

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 Knox County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	165	Median	92.71
Total Sales Price	\$10,604,325	Mean	91.31
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$10,536,825	Wgt. Mean	85.48
Total Assessed Value	\$9,007,135	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$39,068
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$63,860	Avg. Assessed Value	\$54,589

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.48 to 93.99
95% Mean C.I	82.56 to 88.41
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.71 to 93.91
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	20.52
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.41
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.76

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	210	93	93
2009	284	94	94
2008	316	95	95
2007	316	96	96

2011 Commission Summary for Knox County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	24	Median	97.67
Total Sales Price	\$1,703,675	Mean	97.84
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,264,321	Wgt. Mean	93.77
Total Assessed Value	\$1,185,530	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$51,515
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$52,680	Avg. Assessed Value	\$49,397

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	88.05 to 103.35
95% Mean C.I	89.30 to 106.38
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.93 to 98.61
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.35
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.01
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.84

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	36	97	97
2009	42	100	100
2008	48	99	99
2007	54	98	98

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Knox 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	93	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	69	The qualitative measures calculated in the random exclude sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

***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 Knox County

All valuation groupings were reviewed with the sales comparison approach being used to determine the changes needed to bring them into the acceptable range required by law. Lots and improvements were raised in some of the lake subdivisions based on this analysis.

The assessor reviewed all residential sales. Questionnaires were sent to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible.

All pick up work was completed and placed on the assessment roll for 2011.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Knox County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Staff	
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	Bloomfield, located in the eastern side of the county, school, active businesses, large commercial chicken facility, and call center for employment, well maintained.
	3	Bazile Mills, small population, no gas or grocery.
	5	Center, county seat, small population, no gas or grocery, only a post office.
	10	Creighton, located in the central area of the county, has school, hospital, care center, active business community, well maintained.
	15	Crofton, located in the northeast part of the county, closer to Yankton, SD community. Has two schools, typical business community and well maintained.
	20	Lake, residences located on the northern portion of the county along the Lewis and Clark lake, occupied either full or part time.
	26	Devil's Nest, is a subdivided area that has been in existence for a long time. A new developer is trying to revitalize and build the area.
	30	Niobrara, located in the northwestern, central portion of the county. Medical clinic and typical business community.
	35	Rural, residential property located outside the boundaries of the villages.
	40	Verdel, located in the northwestern part of the county and has nothing to offer in the way of business or schools.
	45	Verdigre, located in the western portion of the county, has school, medical clinic and typical business activity.
	50	Wausa, located in the southeastern portion of the county, has school, care center and assisted living and typical small business community.
	55	Winnetoon, small community, not far from Center, has minimal business facilities, bank and café.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Sales approach.	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2010 for all valuation groupings	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	Sales/market per square foot	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	

	2004
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?
	Local market as compared to CAMA depreciation.
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes.
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?
	Every so many years at our discretion, based on a market analysis.
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.
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives. We also utilize specific written county policies and procedures.

**54 Knox
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 165
 Total Sales Price : 10,604,325
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,536,825
 Total Assessed Value : 9,007,135
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 63,860
 Avg. Assessed Value : 54,589

MEDIAN : 93
 WGT. MEAN : 85
 MEAN : 91
 COD : 13.84
 PRD : 106.82

COV : 18.64
 STD : 17.02
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.83
 MAX Sales Ratio : 157.60
 MIN Sales Ratio : 53.68

95% Median C.I. : 90.48 to 93.99
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.56 to 88.41
 95% Mean C.I. : 88.71 to 93.91

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:40PM

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-08 To 30-SEP-08	33	89.90	93.48	86.63	16.64	107.91	61.80	157.60	82.25 to 101.00	64,982	56,292
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	14	99.72	99.42	97.14	09.40	102.35	72.57	134.23	93.48 to 106.23	26,607	25,847
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	17	93.83	92.15	88.03	09.62	104.68	65.69	115.09	84.01 to 100.09	47,332	41,666
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	21	86.29	85.62	84.27	13.32	101.60	53.68	110.66	72.88 to 95.55	55,845	47,058
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	24	94.02	96.20	90.93	14.60	105.80	55.68	133.90	87.56 to 104.00	74,021	67,310
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	16	91.52	88.76	81.66	11.92	108.69	67.58	112.08	76.34 to 98.27	45,456	37,121
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	11	91.67	84.85	75.21	16.69	112.82	54.06	113.02	58.06 to 103.00	61,636	46,356
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	29	92.43	88.34	82.91	13.78	106.55	57.52	133.20	76.12 to 94.51	98,646	81,786
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	85	92.88	92.25	87.13	13.56	105.88	53.68	157.60	86.29 to 95.18	52,874	46,071
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	80	92.47	90.30	84.25	14.15	107.18	54.06	133.90	87.56 to 94.51	75,532	63,639
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	78	92.66	90.94	87.16	12.72	104.34	53.68	133.90	88.40 to 94.81	57,451	50,076
<u>ALL</u>	165	92.71	91.31	85.48	13.84	106.82	53.68	157.60	90.48 to 93.99	63,860	54,589

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	30	93.38	94.15	84.42	13.28	111.53	62.02	133.15	86.60 to 100.94	42,098	35,541
05	4	100.16	95.68	89.59	11.66	106.80	73.19	109.22	N/A	53,750	48,154
10	24	94.10	95.79	84.88	17.17	112.85	65.69	157.60	81.53 to 102.67	47,740	40,520
15	10	95.53	97.74	94.10	12.97	103.87	77.27	133.90	80.84 to 110.66	56,150	52,839
20	31	92.22	85.15	83.57	15.22	101.89	54.06	126.03	74.18 to 93.55	142,706	119,262
26	9	91.67	88.03	89.57	10.73	98.28	61.80	100.00	75.00 to 100.00	10,544	9,444
30	10	93.25	88.33	90.30	12.30	97.82	53.68	110.85	76.34 to 105.46	52,150	47,092
35	14	91.88	89.33	83.46	13.42	107.03	59.86	116.67	70.50 to 104.00	82,718	69,040
45	14	91.64	91.53	87.49	14.76	104.62	65.08	124.03	69.94 to 115.09	38,464	33,651
50	14	93.47	92.85	91.50	10.81	101.48	72.88	113.02	80.31 to 103.00	38,379	35,117
55	5	92.75	86.99	83.94	06.58	103.63	73.60	93.48	N/A	15,500	13,011
<u>ALL</u>	165	92.71	91.31	85.48	13.84	106.82	53.68	157.60	90.48 to 93.99	63,860	54,589

**54 Knox
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 165
 Total Sales Price : 10,604,325
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,536,825
 Total Assessed Value : 9,007,135
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 63,860
 Avg. Assessed Value : 54,589

MEDIAN : 93
 WGT. MEAN : 85
 MEAN : 91
 COD : 13.84
 PRD : 106.82

COV : 18.64
 STD : 17.02
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.83
 MAX Sales Ratio : 157.60
 MIN Sales Ratio : 53.68

95% Median C.I. : 90.48 to 93.99
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.56 to 88.41
 95% Mean C.I. : 88.71 to 93.91

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:40PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	117	93.78	94.18	87.82	13.15	107.24	62.02	157.60	91.34 to 95.18	48,582	42,663
06	39	91.67	85.45	83.53	14.45	102.30	54.06	126.03	75.45 to 93.55	114,648	95,766
07	9	76.34	79.32	73.58	18.86	107.80	53.68	100.94	59.86 to 99.47	42,389	31,191
<u>ALL</u>	165	92.71	91.31	85.48	13.84	106.82	53.68	157.60	90.48 to 93.99	63,860	54,589

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	4	100.00	94.00	85.86	06.50	109.48	75.00	101.00	N/A	1,750	1,503
5000 TO 9999	12	102.84	105.26	101.52	18.19	103.68	61.80	157.60	84.62 to 117.92	6,767	6,870
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	16	100.50	102.45	100.28	15.91	102.16	61.80	157.60	84.62 to 116.67	5,513	5,528
10000 TO 29999	36	98.86	99.69	98.07	10.31	101.65	72.88	133.15	93.48 to 105.50	18,568	18,209
30000 TO 59999	52	92.85	91.22	91.29	13.42	99.92	53.68	134.23	87.56 to 97.07	40,024	36,536
60000 TO 99999	29	86.29	85.70	85.22	11.94	100.56	58.06	110.85	77.27 to 93.78	74,140	63,180
100000 TO 149999	13	81.53	82.36	82.19	14.83	100.21	59.86	107.70	70.37 to 94.76	119,000	97,801
150000 TO 249999	15	76.12	79.63	79.27	15.38	100.45	54.06	102.63	69.95 to 92.43	185,758	147,256
250000 TO 499999	4	88.49	85.97	86.45	07.50	99.44	74.18	92.71	N/A	303,875	262,704
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	165	92.71	91.31	85.48	13.84	106.82	53.68	157.60	90.48 to 93.99	63,860	54,589

**2011 Correlation Section
for Knox County**

A. Residential Real Property

The residential sales file for Knox County consists of 165 qualified sales. This sample will be considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. The calculated median is 93%. All valuation groupings that are adequately represented in the sales file are within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, while the price related differential is slightly above. Based on the known assessment practices it is believed the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

The assessor's office reviewed all residential sales. Sales reviews include questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. All efforts are made to talk to either the buyer or the seller.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 93% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox County

The only changes made to the commercial file were those found through sales review and pick up work.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Knox County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Staff	
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	Bloomfield, located in the eastern side of the county, school, active businesses, large commercial chicken facility, and call center for employment, well maintained.
	3	Bazille Mills, small population, no gas or grocery.
	5	Center, county seat, small population, no gas or grocery, only a post office.
	10	Creighton, located in the central area of the county, has school, hospital, care center, active business community, well maintained.
	15	Crofton, located in the northeast part of the county, closer to the Yankton community. Have two schools, typical business community.
	20	Lake, residences located on the northern portion of the county along the Lewis and Clark lake, occupied either full or part time.
	26	Devil's Nest, is a subdivided area that has been in existence for a long time. A developer has started to revitalize the area.
	30	Niobrara, located in the northwestern, central portion of the county. Medical clinic and typical business community.
	35	Rural, residential property located outside the boundaries of the villages.
	40	Verdel, located in the northwestern part of the county and has nothing to offer in the way of business or schools.
	45	Verdigre, located in the western portion of the county, has school, medical clinic and typical business activity.
	50	Wausa, located in the southeastern portion of the county, has school, typical small business community.
	55	Winnetoon, small community, not far from Center, has minimal business facilities, bank and café.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Sales Comparison	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2010 for all valuation groupings	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Sales/Market square foot	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2004	

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?
	Local market as compared to CAMA depreciation
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes.
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?
	Every so many years at our discretion with an analysis of the market
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.
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations and directives and follow specific written county policies and procedures.

54 Knox
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 : 24
Total Sales Price : 1,703,675
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,264,321
Total Assessed Value : 1,185,530
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,680
Avg. Assessed Value : 49,397

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 98
COD : 13.50
PRD : 104.34

COV : 20.68
STD : 20.23
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.19
MAX Sales Ratio : 153.75
MIN Sales Ratio : 43.33

95% Median C.I. : 88.05 to 103.35
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.93 to 98.61
95% Mean C.I. : 89.30 to 106.38

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:43PM

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	2	115.62	115.62	108.03	06.97	107.03	107.56	123.67	N/A	25,750	27,818
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	106.50	106.50	102.58	06.86	103.82	99.19	113.80	N/A	45,573	46,750
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	2	85.23	85.23	107.40	49.16	79.36	43.33	127.12	N/A	5,100	5,478
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	89.74	89.74	90.45	01.88	99.22	88.05	91.43	N/A	63,288	57,245
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	93.20	93.20	93.34	01.28	99.85	92.01	94.38	N/A	40,000	37,338
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	99.73	99.73	99.73	00.00	100.00	99.73	99.73	N/A	80,000	79,780
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	102.55	108.59	100.85	14.39	107.67	85.95	153.75	N/A	47,680	48,086
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	93.06	93.06	85.86	12.44	108.39	81.48	104.64	N/A	18,500	15,885
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	84.68	84.68	84.68	00.00	100.00	84.68	84.68	N/A	82,000	69,435
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	82.05	85.71	84.62	06.09	101.29	80.04	95.05	N/A	110,000	93,085
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	99.09	99.09	99.09	00.00	100.00	99.09	99.09	N/A	80,000	79,275
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	97.97	97.97	97.97	00.00	100.00	97.97	97.97	N/A	57,500	56,330
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	8	103.38	99.27	98.27	18.16	101.02	43.33	127.12	43.33 to 127.12	34,928	34,323
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	10	98.55	101.52	97.99	11.45	103.60	81.48	153.75	85.95 to 104.64	43,540	42,666
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	6	89.87	89.81	88.13	08.41	101.91	80.04	99.09	80.04 to 99.09	91,583	80,716
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	92.01	90.86	94.31	15.28	96.34	43.33	127.12	43.33 to 127.12	42,396	39,986
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	11	95.05	97.35	90.32	14.10	107.78	80.04	153.75	81.48 to 104.64	62,491	56,445
<u>ALL</u>	24	97.67	97.84	93.77	13.50	104.34	43.33	153.75	88.05 to 103.35	52,680	49,397

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	97.39	96.32	92.75	09.56	103.85	80.04	113.80	80.04 to 113.80	54,024	50,110
10	1	127.12	127.12	127.12	00.00	100.00	127.12	127.12	N/A	7,800	9,915
15	4	91.72	106.31	96.12	18.07	110.60	88.05	153.75	N/A	44,131	42,420
20	1	82.05	82.05	82.05	00.00	100.00	82.05	82.05	N/A	155,000	127,175
30	2	99.96	99.96	98.44	02.60	101.54	97.36	102.55	N/A	87,725	86,355
35	3	97.97	93.95	93.17	04.94	100.84	84.68	99.19	N/A	69,833	65,067
40	1	123.67	123.67	123.67	00.00	100.00	123.67	123.67	N/A	1,500	1,855
45	5	94.38	85.17	96.92	17.34	87.88	43.33	107.56	N/A	41,480	40,202
50	1	104.64	104.64	104.64	00.00	100.00	104.64	104.64	N/A	7,000	7,325
<u>ALL</u>	24	97.67	97.84	93.77	13.50	104.34	43.33	153.75	88.05 to 103.35	52,680	49,397

54 Knox
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 : 24
Total Sales Price : 1,703,675
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,264,321
Total Assessed Value : 1,185,530
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,680
Avg. Assessed Value : 49,397

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 98
COD : 13.50
PRD : 104.34

COV : 20.68
STD : 20.23
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.19
MAX Sales Ratio : 153.75
MIN Sales Ratio : 43.33

95% Median C.I. : 88.05 to 103.35
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.93 to 98.61
95% Mean C.I. : 89.30 to 106.38

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:43PM

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	24	97.67	97.84	93.77	13.50	104.34	43.33	153.75	88.05 to 103.35	52,680	49,397
04											
<u>ALL</u>	24	97.67	97.84	93.77	13.50	104.34	43.33	153.75	88.05 to 103.35	52,680	49,397

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	83.50	83.50	74.23	48.11	112.49	43.33	123.67	N/A	1,950	1,448
5000 TO 9999	1	127.12	127.12	127.12	00.00	100.00	127.12	127.12	N/A	7,800	9,915
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	3	123.67	98.04	109.49	22.58	89.54	43.33	127.12	N/A	3,900	4,270
10000 TO 29999	3	104.64	120.58	121.53	16.06	99.22	103.35	153.75	N/A	13,983	16,993
30000 TO 59999	6	97.28	97.58	97.57	10.69	100.01	81.48	113.80	81.48 to 113.80	34,870	34,022
60000 TO 99999	5	97.97	95.19	94.90	04.05	100.31	84.68	99.73	N/A	66,900	63,490
100000 TO 149999	3	85.95	87.01	86.77	05.82	100.28	80.04	95.05	N/A	67,667	58,715
150000 TO 249999	4	94.40	92.48	91.39	06.08	101.19	82.05	99.09	N/A	115,988	106,004
250000 TO 499999											
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	24	97.67	97.84	93.77	13.50	104.34	43.33	153.75	88.05 to 103.35	52,680	49,397

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	2	83.50	83.50	74.23	48.11	112.49	43.33	123.67	N/A	1,950	1,448
336	1	102.55	102.55	102.55	00.00	100.00	102.55	102.55	N/A	36,500	37,430
353	3	127.12	126.08	104.01	14.79	121.22	97.36	153.75	N/A	53,900	56,060
386	4	91.94	91.41	89.36	08.76	102.29	82.05	99.73	N/A	96,750	86,456
406	1	107.56	107.56	107.56	00.00	100.00	107.56	107.56	N/A	50,000	53,780
442	5	88.05	92.26	90.89	08.72	101.51	81.48	113.80	N/A	30,144	27,397
472	1	103.35	103.35	103.35	00.00	100.00	103.35	103.35	N/A	20,000	20,670
528	3	99.09	100.57	98.91	02.24	101.68	97.97	104.64	N/A	48,167	47,643
531	3	91.43	88.84	88.44	05.47	100.45	80.04	95.05	N/A	88,333	78,122
594	1	94.38	94.38	94.38	00.00	100.00	94.38	94.38	N/A	45,000	42,470
<u>ALL</u>	24	97.67	97.84	93.77	13.50	104.34	43.33	153.75	88.05 to 103.35	52,680	49,397

**2011 Correlation Section
for Knox County**

A. Commerical Real Property

A review of the statistical analysis reveals 24 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate the level of value is within the acceptable range, there are not a sufficient number of sales to have confidence in the calculated statistics. Commercial parcels in Knox County are generally valued by occupancy code. When reviewing the occupancy code of the 24 sales, Bar/Tavern (442) has the most number of sales with five. The sample is not representative of the population as a whole. Since commercial parcels in Knox County are made up of a much broader mix of occupancies, the calculated median should not be used as an indication of the level of value in the county.

The assessor's office reviewed all commercial sales. Sales reviews include questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. All efforts are made to talk to either the buyer or the seller.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox County

For assessment year 2011 a market study of land was performed to determine values and to bring the land values into the statutory required level of value. In market area 1 irrigated and grass values were increased 5%. Dry land was raised 10%. In market area 2 irrigated land was increased 5%. In market area 3 irrigated land was raised 2%.

The assessor reviewed all agricultural sales. Questionnaires were sent to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible.

All pick up work was completed and placed on the assessment roll for 2011.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Knox County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Area 1 is the south eastern portion of the county with borders of Cedar and Pierce Counties. This area has the same characteristics as the bordering counties and tends to have more tillable acres.
	2	Area 2 is the western portion of the county with borders of Holt and Antelope Counties. This area is utilized more for the grassland characteristics.
	3	Area 3 is the north eastern portion of the county with the north border as the Missouri River and the eastern border Cedar County. This area tends to have a mixture of characteristics.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	The county is divided into three market areas; the east is divided into two areas. The northern area is Area 3 and the southern area is Area 1. The western area is Area 2. The diversity of the land characteristics is evident in both the parcel type and geographic characteristics of area 1 and 3. Area 1 has the potential for irrigation and is not as hilly.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	Rural residential land is 20 acres or less and recreational land is anything having lake influence.	
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?	
	Same value.	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	Irrigated, Dry, Grass, Waste, Shelterbelt, WRP and feedlots.	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	Physical inspection, GIS mapping and FSA map.	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales are monitored and the questionnaires are studied and kept on record.	
9.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
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.
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added or land use changes that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations and directives. We also use the specific written county policies and procedures.

54 Knox
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 : 64
 Total Sales Price : 15,078,491
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,946,296
 Total Assessed Value : 10,118,845
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 233,536
 Avg. Assessed Value : 158,107

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 69
 COD : 18.54
 PRD : 102.42

COV : 22.05
 STD : 15.29
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.94
 MAX Sales Ratio : 103.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.86

95% Median C.I. : 60.39 to 76.75
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.40 to 72.00
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.59 to 73.09

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:46PM

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	4	88.03	90.25	93.09	09.22	96.95	81.85	103.10	N/A	149,175	138,870
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	82.31	80.61	80.40	04.54	100.26	74.40	85.26	N/A	297,395	239,116
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	11	72.45	72.25	73.61	17.82	98.15	52.88	103.42	55.50 to 93.63	173,568	127,764
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	6	58.77	63.11	58.70	15.67	107.51	48.56	79.51	48.56 to 79.51	354,670	208,178
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	78.62	78.62	72.52	11.69	108.41	69.43	87.80	N/A	206,975	150,093
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	66.72	65.14	63.11	09.77	103.22	52.84	76.25	52.84 to 76.25	187,900	118,586
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	54.83	53.45	54.18	05.00	98.65	48.11	57.92	N/A	175,859	95,278
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	56.17	57.77	44.90	21.47	128.66	35.86	82.90	N/A	153,250	68,804
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	46.76	46.76	46.76	00.00	100.00	46.76	46.76	N/A	58,000	27,120
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	76.56	72.23	72.32	11.12	99.88	47.01	85.85	47.01 to 85.85	319,157	230,799
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	78.00	73.06	71.57	08.79	102.08	60.30	80.87	N/A	238,034	170,350
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	8	67.51	68.15	63.50	21.26	107.32	47.29	96.40	47.29 to 96.40	284,806	180,858
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	26	76.85	74.52	71.97	16.01	103.54	48.56	103.42	60.39 to 82.41	235,421	169,443
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	18	57.77	61.75	58.42	16.88	105.70	35.86	87.80	54.83 to 69.43	178,975	104,549
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	20	73.13	69.45	68.37	16.93	101.58	46.76	96.40	60.30 to 78.53	280,190	191,571
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	26	69.01	68.72	65.63	16.01	104.71	48.56	103.42	57.15 to 76.25	221,789	145,568
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	57.34	62.38	63.97	21.35	97.51	35.86	85.85	51.25 to 76.75	227,975	145,840
<u>ALL</u>	64	69.81	69.34	67.70	18.54	102.42	35.86	103.42	60.39 to 76.75	233,536	158,107

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	10	73.19	72.62	67.99	17.49	106.81	48.21	103.10	54.83 to 85.26	310,063	210,819
2	47	69.43	68.54	69.21	18.85	99.03	35.86	103.42	60.30 to 76.75	201,726	139,607
3	7	72.60	70.07	61.29	16.05	114.33	54.58	87.80	54.58 to 87.80	337,793	207,017
<u>ALL</u>	64	69.81	69.34	67.70	18.54	102.42	35.86	103.42	60.39 to 76.75	233,536	158,107

54 Knox
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 : 64
 Total Sales Price : 15,078,491
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,946,296
 Total Assessed Value : 10,118,845
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 233,536
 Avg. Assessed Value : 158,107

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 69
 COD : 18.54
 PRD : 102.42

COV : 22.05
 STD : 15.29
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.94
 MAX Sales Ratio : 103.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.86

95% Median C.I. : 60.39 to 76.75
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.40 to 72.00
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.59 to 73.09

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:46PM

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
Irrigated											
County	1	47.01	47.01	47.01	00.00	100.00	47.01	47.01	N/A	397,149	186,690
2	1	47.01	47.01	47.01	00.00	100.00	47.01	47.01	N/A	397,149	186,690
Dry											
County	5	79.51	73.95	74.54	11.34	99.21	52.84	85.26	N/A	132,322	98,631
1	2	77.50	77.50	76.58	10.01	101.20	69.74	85.26	N/A	163,305	125,065
2	1	52.84	52.84	52.84	00.00	100.00	52.84	52.84	N/A	100,000	52,840
3	2	80.96	80.96	80.93	01.79	100.04	79.51	82.41	N/A	117,500	95,093
Grass											
County	25	69.16	68.69	72.82	16.31	94.33	46.76	87.80	56.76 to 78.00	181,078	131,860
1	1	69.16	69.16	69.16	00.00	100.00	69.16	69.16	N/A	70,000	48,410
2	22	71.49	68.44	73.59	15.81	93.00	46.76	85.85	55.97 to 78.00	189,502	139,449
3	2	71.19	71.19	62.60	23.33	113.72	54.58	87.80	N/A	143,950	90,110
ALL	64	69.81	69.34	67.70	18.54	102.42	35.86	103.42	60.39 to 76.75	233,536	158,107

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	5	48.21	58.27	54.17	32.11	107.57	35.86	103.10	N/A	434,145	235,194
1	3	57.15	69.49	61.96	32.02	112.15	48.21	103.10	N/A	451,192	279,560
2	2	41.44	41.44	41.28	13.47	100.39	35.86	47.01	N/A	408,575	168,645
Dry											
County	9	79.51	74.58	76.42	11.36	97.59	52.84	85.26	56.03 to 84.46	143,478	109,643
1	4	80.55	79.03	79.47	07.25	99.45	69.74	85.26	N/A	197,652	157,066
2	3	56.03	64.41	63.36	18.76	101.66	52.84	84.36	N/A	88,563	56,112
3	2	80.96	80.96	80.93	01.79	100.04	79.51	82.41	N/A	117,500	95,093
Grass											
County	29	69.88	69.81	73.65	16.16	94.79	46.76	93.63	57.92 to 78.00	194,853	143,516
1	1	69.16	69.16	69.16	00.00	100.00	69.16	69.16	N/A	70,000	48,410
2	26	72.14	69.73	74.31	15.64	93.84	46.76	93.63	57.92 to 78.00	203,570	151,282
3	2	71.19	71.19	62.60	23.33	113.72	54.58	87.80	N/A	143,950	90,110
ALL	64	69.81	69.34	67.70	18.54	102.42	35.86	103.42	60.39 to 76.75	233,536	158,107

54 Knox
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 : 69
 Total Sales Price : 15,803,043
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 15,670,848
 Total Assessed Value : 10,581,258
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 227,114
 Avg. Assessed Value : 153,352

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 69
 COD : 18.55
 PRD : 102.04

COV : 21.96
 STD : 15.13
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.88
 MAX Sales Ratio : 103.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.86

95% Median C.I. : 60.30 to 76.64
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.42 to 71.62
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.33 to 72.47

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:49PM

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	4	88.03	90.25	93.09	09.22	96.95	81.85	103.10	N/A	149,175	138,870
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	82.31	80.61	80.40	04.54	100.26	74.40	85.26	N/A	297,395	239,116
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	11	72.45	72.25	73.61	17.82	98.15	52.88	103.42	55.50 to 93.63	173,568	127,764
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	6	58.77	63.11	58.70	15.67	107.51	48.56	79.51	48.56 to 79.51	354,670	208,178
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	69.43	72.01	68.38	13.93	105.31	58.79	87.80	N/A	197,475	135,037
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	9	66.37	63.64	61.86	10.37	102.88	50.39	76.25	52.84 to 72.60	179,711	111,172
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	54.99	53.97	54.34	04.69	99.32	48.11	57.92	48.11 to 57.92	157,174	85,411
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	56.17	57.77	44.90	21.47	128.66	35.86	82.90	N/A	153,250	68,804
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	46.76	46.76	46.76	00.00	100.00	46.76	46.76	N/A	58,000	27,120
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	76.56	72.23	72.32	11.12	99.88	47.01	85.85	47.01 to 85.85	319,157	230,799
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	79.44	75.73	74.02	08.28	102.31	60.30	83.76	N/A	223,582	165,504
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	8	67.51	68.15	63.50	21.26	107.32	47.29	96.40	47.29 to 96.40	284,806	180,858
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	26	76.85	74.52	71.97	16.01	103.54	48.56	103.42	60.39 to 82.41	235,421	169,443
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	22	57.77	61.08	58.24	15.25	104.88	35.86	87.80	54.83 to 68.58	171,176	99,697
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	21	76.37	70.13	68.85	15.90	101.86	46.76	96.40	60.30 to 80.87	275,430	189,638
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	29	66.72	67.66	64.99	16.32	104.11	48.56	103.42	57.15 to 73.13	215,417	140,004
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	19	56.76	62.08	63.86	20.45	97.21	35.86	85.85	51.25 to 76.75	219,332	140,063
<u>ALL</u>	69	69.43	68.90	67.52	18.55	102.04	35.86	103.42	60.30 to 76.64	227,114	153,352

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	15	69.16	69.47	67.20	18.15	103.38	48.21	103.10	56.59 to 83.76	255,012	171,374
2	47	69.43	68.54	69.21	18.85	99.03	35.86	103.42	60.30 to 76.75	201,726	139,607
3	7	72.60	70.07	61.29	16.05	114.33	54.58	87.80	54.58 to 87.80	337,793	207,017
<u>ALL</u>	69	69.43	68.90	67.52	18.55	102.04	35.86	103.42	60.30 to 76.64	227,114	153,352

54 Knox
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 : 69
 Total Sales Price : 15,803,043
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 15,670,848
 Total Assessed Value : 10,581,258
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 227,114
 Avg. Assessed Value : 153,352

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 69
 COD : 18.55
 PRD : 102.04

COV : 21.96
 STD : 15.13
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.88
 MAX Sales Ratio : 103.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.86

95% Median C.I. : 60.30 to 76.64
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.42 to 71.62
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.33 to 72.47

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:49PM

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
Irrigated											
County	1	47.01	47.01	47.01	00.00	100.00	47.01	47.01	N/A	397,149	186,690
2	1	47.01	47.01	47.01	00.00	100.00	47.01	47.01	N/A	397,149	186,690
Dry											
County	8	74.63	72.34	72.71	13.94	99.49	52.84	85.26	52.84 to 85.26	141,789	103,089
1	5	69.74	72.78	72.77	12.58	100.01	58.79	85.26	N/A	159,862	116,337
2	1	52.84	52.84	52.84	00.00	100.00	52.84	52.84	N/A	100,000	52,840
3	2	80.96	80.96	80.93	01.79	100.04	79.51	82.41	N/A	117,500	95,093
Grass											
County	25	69.16	68.69	72.82	16.31	94.33	46.76	87.80	56.76 to 78.00	181,078	131,860
1	1	69.16	69.16	69.16	00.00	100.00	69.16	69.16	N/A	70,000	48,410
2	22	71.49	68.44	73.59	15.81	93.00	46.76	85.85	55.97 to 78.00	189,502	139,449
3	2	71.19	71.19	62.60	23.33	113.72	54.58	87.80	N/A	143,950	90,110
ALL	69	69.43	68.90	67.52	18.55	102.04	35.86	103.42	60.30 to 76.64	227,114	153,352

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	5	48.21	58.27	54.17	32.11	107.57	35.86	103.10	N/A	434,145	235,194
1	3	57.15	69.49	61.96	32.02	112.15	48.21	103.10	N/A	451,192	279,560
2	2	41.44	41.44	41.28	13.47	100.39	35.86	47.01	N/A	408,575	168,645
Dry											
County	13	76.64	72.06	74.10	13.99	97.25	52.84	85.26	56.59 to 84.36	140,596	104,186
1	8	73.19	72.70	75.05	13.43	96.87	56.59	85.26	56.59 to 85.26	165,882	124,487
2	3	56.03	64.41	63.36	18.76	101.66	52.84	84.36	N/A	88,563	56,112
3	2	80.96	80.96	80.93	01.79	100.04	79.51	82.41	N/A	117,500	95,093
Grass											
County	29	69.88	69.81	73.65	16.16	94.79	46.76	93.63	57.92 to 78.00	194,853	143,516
1	1	69.16	69.16	69.16	00.00	100.00	69.16	69.16	N/A	70,000	48,410
2	26	72.14	69.73	74.31	15.64	93.84	46.76	93.63	57.92 to 78.00	203,570	151,282
3	2	71.19	71.19	62.60	23.33	113.72	54.58	87.80	N/A	143,950	90,110
ALL	69	69.43	68.90	67.52	18.55	102.04	35.86	103.42	60.30 to 76.64	227,114	153,352

54 Knox
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 : 75
 Total Sales Price : 17,526,406
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,289,211
 Total Assessed Value : 11,581,557
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 230,523
 Avg. Assessed Value : 154,421

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 67
 MEAN : 69
 COD : 18.88
 PRD : 102.97

COV : 22.21
 STD : 15.32
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.06
 MAX Sales Ratio : 103.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.86

95% Median C.I. : 60.30 to 76.37
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.97 to 71.01
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.51 to 72.45

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:52PM

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	4	88.03	90.25	93.09	09.22	96.95	81.85	103.10	N/A	149,175	138,870
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	82.31	80.61	80.40	04.54	100.26	74.40	85.26	N/A	297,395	239,116
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	11	72.45	72.25	73.61	17.82	98.15	52.88	103.42	55.50 to 93.63	173,568	127,764
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	7	57.15	61.37	57.48	15.36	106.77	48.56	79.51	48.56 to 79.51	360,432	207,176
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	69.43	72.01	68.38	13.93	105.31	58.79	87.80	N/A	197,475	135,037
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	65.74	63.78	62.30	09.61	102.38	50.39	76.25	52.84 to 72.60	187,005	116,504
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	7	55.14	58.55	55.25	12.01	105.97	48.11	86.01	48.11 to 86.01	138,721	76,650
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	57.50	64.91	55.68	26.97	116.58	35.86	100.10	35.86 to 100.10	175,952	97,962
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	46.76	46.76	46.76	00.00	100.00	46.76	46.76	N/A	58,000	27,120
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	76.37	70.82	70.23	12.35	100.84	47.01	85.85	59.60 to 82.34	339,251	238,266
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	79.44	75.73	74.02	08.28	102.31	60.30	83.76	N/A	223,582	165,504
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	8	67.51	68.15	63.50	21.26	107.32	47.29	96.40	47.29 to 96.40	284,806	180,858
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	27	76.64	73.64	70.70	16.70	104.16	48.56	103.42	57.15 to 82.41	241,331	170,618
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	26	58.52	63.58	60.02	17.81	105.93	35.86	100.10	55.57 to 68.58	172,663	103,634
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	22	73.13	69.65	68.12	16.89	102.25	46.76	96.40	59.60 to 80.87	285,638	194,563
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	31	66.37	67.04	64.19	16.18	104.44	48.56	103.42	57.15 to 72.60	222,411	142,767
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	23	58.24	64.50	64.15	21.93	100.55	35.86	100.10	55.14 to 76.75	223,392	143,297
<u>ALL</u>	75	69.16	68.98	66.99	18.88	102.97	35.86	103.42	60.30 to 76.37	230,523	154,421

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	15	69.16	69.47	67.20	18.15	103.38	48.21	103.10	56.59 to 83.76	255,012	171,374
2	53	68.58	68.70	68.13	19.41	100.84	35.86	103.42	59.60 to 76.75	209,424	142,676
3	7	72.60	70.07	61.29	16.05	114.33	54.58	87.80	54.58 to 87.80	337,793	207,017
<u>ALL</u>	75	69.16	68.98	66.99	18.88	102.97	35.86	103.42	60.30 to 76.37	230,523	154,421

54 Knox
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 : 75
 Total Sales Price : 17,526,406
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,289,211
 Total Assessed Value : 11,581,557
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 230,523
 Avg. Assessed Value : 154,421

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 67
 MEAN : 69
 COD : 18.88
 PRD : 102.97

COV : 22.21
 STD : 15.32
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.06
 MAX Sales Ratio : 103.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.86

95% Median C.I. : 60.30 to 76.37
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.97 to 71.01
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.51 to 72.45

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:52PM

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
Irrigated											
County	1	47.01	47.01	47.01	00.00	100.00	47.01	47.01	N/A	397,149	186,690
2	1	47.01	47.01	47.01	00.00	100.00	47.01	47.01	N/A	397,149	186,690
Dry											
County	9	79.51	73.85	73.03	12.54	101.12	52.84	86.01	58.79 to 85.26	129,145	94,310
1	5	69.74	72.78	72.77	12.58	100.01	58.79	85.26	N/A	159,862	116,337
2	2	69.43	69.43	60.10	23.89	115.52	52.84	86.01	N/A	64,000	38,462
3	2	80.96	80.96	80.93	01.79	100.04	79.51	82.41	N/A	117,500	95,093
Grass											
County	25	69.16	68.69	72.82	16.31	94.33	46.76	87.80	56.76 to 78.00	181,078	131,860
1	1	69.16	69.16	69.16	00.00	100.00	69.16	69.16	N/A	70,000	48,410
2	22	71.49	68.44	73.59	15.81	93.00	46.76	85.85	55.97 to 78.00	189,502	139,449
3	2	71.19	71.19	62.60	23.33	113.72	54.58	87.80	N/A	143,950	90,110
ALL	75	69.16	68.98	66.99	18.88	102.97	35.86	103.42	60.30 to 76.37	230,523	154,421

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	50.93	57.21	54.17	24.52	105.61	35.86	103.10	35.86 to 103.10	411,103	222,693
1	3	57.15	69.49	61.96	32.02	112.15	48.21	103.10	N/A	451,192	279,560
2	4	48.97	48.01	47.25	13.44	101.61	35.86	58.24	N/A	381,037	180,042
Dry											
County	14	78.08	73.06	74.28	13.61	98.36	52.84	86.01	56.59 to 84.46	132,554	98,464
1	8	73.19	72.70	75.05	13.43	96.87	56.59	85.26	56.59 to 85.26	165,882	124,487
2	4	70.20	69.81	65.52	21.91	106.55	52.84	86.01	N/A	73,423	48,105
3	2	80.96	80.96	80.93	01.79	100.04	79.51	82.41	N/A	117,500	95,093
Grass											
County	29	69.88	69.81	73.65	16.16	94.79	46.76	93.63	57.92 to 78.00	194,853	143,516
1	1	69.16	69.16	69.16	00.00	100.00	69.16	69.16	N/A	70,000	48,410
2	26	72.14	69.73	74.31	15.64	93.84	46.76	93.63	57.92 to 78.00	203,570	151,282
3	2	71.19	71.19	62.60	23.33	113.72	54.58	87.80	N/A	143,950	90,110
ALL	75	69.16	68.98	66.99	18.88	102.97	35.86	103.42	60.30 to 76.37	230,523	154,421

**2011 Correlation Section
for Knox County**

A. Agricultural Land

Knox County has three market areas within the county. Area 1 tends to have more tillable acres, area 2 is utilized more for grassland characteristics and area 3 has more of a mixture of characteristics and is hillier. When looking at the comparability of the surrounding counties, it was determined that land within six miles as well as beyond six miles of the county was comparable. Cedar and Pierce for market one, Boyd, Holt and Antelope for market two and Cedar for market three.

In the base statistic, which is comprised of 64 total sales within Knox County, the distribution of the sales among the three year study period for all areas was reviewed for adequacy, proportionality and representativeness. The sample was not proportionately distributed, nor representative of the make-up of land uses within market area 1 and 3. In market area 1 irrigated land is over representative in the sales file. Market area 3 dry land is over representative. The acceptable thresholds were met for market 2 in the base statistics.

In both the random inclusion and random exclusion samples all sales from comparable areas that adjoin the county were brought in. The search for comparables was extended beyond six miles as there was a lack of newer sales. For market area 1 the sample is now representative of the make-up of land uses in the county. While the threshold for time distribution was not able to be achieved, the sample is reliable because the subclasses within the county are at the same relative proportion of market value. The acceptable thresholds were not able to be met for market area 3 even after extending beyond six miles.

In analyzing the three sets of statistics, the statistical measures of the overall class and subclasses correlate fairly closely. Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are within the acceptable ranges. Based on the assessment practices, the sales review, and the analysis of the agricultural market it is believed that the agricultural properties in Knox County have been treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 69% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 10,857	Value : 921,339,915	Growth 8,233,353	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	305	997,370	16	59,755	12	97,765	333	1,154,890	
02. Res Improve Land	2,242	7,142,740	67	1,201,425	287	5,043,165	2,596	13,387,330	
03. Res Improvements	2,289	79,985,425	72	4,470,345	317	16,757,790	2,678	101,213,560	
04. Res Total	2,594	88,125,535	88	5,731,525	329	21,898,720	3,011	115,755,780	1,161,940
% of Res Total	86.15	76.13	2.92	4.95	10.93	18.92	27.73	12.56	14.11
05. Com UnImp Land	61	173,320	6	10,050	3	16,490	70	199,860	
06. Com Improve Land	463	1,690,245	24	251,045	23	892,775	510	2,834,065	
07. Com Improvements	472	18,481,190	25	2,049,660	32	7,292,505	529	27,823,355	
08. Com Total	533	20,344,755	31	2,310,755	35	8,201,770	599	30,857,280	1,349,483
% of Com Total	88.98	65.93	5.18	7.49	5.84	26.58	5.52	3.35	16.39
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	1,179	8,625,365	1,179	8,625,365	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	489	9,926,200	489	9,926,200	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	1	10,310	649	54,770,095	650	54,780,405	
16. Rec Total	0	0	1	10,310	1,828	73,321,660	1,829	73,331,970	2,860,060
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.01	99.95	99.99	16.85	7.96	34.74
Res & Rec Total	2,594	88,125,535	89	5,741,835	2,157	95,220,380	4,840	189,087,750	4,022,000
% of Res & Rec Total	53.60	46.61	1.84	3.04	44.57	50.36	44.58	20.52	48.85
Com & Ind Total	533	20,344,755	31	2,310,755	35	8,201,770	599	30,857,280	1,349,483
% of Com & Ind Total	88.98	65.93	5.18	7.49	5.84	26.58	5.52	3.35	16.39
17. Taxable Total	3,127	108,470,290	120	8,052,590	2,192	103,422,150	5,439	219,945,030	5,371,483
% of Taxable Total	57.49	49.32	2.21	3.66	40.30	47.02	50.10	23.87	65.24

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	11,380	808,570	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	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	1	11,380	808,570
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	11,380	808,570

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	404	77	707	1,188

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	220	14,001,440	3,749	404,882,835	3,969	418,884,275
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	114	14,366,135	1,286	205,043,415	1,400	219,409,550
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	115	5,332,440	1,334	57,768,620	1,449	63,101,060
30. Ag Total							5,418	701,394,885

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	91	96.00	391,200	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	92	94.00	4,441,900	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	15	30.23	40,655	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	108	474.38	497,980	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	87	0.00	890,540	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	425.14	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	14	14.00	56,000	14	14.00	56,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	933	988.68	3,952,715	1,024	1,084.68	4,343,915	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,053	981.68	41,158,060	1,145	1,075.68	45,599,960	2,861,870
34. HomeSite Total				1,159	1,098.68	49,999,875	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	232	476.51	504,555	247	506.74	545,210	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,239	6,757.36	6,884,975	1,347	7,231.74	7,382,955	
37. FarmSite Improvements	973	0.00	16,610,560	1,060	0.00	17,501,100	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,307	7,738.48	25,429,265	
39. Road & Ditches	0	10,080.40	0	0	10,505.54	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				2,466	19,342.70	75,429,140	2,861,870

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	7	888.00	531,415	7	888.00	531,415

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	2,675.11	8.19%	5,818,395	9.50%	2,175.01
46. 1A	9,418.89	28.84%	20,476,140	33.44%	2,173.94
47. 2A1	2,176.89	6.67%	4,505,750	7.36%	2,069.81
48. 2A	1,614.81	4.94%	3,172,815	5.18%	1,964.82
49. 3A1	3,211.63	9.83%	5,748,695	9.39%	1,789.96
50. 3A	1,009.77	3.09%	1,751,795	2.86%	1,734.85
51. 4A1	12,120.30	37.11%	19,077,710	31.16%	1,574.03
52. 4A	430.22	1.32%	677,445	1.11%	1,574.65
53. Total	32,657.62	100.00%	61,228,745	100.00%	1,874.87
Dry					
54. 1D1	5,207.50	6.08%	10,519,120	7.07%	2,019.99
55. 1D	28,062.10	32.79%	56,545,180	38.01%	2,015.00
56. 2D1	4,103.11	4.79%	8,062,635	5.42%	1,965.01
57. 2D	3,327.20	3.89%	6,253,850	4.20%	1,879.61
58. 3D1	8,730.86	10.20%	15,540,875	10.45%	1,779.99
59. 3D	1,552.06	1.81%	2,599,820	1.75%	1,675.08
60. 4D1	33,926.73	39.64%	48,515,385	32.61%	1,430.00
61. 4D	676.29	0.79%	743,930	0.50%	1,100.02
62. Total	85,585.85	100.00%	148,780,795	100.00%	1,738.38
Grass					
63. 1G1	532.83	1.61%	346,385	1.80%	650.09
64. 1G	4,769.64	14.41%	3,100,560	16.13%	650.06
65. 2G1	1,848.79	5.59%	1,164,775	6.06%	630.02
66. 2G	2,047.98	6.19%	1,290,240	6.71%	630.01
67. 3G1	2,145.27	6.48%	1,212,035	6.31%	564.98
68. 3G	3,322.89	10.04%	1,877,520	9.77%	565.03
69. 4G1	12,657.81	38.25%	7,025,175	36.55%	555.01
70. 4G	5,770.79	17.44%	3,202,810	16.66%	555.00
71. Total	33,096.00	100.00%	19,219,500	100.00%	580.72
Irrigated Total					
	32,657.62	21.51%	61,228,745	26.68%	1,874.87
Dry Total					
	85,585.85	56.37%	148,780,795	64.84%	1,738.38
Grass Total					
	33,096.00	21.80%	19,219,500	8.38%	580.72
72. Waste	82.17	0.05%	4,110	0.00%	50.02
73. Other	413.27	0.27%	224,895	0.10%	544.18
74. Exempt	1,047.55	0.69%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	151,834.91	100.00%	229,458,045	100.00%	1,511.23

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	3,077.25	13.22%	5,015,915	15.50%	1,630.00
46. 1A	2,404.04	10.33%	3,750,310	11.59%	1,560.00
47. 2A1	3,366.64	14.46%	5,016,285	15.50%	1,490.00
48. 2A	4,842.91	20.81%	6,707,415	20.72%	1,385.00
49. 3A1	2,902.34	12.47%	3,860,070	11.93%	1,329.99
50. 3A	2,718.49	11.68%	3,466,090	10.71%	1,275.01
51. 4A1	3,454.07	14.84%	3,989,505	12.33%	1,155.02
52. 4A	511.73	2.20%	562,905	1.74%	1,100.00
53. Total	23,277.47	100.00%	32,368,495	100.00%	1,390.55
Dry					
54. 1D1	11,120.45	15.15%	11,175,320	19.98%	1,004.93
55. 1D	11,877.99	16.18%	11,102,315	19.84%	934.70
56. 2D1	6,883.12	9.38%	6,056,465	10.83%	879.90
57. 2D	15,648.95	21.32%	11,189,055	20.00%	715.00
58. 3D1	5,755.81	7.84%	3,712,160	6.64%	644.94
59. 3D	3,000.53	4.09%	1,770,355	3.16%	590.01
60. 4D1	17,437.60	23.76%	10,201,105	18.23%	585.01
61. 4D	1,678.68	2.29%	738,565	1.32%	439.97
62. Total	73,403.13	100.00%	55,945,340	100.00%	762.17
Grass					
63. 1G1	2,560.59	1.03%	1,761,035	1.03%	687.75
64. 1G	8,186.48	3.29%	5,668,300	3.31%	692.40
65. 2G1	6,290.52	2.53%	4,224,600	2.46%	671.58
66. 2G	16,109.76	6.48%	11,090,995	6.47%	688.46
67. 3G1	8,868.80	3.57%	6,028,840	3.52%	679.78
68. 3G	16,541.35	6.65%	11,292,115	6.58%	682.66
69. 4G1	73,754.99	29.66%	51,025,440	29.75%	691.82
70. 4G	116,361.17	46.79%	80,395,065	46.88%	690.91
71. Total	248,673.66	100.00%	171,486,390	100.00%	689.60
Irrigated Total					
	23,277.47	6.42%	32,368,495	12.38%	1,390.55
Dry Total					
	73,403.13	20.23%	55,945,340	21.40%	762.17
Grass Total					
	248,673.66	68.55%	171,486,390	65.61%	689.60
72. Waste	8,360.77	2.30%	1,051,605	0.40%	125.78
73. Other	9,038.54	2.49%	540,180	0.21%	59.76
74. Exempt	11,682.91	3.22%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	362,753.57	100.00%	261,392,010	100.00%	720.58

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	380.05	4.39%	687,890	5.53%	1,810.00
46. 1A	1,862.99	21.54%	3,293,015	26.45%	1,767.60
47. 2A1	661.70	7.65%	1,117,075	8.97%	1,688.19
48. 2A	1,247.57	14.42%	1,945,485	15.63%	1,559.42
49. 3A1	528.24	6.11%	754,540	6.06%	1,428.40
50. 3A	202.75	2.34%	260,270	2.09%	1,283.70
51. 4A1	3,562.63	41.19%	4,161,795	33.43%	1,168.18
52. 4A	204.15	2.36%	228,370	1.83%	1,118.64
53. Total	8,650.08	100.00%	12,448,440	100.00%	1,439.11
Dry					
54. 1D1	4,375.28	8.70%	6,231,535	9.85%	1,424.26
55. 1D	12,572.31	25.01%	17,287,055	27.31%	1,375.01
56. 2D1	3,578.29	7.12%	4,884,170	7.72%	1,364.95
57. 2D	5,773.52	11.49%	7,792,080	12.31%	1,349.62
58. 3D1	2,671.78	5.32%	3,471,130	5.48%	1,299.18
59. 3D	548.03	1.09%	657,640	1.04%	1,200.01
60. 4D1	19,866.89	39.52%	22,151,650	35.00%	1,115.00
61. 4D	881.65	1.75%	815,525	1.29%	925.00
62. Total	50,267.75	100.00%	63,290,785	100.00%	1,259.07
Grass					
63. 1G1	527.96	0.68%	414,425	0.70%	784.96
64. 1G	5,221.49	6.76%	4,098,750	6.95%	784.98
65. 2G1	2,982.54	3.86%	2,296,565	3.90%	770.00
66. 2G	2,628.39	3.40%	2,023,850	3.43%	770.00
67. 3G1	2,540.04	3.29%	1,955,815	3.32%	769.99
68. 3G	1,335.86	1.73%	1,028,605	1.74%	769.99
69. 4G1	28,017.37	36.27%	21,293,215	36.12%	760.00
70. 4G	34,000.09	44.01%	25,840,075	43.83%	760.00
71. Total	77,253.74	100.00%	58,951,300	100.00%	763.09
Irrigated Total					
	8,650.08	6.14%	12,448,440	9.21%	1,439.11
Dry Total					
	50,267.75	35.67%	63,290,785	46.84%	1,259.07
Grass Total					
	77,253.74	54.82%	58,951,300	43.63%	763.09
72. Waste	1,498.21	1.06%	74,955	0.06%	50.03
73. Other	3,247.61	2.30%	350,210	0.26%	107.84
74. Exempt	11,248.09	7.98%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	140,917.39	100.00%	135,115,690	100.00%	958.83

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	2,811.92	4,697,895	61,773.25	101,347,785	64,585.17	106,045,680
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	12,696.53	15,350,105	196,560.20	252,666,815	209,256.73	268,016,920
78. Grass	0.00	0	10,685.42	7,327,755	348,337.98	242,329,435	359,023.40	249,657,190
79. Waste	0.00	0	352.71	30,355	9,588.44	1,100,315	9,941.15	1,130,670
80. Other	0.00	0	468.26	31,630	12,231.16	1,083,655	12,699.42	1,115,285
81. Exempt	0.00	0	1,907.33	0	22,071.22	0	23,978.55	0
82. Total	0.00	0	27,014.84	27,437,740	628,491.03	598,528,005	655,505.87	625,965,745

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	64,585.17	9.85%	106,045,680	16.94%	1,641.95
Dry Land	209,256.73	31.92%	268,016,920	42.82%	1,280.80
Grass	359,023.40	54.77%	249,657,190	39.88%	695.38
Waste	9,941.15	1.52%	1,130,670	0.18%	113.74
Other	12,699.42	1.94%	1,115,285	0.18%	87.82
Exempt	23,978.55	3.66%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	655,505.87	100.00%	625,965,745	100.00%	954.94

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

54 Knox

	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	114,132,150	115,755,780	1,623,630	1.42%	1,161,940	0.40%
02. Recreational	69,908,240	73,331,970	3,423,730	4.90%	2,860,060	0.81%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	49,543,610	49,999,875	456,265	0.92%	2,861,870	-4.86%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	233,584,000	239,087,625	5,503,625	2.36%	6,883,870	-0.59%
05. Commercial	29,434,845	30,857,280	1,422,435	4.83%	1,349,483	0.25%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	23,901,230	25,429,265	1,528,035	6.39%	0	6.39%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	53,336,075	56,286,545	2,950,470	5.53%	1,349,483	3.00%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	286,920,075	295,374,170	8,454,095	2.95%	8,233,353	0.08%
11. Irrigated	98,986,065	106,045,680	7,059,615	7.13%		
12. Dryland	255,894,345	268,016,920	12,122,575	4.74%		
13. Grassland	251,386,255	249,657,190	-1,729,065	-0.69%		
14. Wasteland	1,126,465	1,130,670	4,205	0.37%		
15. Other Agland	351,400	1,115,285	763,885	217.38%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	607,744,530	625,965,745	18,221,215	3.00%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	894,664,605	921,339,915	26,675,310	2.98%	8,233,353	2.06%

2010 Knox County 3 year Plan of Assessment

<u>County Description</u>	<u>Parcels</u>		<u>Valuation</u>
Residential/Recreational	4831	20.46%	183,056,735
Commercial	613	3.30%	29,592,040
Agricultural	<u>5398</u>	<u>76.24%</u>	<u>682,333,295</u>
Totals	10,842	100%	\$894,982,070

2010-2011 Budget, Staffing and Training

Assessor Budget-\$ 156,107

Re-Appraisal Budget-\$ 53,305

Staff

1 Assessor

1 Deputy Assessor

2 Full Time Clerks/Appraisers

All staff functions are performed by everyone in the office. This makes all help accessible at all times to any customer. The Assessor does all of the reports.

Contract Appraiser-none

Training

As the Assessor, I have attended all workshops and completed my educational hours needed to maintain my Assessor Certificate. The Deputy Assessor, Assessor Assistant and the office clerks all try to attend school on a regular basis. The GoToMeeting training is a good idea for education for hours that are so hard to find otherwise.

2010 R & O Statistics

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	93.00%	16.29	107.90
Commercial	97.00%	15.47	107.34
Agricultural	70.00%	18.27	99.57

3 Year Appraisal Plan

2011

Residential

Appraisal maintenance for all towns and lake area will be maintained. This includes review and pickup work. Sale reviews include questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property, if not just done in the recent past. We make all efforts to talk to either the buyer or the seller. All building permits and information statements are physically reviewed. We continually review all files for accuracy and correct statistics.

Commercial

Appraisal maintenance will be the agenda for all commercial properties. Knox County generally has a low number of commercial sales with many single type sales. Normally it is very hard to compare because of the uniqueness and the small number of properties selling.

Agricultural

Review of all rural properties began ahead of schedule in July 2009. We are conducting a total sight review of all farm buildings and rural homes. The actual review work should be completed this winter, 2011. All data entry will be done by my office help. A two and a half year time span to complete this project is planned. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification groupings will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map in our office showing the market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house, by myself, using all information collected. My liaison is also asked for advice. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed by the office staff. GIS updates are continuing. The 2009 aerial map was obtained in January 2010 and the new 2010 aerial will be available yet in 2010. This makes for a very vigorous review time frame.

Other

We are using new property record cards for the rural updates and we are transferring the five year data to the new files and putting the old records, which have been in use since 1975, in storage. Personnel shall continue to transfer all information, gather personal property, file homestead exemptions, work within the sales rosters and set the yearly values, file abstract, handle all 521 transfer statements and get the required

original into the state department one and one-half months after the sale date, implement 521 sale transfers, change property names, handle the splits, maintain property record cards, generate yearly records, review all sales, keep mapping up to date, generate the valuation change notices, prepare omitted and undervalued notices, hear protests, review and visit each protest sight, figure growth, prepare centrally assessed values, generate valuations and distribute, certify school values, correct sales file roster, prepare charitable exemptions, generate trust land reports, combine and balance levies, prepare Certified Tax List, prepare school aid reports, generate tax roles, tax list corrections, prepare update with FSA records and update CRP records and prepare for TERC.

2012

Residential

We shall begin field inspections on the residential lake areas along the Missouri and Niobrara Rivers. A physical inspection will be done on each individual property. All information will be verified and new digital photos will be taken. Yearly appraisal maintenance will be done for the residential lake and city, which includes sales review and pickup work. Sale review includes a physical inspection of the property. We try to contact either the buyer or the seller. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics. A total lake review shall begin with door to door review.

Commercial

Commercial maintenance will be conducted for 2012. Knox County normally does not have a large number of sales in commercial property. A market analysis will continue to be done as in the past. Sales review and pickup work will continue as before

Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map showing market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house, by me, using all the information collected and with the advice of the state liaison. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed for agricultural properties. Personnel will continue to update ag land properties. GIS updates will continue as each new yearly aerial is received.

Other

Personnel will continue with entering land use into the GIS system. I shall possibly order property record cards for residential properties and transfer all information, gather personal property, file homestead exemptions, work within the sales rosters and set the

yearly values, file abstract, implement 521's sale transfers, change property names, handle the splits, maintain property record cards, generate yearly records, review all sales, keep mapping up to date, generate the valuation change notices, prepare omitted and undervalued notices, hear protests, review and visit each protest sight, figure growth, prepare centrally assessed values, generate valuations and distribute, certify school values, correct sales file roster, prepare charitable exemptions, generate trust land reports, combine and balance levies, prepare Certified Tax List, prepare school aid reports, generate tax roles, tax list corrections, prepare update with FSA records and update CRP records and prepare for TERC.

2013

Residential

Review work shall continue on the lake properties and finalized for 2013. Yearly maintenance will include sale reviews and pickup work. Sale reviews include questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property, if not just done in the recent past. We make all efforts to talk to either the buyer or the seller. All building permits and information statements are physically reviewed. We continually review all files for accuracy and correct statistics.

Commercial

Appraisal maintenance will be the agenda for all commercial properties. Knox County generally has a low number of commercial sales with many single type sales. Normally it is very hard to compare because of the uniqueness and the small number of properties selling.

Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification groupings will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map in our office showing the market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house, by myself, using all information collected. My liaison is also asked for advice. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed by the office staff. GIS updates are continuing. The 2009 aerial map was obtained in January 2010 and the new 2010 aerial will be available yet in 2010. This makes for a very vigorous review time frame.

Other

Personnel shall continue to transfer all information, gather personal property, file homestead exemptions, work within the sales rosters and set the yearly values, file abstract, handle all 521 transfer statements and get the required original into the state department one and one-half months after the sale date, implement 521 sale transfers, change property names, handle the splits, maintain property record cards, generate yearly

records, review all sales, keep mapping up to date, generate the valuation change notices, prepare omitted and undervalued notices, hear protests, review and visit each protest sight, figure growth, prepare centrally assessed values, generate valuations and distribute, certify school values, correct sales file roster, prepare charitable exemptions, generate trust land reports, combine and balance levies, prepare Certified Tax List, prepare school aid reports, generate tax roles, tax list corrections, prepare update with FSA records and update CRP records and prepare for TERC.

<u>Class</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Residential	Market Analysis	Begin lake Review Market Analysis	Finalize lake Review Market Analysis
Commercial	Market Analysis	Market Analysis	Market Analysis
Agricultural	Continue Farm Site Entry Continue Upgrading Ag Land Files GIS Updates Market Analysis	Continue Upgrading Ag Files for GIS Updates Market Analysis	GIS Updates Market Analysis

2011 Assessment Survey for Knox County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$156,107
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$0
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$0
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	\$53,305
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$22,500
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,500
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$0
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	\$0

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Terra Scan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Using GIS but still mark cadastral maps
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	All help/specifically Connie since she does sales
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	GIS Workshop

6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Christa
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All towns and villages-Bazile Mills, Bloomfield, Center, Creighton, Crofton, Niobrara, Santee, Verdel, Wausa, Winetoon and Verdigre
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	July 1995

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	In House
2.	Other services:
	None

2011 Certification for Knox 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 Knox 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

