476.07	10.03%	3,136,730	8.97%	2,125.06
51. 4A1	1,642.27	11.16%	3,103,885	8.88%	1,890.00
52. 4A	7.97	0.05%	12,235	0.04%	1,535.13
53. Total	14,715.06	100.00%	34,951,690	100.00%	2,375.23
Dry					
54. 1D1	3,412.76	4.41%	8,924,350	5.36%	2,614.99
55. 1D	15,264.50	19.73%	39,306,225	23.60%	2,575.01
56. 2D1	4,154.74	5.37%	9,182,020	5.51%	2,210.01
57. 2D	6,196.94	8.01%	13,633,305	8.19%	2,200.01
58. 3D1	20,181.62	26.09%	44,399,600	26.66%	2,200.00
59. 3D	9,303.37	12.03%	18,141,800	10.89%	1,950.02
60. 4D1	17,958.34	23.21%	31,606,760	18.98%	1,760.00
61. 4D	887.18	1.15%	1,330,770	0.80%	1,500.00
62. Total	77,359.45	100.00%	166,524,830	100.00%	2,152.61
Grass					
63. 1G1	191.42	2.51%	258,015	3.50%	1,347.90
64. 1G	1,351.15	17.69%	1,756,480	23.80%	1,299.99
65. 2G1	968.59	12.68%	1,065,145	14.43%	1,099.69
66. 2G	1,670.84	21.87%	1,670,840	22.64%	1,000.00
67. 3G1	955.81	12.51%	860,205	11.66%	899.97
68. 3G	545.78	7.14%	436,620	5.92%	799.99
69. 4G1	1,592.34	20.84%	1,113,925	15.10%	699.55
70. 4G	363.63	4.76%	218,195	2.96%	600.05
71. Total	7,639.56	100.00%	7,379,425	100.00%	965.95
Irrigated Total					
	14,715.06	14.69%	34,951,690	16.73%	2,375.23
Dry Total					
	77,359.45	77.21%	166,524,830	79.72%	2,152.61
Grass Total					
	7,639.56	7.63%	7,379,425	3.53%	965.95
72. Waste	476.82	0.48%	43,505	0.02%	91.24
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	57.84	0.06%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	100,190.89	100.00%	208,899,450	100.00%	2,085.01

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,296.27	9.43%	3,046,235	11.71%	2,350.00
46. 1A	2,488.57	18.10%	5,723,740	22.00%	2,300.01
47. 2A1	2,719.17	19.78%	5,574,335	21.42%	2,050.01
48. 2A	429.43	3.12%	815,920	3.14%	1,900.01
49. 3A1	2,836.01	20.63%	5,104,805	19.62%	1,800.00
50. 3A	1,009.91	7.35%	1,615,845	6.21%	1,599.99
51. 4A1	2,846.57	20.71%	3,985,150	15.31%	1,399.98
52. 4A	119.90	0.87%	155,870	0.60%	1,300.00
53. Total	13,745.83	100.00%	26,021,900	100.00%	1,893.08
Dry					
54. 1D1	4,524.05	3.99%	9,206,380	5.16%	2,034.99
55. 1D	22,224.99	19.59%	44,116,760	24.72%	1,985.01
56. 2D1	10,050.91	8.86%	17,590,130	9.86%	1,750.10
57. 2D	1,190.26	1.05%	2,023,450	1.13%	1,700.01
58. 3D1	24,544.20	21.63%	35,834,630	20.08%	1,460.00
59. 3D	6,799.22	5.99%	9,926,870	5.56%	1,460.00
60. 4D1	34,760.18	30.64%	47,621,700	26.68%	1,370.01
61. 4D	9,355.80	8.25%	12,162,570	6.81%	1,300.00
62. Total	113,449.61	100.00%	178,482,490	100.00%	1,573.23
Grass					
63. 1G1	375.65	0.77%	438,100	1.10%	1,166.25
64. 1G	6,167.69	12.65%	7,503,695	18.77%	1,216.61
65. 2G1	2,436.68	5.00%	2,690,325	6.73%	1,104.09
66. 2G	199.06	0.41%	223,960	0.56%	1,125.09
67. 3G1	6,008.67	12.32%	5,914,995	14.79%	984.41
68. 3G	1,231.75	2.53%	1,119,155	2.80%	908.59
69. 4G1	15,127.57	31.03%	11,355,500	28.40%	750.65
70. 4G	17,209.00	35.30%	10,739,475	26.86%	624.06
71. Total	48,756.07	100.00%	39,985,205	100.00%	820.11
Irrigated Total					
	13,745.83	7.53%	26,021,900	10.61%	1,893.08
Dry Total					
	113,449.61	62.17%	178,482,490	72.78%	1,573.23
Grass Total					
	48,756.07	26.72%	39,985,205	16.30%	820.11
72. Waste	6,535.83	3.58%	760,570	0.31%	116.37
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	351.35	0.19%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	182,487.34	100.00%	245,250,165	100.00%	1,343.93

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	154.55	383,075	28,306.34	60,590,515	28,460.89	60,973,590
77. Dry Land	8.05	19,405	1,981.88	3,821,895	188,819.13	341,166,020	190,809.06	345,007,320
78. Grass	0.00	0	1,657.62	1,435,705	54,738.01	45,928,925	56,395.63	47,364,630
79. Waste	0.00	0	91.14	9,120	6,921.51	794,955	7,012.65	804,075
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	23.18	0	386.01	0	409.19	0
82. Total	8.05	19,405	3,885.19	5,649,795	278,784.99	448,480,415	282,678.23	454,149,615

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	28,460.89	10.07%	60,973,590	13.43%	2,142.36
Dry Land	190,809.06	67.50%	345,007,320	75.97%	1,808.13
Grass	56,395.63	19.95%	47,364,630	10.43%	839.86
Waste	7,012.65	2.48%	804,075	0.18%	114.66
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	409.19	0.14%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	282,678.23	100.00%	454,149,615	100.00%	1,606.60

2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2010 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

26 Dixon

	2010 CTL County Total	2011 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2011 form 45 - 2010 CTL)	Percent Change	2011 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	112,276,700	114,605,675	2,328,975	2.07%	2,045,055	0.25%
02. Recreational	1,144,600	1,241,315	96,715	8.45%	0	8.45%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	37,370,440	37,474,425	103,985	0.28%	351,765	-0.66%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	150,791,740	153,321,415	2,529,675	1.68%	2,396,820	0.09%
05. Commercial	13,174,430	13,753,095	578,665	4.39%	996,830	-3.17%
06. Industrial	26,634,330	26,650,780	16,450	0.06%	0	0.06%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	15,335,745	16,126,840	791,095	5.16%	505,245	1.86%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	55,144,505	56,530,715	1,386,210	2.51%	1,502,075	-0.21%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	205,936,245	209,852,130	3,915,885	1.90%	3,898,895	0.01%
11. Irrigated	57,566,215	60,973,590	3,407,375	5.92%		
12. Dryland	329,451,210	345,007,320	15,556,110	4.72%		
13. Grassland	47,387,360	47,364,630	-22,730	-0.05%		
14. Wasteland	772,305	804,075	31,770	4.11%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	435,177,090	454,149,615	18,972,525	4.36%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	641,113,335	664,003,720	22,890,385	3.57%	3,898,895	2.96%

AMY WATCHORN DIXON COUNTY ASSESSOR

**302 3RD ST
PO BOX 369
PONCA, NE 68770**

**GRETA KRAEMER, DEPUTY
PHONE: (402) 755-5601
FAX: (402) 755-5650**

DIXON COUNTY 2010 3 YEAR PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

Purpose – Submit plan to the County Board of Equalization and the Department Of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31, 2010.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE COUNTY

In 2010 Dixon County has a total of 6157 parcels, of that approximately 6% are commercial and approximately industrial, 9% are exempt, approximately 35% are residential and 50% are agricultural. 593 Personal property schedules were filed in the county this year and Homesteads Applications were accepted. Dixon County's total valuation for 2010 is 670,904,312.

BUDGET

2010 General Budget = \$ 102,029.18
(Salaries for one clerk, county deputy and the county assessor salary, office supplies, mileage, schooling, postage, misc.)

2010 Reappraisal Budget = 42,920.00
(One clerks salary, postage, computer expense, mileage, schooling, dues, and supplies, GIS)

RESPONSIBILITES

The office currently has 3 employees besides myself. The Deputy Assessor duties include: filling out the green sheets, assists with pickup work, enters information in the CAMA system, prices out buildings using the Marshall & Swift pricing, she also prices out the commercial property and also assisting with personal property and homestead filings.

Two clerks work 5 days a week. One of the clerks handles all transfer statements, land splits and keeps the cadastral maps current, as well as keeping the property record cards current. These duties are done as soon as the paperwork is received from the County Clerk's Office. This clerk is also responsible for the GIS system. She also assists with personal property and homesteads.

The other clerk handles the majority of the personal property and homestead filings. The clerk handles the majority of phone calls and faxes that come into the office.

As the Assessor I file all reports when they are due following the statutes, Assist with pickup work, enter information into the CAMA system, price out improvements, and calculate depreciation percentages for improvements. I and one of my staff do all the data collection and physically inspect property as needed. We perform sales ratio studies in-house as well as doing our own modeling for depreciation tables. We use the cost approach and get our depreciations from the market. I also calculate all valuation changes for agland, residential and commercial properties. We currently have our administrative and cama packages with MIPS. We do not have any other contracts for pickup work or appraisal services.

All the staff in the office is able to assist the taxpayer with any questions or concerns they may have. We have developed sales books, which are helpful to both the taxpayers and appraisers who come into our office. Along with the valuation notices that are sent out, we send a flyer for land sales and residential and rural homes and commercial properties which have sold. This seemed to be a very helpful tool for getting information to people who may not come in the office informed of what the market is in their town. We make an effort to make the public feel comfortable when they come into our office and are very honest with them about what is going on with them and their values. I believe this has helped a great deal during protest time. I also think this is the reason we have relatively few protest. We attempt to talk to every taxpayer requesting a protest form. We show them how there values were arrived at and many times they don't protest because we have shown them why their value changed and what the changes were based upon. Our hope is that they leave the office more informed about what this office does and why these things have to be done.

RESIDENTIAL

Dixon County had a complete residential reappraisal in 1997 using 1996 Marshall & Swift pricing. Since that time we have revalued the majority of our towns to meet the changing trends in the market.

We will continue to use the CAMA system to reappraise our towns as needed. Currently the median in our towns look pretty good, we will continue to monitor this and make the changes necessary to improve our assessment practices. We have valued lots using the square foot method at the same time we revalue the town so we can have a more accurate picture of the properties true market value. The CAMA pricing being used on all the houses is 6-1- 2005. MIPS is working on a new administrative package which we will be getting as soon as it is available to the counties. While we are sure this will be a great tool we are also sure it will not come without some added work. Two of the staff will have to be trained in use of the appraisal side as this information is currently not available on their computers. We just received our rural flights, due to poor weather conditions they were unable to fly until spring 2010.

2010 – Area 1 & 2 Rural Residence

2011 – Area 3 Rural Residence, Wakefield City

2012 – Concord, Dixon, Maskell

2013-Allen, Emerson, Waterbury, Newcastle

COMMERCIAL

A complete reappraisal of commercial properties was completed in 1999 by the Assessor's office staff. Industrial properties were reappraised in 2001. Pricing was done

on the 1999 Marshall & Swift computer program. Final valuation is by the sales comparison approach. Income and expense data was gathered but there was insufficient rental information to utilize the income approach to value. We have been working on Waldbaum's industrial plants. We have visited the sites and are currently reviewing our records for each of their facilities. Commercial properties will continue to be monitored and adjustments made when deemed necessary by the market. We continue to wait for the new CAMA and administrative package from MIPS to become available, we are on the list but do not have a time line as to when we will be put on.

2010 – Reappraisal of Commercial Property

2011 – Appraisal maintenance

2012 – Appraisal maintenance

2013-Appraisal Maintenance

AGRICULTURAL

Rural residences were reappraised in 1997 and updated in 2005 using 2000 Marshall & Swift computer pricing. We are also studying the market to see how distance from pavement, towns etc. are impacting rural sales. Site values will continue to be studied.

Agricultural land will continue to be reviewed annually as will the current market areas, for changes in the market. We no longer go to the FSA office to review land use changes unless we have problems. We will begin getting their CD's and using the GIS to update each year of land use changes. The new soil survey was completed last year and we are now making land use changes. This has proven to be extremely time consuming and difficult to do with MIPS & GIS. Land use changes which we are made aware of or discover, will be treated as pick up work and revalued for the year the change occurred. We also will continue to study market area lines to ensure they are appropriate for current sales.

2010 – Monitor market by LCG

2011 – Monitor market by LCG

2012 – Monitor market by LCG

2013 - Monitor market by LCG

SALES REVIEW

Dixon County currently reviews all sales by sending a verification form to the buyer in a self- addressed stamp envelope. We have also contacted the seller, realtor, or physically inspected the property sold if we need more information than we were able to obtain from the buyer. We have approximately 75% return on our verification form.

CONCLUSION

I have put Dixon County on MIPS list to get the new administrative and cama package. We do not have a date as to when this will occur. We will also be going on line at that time. As soon as all of our information has been verified as being correct. MIPS is not going to charge anything for our data to be put on line so this will save the county

thousands of dollars. A GIS system for the county was purchased in late 2004. This has taken a majority of one of my Clerk's time. We feel this has made our office more efficient and accurate. Also, it will make it much easier to get the taxpayer current maps. Each year our office reviews all statistical information to ensure that our values are within the acceptable ranges. **We will also try to improve our PRD & COD on all types of property each year. We use a good deal of our sales throwing out only the sales we feel are not arms length transactions. This office does everything in-house with the number of employees that we have, we do all the TERC Appeal, County Board of Equalization Meetings, prepare tax lists, consolidate levies, etc. We also have exceeded the educational hours required every year since they were enacted.**

Sincerely,

Amy Watchorn
Dixon County Assessor

6 YEAR REVIEW CYCLE

2010- AREA 1 & 2 RURAL RESIDENCE

**2011- AREA 3 RURAL RESIDENCE,
WAKEFIELD CITY**

2012- CONCORD, DIXON, MASKELL

**2013 – ALLEN, EMERSON, NEWCASTLE,
WATERBURY**

2014 – COMMERCIAL

2015 – PONCA & MARTINSBURG

**AGRICULTURAL LAND IS REVIEWED
YEARLY FOR USE CHANGES AND THE
MARKETS MONITORED ON A YEARLY
BASIS**

**During these years property is to be reviewed, not necessarily
revalued.**

2011 Assessment Survey for Dixon County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	NA
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2
4.	Other part-time employees:
	NA
5.	Number of shared employees:
	NA
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$102,029.18
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$102,029.18
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	\$42,920.00
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$4,400.00
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,000.00
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	0

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes in conjunction with GIS
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Clerk
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Clerk
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning? NO
	No
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide? NA
	NA
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned
	Wakefield City and Ponca City
4.	When was zoning implemented? NA
	NA

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	NA
2.	Other services:
	NA

2011 Certification for Dixon County

This is to certify that the 2011 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

One copy by electronic transmission to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

One copy by electronic transmission to the Dixon County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

