

# 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 Phelps County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	272	Median	93.62
Total Sales Price	\$22,215,803	Mean	101.67
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$22,287,128	Wgt. Mean	92.31
Total Assessed Value	\$20,572,909	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$75,674
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$81,938	Avg. Assessed Value	\$75,636

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.43 to 95.11
95% Mean C.I	89.68 to 94.94
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	96.73 to 106.61
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	28.03
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.13
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.13

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	265	94	94
2009	270	94	94
2008	319	94	94
2007	318	93	93

## 2011 Commission Summary for Phelps County

---

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	36	Median	98.04
Total Sales Price	\$3,929,001	Mean	104.11
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,926,501	Wgt. Mean	94.00
Total Assessed Value	\$3,690,742	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$127,733
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$109,069	Avg. Assessed Value	\$102,521

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.02 to 99.54
95% Mean C.I	85.81 to 122.41
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	85.49 to 102.50
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	6.93
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.44
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.17

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	50	98	98
2009	45	99	99
2008	43	94	94
2007	37	97	97



## 2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Phelps 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
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>94</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>71</b>	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*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## **2011 Assessment Actions for Phelps County**

### **taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Residential**

A physical inspection of rural homes in Laird, Westmark, Williamsburg, Cottonwood, Anderson, Center, Sheridan & Divide townships was completed. The three year plan indicated that the rural review would not be completed for this year. Only Lake and Prairie townships were not done for 2011, and will be completed next year. Questionnaires are left at each property if no one is home at the time of the inspection.

The costing tables were updated to the 2010 tables.

A sales study was completed of all residential parcels. The study indicated that the depreciation tables for bi-level homes and homes built in the early 1990's needed to be adjusted. Additionally, the economic depreciation for Atlanta and for the rural area was changed. Within Holdrege, the good quality homes appeared to be assessed low, so they received less depreciation for 2011.

A lot value study was also completed. Residential lot values within Atlanta were slightly decreased; all other lot values remained unchanged.

The pickup work was completed timely.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Phelps County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The assessor & staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Holdrege – Largest community in the county, strong economic growth, with active businesses and schools.
	02	Bertrand & Loomis – these are midsize villages. They have their own school systems and some local businesses/amenities.
	03	Funk & Atlanta – small villages with no schools or local businesses. The market is somewhat sporadic in these small villages.
	04	Rural – homes outside of the political subdivisions
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Both the sales comparison and the cost approach are used in the residential class.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	2008	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	Lots are priced by the square foot and by the acre. Lot values are established by neighborhood, village, or location in the rural area.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	December, 2008 is used for the entire residential class.	
7.	<b>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?</b>	
	The depreciation tables are developed using local market information.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	No, one physical depreciation table is established for all residential parcels countywide. Economic depreciation is developed and applied by location when warranted.	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	The current tables were last updated in 2009; however, they are reviewed yearly and updated as needed.	
10.	<b>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?</b>	
	Yes	
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>	
	Typically, a parcel is considered substantially changed when a dwelling has either	

	been added to or removed from a parcel. However, major remodels, additions, or the construction of a new garage may also result in a sale being considered substantially changed.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>
	The county does not have any written policies or procedures for use in the residential class, but refers to Statutes and Regulations when necessary.

**69 Phelps**  
**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 : 272  
 Total Sales Price : 22,215,803  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,287,128  
 Total Assessed Value : 20,572,909  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 81,938  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 75,636

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 92  
 MEAN : 102  
 COD : 25.21  
 PRD : 110.14

COV : 40.89  
 STD : 41.57  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.60  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 395.20  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 20.91

95% Median C.I. : 91.43 to 95.11  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.68 to 94.94  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.73 to 106.61

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:32PM

**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	36	95.86	95.60	91.43	15.14	104.56	63.87	133.63	87.08 to 105.26	70,758	64,697
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	32	91.59	93.42	88.16	25.12	105.97	34.11	226.37	77.59 to 99.17	80,656	71,106
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	31	93.30	105.13	99.28	23.97	105.89	70.56	214.82	88.49 to 106.14	84,713	84,100
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	46	94.71	105.99	94.36	26.95	112.33	53.75	337.00	87.82 to 109.98	76,189	71,891
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	31	95.11	117.00	92.82	39.11	126.05	44.31	395.20	84.54 to 105.99	85,831	79,667
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	27	102.16	105.28	94.22	29.81	111.74	20.91	206.17	82.93 to 117.58	68,450	64,492
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	36	93.95	102.69	91.24	21.71	112.55	64.32	286.68	90.13 to 96.67	91,149	83,163
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	33	90.06	88.59	88.01	18.33	100.66	39.98	162.49	78.16 to 95.29	98,115	86,349
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	145	93.92	100.45	93.42	23.04	107.53	34.11	337.00	92.19 to 96.50	77,649	72,542
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	127	93.05	103.07	91.17	27.76	113.05	20.91	395.20	90.06 to 95.39	86,835	79,168
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	135	94.74	108.18	95.16	30.11	113.68	20.91	395.20	91.63 to 102.04	78,813	75,000
<u>ALL</u>	272	93.62	101.67	92.31	25.21	110.14	20.91	395.20	91.43 to 95.11	81,938	75,636

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	198	92.86	100.47	92.47	23.42	108.65	34.11	395.20	90.46 to 95.29	81,164	75,053
02	36	93.18	103.99	85.32	33.99	121.88	44.31	337.00	76.66 to 111.27	60,872	51,935
03	14	94.31	109.37	89.56	37.08	122.12	20.91	280.20	82.83 to 120.07	51,964	46,541
04	24	94.93	103.69	96.77	20.96	107.15	66.98	192.44	85.44 to 108.73	137,404	132,964
<u>ALL</u>	272	93.62	101.67	92.31	25.21	110.14	20.91	395.20	91.43 to 95.11	81,938	75,636

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	271	93.63	101.77	92.36	25.24	110.19	20.91	395.20	91.43 to 95.15	81,989	75,722
06											
07	1	76.88	76.88	76.88	00.00	100.00	76.88	76.88	N/A	68,000	52,275
<u>ALL</u>	272	93.62	101.67	92.31	25.21	110.14	20.91	395.20	91.43 to 95.11	81,938	75,636

**69 Phelps**  
**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 : 272  
 Total Sales Price : 22,215,803  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,287,128  
 Total Assessed Value : 20,572,909  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 81,938  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 75,636

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 92  
 MEAN : 102  
 COD : 25.21  
 PRD : 110.14

COV : 40.89  
 STD : 41.57  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.60  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 395.20  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 20.91

95% Median C.I. : 91.43 to 95.11  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.68 to 94.94  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.73 to 106.61

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:32PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	5	99.80	110.41	102.76	32.28	107.44	69.00	190.00	N/A	1,740	1,788	
5000 TO 9999	5	196.22	203.03	192.06	29.51	105.71	77.94	337.00	N/A	7,900	15,173	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	10	151.71	156.72	175.94	45.30	89.08	69.00	337.00	76.56 to 217.25	4,820	8,481	
10000 TO 29999	34	124.18	141.32	135.74	32.39	104.11	39.98	395.20	109.98 to 141.62	21,072	28,604	
30000 TO 59999	72	95.23	102.17	100.45	25.66	101.71	34.11	214.82	90.92 to 104.06	44,832	45,032	
60000 TO 99999	66	91.62	89.87	90.00	16.25	99.86	20.91	184.64	83.59 to 94.97	75,629	68,068	
100000 TO 149999	56	89.99	88.71	88.47	15.10	100.27	44.31	149.10	84.54 to 93.10	117,711	104,140	
150000 TO 249999	29	87.08	86.37	86.59	09.55	99.75	67.02	103.77	82.00 to 93.92	187,320	162,197	
250000 TO 499999	4	92.40	94.53	93.93	08.32	100.64	83.62	109.69	N/A	298,500	280,387	
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	272	93.62	101.67	92.31	25.21	110.14	20.91	395.20	91.43 to 95.11	81,938	75,636	



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Phelps County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

The residential statistical profile in Phelps County is reliable for measurement purposes. The median and the weighted mean correlate closely. The 95% median confidence interval is sufficiently narrow and supports a median within the acceptable range. The mean is slightly high and is impacted by outlier ratios. All valuation grouping substrata appear to be within the acceptable range.

The sales verification process in Phelps County includes mailing a letter and verification questionnaire to the seller and/or the buyer in the transaction. Occasionally, phone calls are made to either the buyer or seller or a professional involved in the transaction to clarify sale terms. A review of the qualified and non-qualified sales rosters revealed no bias in qualification determinations.

Phelps County is very active in completing their physical review work. The process employed by the assessor and her staff is very thorough; questionnaires are left at each property if no one is home at the time of the visit. The costing indexes are also kept up to date in the county, and were updated for the 2011 assessment year. Depreciation is annually reviewed and adjusted where warranted based on market information.

The qualitative statistics are well above the range recommended by the IAAO. A review of the sale price substrata in the statistical profile reveals that the calculated medians decrease as the sale price increases, indicating regressive assessments. While the county may want to review the valuation models prior to future appraisals, the statistical calculations are not conclusive determinants of assessment quality. The county has demonstrated processes that meet generally accepted mass appraisal standards. Based on assessment actions it is believed that assessments are uniform and proportionate within the residential class.

After reviewing all available information, the level of value of the residential class in Phelps County is determined to be 94%; all subclasses are within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Phelps 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 Phelps 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 Phelps 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 Phelps 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 Assessment Actions for Phelps County**

### **taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Commercial**

A physical inspection of all rural commercial parcels was completed. Physical review work also began within the City of Holdrege. All parcels west of Broadway Street were reviewed this year; the remainder of Holdrege will be finished for 2012.

A market analysis and review of the depreciation schedules was completed, no adjustments were made.

The pickup work was completed timely.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Phelps County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The assessor & staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Holdrege – Largest community in the county, strong economic growth, with active businesses and schools.
	02	Bertrand & Loomis – these are midsize villages. They have their own school systems and some local businesses/amenities.
	03	Funk & Atlanta – small villages with no schools or local businesses. There are very few commercial parcels within these villages and sales are very sporadic.
	04	Rural – parcels outside the political subdivisions
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	The sales comparison and the cost approach are used within the commercial class of property; the income approach is also developed where information is available.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	2009	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Lots are priced by the square foot and by the acre. Lots are valued by neighborhood, Village or location in the rural area.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2007 is used for the entire commercial class	
7.	<b>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?</b>	
	Depreciation tables are developed by the assessor and the contract appraiser using local market depreciation.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	One depreciation table is used countywide to establish physical depreciation; economic depreciation may also be applied by location when warranted.	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	The depreciation tables are reviewed annually and are updated when necessary.	
10.	<b>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?</b>	
	Yes	
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>	

	Generally, a parcel is considered to be substantially changed when an improvement has been added to or removed from a parcel. However, a parcel that has received major remodeling may also be coded substantially changed.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>
	The county does not have any written policies or procedures for use in the residential class, but refers to Statutes and Regulations when necessary.

**69 Phelps**  
**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 : 36  
Total Sales Price : 3,929,001  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,926,501  
Total Assessed Value : 3,690,742  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 109,069  
Avg. Assessed Value : 102,521

MEDIAN : 98  
WGT. MEAN : 94  
MEAN : 104  
COD : 25.51  
PRD : 110.76

COV : 53.80  
STD : 56.01  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 25.01  
MAX Sales Ratio : 388.57  
MIN Sales Ratio : 44.00

95% Median C.I. : 91.02 to 99.54  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.49 to 102.50  
95% Mean C.I. : 85.81 to 122.41

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:35PM

**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	3	98.57	98.56	98.55	00.66	100.01	97.58	99.54	N/A	53,000	52,233
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	98.46	98.22	97.94	01.08	100.29	95.97	100.00	N/A	197,500	193,430
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	99.20	99.20	99.20	00.00	100.00	99.20	99.20	N/A	200,000	198,400
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	94.74	90.73	90.41	07.15	100.35	77.75	98.66	N/A	72,800	65,820
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	101.88	98.37	101.13	08.83	97.27	79.78	109.92	N/A	131,875	133,369
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	85.63	118.49	92.39	52.76	128.25	67.14	202.69	N/A	101,667	93,930
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	85.52	85.52	80.10	07.96	106.77	78.71	92.33	N/A	147,500	118,141
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	112.00	108.30	102.37	19.76	105.79	63.33	151.00	63.33 to 151.00	36,500	37,366
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	53.14	53.14	51.73	17.20	102.73	44.00	62.27	N/A	26,000	13,450
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	388.57	388.57	388.57	00.00	100.00	388.57	388.57	N/A	3,500	13,600
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	99.57	91.87	92.86	17.62	98.93	61.70	114.33	N/A	300,000	278,567
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	58.02	58.02	58.02	00.00	100.00	58.02	58.02	N/A	75,000	43,515
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	13	98.35	95.50	96.36	03.60	99.11	77.75	100.00	94.74 to 99.20	116,385	112,148
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	16	95.65	104.88	94.95	24.81	110.46	63.33	202.69	79.78 to 121.50	86,438	82,069
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	62.27	118.35	89.25	100.66	132.61	44.00	388.57	44.00 to 388.57	147,214	131,388
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	13	97.73	100.14	96.15	17.66	104.15	67.14	202.69	79.78 to 104.80	107,423	103,290
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	91.79	118.67	88.84	51.09	133.58	44.00	388.57	63.33 to 128.00	50,500	44,862
<u>ALL</u>	36	98.04	104.11	94.00	25.51	110.76	44.00	388.57	91.02 to 99.54	109,069	102,521

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	22	98.04	108.02	91.42	32.69	118.16	44.00	388.57	79.78 to 104.80	114,773	104,926
02	11	98.57	98.42	96.06	14.50	102.46	62.27	151.00	77.75 to 121.50	49,318	47,373
04	3	95.97	96.34	100.27	12.37	96.08	78.71	114.33	N/A	286,333	287,094
<u>ALL</u>	36	98.04	104.11	94.00	25.51	110.76	44.00	388.57	91.02 to 99.54	109,069	102,521

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	1	99.57	99.57	99.57	00.00	100.00	99.57	99.57	N/A	115,000	114,500
03	35	97.73	104.24	93.83	26.28	111.09	44.00	388.57	91.02 to 99.20	108,900	102,178
04											
<u>ALL</u>	36	98.04	104.11	94.00	25.51	110.76	44.00	388.57	91.02 to 99.54	109,069	102,521



**69 Phelps**  
**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 : 36  
Total Sales Price : 3,929,001  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,926,501  
Total Assessed Value : 3,690,742  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 109,069  
Avg. Assessed Value : 102,521

MEDIAN : 98  
WGT. MEAN : 94  
MEAN : 104  
COD : 25.51  
PRD : 110.76

COV : 53.80  
STD : 56.01  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 25.01  
MAX Sales Ratio : 388.57  
MIN Sales Ratio : 44.00

95% Median C.I. : 91.02 to 99.54  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.49 to 102.50  
95% Mean C.I. : 85.81 to 122.41

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:35PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	3	128.00	209.52	267.08	72.02	78.45	112.00	388.57	N/A	2,167	5,787	
5000 TO 9999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	8,000	8,000	
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	4	120.00	182.14	174.90	63.45	104.14	100.00	388.57	N/A	3,625	6,340	
10000 TO 29999	5	94.74	87.79	89.03	10.58	98.61	62.27	98.57	N/A	25,520	22,720	
30000 TO 59999	8	91.79	105.74	107.67	39.38	98.21	44.00	202.69	44.00 to 202.69	36,250	39,030	
60000 TO 99999	5	97.73	91.53	90.66	09.98	100.96	58.02	104.80	N/A	68,700	62,283	
100000 TO 149999	6	93.50	88.35	88.75	10.40	99.55	67.14	99.57	67.14 to 99.57	118,483	105,158	
150000 TO 249999	3	99.20	98.25	98.09	08.17	100.16	85.63	109.92	N/A	170,000	166,758	
250000 TO 499999	4	88.84	88.43	90.68	20.51	97.52	61.70	114.33	N/A	330,000	299,245	
500000 +	1	98.35	98.35	98.35	00.00	100.00	98.35	98.35	N/A	610,000	599,921	
ALL	36	98.04	104.11	94.00	25.51	110.76	44.00	388.57	91.02 to 99.54	109,069	102,521	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	112.00	112.00	112.00	00.00	100.00	112.00	112.00	N/A	500	560	
325	1	67.14	67.14	67.14	00.00	100.00	67.14	67.14	N/A	110,000	73,850	
326	1	128.00	128.00	128.00	00.00	100.00	128.00	128.00	N/A	2,500	3,200	
340	1	84.78	84.78	84.78	00.00	100.00	84.78	84.78	N/A	23,000	19,500	
344	8	98.57	96.54	79.54	08.48	121.37	61.70	121.50	61.70 to 121.50	75,700	60,213	
349	3	98.35	94.21	96.10	04.41	98.03	85.63	98.66	N/A	296,467	284,907	
350	1	77.75	77.75	77.75	00.00	100.00	77.75	77.75	N/A	120,000	93,300	
352	1	99.57	99.57	99.57	00.00	100.00	99.57	99.57	N/A	115,000	114,500	
353	6	99.08	120.48	106.24	30.76	113.40	79.78	202.69	79.78 to 202.69	105,000	111,557	
381	1	95.97	95.97	95.97	00.00	100.00	95.97	95.97	N/A	144,000	138,200	
391	1	109.92	109.92	109.92	00.00	100.00	109.92	109.92	N/A	150,000	164,875	
406	7	92.33	121.23	83.14	65.85	145.81	44.00	388.57	44.00 to 388.57	42,429	35,274	
528	3	78.71	85.10	99.97	22.04	85.13	62.27	114.33	N/A	245,667	245,594	
586	1	91.02	91.02	91.02	00.00	100.00	91.02	91.02	N/A	102,500	93,300	
ALL	36	98.04	104.11	94.00	25.51	110.76	44.00	388.57	91.02 to 99.54	109,069	102,521	



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Phelps County**

---

**A. Commerical Real Property**

The sales in the commercial sample are not representative of commercial parcels in Phelps County. A review of the occupancy code listing indicates that only office buildings (344), retail stores (353), and warehouses (406) appear in the sales file with any frequency. Since the commercial parcels in Phelps 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 sales verification process in Phelps County includes mailing a letter and verification questionnaire to the seller and/or the buyer in the transaction. Occasionally, phone calls are made to either the buyer or seller or a professional involved in the transaction to clarify sale terms. A review of the qualified and non-qualified sales rosters revealed no bias in qualification determinations.

The assessor uses a contract appraiser to aid in valuing commercial parcels. The appraisal service last conducted a county wide reappraisal of commercial parcels in 2009. Since then, assessments have been updated through pick-up work, and through the cyclical review process. The appraiser annually conducts a sales study to determine whether adjustments to the valuation model are warranted. Because the assessment process is uniformly applied, it is believed that assessments are uniform and proportionate within the commercial class.

There is no reliable information available to determine the level of value of commercial parcels in Phelps County.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Phelps 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 Phelps 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 Phelps 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 Phelps 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 Assessment Actions for Phelps County**

### **taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Agricultural**

A physical inspection of rural homes in Laird, Westmark, Williamsburg, Cottonwood, Anderson, Center, Sheridan & Divide townships was completed. The three year plan indicated that the rural review would not be completed for this year. Only Lake and Prairie townships were not done for 2011, and will be completed next year. Questionnaires are left at each property if no one is home at the time of the inspection.

A physical inspection of rural outbuilding was also started. The townships of Laird, Sheridan, Divide, and Lake were completed during 2010; the rest will be completed next year as scheduled in the three year plan.

The costing tables for all agricultural improvements and rural homes were updated to the 2010 tables. The pickup work was completed timely.

The annual land use study was completed using GIS and through normal discovery. The assessor also began physically inspecting unimproved agricultural parcels this year. Parcels were inspected in Garfield, Industry, Laird, and Lake Townships.

A sales study of agricultural land sales was also completed. The study indicated that no changes in value were necessary for market area two. Within market area one, irrigated land increased approximately 25% while dry and grass land increased about 3% each.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Phelps County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The assessor and staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	This area is flat, rich farmland with good irrigation potential. The majority of the market area is irrigated farmland.
	02	This area is topographically rough, and is mostly hills and canyons. The majority of the area is pasture land, although some farming is done in spots. Well depths are much deeper in this area, and there is little irrigation.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The area was mapped according to soils and topography. Annually, sales are plotted and reviewed and a ratio study is conducted to determine whether the market continues to support the defined areas.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	Currently, the only recreational land that exists in the county would be land that has been enrolled in WRP. Values are established for WRP acres at 100% of the agricultural market. The office continues to send verification documents and conducts a thorough land use study to monitor for non-agricultural uses. Rural residential land is valued using local sales information.	
5.	<b>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?</b>	
	Farm home sites carry the same value that rural residential home site do; however, rural tracts around Holdrege are valued slightly higher than rural tracts in the remainder of the county.	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	Lcg's and soil types are primarily used to assign assessed values. The county also differentiates value for land enrolled in CRP and WRP programs.	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	The county conducts their land use study with FSA maps, irrigated acre certification, the GIS, and through physical inspection.	
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	The county monitors land use carefully by completing their annual land use study, which includes physical inspection. The county also uses their sales verification procedure to screen for sales with non-agricultural influences.	
9.	<b>Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	No	

10.	<b>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?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	Typically, a parcel is considered substantially changed when an improvement has been added to or removed from a parcel. In the agricultural class, a parcel may also be considered substantially changed when it changes use (from dry to irrigated, etc.).
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>
	The county does not have any written policies or procedures for use in the agricultural class, but refers to Statutes and Regulations when necessary.

**69 Phelps**  
**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 : 29  
 Total Sales Price : 9,528,356  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,040,631  
 Total Assessed Value : 6,508,376  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 346,229  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 224,427

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 65  
 MEAN : 69  
 COD : 14.97  
 PRD : 106.43

COV : 20.81  
 STD : 14.36  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.47  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 107.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 30.17

95% Median C.I. : 61.60 to 75.57  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.54 to 75.10  
 95% Mean C.I. : 63.53 to 74.45

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:37PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Qtrts</b>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	1	71.43	71.43	71.43	00.00	100.00	71.43	71.43	N/A	100,000	71,433
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	1	85.08	85.08	85.08	00.00	100.00	85.08	85.08	N/A	435,000	370,080
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	4	65.67	68.29	66.46	15.78	102.75	56.93	84.90	N/A	421,688	280,254
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	71.25	73.37	72.47	07.03	101.24	64.13	84.48	N/A	251,460	182,235
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	75.57	75.57	75.57	00.00	100.00	75.57	75.57	N/A	165,000	124,694
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	53.79	53.28	54.99	06.64	96.89	47.67	58.38	N/A	319,550	175,727
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	76.99	82.37	82.73	16.27	99.56	68.00	107.50	N/A	279,304	231,059
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	79.55	79.55	79.55	00.00	100.00	79.55	79.55	N/A	247,500	196,885
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	64.04	68.79	68.18	13.46	100.89	58.23	84.10	N/A	497,850	339,448
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	6	62.53	58.92	48.20	13.67	122.24	30.17	69.92	30.17 to 69.92	429,944	207,223
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
<b>Study Yrs</b>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	11	71.43	72.41	71.10	10.22	101.84	56.93	85.08	58.93 to 84.90	316,277	224,882
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	9	71.68	71.60	71.25	18.15	100.49	47.67	107.50	53.79 to 82.30	276,485	196,999
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	9	63.46	62.21	55.53	13.61	112.03	30.17	84.10	58.23 to 69.92	452,579	251,298
<b>Calendar Yrs</b>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	13	71.13	67.34	65.98	13.48	102.06	47.67	84.90	56.93 to 75.84	312,900	206,466
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	75.62	76.93	74.85	15.13	102.78	58.23	107.50	58.23 to 107.50	357,283	267,433
<b>ALL</b>	29	69.92	68.99	64.82	14.97	106.43	30.17	107.50	61.60 to 75.57	346,229	224,427

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	26	69.47	68.83	64.39	16.08	106.90	30.17	107.50	59.33 to 75.57	355,870	229,138
2	3	71.25	70.41	69.90	05.47	100.73	64.13	75.84	N/A	262,667	183,598
<b>ALL</b>	29	69.92	68.99	64.82	14.97	106.43	30.17	107.50	61.60 to 75.57	346,229	224,427

**69 Phelps**  
**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 : 29  
 Total Sales Price : 9,528,356  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,040,631  
 Total Assessed Value : 6,508,376  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 346,229  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 224,427

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 65  
 MEAN : 69  
 COD : 14.97  
 PRD : 106.43

COV : 20.81  
 STD : 14.36  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.47  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 107.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 30.17

95% Median C.I. : 61.60 to 75.57  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.54 to 75.10  
 95% Mean C.I. : 63.53 to 74.45

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:37PM

**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
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	18	68.51	70.53	70.18	16.17	100.50	47.67	107.50	59.33 to 82.30	332,280	233,182
1	18	68.51	70.53	70.18	16.17	100.50	47.67	107.50	59.33 to 82.30	332,280	233,182
<b>Dry</b>											
County	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
1	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
<b>Grass</b>											
County	2	69.99	69.99	67.67	08.37	103.43	64.13	75.84	N/A	149,000	100,822
2	2	69.99	69.99	67.67	08.37	103.43	64.13	75.84	N/A	149,000	100,822
<b>ALL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>69.92</b>	<b>68.99</b>	<b>64.82</b>	<b>14.97</b>	<b>106.43</b>	<b>30.17</b>	<b>107.50</b>	<b>61.60 to 75.57</b>	<b>346,229</b>	<b>224,427</b>

**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
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	20	69.47	71.30	71.08	15.68	100.31	47.67	107.50	61.60 to 82.30	332,567	236,372
1	20	69.47	71.30	71.08	15.68	100.31	47.67	107.50	61.60 to 82.30	332,567	236,372
<b>Dry</b>											
County	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
1	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
<b>Grass</b>											
County	2	69.99	69.99	67.67	08.37	103.43	64.13	75.84	N/A	149,000	100,822
2	2	69.99	69.99	67.67	08.37	103.43	64.13	75.84	N/A	149,000	100,822
<b>ALL</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>69.92</b>	<b>68.99</b>	<b>64.82</b>	<b>14.97</b>	<b>106.43</b>	<b>30.17</b>	<b>107.50</b>	<b>61.60 to 75.57</b>	<b>346,229</b>	<b>224,427</b>

**69 Phelps**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 3/12/2011

Number of Sales : 51  
 Total Sales Price : 17,161,790  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,824,065  
 Total Assessed Value : 11,936,416  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 349,491  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 234,047

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 67  
 MEAN : 72  
 COD : 17.19  
 PRD : 107.78

COV : 22.43  
 STD : 16.19  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.23  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 109.88  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 30.17

95% Median C.I. : 66.21 to 74.77  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.35 to 73.59  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.74 to 76.62

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:40PM

**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-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	81.58	81.58	84.84	12.44	96.16	71.43	91.72	N/A	147,476	125,125
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	3	90.41	89.38	88.07	02.80	101.49	85.08	92.66	N/A	271,383	239,006
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	6	78.65	79.55	72.91	21.35	109.11	56.93	109.88	56.93 to 109.88	336,492	245,322
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	7	75.84	78.19	78.88	11.01	99.13	64.13	100.50	64.13 to 100.50	291,757	230,140
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	75.57	78.70	79.91	07.33	98.49	71.96	88.58	N/A	112,833	90,160
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	53.79	53.19	54.08	05.00	98.35	47.67	58.38	N/A	404,230	218,601
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	73.19	79.22	78.97	12.23	100.32	68.00	107.50	68.00 to 107.50	289,119	228,312
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	71.15	72.92	72.69	05.38	100.32	68.06	79.55	N/A	271,500	197,347
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	101.34	101.34	101.34	00.00	100.00	101.34	101.34	N/A	259,855	263,350
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	61.14	63.61	63.16	17.11	100.71	48.08	84.10	N/A	497,643	314,323
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	62.53	58.63	53.40	13.53	109.79	30.17	69.92	30.17 to 69.92	579,333	309,370
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	66.21	68.13	65.74	05.71	103.64	63.42	74.77	N/A	286,583	188,414
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	18	82.25	80.88	78.33	14.31	103.26	56.93	109.88	71.25 to 91.72	287,242	225,010
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	17	71.15	70.36	67.74	14.77	103.87	47.67	107.50	54.42 to 79.55	288,757	195,612
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	16	63.75	64.33	58.89	15.84	109.24	30.17	101.34	58.23 to 69.92	484,053	285,052
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	21	71.96	72.70	69.25	18.40	104.98	47.67	109.88	58.38 to 84.48	305,757	211,733
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	14	71.42	74.99	72.56	15.25	103.35	48.08	107.50	64.04 to 84.10	342,832	248,754
<u>ALL</u>	51	71.15	72.18	66.97	17.19	107.78	30.17	109.88	66.21 to 74.77	349,491	234,047

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	43	71.13	71.95	66.55	18.99	108.11	30.17	109.88	63.46 to 79.55	354,734	236,080
2	8	73.33	73.40	69.44	06.91	105.70	64.13	88.58	64.13 to 88.58	321,313	223,123
<u>ALL</u>	51	71.15	72.18	66.97	17.19	107.78	30.17	109.88	66.21 to 74.77	349,491	234,047

**69 Phelps**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 3/12/2011

Number of Sales : 51  
 Total Sales Price : 17,161,790  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,824,065  
 Total Assessed Value : 11,936,416  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 349,491  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 234,047

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 67  
 MEAN : 72  
 COD : 17.19  
 PRD : 107.78

COV : 22.43  
 STD : 16.19  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.23  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 109.88  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 30.17

95% Median C.I. : 66.21 to 74.77  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.35 to 73.59  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.74 to 76.62

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:40PM

**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
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	34	70.53	74.29	70.98	19.65	104.66	47.67	109.88	63.46 to 84.48	337,793	239,770
1	34	70.53	74.29	70.98	19.65	104.66	47.67	109.88	63.46 to 84.48	337,793	239,770
<b>Dry</b>											
County	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
1	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
<b>Grass</b>											
County	3	71.96	70.64	68.26	05.42	103.49	64.13	75.84	N/A	115,167	78,608
2	3	71.96	70.64	68.26	05.42	103.49	64.13	75.84	N/A	115,167	78,608
<b>ALL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>71.15</b>	<b>72.18</b>	<b>66.97</b>	<b>17.19</b>	<b>107.78</b>	<b>30.17</b>	<b>109.88</b>	<b>66.21 to 74.77</b>	<b>349,491</b>	<b>234,047</b>

**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
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	37	71.13	73.80	70.51	19.32	104.67	47.67	109.88	64.04 to 82.30	341,953	241,116
1	37	71.13	73.80	70.51	19.32	104.67	47.67	109.88	64.04 to 82.30	341,953	241,116
<b>Dry</b>											
County	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
1	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
<b>Grass</b>											
County	3	71.96	70.64	68.26	05.42	103.49	64.13	75.84	N/A	115,167	78,608
2	3	71.96	70.64	68.26	05.42	103.49	64.13	75.84	N/A	115,167	78,608
<b>ALL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>71.15</b>	<b>72.18</b>	<b>66.97</b>	<b>17.19</b>	<b>107.78</b>	<b>30.17</b>	<b>109.88</b>	<b>66.21 to 74.77</b>	<b>349,491</b>	<b>234,047</b>

**69 Phelps**  
**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 : 71  
 Total Sales Price : 25,735,773  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,398,048  
 Total Assessed Value : 17,459,983  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 371,803  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 245,915

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 66  
 MEAN : 72  
 COD : 21.39  
 PRD : 109.10

COV : 29.75  
 STD : 21.47  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.24  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 148.45  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 13.54

95% Median C.I. : 66.21 to 74.69  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 59.28 to 73.00  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.17 to 77.15

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:43PM

**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>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	3	71.43	64.87	76.25	28.11	85.08	31.47	91.72	N/A	117,174	89,351
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	85.08	82.77	80.09	08.78	103.35	72.26	92.66	N/A	349,830	280,166
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	9	88.72	87.51	85.02	19.11	102.93	56.93	125.30	58.93 to 109.88	335,662	285,376
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	7	75.84	78.19	78.88	11.01	99.13	64.13	100.50	64.13 to 100.50	291,757	230,140
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	74.21	78.44	77.24	08.14	101.55	71.96	93.39	N/A	178,875	138,158
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	54.41	57.14	55.73	09.65	102.53	47.67	79.52	47.67 to 79.52	361,168	201,271
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	9	74.69	86.81	75.67	25.60	114.72	56.48	148.45	68.00 to 107.50	382,296	289,278
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	5	74.52	75.48	75.09	06.56	100.52	68.06	84.12	N/A	232,100	174,274
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	101.34	101.34	101.34	00.00	100.00	101.34	101.34	N/A	259,855	263,350
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	58.23	57.81	53.41	21.02	108.24	26.98	84.10	26.98 to 84.10	603,550	322,358
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	9	61.60	58.45	53.84	13.04	108.56	30.17	69.92	49.55 to 69.02	584,407	314,617
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	64.82	54.49	48.50	24.70	112.35	13.54	74.77	N/A	320,938	155,665
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	24	82.25	80.98	81.63	17.47	99.20	31.47	125.30	71.43 to 91.72	298,497	243,677
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	26	71.82	74.22	68.70	19.35	108.03	47.67	148.45	58.38 to 79.52	315,616	216,833
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	21	63.42	59.52	54.17	20.04	109.88	13.54	101.34	55.33 to 67.90	525,149	284,479
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	28	72.63	75.21	73.17	20.51	102.79	47.67	125.30	58.93 to 84.48	309,575	226,506
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	71.42	75.67	65.98	22.53	114.69	26.98	148.45	64.04 to 84.10	412,994	272,487
<u>ALL</u>	71	71.25	72.16	66.14	21.39	109.10	13.54	148.45	66.21 to 74.69	371,803	245,915

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	63	71.13	71.92	65.75	23.10	109.38	13.54	148.45	64.04 to 74.52	378,104	248,609
2	8	73.33	74.00	69.74	07.73	106.11	64.13	93.39	64.13 to 93.39	322,188	224,699
<u>ALL</u>	71	71.25	72.16	66.14	21.39	109.10	13.54	148.45	66.21 to 74.69	371,803	245,915



**69 Phelps**  
**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 : 71  
 Total Sales Price : 25,735,773  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,398,048  
 Total Assessed Value : 17,459,983  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 371,803  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 245,915

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 66  
 MEAN : 72  
 COD : 21.39  
 PRD : 109.10

COV : 29.75  
 STD : 21.47  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.24  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 148.45  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 13.54

95% Median C.I. : 66.21 to 74.69  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 59.28 to 73.00  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.17 to 77.15

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:43PM

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	45	69.92	75.19	70.53	22.31	106.61	47.67	148.45	63.46 to 80.01	364,930	257,393
1	45	69.92	75.19	70.53	22.31	106.61	47.67	148.45	63.46 to 80.01	364,930	257,393
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
1	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	5	64.13	51.39	37.65	32.06	136.49	13.54	75.84	N/A	165,214	62,209
1	2	22.51	22.51	15.65	39.85	143.83	13.54	31.47	N/A	240,285	37,611
2	3	71.96	70.64	68.26	05.42	103.49	64.13	75.84	N/A	115,167	78,608
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>71.25</b>	<b>72.16</b>	<b>66.14</b>	<b>21.39</b>	<b>109.10</b>	<b>13.54</b>	<b>148.45</b>	<b>66.21 to 74.69</b>	<b>371,803</b>	<b>245,915</b>

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	52	71.42	75.29	71.00	21.07	106.04	47.67	148.45	66.21 to 79.55	367,710	261,076
1	52	71.42	75.29	71.00	21.07	106.04	47.67	148.45	66.21 to 79.55	367,710	261,076
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
1	2	73.35	73.35	72.81	03.03	100.74	71.13	75.57	N/A	217,650	158,477
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	5	64.13	51.39	37.65	32.06	136.49	13.54	75.84	N/A	165,214	62,209
1	2	22.51	22.51	15.65	39.85	143.83	13.54	31.47	N/A	240,285	37,611
2	3	71.96	70.64	68.26	05.42	103.49	64.13	75.84	N/A	115,167	78,608
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>71.25</b>	<b>72.16</b>	<b>66.14</b>	<b>21.39</b>	<b>109.10</b>	<b>13.54</b>	<b>148.45</b>	<b>66.21 to 74.69</b>	<b>371,803</b>	<b>245,915</b>



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Phelps County**

---

**A. Agricultural Land**

The majority of Phelps County is fairly homogeneous and consists of flat crop land with rich soils and an adequate water supply for irrigation. Only the southwestern corner of the county is different, and consists of hills and poorer soils. The southwestern corner is market area 2, the rest of the county is market area 1. All counties surrounding Phelps County are comparable with the exception of irrigated land in Harlan and Franklin Counties, and the special value areas of Buffalo County. Harlan and Franklin Counties lie in the Lower Republican Natural Resource District while Phelps County is in the Tri Basin Natural Resource District. The Lower Republican has irrigation pumping allocation restrictions, Tri Basin does not.

Three statistical samples were analyzed for measurement purposes. The base sample contained a proportionately distributed sample for market area 1, but the sample did not adequately represent the mix of land uses in the population. Area 2, with only three sales, is too small to be statistically reliable.

Sales of agricultural land from comparable adjoining areas were brought into the samples. For market area 1 the thresholds were achieved in both expanded samples. For market area 2, very few sales within the newest year of the study period were available within a six mile perimeter. The expansion of the perimeter did not reveal any additional sales in the newest year; therefore, the sample is still too small to be reliable. When samples sizes were large enough to be reliable, the calculated statistics correlated closely in all three samples and suggest that assessments are acceptable.

Since only the irrigated subclass in market area 1 is large enough to measure, determinations of assessment quality must be made based on a comparison of the county's values to surrounding counties and an examination of the assessment actions. For 2011, dry and grassland within market area 1 were only increased slightly, while irrigated land increased significantly. No changes were made to values within market area 2. The values established by Phelps County are slightly higher than Dawson, Gosper, and Harlan Counties and are very comparable to Kearney County's values. Because the values established by the county are so comparable to the surrounding counties, it is believed that assessments are both acceptable and proportionate.

Based on an analysis of all information, it has been determined that the level of value of agricultural land in Phelps County is 71%; all subclasses are within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Phelps 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 Phelps 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 Phelps 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 Phelps 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.





<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 6,953</b>	<b>Value : 1,029,847,777</b>	<b>Growth 8,929,795</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	346	2,442,503	0	0	16	1,619,787	362	4,062,290	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,814	27,197,030	0	0	491	15,449,147	3,305	42,646,177	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,945	184,839,695	0	0	507	57,144,617	3,452	241,984,312	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	3,291	214,479,228	0	0	523	74,213,551	3,814	288,692,779	2,317,925
<b>% of Res Total</b>	86.29	74.29	0.00	0.00	13.71	25.71	54.85	28.03	25.96
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	87	1,000,841	0	0	14	133,016	101	1,133,857	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	389	5,505,580	0	0	67	1,427,294	456	6,932,874	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	389	42,499,776	0	0	60	10,804,625	449	53,304,401	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	476	49,006,197	0	0	74	12,364,935	550	61,371,132	3,978,845
<b>% of Com Total</b>	86.55	79.85	0.00	0.00	13.45	20.15	7.91	5.96	44.56
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	3	23,475	0	0	0	0	3	23,475	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	3	64,250	0	0	3	320,440	6	384,690	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	3	812,650	0	0	3	8,810,960	6	9,623,610	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	6	900,375	0	0	3	9,131,400	9	10,031,775	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	66.67	8.98	0.00	0.00	33.33	91.02	0.13	0.97	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1	2,423	1	2,423	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	1	2,423	1	2,423	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	3,291	214,479,228	0	0	524	74,215,974	3,815	288,695,202	2,317,925
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	86.26	74.29	0.00	0.00	13.74	25.71	54.87	28.03	25.96
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	482	49,906,572	0	0	77	21,496,335	559	71,402,907	3,978,845
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	86.23	69.89	0.00	0.00	13.77	30.11	8.04	6.93	44.56
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	3,773	264,385,800	0	0	601	95,712,309	4,374	360,098,109	6,296,770
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	86.26	73.42	0.00	0.00	13.74	26.58	62.91	34.97	70.51

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	29	281,313	536,052	0	0	0
19. Commercial	17	563,586	6,104,410	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	29	281,313	536,052
19. Commercial	0	0	0	17	563,586	6,104,410
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				46	844,899	6,640,462

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	424	0	425	849

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,844	434,510,781	1,844	434,510,781
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	735	182,751,662	735	182,751,662
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	735	52,487,225	735	52,487,225
30. Ag Total							2,579	669,749,668

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	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	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	11	12.02	260,500	11	12.02	260,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	366	388.65	9,296,710	366	388.65	9,296,710	
33. HomeSite Improvements	379	0.00	32,533,160	379	0.00	32,533,160	1,083,300
34. HomeSite Total				<b>390</b>	<b>400.67</b>	<b>42,090,370</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	67	291.26	485,767	67	291.26	485,767	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	618	3,215.28	6,415,863	618	3,215.28	6,415,863	
37. FarmSite Improvements	706	0.00	19,954,065	706	0.00	19,954,065	1,549,725
38. FarmSite Total				<b>773</b>	<b>3,506.54</b>	<b>26,855,695</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	2,211	6,742.81	0	2,211	6,742.81	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,163</b>	<b>10,650.02</b>	<b>68,946,065</b>	<b>2,633,025</b>

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	253.17	0.10%	461,683	0.08%	1,823.61
46. 1A	191,138.28	78.54%	468,249,625	85.49%	2,449.80
47. 2A1	4,424.52	1.82%	8,627,928	1.58%	1,950.03
48. 2A	15,092.08	6.20%	29,413,196	5.37%	1,948.92
49. 3A1	8,218.93	3.38%	12,328,395	2.25%	1,500.00
50. 3A	2,384.49	0.98%	3,219,104	0.59%	1,350.02
51. 4A1	17,684.66	7.27%	21,221,592	3.87%	1,200.00
52. 4A	4,179.23	1.72%	4,179,230	0.76%	1,000.00
53. Total	243,375.36	100.00%	547,700,753	100.00%	2,250.44
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	52.91	0.38%	66,138	0.45%	1,250.01
55. 1D	9,473.51	68.47%	11,842,202	80.60%	1,250.03
56. 2D1	413.61	2.99%	413,610	2.82%	1,000.00
57. 2D	1,561.82	11.29%	1,288,552	8.77%	825.03
58. 3D1	454.17	3.28%	236,159	1.61%	519.98
59. 3D	229.06	1.66%	107,660	0.73%	470.01
60. 4D1	1,311.27	9.48%	590,139	4.02%	450.05
61. 4D	339.02	2.45%	147,473	1.00%	435.00
62. Total	13,835.37	100.00%	14,691,933	100.00%	1,061.91
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	145.41	0.89%	65,003	0.82%	447.03
64. 1G	3,530.51	21.59%	2,180,047	27.46%	617.49
65. 2G1	447.03	2.73%	332,898	4.19%	744.69
66. 2G	1,333.77	8.16%	808,650	10.19%	606.29
67. 3G1	334.84	2.05%	160,750	2.03%	480.08
68. 3G	448.78	2.74%	210,375	2.65%	468.77
69. 4G1	6,173.38	37.75%	2,676,658	33.72%	433.58
70. 4G	3,937.57	24.08%	1,503,514	18.94%	381.84
71. Total	16,351.29	100.00%	7,937,895	100.00%	485.46
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	243,375.36	87.87%	547,700,753	95.52%	2,250.44
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	13,835.37	5.00%	14,691,933	2.56%	1,061.91
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	16,351.29	5.90%	7,937,895	1.38%	485.46
72. Waste	219.30	0.08%	7,674	0.00%	34.99
73. Other	3,198.73	1.15%	3,026,192	0.53%	946.06
74. Exempt	14,469.08	5.22%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	276,980.05	100.00%	573,364,447	100.00%	2,070.06

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	6,821.02	62.72%	10,470,275	80.64%	1,535.00
47. 2A1	54.72	0.50%	68,402	0.53%	1,250.04
48. 2A	39.62	0.36%	38,631	0.30%	975.04
49. 3A1	1,439.16	13.23%	1,180,114	9.09%	820.00
50. 3A	62.86	0.58%	34,578	0.27%	550.08
51. 4A1	707.27	6.50%	360,710	2.78%	510.00
52. 4A	1,750.30	16.09%	831,412	6.40%	475.01
53. Total	10,874.95	100.00%	12,984,122	100.00%	1,193.95
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	2,371.28	42.20%	2,489,884	54.83%	1,050.02
56. 2D1	19.94	0.35%	16,951	0.37%	850.10
57. 2D	17.04	0.30%	14,059	0.31%	825.06
58. 3D1	1,801.98	32.07%	1,396,847	30.76%	775.17
59. 3D	231.25	4.12%	106,375	2.34%	460.00
60. 4D1	644.41	11.47%	290,014	6.39%	450.05
61. 4D	533.17	9.49%	226,622	4.99%	425.05
62. Total	5,619.07	100.00%	4,540,752	100.00%	808.10
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1,625.38	6.98%	759,633	7.66%	467.36
65. 2G1	249.93	1.07%	114,970	1.16%	460.01
66. 2G	285.88	1.23%	127,218	1.28%	445.00
67. 3G1	597.24	2.56%	267,010	2.69%	447.07
68. 3G	153.68	0.66%	66,851	0.67%	435.00
69. 4G1	1,422.82	6.11%	612,125	6.17%	430.22
70. 4G	18,964.55	81.39%	7,965,870	80.35%	420.04
71. Total	23,299.48	100.00%	9,913,677	100.00%	425.49
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	10,874.95	27.32%	12,984,122	47.32%	1,193.95
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	5,619.07	14.11%	4,540,752	16.55%	808.10
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	23,299.48	58.53%	9,913,677	36.13%	425.49
72. Waste	17.30	0.04%	605	0.00%	34.97
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	1,044.82	2.62%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	39,810.80	100.00%	27,439,156	100.00%	689.24

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	254,250.31	560,684,875	254,250.31	560,684,875
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	19,454.44	19,232,685	19,454.44	19,232,685
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	39,650.77	17,851,572	39,650.77	17,851,572
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	236.60	8,279	236.60	8,279
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,198.73	3,026,192	3,198.73	3,026,192
<b>81. Exempt</b>	3,398.01	0	0.00	0	12,115.89	0	15,513.90	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>316,790.85</b>	<b>600,803,603</b>	<b>316,790.85</b>	<b>600,803,603</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	254,250.31	80.26%	560,684,875	93.32%	2,205.25
<b>Dry Land</b>	19,454.44	6.14%	19,232,685	3.20%	988.60
<b>Grass</b>	39,650.77	12.52%	17,851,572	2.97%	450.22
<b>Waste</b>	236.60	0.07%	8,279	0.00%	34.99
<b>Other</b>	3,198.73	1.01%	3,026,192	0.50%	946.06
<b>Exempt</b>	15,513.90	4.90%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>316,790.85</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>600,803,603</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,896.53</b>

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

### 69 Phelps

	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	285,676,867	288,692,779	3,015,912	1.06%	2,317,925	0.24%
02. Recreational	2,040	2,423	383	18.77%	0	18.77%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	42,566,890	42,090,370	-476,520	-1.12%	1,083,300	-3.66%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>328,245,797</b>	<b>330,785,572</b>	<b>2,539,775</b>	<b>0.77%</b>	<b>3,401,225</b>	<b>-0.26%</b>
05. Commercial	57,359,318	61,371,132	4,011,814	6.99%	3,978,845	0.06%
06. Industrial	10,024,705	10,031,775	7,070	0.07%	0	0.07%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	25,993,473	26,855,695	862,222	3.32%	1,549,725	-2.64%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>93,377,496</b>	<b>98,258,602</b>	<b>4,881,106</b>	<b>5.23%</b>	<b>5,528,570</b>	<b>-0.69%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>421,623,293</b>	<b>429,044,174</b>	<b>7,420,881</b>	<b>1.76%</b>	<b>8,929,795</b>	<b>-0.36%</b>
11. Irrigated	452,008,500	560,684,875	108,676,375	24.04%		
12. Dryland	18,620,888	19,232,685	611,797	3.29%		
13. Grassland	17,499,082	17,851,572	352,490	2.01%		
14. Wasteland	7,726	8,279	553	7.16%		
15. Other Agland	2,789,424	3,026,192	236,768	8.49%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>490,925,620</b>	<b>600,803,603</b>	<b>109,877,983</b>	<b>22.38%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>912,548,913</b>	<b>1,029,847,777</b>	<b>117,298,864</b>	<b>12.85%</b>	<b>8,929,795</b>	<b>11.88%</b>



**2010 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR PHELPS COUNTY  
ASSESSMENT YEARS 2011-2012-2013  
DATE: 07-31-2010**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.”

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1. 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2. 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticulture land.

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY IN PHELPS COUNTY**

Per the 2010 County Abstract, Phelps County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels
Residential	3823	54%
Commercial	552	8%
Industrial	9	1%
Recreational	1	
Agricultural	2579	37%

Agricultural land for taxable acres for 2010 assessment was 343,047.

Agricultural land is approx 54% of the real property valuation base in Phelps County and of that approx 74% is taxed as irrigated.

For more information see the 2010 Reports and Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

## CURRENT RESOURCES

There are currently four full time employees on staff including the Assessor. The Assessor is certified by the Property Tax Administrator. The Assessor will continue to keep her certification current by attending continuing education and obtaining the number of hours as required by the Property Tax Division. The assessor or staff member will attend all the district meetings and workshops provided. Current statues and regulations will continue to be followed to the best of our ability and the office will keep current on any changes that may be made in them.

Proposed Office Budget for July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 will be \$85,340. The proposed appraisal budget for July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 will be \$104,600.

### Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

#### Residential:

Continue on Rural physical dwelling reviews. Do market study to insure residential properties are in compliance with state statutes. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2011. Start on aerial photos for Rural sites.

#### Commercial:

Continue with Villages of Commercial physical reviews. Start on Rural physical reviews. Maybe start with Holdrege physical reviews. Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2011.

#### Agricultural land:

Continue to review 20% of land use and acres with new aerial. Land use and water transfers will be updated in GIS as reported. Land use and market areas will be reviewed and updated as information becomes available. Start to review out buildings from aerial photos. Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Pick up work and permits will be done by March 1, 2011.

Assessment Actions Planned by Assessment Year 2012:

Residential:

Finish with physical dwelling review of Rural properties. Start on physical dwelling reviews of Holdrege. Do market study to insure residential properties are in compliance with state statutes. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2012. Continue on aerial photos for rural sites.

Commercial:

Continue with Holdrege of Commercial physical reviews. Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2012.

Agricultural:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Continue to review 20% of land use and acres with new aerial. Land use and market areas will be reviewed and updated as information becomes available. Finish review of out buildings from aerial photos. Pick up work and permits will be done by March 1, 2012.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Residential:

Continue with physical dwelling review of Holdrege properties. Do market analysis to insure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Complete pick-up work and building permits by March 1, 2013.

Commercial:

Continue with Holdrege physical reviews of commercial. Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Pick-up and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2013.

Agricultural:

Continue to review 20% of land use and acres with new aerial. Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance to state statutes. Land use and market areas will be reviewed and updated as information becomes available. Pick up work and permits will be done by March 1, 2013.

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

1. Appraisal cards are updated yearly. Ownership changes are made as the transfers are given to the assessor's office from the register of deeds and the green sheets are worked and forward to the Property Assessment Division. Splits and subdivision changes are made as they become available to the assessor's office from the surveyor or county clerk. These are updated in the GIS system at the same time they are changed on the appraisal cards and in the computer administrative package.
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value update w/abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - h. Report of all exempt property and taxable government owned property
  - i. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property - administer annual filing of approximately 1400 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions - administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property - annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions - administer approximately 350 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed - review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and Public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing - management of record/valuation information for Properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on Administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates - management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process

10. Tax Lists - prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board to approve.
12. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests- assemble and provide information.
13. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization - attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education - Assessor and/or Appraisal Education - attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

Conclusion:

For 2010-2011 a budget request of an increase of approximately 4% will be submitted to the County Board for approval.

The Phelps County Assessor's Office will strive to maintain an efficient and professional office.

Respectfully submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_, Dated this 31<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2010.

Melodie Marvin  
Phelps County Assessor

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Phelps County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	3
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$85,340
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$85,340
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$14,000
9.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	\$104,600
10.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$13,000 for appraisal \$2,000 for administrative
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,000 for administrative and \$1,000 for appraisal
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	n/a
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	Yes, \$8,000 of the appraisal budget was not used and \$5,200 of the administrative budget was unused.

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	The assessor and staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>

	Yes
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	The assessor & staff
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	All municipalities are zoned.
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2000

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Knoche Appraisal Services
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None





## 2011 Certification for Phelps 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 Phelps County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



