Table of Contents

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 Saunders County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	477	Median	94.93
Total Sales Price	$67,273,638	Mean	103.03
Total Adj. Sales Price	$67,348,388	Wgt. Mean	94.24
Total Assessed Value	$63,466,740	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$119,055
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$141,192	Avg. Assessed Value	$133,054

Confidenence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.79 to 97.38
95% Mean C.I	
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	97.71 to 108.35
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	46.26
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.72
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.39

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	506	95	95
2009	675	94	94
2008	779	95	95
2007	811	95	95

2011 Commission Summary

for Saunders County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	44	Median	97.50
Total Sales Price	$4,012,250	Mean	109.16
Total Adj. Sales Price	$4,012,250	Wgt. Mean	90.08
Total Assessed Value	$3,614,220	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$132,980
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$91,188	Avg. Assessed Value	$82,141

Confidenence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.15 to 101.40
95% Mean C.I	84.36 to 133.96
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	82.09 to 98.07
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.32
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.12
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.16

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	47	99	99
2009	58	98	98
2008	68	96	96
2007	74	94	94

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Saunders County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within this Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	**95**	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	**98**	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	**70**	The qualitative measures calculated in the base stat sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of Agricultural Land	**70**	The qualitative measures calculated in the base stat sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Saunders County

For 2011, Saunders County conducted a market analysis for the residential class of property. Using primarily sale information, the county identified areas that were outside of the acceptable value range and made valuation changes accordingly. The following are some of the specific assessment actions completed by the county as indicated by the sale analysis and as part of the county's review and inspection cycle:

- Willow Point, Whitetail Cove, Pine Ridge Estates and Shunk Subdivision, and Richey's Subdivision were completely reappraised including new photos and an onsite inspection.

- Woodcliff River and Thomas Lakes were reviewed using the information contained within the property record file. New values resulted.

- Rural residential land was also reviewed and revalued using market information.

In addition to the assessment actions reported for particular subclasses, other value changes resulted from the pick-up work of new construction

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Saunders County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Appraiser and Assistant
2.	**List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
1	Consists of all parcels around Ashland Lake and the River Area.
2	Parcels within the town of Ashland.
3	Parcels within the town of Ceresco.
4	East Lake/River which consists of Championship lake, Rustic Island, Leshara, Happy Farms, and Shunk.
5	Consists of subdivisions in the North end of the county near Fremont.
6	Area consists of lakes and rivers around Morse Bluff--Wolfes, Whitetail, and Hidden Cove. Consists of average quality properties with lower values compared to other lakes in the county.
7	Mead and Cedar Bluffs are combined because these two towns each have a K-12 school and are located along major highways which create a similar market.
8	Small Town Wahoo, which consists of the towns of Ithaca, Leshara, Colon, Swedeburg, Malmo. The market in this area is impacted by the fact that no schools exist in this area.
9	Unincorporated Areas, which are relatively quite markets in the towns of Wann, Memphis, and Touhy.
10	Parcels within the town of Valparaiso.
11	Parcels within the town of Wahoo.
12	West Small Towns, which consists of Prague, Morse Bluff, and Weston and have no high school.
13	All parcels in the Woodcliff subdivision area.
14	All parcels in the town of Yutan.
15	Consists of all rural residential parcels in the county.

3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.**
	The cost approach is used in the county with market defined depreciation.
4	**When was the last lot value study completed?**
	The last lot value study was completed for 2011 in Thomas Lakes, Willow Point, and Whitetail Cove.
5.	**Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.**
	The county uses vacant lot sales to determine residential lot values.
6.	**What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?**
	2007
7.	**If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation**

	study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?
	The County uses local market information
8.	**Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?**
	Yes. Depreciation schedules are also developed for neighborhoods within many of the valuation groupings.
9.	**How often does the County update the depreciation tables?**
	The county updates depreciation tables in conjunction with neighborhood revaluations.
10.	**Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?**
	Yes
11.	**Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.**
	The county considers the overall change to market value in making the substantially changed determination rather than considering just the cost of the changes made. Substantial changes in market value result in the sale being removed from the qualified roster in the state sales file.
12.	**Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.**

78 Saunders

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 :	477	MEDIAN :	95	COV : 57.54	95% Median C.I. : 93.79 to 97.38
Total Sales Price :	67,273,638	WGT. MEAN :	94	STD : 59.28	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
Total Adj. Sales Price :	67,348,388	MEAN :	103	Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.10	95% Mean C.I. : 97.71 to 108.35
Total Assessed Value :	63,466,740				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	141,192	COD :	21.17	MAX Sales Ratio : 827.52	
Avg. Assessed Value :	133,054	PRD :	109.33	MIN Sales Ratio : 36.00	*Printed:3/18/2011 4:07:58PM*

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	69	94.33	97.59	88.96	17.18	109.70	48.90	223.58	91.25 to 99.94	175,965	156,543
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	52	96.68	102.15	93.17	16.09	109.64	52.13	239.43	94.12 to 101.45	134,615	125,423
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	38	100.18	99.54	97.70	12.55	101.88	45.00	132.51	92.81 to 104.27	139,387	136,182
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	57	93.68	98.52	92.72	18.39	106.26	50.40	261.13	88.23 to 96.53	143,139	132,719
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	64	90.39	105.08	94.24	30.11	111.50	43.77	827.52	84.96 to 93.99	140,125	132,060
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	79	99.73	102.59	96.94	16.34	105.83	40.25	199.96	94.93 to 103.44	122,504	118,759
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	40	92.15	113.92	100.44	31.36	113.42	65.63	780.25	89.20 to 98.99	132,940	133,527
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	78	97.23	106.59	94.82	24.50	112.41	36.00	660.11	91.96 to 100.41	138,304	131,135
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	216	95.76	99.28	92.23	16.58	107.64	45.00	261.13	93.68 to 98.95	150,913	139,182
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	261	94.53	106.13	96.12	24.93	110.41	36.00	827.52	93.01 to 97.65	133,146	127,982
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	238	94.67	101.80	95.24	20.49	106.89	40.25	827.52	93.01 to 98.17	134,880	128,461
_____ALL_____	477	94.93	103.03	94.24	21.17	109.33	36.00	827.52	93.79 to 97.38	141,192	133,054

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	33	94.74	102.25	86.96	23.03	117.58	52.13	223.58	90.60 to 100.00	232,121	201,853
02	72	94.93	97.36	94.19	13.34	103.37	55.94	179.50	92.07 to 99.20	116,752	109,963
03	26	92.87	96.31	93.98	09.43	102.48	80.63	130.40	87.65 to 99.94	113,113	106,303
04	1	92.93	92.93	92.93	00.00	100.00	92.93	92.93	N/A	37,500	34,850
05	18	94.97	92.02	89.84	13.81	102.43	50.40	111.12	81.12 to 105.24	170,665	153,334
06	12	91.53	91.92	92.69	10.59	99.17	66.67	113.51	84.21 to 100.00	72,750	67,432
07	18	94.25	104.32	97.12	26.04	107.41	48.90	239.43	88.05 to 110.80	85,772	83,299
08	15	99.25	116.14	96.78	37.28	120.00	44.38	271.88	89.50 to 132.40	62,790	60,768
09	6	62.05	92.94	74.22	84.64	125.22	36.00	261.13	36.00 to 261.13	31,917	23,688
10	14	98.11	101.95	99.12	15.29	102.86	76.47	179.08	84.66 to 114.81	114,357	113,355
11	109	97.55	107.43	97.39	22.18	110.31	64.74	827.52	93.57 to 100.76	120,399	117,253
12	13	93.03	87.87	90.94	21.52	96.62	43.77	137.50	69.50 to 108.58	63,790	58,010
13	28	92.15	93.55	92.84	09.08	100.76	75.77	116.62	87.61 to 98.62	262,834	244,026
14	41	94.59	124.81	96.94	41.83	128.75	65.63	780.25	91.57 to 101.45	161,037	156,104
15	71	95.67	101.55	95.45	19.11	106.39	45.42	339.03	89.19 to 101.27	171,352	163,558
_____ALL_____	477	94.93	103.03	94.24	21.17	109.33	36.00	827.52	93.79 to 97.38	141,192	133,054

78 Saunders

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 :	477	MEDIAN :	95	COV :	57.54
Total Sales Price :	67,273,638	WGT. MEAN :	94	STD :	59.28
Total Adj. Sales Price :	67,348,388	MEAN :	103	Avg. Abs. Dev :	20.10
Total Assessed Value :	63,466,740				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	141,192	COD :	21.17	MAX Sales Ratio :	827.52
Avg. Assessed Value :	133,054	PRD :	109.33	MIN Sales Ratio :	36.00

95% Median C.I. : 93.79 to 97.38

95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :

95% Mean C.I. : 97.71 to 108.35

Printed:3/18/2011 4:07:58PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	470	94.94	102.99	94.23	20.69	109.30	36.00	827.52	93.82 to 97.38	142,757	134,518
06	1	50.40	50.40	50.40	00.00	100.00	50.40	50.40	N/A	25,000	12,600
07	6	89.15	114.66	101.51	57.75	112.95	43.77	271.88	43.77 to 271.88	37,908	38,480
_____ALL_____	477	94.93	103.03	94.24	21.17	109.33	36.00	827.52	93.79 to 97.38	141,192	133,054

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Low $_____											
1 TO 4999											
5000 TO 9999	2	153.94	153.94	161.80	76.61	95.14	36.00	271.88	N/A	7,500	12,135
_____Total $_____											
1 TO 9999	2	153.94	153.94	161.80	76.61	95.14	36.00	271.88	N/A	7,500	12,135
10000 TO 29999	21	132.40	188.17	193.65	74.98	97.17	43.77	780.25	99.20 to 179.50	23,104	44,740
30000 TO 59999	53	103.23	123.40	119.86	39.41	102.95	44.38	827.52	93.50 to 113.51	46,451	55,676
60000 TO 99999	102	99.63	101.32	101.16	14.47	100.16	40.25	184.84	95.09 to 105.21	79,813	80,740
100000 TO 149999	129	92.26	94.77	94.83	13.02	99.94	51.95	223.58	89.50 to 96.09	124,505	118,074
150000 TO 249999	120	93.74	94.96	94.81	09.59	100.16	65.76	153.63	92.07 to 95.48	187,232	177,508
250000 TO 499999	43	89.77	90.92	90.54	12.34	100.42	45.42	134.16	85.41 to 97.07	304,239	275,454
500000 +	6	61.95	63.76	62.67	11.09	101.74	52.13	75.16	52.13 to 75.16	755,670	473,550
_____ALL_____	477	94.93	103.03	94.24	21.17	109.33	36.00	827.52	93.79 to 97.38	141,192	133,054

A. Residential Real Property

The residential market in Saunders County is split into 15 valuation groupings by the county to indicate areas with different residential markets. These markets are affected by a variety of factors including proximity to the metropolitan areas of Omaha and Lincoln, as well as a relationship to the local economies of Ashland, Wahoo, and Fremont. The residential market was generally flat in the county for 2011. The assessment actions of the county resulted in about a one percent increase to the values of residential properties.

The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. The COD appears to a result of outliers in the sales file. The excessive PRD tends to indicate regressivity among assessments. Further analysis conducted by arraying the sale price categories indicates the median measures diminish as the sale prices climb. While a high PRD measure is not a single method to determine the county is out of compliance, it is worthy to note as the county conducts future appraisals. The overall assessment actions demonstrated by Saunders County indicate the quality of assessment is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal standards.

Review of the subclass statistics indicates that all valuation groupings with a sufficient number of sales are valued within the acceptable range. Because all valuation groupings sufficiently represented by sales have median ratios within the acceptable range, it is assumed that equalization exists within the residential class.

The overall assessment actions demonstrated by Saunders County indicate the quality of assessment is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal standards. The level of value for the residential class is determined to be 95% of market value.

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.

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.

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,

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

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

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

2011 Commercial Assessment Actions for Saunders County

No changes to the commercial and industrial class of property were reported for 2011. The County conducted a market analysis and determined the level of value was within the acceptable range for the class and that no individual valuation groupings had sufficient information to indicate an adjustment was necessary.

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

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Saunders County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Appraiser and staff
2.	**List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
1	Consists of the commercial properties within the town of Ashland. The unique characteristics are tied to the local economic conditions of the area.
2	All commercial properties in the Northern half of the county. These are mostly commercial properties in small towns. The influence is primarily the town of Fremont and Wahoo.
3	South Commercial encompasses the small town and rural commercial parcels in the South half of the county. Proximity to Lincoln and Wahoo are an influence.
4	Consists of the commercial properties within the town of Wahoo. The unique characteristics are tied to the local economic conditions of the area.

3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.**
	Cost approach is primarily used with depreciation established from sale information, although income information is used when sufficient data is available.
4.	**When was the last lot value study completed?**
	Lot values were last changed for Wahoo and Ashland in 2009.
5.	**Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.**
	Vacant sales analysis primarily.
6.	**What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?**
	June, 2007.
7.	**If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?**
	Depreciation tables are determined using local market information when sufficient information is available.
8.	**Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?**
	Yes
9.	**How often does the County update the depreciation tables?**
	Tables are updated in conjunction with neighborhood revaluations.
10.	**Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?**
	Yes

11.	**Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.**
	The county considers the overall change to market value in making the substantially changed determination rather than considering just the cost of the changes made. Substantial changes in market value result in the sale being removed from the qualified roster in the state sales file.
12.	**Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.**

78 Saunders

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 : 44	MEDIAN : 98	COV : 76.90	95% Median C.I. : 92.15 to 101.40
Total Sales Price : 4,012,250	WGT. MEAN : 90	STD : 83.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.09 to 98.07
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,012,250	MEAN : 109	Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.38	95% Mean C.I. : 84.36 to 133.96
Total Assessed Value : 3,614,220			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 91,188	COD : 31.16	MAX Sales Ratio : 600.20	
Avg. Assessed Value : 82,141	PRD : 121.18	MIN Sales Ratio : 49.25	*Printed:3/18/2011 4:08:01PM*

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	5	100.00	195.84	119.09	109.36	164.45	67.06	600.20	N/A	24,710	29,428
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	107.34	99.72	91.96	17.53	108.44	49.25	135.24	N/A	75,650	69,564
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	2	105.37	105.37	105.69	03.77	99.70	101.40	109.33	N/A	124,750	131,845
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	8	92.88	110.83	86.28	39.16	128.45	63.84	290.80	63.84 to 290.80	86,500	74,636
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	97.56	101.99	103.81	05.28	98.25	96.48	111.92	N/A	79,400	82,427
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	94.15	94.15	95.44	04.39	98.65	90.02	98.27	N/A	68,500	65,375
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	117.51	117.51	105.93	21.58	110.93	92.15	142.86	N/A	51,500	54,555
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	104.93	113.75	106.24	10.93	107.07	100.96	135.36	N/A	125,667	133,507
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	88.08	88.08	88.08	00.00	100.00	88.08	88.08	N/A	78,000	68,700
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	80.77	79.79	84.96	20.52	93.91	55.32	102.07	55.32 to 102.07	107,833	91,618
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	92.86	87.70	91.66	06.40	95.68	76.21	94.02	N/A	112,500	103,120
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	78.83	81.88	68.03	27.58	120.36	60.07	109.80	N/A	162,813	110,763
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	20	99.66	128.76	93.93	48.25	137.08	49.25	600.20	90.93 to 107.44	72,165	67,787
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	10	99.62	107.05	103.80	12.21	103.13	90.02	142.86	92.15 to 135.36	85,520	88,766
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	14	90.47	82.67	79.99	16.50	103.35	55.32	109.80	60.22 to 97.44	122,411	97,916
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	15	97.56	106.11	94.08	22.94	112.79	63.84	290.80	90.02 to 103.87	87,780	82,587
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	93.50	95.25	93.61	19.34	101.75	55.32	142.86	68.36 to 104.93	100,417	94,003
_____ALL_____	44	97.50	109.16	90.08	31.16	121.18	49.25	600.20	92.15 to 101.40	91,188	82,141

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	11	98.27	97.70	94.12	13.78	103.80	60.22	142.86	68.36 to 109.80	96,450	90,779
02	9	90.93	109.05	67.51	52.19	161.53	49.25	290.80	55.32 to 135.36	71,583	48,326
03	8	99.23	152.72	92.15	73.69	165.73	68.30	600.20	68.30 to 600.20	71,756	66,123
04	16	95.79	95.32	95.31	10.76	100.01	63.84	112.80	90.02 to 107.34	108,313	103,234
_____ALL_____	44	97.50	109.16	90.08	31.16	121.18	49.25	600.20	92.15 to 101.40	91,188	82,141

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	44	97.50	109.16	90.08	31.16	121.18	49.25	600.20	92.15 to 101.40	91,188	82,141
04											
_____ALL_____	44	97.50	109.16	90.08	31.16	121.18	49.25	600.20	92.15 to 101.40	91,188	82,141

78 Saunders

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 :	44	MEDIAN :	98	COV : 76.90	95% Median C.I. : 92.15 to 101.40
Total Sales Price :	4,012,250	WGT. MEAN :	90	STD : 83.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 82.09 to 98.07
Total Adj. Sales Price :	4,012,250	MEAN :	109	Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.38	95% Mean C.I. : 84.36 to 133.96
Total Assessed Value :	3,614,220				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	91,188	COD :	31.16	MAX Sales Ratio : 600.20	
Avg. Assessed Value :	82,141	PRD :	121.18	MIN Sales Ratio : 49.25	*Printed:3/18/2011 4:08:01PM*

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Low $_____											
1 TO 4999											
5000 TO 9999	3	290.80	342.08	338.69	53.30	101.00	135.24	600.20	N/A	5,083	17,217
_____Total $_____											
1 TO 9999	3	290.80	342.08	338.69	53.30	101.00	135.24	600.20	N/A	5,083	17,217
10000 TO 29999	4	113.15	109.05	116.33	26.57	93.74	67.06	142.86	N/A	21,250	24,720
30000 TO 59999	9	97.44	91.37	90.55	10.73	100.91	55.32	112.80	76.21 to 100.00	42,561	38,538
60000 TO 99999	13	96.48	89.28	88.21	15.25	101.21	49.25	109.80	68.36 to 107.34	76,958	67,883
100000 TO 149999	8	96.08	88.66	87.70	17.52	101.09	60.22	111.92	60.22 to 111.92	120,563	105,734
150000 TO 249999	5	94.82	96.68	96.61	03.00	100.07	93.18	102.07	N/A	175,800	169,834
250000 TO 499999	2	82.50	82.50	78.73	27.19	104.79	60.07	104.93	N/A	342,500	269,665
500000 +											
_____ALL_____	44	97.50	109.16	90.08	31.16	121.18	49.25	600.20	92.15 to 101.40	91,188	82,141

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	5	104.93	233.10	103.53	137.51	225.15	74.74	600.20	N/A	109,800	113,674
297	1	96.48	96.48	96.48	00.00	100.00	96.48	96.48	N/A	83,200	80,270
302	1	49.25	49.25	49.25	00.00	100.00	49.25	49.25	N/A	80,000	39,400
325	1	68.30	68.30	68.30	00.00	100.00	68.30	68.30	N/A	135,000	92,200
336	1	98.27	98.27	98.27	00.00	100.00	98.27	98.27	N/A	90,000	88,440
341	3	94.02	96.42	96.36	03.15	100.06	93.18	102.07	N/A	180,000	173,440
346	1	67.06	67.06	67.06	00.00	100.00	67.06	67.06	N/A	17,000	11,400
349	1	109.80	109.80	109.80	00.00	100.00	109.80	109.80	N/A	66,250	72,740
350	2	64.22	64.22	61.38	06.46	104.63	60.07	68.36	N/A	237,500	145,780
352	2	100.13	100.13	107.49	09.19	93.15	90.93	109.33	N/A	75,000	80,615
353	9	103.87	113.58	106.36	14.16	106.79	92.86	142.86	99.14 to 135.36	55,200	58,709
386	2	100.36	100.36	100.16	01.05	100.20	99.31	101.40	N/A	139,750	139,980
406	6	97.71	91.20	92.23	18.42	98.88	55.32	112.80	55.32 to 112.80	54,250	50,037
420	1	63.84	63.84	63.84	00.00	100.00	63.84	63.84	N/A	93,000	59,370
442	1	97.56	97.56	97.56	00.00	100.00	97.56	97.56	N/A	45,000	43,900
459	2	77.02	77.02	69.95	21.81	110.11	60.22	93.82	N/A	95,000	66,450
528	5	92.15	88.97	86.54	08.84	102.81	65.96	99.30	N/A	79,400	68,712
_____ALL_____	44	97.50	109.16	90.08	31.16	121.18	49.25	600.20	92.15 to 101.40	91,188	82,141

A. Commerical Real Property

The commercial market in Saunders County is split into 4 valuation groupings based on different economic areas. These are based on relationship to the local economies of Ashland, Fremont, Wahoo, and Lincoln. The commercial market has generally remained steady with some areas of slight increase in market value. The county commercial increased about 2 percent based on new values for existing properties.

While diversity in commercial properties exists in the commercial sales file, the range of sale prices indicates a spread consistent with the value spread in the population. The coefficient of dispersion reflects the disparity expected in the commercial class of property in Saunders County. These properties range from vacant, small town commercial properties to a recently constructed ethanol plant.

Analysis of the commercial statistics suggests the level of value is within the acceptable range, as measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales, and because the County applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file represents the level of value for the population. Based on the uniform assessment actions in the commercial class, the level of value is determined to be 95 percent of market value and the quality of assessment is considered to be acceptable.

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.

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.

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,

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

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

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

2011 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Saunders County

For the 2011 assessment year the county conducted a market study of the agricultural class of property. Using sales from uninfluenced areas outside the county, the county established values resulting in significant increases to both market areas.

Market Area 1 increased 25 percent for the irrigated and dryland classes while the grass increased 35 percent.

Market Area 2 increased 20 percent in the irrigated subclass, while dryland increased 10 percent. Grassland was increased 35 percent, although it makes up a relatively small portion of the total land area.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Saunders County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Appraiser and staff
2.	**List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.**

Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
1	Market Area 1 is the entire County except the Todd Valley. This land is primarily dryland with rolling hills.
2	Market Area 2 consists of the Todd Valley which is arguably the most productive land in the state. The land in this area is primarily crop land and relatively level with a low water table.

3.	**Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.**
	The county monitors the sales activity for agricultural land and forms the boundaries based on similar activity within each area.
4.	**Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.**
	The county identifies small tracts of land that sell in the rural areas and does not use them in the agricultural land analysis. The recreational properties are discovered during land use verification.
5.	**Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?**
	Yes
6.	**What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?**
	The values are established and assigned by land capability groupings.
7.	**What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)**
	The county uses information gathered from physical inspection, FSA information, and other info brought forward by the land owner such as NRD certifications.
8.	**Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.**
	Sales are monitored and questionnaires are reviewed to determine the types of influences present. The county also considers sales from uninfluenced areas outside the county as a comparison to the sale prices within Saunders County to gauge the degree of influence.
9.	**Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.**
	Applications have been received and the county is determined to be completely influenced.
10.	**Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?**
	Yes
11.	**Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially**

	changed.
	The county considers the overall change to market value in making the substantially changed determination rather than considering just the cost of the changes made. Substantial changes in market value result in the sale being removed from the qualified roster in the state sales file.
12.	**Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.**

Special Valuation Reports

2011

Methodology for Special Valuation

Saunders County

The State Assessment office for Saunders County submits this report pursuant to Title 350, Neb. R. & Regs., Reg-11-005.004. The following methodologies are used to value agricultural land that is influenced by market factors other than purely agricultural or horticultural purposes. The following non-agricultural influences have been identified: Residential and Recreational. The office maintains a file of all data used for determining the special and actual valuation. This file shall be available for inspection at the State Assessment office for Saunders County by any interested person.

A. Identification of the influenced area:

The assumption is made that there are few true agricultural sales in Saunders County. There are five market areas. There are two separate and distinct areas of special valuation for Saunders County.

Special valuation Area 1 is the entire county except Area 2 which is Todd Valley. Area 1 has less productive soils. Area 1 has some irrigation but it is limited in both quality and quantity. Area 1 has some pasture grass, CRP and hay production. However, most of the land is row crop production.

Area 2 is Todd Valley. Todd Valley is the old Platte River bed. This silted-in area has created an excellent agricultural production area. The Todd Valley area wanders throughout the county and is totally surrounded by the other market areas in the county. Topographically, Todd Valley is mainly a flat area consisting of better quality soils with unlimited irrigation. Area 2 consists of mostly row crop production of corn and soybeans.

B. Describe the highest and best use of the properties in the influenced area, and how this was determined:

Residential acreages, rural suburbs and recreational usage are the highest and best use of properties in Saunders County. There are several highways connecting the county to Lincoln, Omaha and Fremont. Highways 77, 63 and 92 run through these areas making it easily accessible for outside residential use. The Platte River provides opportunities for recreational uses such as fishing, boating and hunting. This conclusion was determined by analyzing sales.

C. Describe the valuation models used in arriving at the value estimates, and explain why and how they were selected:

Two methods of valuation were analyzed for determining special valuation. Comparable sales of farm ground from uninfluenced counties and an income valuation method using cash rents and a cap rate from the market were considered. Sales of farm ground from uninfluenced counties were selected as the most accurate and reliable method of special valuation for Saunders County.

D. Describe which market areas were analyzed, both in the County and in any county deemed comparable:

Comparable sales for Area 1 were analyzed from the eastern side of Butler County, Johnson County, Nemaha County and Otoe County. These counties resemble the majority of Area 1 with similar soil profiles, limited irrigation availability and land management techniques.

Comparable sales for Area 2 were analyzed from York County, Butler County, Seward County and Dodge County. The soil profile, crop production and irrigation use are well matched.

E. Describe any adjustments made to sales to reflect current cash equivalency of typical market conditions. Include how this affects the actual and special value:

No adjustments were made to sales for any reason.

F. Describe any estimates of economic rent or net operating income used in an income capitalization approach. Include estimates of yields, commodity prices, typical crop share:

We have not studied rents for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office. What appropriate information has been received by this office has been inconclusive

G. Describe the typical expenses allowed in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:

We have not studied the income approach for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office. What appropriate information has been received by this office has been inconclusive.

H. Describe the overall capitalization rate used in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:

We have not studied the income approach for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office. What appropriate information has been received by this office has been inconclusive.

I. Describe any other information used in supporting the estimate of actual and special value. Include how this affects the actual and special value:

No other information was used.

Cathy Gusman
Assessment Administration Manager
For Saunders County

Terry Kubik
State Appraiser
For Saunders County

Nebraska Department of REVENUE

Saunders County
2011 Analysis of Special Valuation

Ratio Study

Final Statistics

Total		Median	69.74%	AAD	14.47%
# sales	396	Mean	71.48%	COD	20.75%
		Wt Mean	66.57%	PRD	107.38%

Confidence Intervals

95% Median C.I.:	68.04%	to	71.35%
95% Mean C.I.:	69.58%	to	73.39%
95% Wt Mean C.I.:	63.23%	to	69.69%

Majority Land Use

95% MLU	Irrigated		Dry		Grass	
	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median
Total	85	67.12%	90	73.15%	8	50.31%

80% MLU	Irrigated		Dry		Grass	
	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median
Total	152	68.58%	144	71.28%	14	55.96%

Nebraska Department of REVENUE

Saunders County Area 1
2011 Analysis of Special Valuation

Ratio Study

		Final Statistics				Confidence Intervals			
TOTAL		Median	68.52%	AAD	16.53%	95% Median C.I.:	64.37%	to	71.12%
# sales	145	Mean	71.05%	COD	24.13%	95% Mean C.I.:	67.50%	to	74.60%
		Wt Mean	66.15%	PRD	107.41%	95% Wt Mean C.I.:	62.15%	to	72.69%
E Butler		Median	65.20%	AAD	12.21%	95% Median C.I.:	54.87%	to	71.94%
# sales	19	Mean	66.46%	COD	18.73%	95% Mean C.I.:	57.79%	to	75.13%
		Wt Mean	66.30%	PRD	100.25%	95% Wt Mean C.I.:	60.45%	to	72.15%
Nemaha		Median	67.33%	AAD	15.25%	95% Median C.I.:	60.59%	to	71.12%
# sales	56	Mean	69.43%	COD	22.65%	95% Mean C.I.:	64.26%	to	74.61%
		Wt Mean	63.91%	PRD	108.64%	95% Wt Mean C.I.:	58.61%	to	69.21%
Otoe		Median	72.10%	AAD	18.53%	95% Median C.I.:	65.02%	to	75.77%
# sales	70	Mean	73.59%	COD	25.70%	95% Mean C.I.:	67.94%	to	79.24%
		Wt Mean	68.30%	PRD	107.75%	95% Wt Mean C.I.:	62.53%	to	74.07%

Majority Land Use

95% MLU	Irrigated		Dry		Grass	
	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median
TOTAL	1	55.92%	42	68.11%	3	68.15%
E Butler	1	55.92%	4	69.61%	0	N/A
Nemaha	0	N/A	14	73.88%	3	68.15%
Otoe	0	N/A	24	65.69%	0	N/A

80% MLU	Irrigated		Dry		Grass	
	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median
TOTAL	2	55.40%	87	69.76%	8	66.59%
E Butler	2	55.40%	8	71.07%	0	N/A
Nemaha	0	N/A	36	70.44%	5	68.15%
Otoe	0	N/A	43	67.71%	3	65.02%

Nebraska Department of REVENUE

Saunders County Area 2
2011 Analysis of Special Valuation

Ratio Study

		Final Statistics				Confidence Intervals			
Total		Median	69.90%	AAD	13.37%	95% Median C.I.:	68.04%	to	72.65%
# sales	251	Mean	71.45%	COD	19.13%	95% Mean C.I.:	69.29%	to	73.60%
		Wt Mean	66.46%	PRD	107.51%	95% Wt Mean C.I.:	64.63%	to	68.29%
Butler		Median	70.48%	AAD	12.56%	95% Median C.I.:	66.22%	to	73.09%
# sales	69	Mean	68.82%	COD	17.83%	95% Mean C.I.:	64.59%	to	73.04%
		Wt Mean	67.90%	PRD	101.35%	95% Wt Mean C.I.:	64.94%	to	70.86%
Seward		Median	73.68%	AAD	14.79%	95% Median C.I.:	67.30%	to	81.20%
# sales	67	Mean	76.46%	COD	20.07%	95% Mean C.I.:	72.12%	to	80.81%
		Wt Mean	68.17%	PRD	112.16%	95% Wt Mean C.I.:	64.41%	to	71.93%
York		Median	69.30%	AAD	12.74%	95% Median C.I.:	64.61%	to	73.48%
# sales	73	Mean	70.83%	COD	18.39%	95% Mean C.I.:	67.13%	to	74.53%
		Wt Mean	65.93%	PRD	107.44%	95% Wt Mean C.I.:	62.59%	to	69.27%
Dodge		Median	67.76%	AAD	12.72%	95% Median C.I.:	61.09%	to	70.77%
# sales	42	Mean	68.83%	COD	18.77%	95% Mean C.I.:	63.81%	to	73.84%
		Wt Mean	62.40%	PRD	110.30%	95% Wt Mean C.I.:	57.80%	to	66.99%

Majority Land Use

95% MLU	Irrigated		Dry		Grass	
	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median
Total	84	68.00%	49	76.80%	5	36.31%
Butler	14	73.23%	22	70.64%	3	29.64%
Seward	9	63.91%	10	94.86%	0	N/A
York	51	69.30%	4	72.42%	2	69.35%
Dodge	10	62.12%	13	77.62%	0	N/A

80% MLU	Irrigated		Dry		Grass	
	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median	# Sales	Median
Total	150	68.96%	61	74.88%	6	36.33%
Butler	32	71.89%	26	71.89%	4	32.98%
Seward	38	66.21%	14	87.20%	0	N/A
York	60	69.81%	4	72.42%	2	69.35%
Dodge	20	67.76%	17	73.90%	0	N/A

Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

A. Agricultural Land

A1. Correlation for Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

The level of value for special valuation in Saunders County was developed using assessment-to-sales ratios developed using sale data from uninfluenced counties considered comparable to Saunders County. Income rental rates, production factors, topography, and other factors were considered to determine general areas of comparability. The 2011 assessed values established by Saunders County were used to estimate value for the uninfluenced sales and the results were measured against the sale prices. Significant differences exist in production capability and rental rates between two market areas. Analysis of the two market areas separately produces a measurement that recognizes the market characteristics inherent in an uninfluenced agricultural land market.

Based on this analysis it is the opinion of the Division that the level of value of Agricultural Special Value in Saunders County is 70%, and the level of value is acceptable in the two market areas.

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.

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.

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,

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

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

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

Total Real Property (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30) **Records :** 15,479 **Value :** 2,147,772,085 **Growth** 18,366,100 (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41)

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	464	4,827,620	230	5,667,670	379	20,240,240	1,073	30,735,530	
02. Res Improve Land	4,224	78,929,050	1,132	67,120,350	1,700	96,022,940	7,056	242,072,340	
03. Res Improvements	4,311	325,337,190	1,172	163,402,260	1,760	230,488,160	7,243	719,227,610	
04. Res Total	4,775	409,093,860	1,402	236,190,280	2,139	346,751,340	8,316	992,035,480	12,135,720
% of Res Total	57.42	41.24	16.86	23.81	25.72	34.95	53.72	46.19	66.08
05. Com UnImp Land	112	4,574,370	17	520,300	16	938,180	145	6,032,850	
06. Com Improve Land	581	11,173,040	54	1,951,030	43	2,133,640	678	15,257,710	
07. Com Improvements	592	72,771,675	68	12,199,400	54	7,968,270	714	92,939,345	
08. Com Total	704	88,519,085	85	14,670,730	70	11,040,090	859	114,229,905	964,240
% of Com Total	81.96	77.49	9.90	12.84	8.15	9.66	5.55	5.32	5.25
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	2	82,350	15	546,310	17	628,660	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	1	32,000	4	447,610	5	479,610	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	1	26,090	11	346,340	12	372,430	
16. Rec Total	0	0	3	140,440	26	1,340,260	29	1,480,700	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	10.34	9.48	89.66	90.52	0.19	0.07	0.00
Res & Rec Total	4,775	409,093,860	1,405	236,330,720	2,165	348,091,600	8,345	993,516,180	12,135,720
% of Res & Rec Total	57.22	41.18	16.84	23.79	25.94	35.04	53.91	46.26	66.08
Com & Ind Total	704	88,519,085	85	14,670,730	70	11,040,090	859	114,229,905	964,240
% of Com & Ind Total	81.96	77.49	9.90	12.84	8.15	9.66	5.55	5.32	5.25
17. Taxable Total	5,479	497,612,945	1,490	251,001,450	2,235	359,131,690	9,204	1,107,746,085	13,099,960
% of Taxable Total	59.53	44.92	16.19	22.66	24.28	32.42	59.46	51.58	71.33

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	25	27,900	702,760	0	0	0
19. Commercial	7	2,996,770	26,193,890	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	25	27,900	702,760
19. Commercial	1	20,540	58,460	8	3,017,310	26,252,350
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				**33**	**3,045,210**	**26,955,110**

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	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	383	181	326	890

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	422	49,609,660	4,133	540,941,160	4,555	590,550,820
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	91,110	142	26,330,810	1,478	260,333,110	1,621	286,755,030
29. Ag Improvements	17	110,610	150	16,198,010	1,553	146,411,530	1,720	162,720,150
30. Ag Total							**6,275**	**1,040,026,000**

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1	1.00	28,000	100	107.00	2,753,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1	1.00	73,660	103	106.00	13,770,630	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	14	38.00	175,000	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	119	316.79	1,492,060	
37. FarmSite Improvements	16	0.00	36,950	135	0.00	2,427,380	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	762.09	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			**Total**			**Growth**
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	9	9.00	222,000	9	9.00	222,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,107	1,155.40	28,714,200	1,208	1,263.40	31,495,200	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,136	1,142.00	122,455,320	1,240	1,249.00	136,299,610	5,266,140
34. HomeSite Total				**1,249**	**1,272.40**	**168,016,810**	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	234	1,709.74	3,250,050	248	1,747.74	3,425,050	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,304	4,051.52	16,398,290	1,423	4,368.31	17,890,350	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,399	0.00	23,956,210	1,550	0.00	26,420,540	0
38. FarmSite Total				**1,798**	**6,116.05**	**47,735,940**	
39. Road & Ditches	0	8,682.31	0	0	9,444.40	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				**3,047**	**16,832.85**	**215,752,750**	**5,266,140**

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	10	705.18	705,860	10	705.18	705,860

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	504	32,223.47	67,103,320
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	504	32,223.47	100,210,240
	Rural			**Total**		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	5,336	382,333.58	716,304,520	5,840	414,557.05	783,407,840
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	1,105.00	11.16%	3,368,290	15.26%	3,048.23
46. 1A	718.42	7.26%	2,038,300	9.23%	2,837.20
47. 2A1	2,315.35	23.39%	6,401,430	29.00%	2,764.78
48. 2A	1,650.51	16.67%	3,869,110	17.53%	2,344.19
49. 3A1	68.00	0.69%	140,340	0.64%	2,063.82
50. 3A	298.00	3.01%	514,810	2.33%	1,727.55
51. 4A1	3,687.96	37.25%	5,658,390	25.63%	1,534.29
52. 4A	56.69	0.57%	82,930	0.38%	1,462.87
53. Total	9,899.93	100.00%	22,073,600	100.00%	2,229.67
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,267.68	1.81%	3,584,900	2.84%	2,827.92
55. 1D	3,423.85	4.90%	8,920,740	7.06%	2,605.47
56. 2D1	17,333.41	24.80%	43,873,770	34.70%	2,531.17
57. 2D	6,254.10	8.95%	13,606,700	10.76%	2,175.64
58. 3D1	475.88	0.68%	882,480	0.70%	1,854.42
59. 3D	2,300.71	3.29%	3,508,040	2.77%	1,524.76
60. 4D1	37,782.64	54.06%	50,679,150	40.09%	1,341.33
61. 4D	1,054.04	1.51%	1,372,290	1.09%	1,301.93
62. Total	69,892.31	100.00%	126,428,070	100.00%	1,808.90
Grass					
63. 1G1	25.90	0.21%	31,860	0.27%	1,230.12
64. 1G	516.99	4.15%	611,120	5.19%	1,182.07
65. 2G1	1,131.07	9.08%	1,665,010	14.13%	1,472.07
66. 2G	1,160.47	9.31%	1,395,460	11.84%	1,202.50
67. 3G1	234.00	1.88%	217,920	1.85%	931.28
68. 3G	708.24	5.68%	801,660	6.80%	1,131.90
69. 4G1	5,132.71	41.19%	5,083,400	43.14%	990.39
70. 4G	3,552.18	28.51%	1,976,320	16.77%	556.37
71. Total	12,461.56	100.00%	11,782,750	100.00%	945.53

Irrigated Total	9,899.93	10.54%	22,073,600	13.74%	2,229.67
Dry Total	69,892.31	74.38%	126,428,070	78.71%	1,808.90
Grass Total	12,461.56	13.26%	11,782,750	7.34%	945.53
72. Waste	1,714.31	1.82%	349,460	0.22%	203.85
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	1,038.97	1.11%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	93,968.11	100.00%	160,633,880	100.00%	1,709.45

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 1**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	4.00	100.00%	5,020	100.00%	1,255.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	4.00	100.00%	5,020	100.00%	1,255.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	12.00	57.14%	14,760	74.36%	1,230.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	9.00	42.86%	5,090	25.64%	565.56
70. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
71. Total	21.00	100.00%	19,850	100.00%	945.24

Irrigated Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry Total	4.00	16.00%	5,020	20.18%	1,255.00
Grass Total	21.00	84.00%	19,850	79.82%	945.24
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	25.00	100.00%	24,870	100.00%	994.80

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 2**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	31,390.79	63.19%	106,181,250	67.94%	3,382.56
46. 1A	635.59	1.28%	2,008,570	1.29%	3,160.17
47. 2A1	7,014.42	14.12%	21,397,360	13.69%	3,050.48
48. 2A	1,207.85	2.43%	3,498,980	2.24%	2,896.87
49. 3A1	5,740.34	11.55%	15,687,280	10.04%	2,732.81
50. 3A	252.50	0.51%	532,710	0.34%	2,109.74
51. 4A1	3,398.74	6.84%	6,925,680	4.43%	2,037.72
52. 4A	39.00	0.08%	59,290	0.04%	1,520.26
53. Total	49,679.23	100.00%	156,291,120	100.00%	3,146.01
Dry					
54. 1D1	16,701.42	52.10%	52,527,150	57.20%	3,145.07
55. 1D	1,199.35	3.74%	3,655,710	3.98%	3,048.08
56. 2D1	4,963.02	15.48%	14,270,710	15.54%	2,875.41
57. 2D	1,762.65	5.50%	4,872,290	5.31%	2,764.18
58. 3D1	3,301.23	10.30%	8,492,230	9.25%	2,572.44
59. 3D	503.13	1.57%	1,023,030	1.11%	2,033.33
60. 4D1	3,477.20	10.85%	6,727,020	7.33%	1,934.61
61. 4D	151.30	0.47%	264,920	0.29%	1,750.96
62. Total	32,059.30	100.00%	91,833,060	100.00%	2,864.47
Grass					
63. 1G1	312.88	10.50%	500,170	16.38%	1,598.60
64. 1G	147.58	4.95%	180,800	5.92%	1,225.10
65. 2G1	226.18	7.59%	213,790	7.00%	945.22
66. 2G	606.78	20.37%	768,430	25.17%	1,266.41
67. 3G1	300.02	10.07%	274,150	8.98%	913.77
68. 3G	231.50	7.77%	229,970	7.53%	993.39
69. 4G1	859.29	28.85%	756,240	24.77%	880.08
70. 4G	294.63	9.89%	129,530	4.24%	439.64
71. Total	2,978.86	100.00%	3,053,080	100.00%	1,024.92
Irrigated Total	49,679.23	58.34%	156,291,120	62.21%	3,146.01
Dry Total	32,059.30	37.65%	91,833,060	36.55%	2,864.47
Grass Total	2,978.86	3.50%	3,053,080	1.22%	1,024.92
72. Waste	430.12	0.51%	60,270	0.02%	140.12
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	12,821.87	15.06%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	85,147.51	100.00%	251,237,530	100.00%	2,950.62

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 3**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,741.44	14.65%	8,298,180	19.63%	3,026.94
46. 1A	1,033.76	5.52%	2,929,070	6.93%	2,833.41
47. 2A1	3,608.07	19.28%	9,951,650	23.54%	2,758.16
48. 2A	4,019.28	21.48%	9,514,580	22.50%	2,367.23
49. 3A1	1,234.70	6.60%	2,349,300	5.56%	1,902.73
50. 3A	340.00	1.82%	582,820	1.38%	1,714.18
51. 4A1	5,488.33	29.33%	8,301,960	19.63%	1,512.66
52. 4A	248.98	1.33%	355,680	0.84%	1,428.55
53. Total	18,714.56	100.00%	42,283,240	100.00%	2,259.38
Dry					
54. 1D1	6,329.82	5.27%	17,695,600	8.01%	2,795.59
55. 1D	6,820.31	5.68%	17,638,560	7.99%	2,586.18
56. 2D1	26,253.97	21.85%	66,456,650	30.10%	2,531.30
57. 2D	11,569.34	9.63%	25,111,500	11.37%	2,170.52
58. 3D1	6,813.33	5.67%	12,175,130	5.51%	1,786.96
59. 3D	960.08	0.80%	1,396,030	0.63%	1,454.08
60. 4D1	59,786.07	49.77%	78,244,930	35.44%	1,308.75
61. 4D	1,603.14	1.33%	2,072,450	0.94%	1,292.74
62. Total	120,136.06	100.00%	220,790,850	100.00%	1,837.84
Grass					
63. 1G1	340.66	1.26%	415,120	1.77%	1,218.58
64. 1G	1,175.36	4.34%	1,497,340	6.39%	1,273.94
65. 2G1	1,944.22	7.18%	2,603,800	11.12%	1,339.25
66. 2G	2,098.78	7.75%	2,416,140	10.31%	1,151.21
67. 3G1	4,153.05	15.34%	3,704,200	15.81%	891.92
68. 3G	439.48	1.62%	556,060	2.37%	1,265.27
69. 4G1	11,766.63	43.45%	10,105,720	43.14%	858.85
70. 4G	5,160.70	19.06%	2,127,370	9.08%	412.23
71. Total	27,078.88	100.00%	23,425,750	100.00%	865.09

Irrigated Total	18,714.56	11.03%	42,283,240	14.73%	2,259.38
Dry Total	120,136.06	70.79%	220,790,850	76.93%	1,837.84
Grass Total	27,078.88	15.96%	23,425,750	8.16%	865.09
72. Waste	3,779.64	2.23%	520,030	0.18%	137.59
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	555.18	0.33%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	169,709.14	100.00%	287,019,870	100.00%	1,691.25

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 3**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	2.00	9.30%	5,190	14.68%	2,595.00
56. 2D1	2.00	9.30%	5,060	14.31%	2,530.00
57. 2D	3.50	16.28%	7,530	21.30%	2,151.43
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	14.00	65.12%	17,580	49.72%	1,255.71
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	21.50	100.00%	35,360	100.00%	1,644.65
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	3.00	30.00%	3,690	48.24%	1,230.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	7.00	70.00%	3,960	51.76%	565.71
70. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
71. Total	10.00	100.00%	7,650	100.00%	765.00

Irrigated Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry Total	21.50	58.90%	35,360	81.27%	1,644.65
Grass Total	10.00	27.40%	7,650	17.58%	765.00
72. Waste	5.00	13.70%	500	1.15%	100.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.28	0.77%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	36.50	100.00%	43,510	100.00%	1,192.05

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 4**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	815.00	11.12%	2,476,350	15.25%	3,038.47
46. 1A	116.00	1.58%	338,700	2.09%	2,919.83
47. 2A1	465.13	6.34%	1,298,530	8.00%	2,791.76
48. 2A	3,173.42	43.29%	7,141,810	43.99%	2,250.51
49. 3A1	315.59	4.30%	608,320	3.75%	1,927.56
50. 3A	1,411.43	19.25%	2,626,400	16.18%	1,860.81
51. 4A1	933.67	12.74%	1,601,120	9.86%	1,714.87
52. 4A	101.10	1.38%	143,290	0.88%	1,417.31
53. Total	7,331.34	100.00%	16,234,520	100.00%	2,214.40
Dry					
54. 1D1	552.75	3.17%	1,547,380	4.45%	2,799.42
55. 1D	600.15	3.44%	1,617,990	4.66%	2,695.98
56. 2D1	2,287.31	13.10%	5,799,220	16.69%	2,535.39
57. 2D	7,287.61	41.73%	15,223,160	43.82%	2,088.91
58. 3D1	693.53	3.97%	1,317,650	3.79%	1,899.92
59. 3D	2,333.02	13.36%	4,092,840	11.78%	1,754.31
60. 4D1	3,478.69	19.92%	4,847,100	13.95%	1,393.37
61. 4D	230.90	1.32%	292,130	0.84%	1,265.18
62. Total	17,463.96	100.00%	34,737,470	100.00%	1,989.09
Grass					
63. 1G1	44.00	0.38%	54,930	0.52%	1,248.41
64. 1G	110.37	0.96%	150,220	1.43%	1,361.06
65. 2G1	57.10	0.50%	49,910	0.48%	874.08
66. 2G	2,964.96	25.75%	3,122,140	29.80%	1,053.01
67. 3G1	309.22	2.69%	428,620	4.09%	1,386.13
68. 3G	2,109.22	18.32%	1,928,760	18.41%	914.44
69. 4G1	4,401.30	38.23%	3,840,870	36.66%	872.67
70. 4G	1,516.11	13.17%	902,560	8.61%	595.31
71. Total	11,512.28	100.00%	10,478,010	100.00%	910.16
Irrigated Total	7,331.34	19.41%	16,234,520	26.25%	2,214.40
Dry Total	17,463.96	46.24%	34,737,470	56.18%	1,989.09
Grass Total	11,512.28	30.48%	10,478,010	16.94%	910.16
72. Waste	1,457.82	3.86%	386,030	0.62%	264.80
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	1,469.88	3.89%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	37,765.40	100.00%	61,836,030	100.00%	1,637.37

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 4**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	34.00	100.00%	26,010	100.00%	765.00
70. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
71. Total	34.00	100.00%	26,010	100.00%	765.00

Irrigated Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total	34.00	100.00%	26,010	100.00%	765.00
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	34.00	100.00%	26,010	100.00%	765.00

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 5**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	834.42	8.47%	2,540,710	11.84%	3,044.88
46. 1A	273.00	2.77%	791,300	3.69%	2,898.53
47. 2A1	3,448.82	35.02%	9,574,260	44.62%	2,776.10
48. 2A	525.56	5.34%	1,257,280	5.86%	2,392.27
49. 3A1	23.00	0.23%	46,350	0.22%	2,015.22
50. 3A	533.00	5.41%	906,100	4.22%	1,700.00
51. 4A1	4,181.09	42.46%	6,299,760	29.36%	1,506.73
52. 4A	29.00	0.29%	41,760	0.19%	1,440.00
53. Total	9,847.89	100.00%	21,457,520	100.00%	2,178.90
Dry					
54. 1D1	989.70	4.62%	2,787,610	6.89%	2,816.62
55. 1D	736.59	3.44%	1,914,100	4.73%	2,598.60
56. 2D1	6,342.65	29.64%	16,143,030	39.92%	2,545.16
57. 2D	2,032.11	9.50%	4,420,560	10.93%	2,175.35
58. 3D1	61.00	0.29%	110,580	0.27%	1,812.79
59. 3D	1,686.28	7.88%	2,579,550	6.38%	1,529.73
60. 4D1	9,452.93	44.17%	12,349,120	30.54%	1,306.38
61. 4D	99.77	0.47%	135,010	0.33%	1,353.21
62. Total	21,401.03	100.00%	40,439,560	100.00%	1,889.61
Grass					
63. 1G1	5.40	0.35%	6,640	0.44%	1,229.63
64. 1G	119.79	7.83%	185,920	12.43%	1,552.05
65. 2G1	159.57	10.42%	173,500	11.60%	1,087.30
66. 2G	395.00	25.80%	460,500	30.79%	1,165.82
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	100.74	6.58%	87,750	5.87%	871.05
69. 4G1	581.34	37.98%	510,900	34.16%	878.83
70. 4G	169.00	11.04%	70,450	4.71%	416.86
71. Total	1,530.84	100.00%	1,495,660	100.00%	977.02

Irrigated Total	9,847.89	29.69%	21,457,520	33.82%	2,178.90
Dry Total	21,401.03	64.52%	40,439,560	63.73%	1,889.61
Grass Total	1,530.84	4.61%	1,495,660	2.36%	977.02
72. Waste	391.83	1.18%	58,810	0.09%	150.09
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	123.73	0.37%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	33,171.59	100.00%	63,451,550	100.00%	1,912.83

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 5**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
70. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
71. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Irrigated Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	4.15	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	9,881.92	28,022,310	85,591.03	230,317,690	95,472.95	258,340,000
77. Dry Land	18.74	63,110	19,615.19	40,891,150	241,344.23	473,315,130	260,978.16	514,269,390
78. Grass	0.00	0	2,952.08	2,442,840	52,675.34	47,845,920	55,627.42	50,288,760
79. Waste	0.00	0	701.40	164,110	7,077.32	1,210,990	7,778.72	1,375,100
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	1,465.12	0	14,548.94	0	16,014.06	0
82. Total	**18.74**	**63,110**	**33,150.59**	**71,520,410**	**386,687.92**	**752,689,730**	**419,857.25**	**824,273,250**

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	95,472.95	22.74%	258,340,000	31.34%	2,705.90
Dry Land	260,978.16	62.16%	514,269,390	62.39%	1,970.55
Grass	55,627.42	13.25%	50,288,760	6.10%	904.03
Waste	7,778.72	1.85%	1,375,100	0.17%	176.78
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	16,014.06	3.81%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	**419,857.25**	100.00%	**824,273,250**	100.00%	1,963.22

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

78 Saunders

	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	962,787,670	992,035,480	29,247,810	3.04%	12,135,720	1.78%
02. Recreational	1,379,190	1,480,700	101,510	7.36%	0	7.36%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	164,921,620	168,016,810	3,095,190	1.88%	5,266,140	-1.32%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	**1,129,088,480**	**1,161,532,990**	**32,444,510**	**2.87%**	**17,401,860**	**1.33%**
05. Commercial	111,355,830	114,229,905	2,874,075	2.58%	964,240	1.72%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	39,245,700	47,735,940	8,490,240	21.63%	0	21.63%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	**150,601,530**	**161,965,845**	**11,364,315**	**7.55%**	**964,240**	**6.91%**
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	**1,279,690,010**	**1,323,498,835**	**43,808,825**	**3.42%**	**18,366,100**	**1.99%**
11. Irrigated	210,080,030	258,340,000	48,259,970	22.97%		
12. Dryland	421,313,180	514,269,390	92,956,210	22.06%		
13. Grassland	39,063,870	50,288,760	11,224,890	28.73%		
14. Wasteland	1,732,380	1,375,100	-357,280	-20.62%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	**672,189,460**	**824,273,250**	**152,083,790**	**22.63%**		
17. Total Value of all Real Property	**1,951,879,470**	**2,147,772,085**	**195,892,615**	**10.04%**	**18,366,100**	**9.10%**
(Locally Assessed)						

2010 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT
FOR
SAUNDERS COUNTY
By Cathy Gusman and Terry Kubik

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), on or before June 15 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 or 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 Revenue, Property Assessment Division 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 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." Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (2003).

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 horticultural land; and
3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2009).

General Description of Real Property in Saunders County: Per the 2010 County Abstract, Saunders County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	**8364**	**53.98%**	**49.37%**
Commercial	**857**	**5.53%**	**5.69%**
Recreational	**29**	**.19%**	**.07%**
Agricultural	**438**	**2.83%**	**12.36%**

Special Value	**5797**	**37.41%**	**32.51%**
Game & Parks	**10**	**.06%**	**.02%**

Agricultural land - taxable acres **404,708.87**

Other pertinent facts: ***46.75% of Saunders County value comes from agricultural parcels. 62.31% of the agricultural acres are in dry farming, 22.48% is irrigated and 13.23% is in grasslands. The county consists of two smaller cities and 13 villages. The commercial properties are limited to mainly small operations.***

New Property: For assessment year 2010, an estimated **1000** building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2010 Reports & Opinion, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training

1 Assessment Manager, 1 Assessment Assistant, 2 Assessment Clerks, 1 Appraiser I, 1 Appraiser Assistant II.

The total budget for Saunders County for 2008/2009 was $360,317.39. Included in the total is $21,138 dedicated to the TerraScan CAMA/assessment administration package, $153,887 for appraisal work, and $1,724 for continuing education.

The assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years. The assessor has met all the educational hours required. The assessor also attends other workshops and meetings to further her knowledge of the assessment field.

The assessment staff at this time does not have continuing education requirements. The staff has voluntarily taken classes such as Windows, TerraScan user education, as well as IAAO classes.

Along with voluntary educational classes, Appraisers attend classes throughout the year to maintain current licenses.

B. Cadastral Maps
The Saunders County cadastral maps were up-dated in June of 1989. The assessment staff maintains the maps. All new subdivisions and parcel splits are kept up to date, as well as ownership transfers.

C. Property Record Cards
The property record cards in Saunders County were new in 1990. Ownership transfers are no longer being kept up to date on paper property record cards. Changes in the property structures are no longer being kept current on the property record cards. A concentrated effort towards a "paperless" property record card is in effect. Saunders

County Assessment Office went on-line in June of 2006 with the property record information.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

The provider for our CAMA and assessment administration is provided by TerraScan. Currently, Saunders County does not have a GIS system. Agridata program is also used to assist with new soil conversion.

E. Web based – property record information access

Property record cards are available online.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property.

Step 1-Building permits are gathered from all the permitting entities, separated into separate categories (rural, towns, etc), entered into the computer system and a plan of action is developed based on the number and location of each permit.

Step 2-A complete review of the readily accessible areas of the improvement is conducted. Measurements and photos are taken; and physical characteristics are noted at the time of inspection.

Step 3-Inspection data is entered into the CAMA system, using marshal and swift cost tables; and market data; a value is generated for each property inspected.

Step 4-The value generated for each property is compared to similar properties in the area, for equalization purposes.

Step 5-Permits are closed and notes are made in the file to roll the value for the following assessment year.

B. Data Collection.

All relevant sales are gathered, analyzed, and separated into groupings. These groupings are properties in similar areas with similar characteristics, purchased at similar rates. A study is conducted to determine if there are patterns, or similarities in sales prices etc, market areas are then developed. Once the market area is determined sales data is analyzed to ascertain what aspects of real property affects value. This information is carefully studied and a model is created to assist in determining property values. At the conclusion of the value generation, a ratio study is conducted to measure the viability of the new valuations. Individual property information is gathered in the same manner as properties that have building permits.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.

Part of market analysis and data collection. Market areas are reviewed on a yearly basis.

1) Approaches to Value;

All three approaches are considered when determining market values. The extent each approach is used depends upon the property type and market data available. The cost approach is most heavily relied upon in the initial evaluation process. All relevant sales are gathered, and analyzed to develop a market generated depreciation table. The market approach is used to support the value generated by the cost approach, broken down price per square foot. Commercial properties are valued in a manner similar to residential properties; however each classification is broken down into a value per square foot in the initial stage of valuation. Comparable agricultural sales from non-influenced counties are used to determine land values. The income approach is used to support agricultural land values in special value areas, properties under rent restrictions, and used to affirm property values for small downtown commercial shops, apartment complexes and income producing properties that are commonly leased or where lease information is available.

2) Market Approach; sales comparisons, **See above**

3) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study,

06/07 for residential and 06/04 for commercial

4) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market,

See above

5) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land

All relevant sales are gathered, analyzed, and separated into groupings. These groupings are properties in similar areas with similar characteristics, purchased at similar rates. When setting agricultural land values, sales are gathered from the entire county. A study is conducted to determine if there are patterns, or similarities in soil classification, sales prices etc. Market areas are then developed and values generated using sales from each market area. Once the market area is determined sales data is analyzed to ascertain what aspects of real property affects value. This information is carefully studied and a model is created to assist in determining property values. At the conclusion of the value generation, a ratio study is conducted to measure the viability of the new valuations.

Special value generation: **Sales from comparable areas from non-influenced**

counties are used to set agricultural values. To support this value, a study is conducted to determine market rental rates for each market area. This information is compared to the study conducted by the Bruce Johnson from the University of Nebraska (using land and funds information). Using market rent information, a rent value is assigned to each soil classification. A capitalization rate is supplied by the Department of Revenue. Using this capitalization rate and the market rental rates, a value is generated for each property in the market area. At the conclusion of the value generation, a comparison study is conducted to measure the viability of the new valuations.

D. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation **See above**

E. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions. **See above**

F. Notices and Public Relations

A new valuation notice is mailed to any property that experiences a valuation change on or before June 1 of each year. The protest process then begins. In the beginning of the process, informal meetings are conducted with individual taxpayers to discuss individual property valuations. Information is provided to each taxpayer both written and verbal, explaining current property valuations. Next step in the process, written and verbal communication is presented to the county boards. A portion of those values need to be later defended in an informal court situation at the Tax Equalization & Review Commission. A more in-depth report is supplied for this process and verbal testimony presented defending each property value in question. On occasion written communication or an explanation of a property value is prepared for the Governor's office or a State Senator.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2010:

Property Class	Median	COD*	PRD*
Residential	95	13.93	105.96
Commercial	99	28.56	121.13
Agricultural Land	N/A	N/A	N/A
Special Value Agland	73	N/A	N/A

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.
For more information regarding statistical measures see 2010 Reports & Opinions.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

Permits and information statements for all property classes will be complete. A ratio study for all classes will also be complete for statutory compliance.

Residential: **Review residential parcels in Ceresco, Colon, Leshara, Malmo, Morse Bluff and begin a review of rural acreages which will continue in 2012.**

Commercial: **Review commercial properties in Ceresco, Colon, Leshara, Malmo, Morse Bluff.**

Agricultural:

Special Value-Agland:

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

Permits and information statements for all property classes will be complete. A ratio study for all classes will also be complete for statutory compliance.

Residential: **Continue with the review of rural acreages and the residential properties in Yutan and Wahoo as well as the surrounding sub-divisions.**

Commercial: **Review the commercial properties in Yutan and Wahoo and the surrounding sub-divisions. Review of gravel pits. Review any commercial properties at lake sub-divisions.**

Agricultural Land:

Special Value – Agland:

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Permits and information statements for all property classes will be complete. A ratio study for all classes will also be complete for statutory compliance.

Residential: **Review residential properties in Ashland and the surrounding sub-divisions. Review all lake properties.**

Commercial: **Review commercial properties in Ashland, Mead, Cedar Bluffs, and the surrounding sub-divisions.**

Agricultural Land: **Begin review of rural properties, including homes and outbuildings. It will continue into the 2013 year.**

Special Value – Agland: **Verify ag use on agricultural properties.**

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

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes

Deeds are received daily from the Register of Deeds office. Sales are updated in the computer and in the cadastral maps. Splits and new subdivisions are also completed in the computer system, cadastral maps updated for ownership and parcel size accordingly. The County Surveyor provides assistance to the office when needed.

2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:

    a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
    b. Assessor Survey
    c. Sales information to PAD rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
    d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
    e. School District Taxable Value Report
    f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
    g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
    h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
    i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
    j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report

3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of **1469** returns, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.

    Preprinted personal property returns are mailed each year to those that filed a return the prior year, as well as any new businesses/agricultural equipment owners that are discovered by the assessment office. Notice was given in 2010 to all preprinted recipients that due to budgetary constraints, this would be the last year that preprinted returns would be sent and a postcard reminder would be sent in the future as access to blank forms is available on the Department of Revenue website.

4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.

    Saunders County currently has 89 approved permissive exemption applications on file.

5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.

    Reminder notices are sent annually each year to political subdivisions who own property to notify them of their requirements on new or updated contracts for leases they may have.

6. Homestead Exemptions; administer **806** annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.

   The Saunders County Board of Equalization annually extends the filing deadline for homestead exemptions as allowed by Nebraska Statute 77-3512.

7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

   Information provided by PAD is reviewed and verified for accuracy in balancing with the county.

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.

   Saunders County has 8 Tax Increment Financing projects throughout the county; one in Mead and seven in Wahoo. The projects affect 33 parcels in the county. Currently, one is in bankruptcy, one is partially complete and it does not appear that the project will be completed due to economic factors. One project has not started even though the request for the taxes to be split was requested three years ago.

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.

   The assessor works with both the Treasurer and the Clerk to ensure accuracy.

10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.

    The Saunders County Treasurer and Assessor are not on the same computer systems. A conversion must be done each year with the two vendors for the tax list and tax bills to be completed.

11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

    Tax list corrections are prepared and given to the County Clerk to be put on the Board of Equalizations agenda. Assessment manager or representative meets with the Board during the meeting and offers explanation of correction(s)

12. County Board of Equalization - attends county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.

Due to budgetary constraints, this year Saunders County is asking each protester if they would like to request a referee hearing, or allow Saunders County Board of Equalization with assistance from the assessment office to determine whether a change in the valuation is warranted or not for their property. A representative from the appraisal staff or the assessment manager sits in on referee hearings at the time of protest. The appraisal staff assists the referees as requested on information needed for protests. Assessor and head appraiser attend the final hearings of all protests, providing any additional information as requested by the Board.

13. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.

    The appraiser meets with the County Attorney prior to the hearing to prepare exhibits and work on case matters.

14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.

    Appraiser and assessment manager works directly with liaison and applicable staff members from PAD in preparation of evidence to bring forward to the commission.

15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc.

    Assessment manager is current on education requirements to maintain her assessor certification.

Conclusion:

With all the entities of county government that utilize the assessor records in their operation, it is paramount for this office to constantly work toward perfection in record keeping.

With the continual review of all properties, records will become more accurate, and values will be assessed more equally and fairly across the county. With a well-developed plan in place, this process can flow more smoothly. Sales review will continue to be important in order to adjust for market areas in the county.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature: Cathy Bussman Date: June 14, 2010

2011 Assessment Survey for Saunders County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	**Deputy(ies) on staff:**
	0
2.	**Appraiser(s) on staff:**
	1 and 1 appraiser assistant
3.	**Other full-time employees:**
	2 + 1 full-time temporary employee
4.	**Other part-time employees:**
	0
5.	**Number of shared employees:**
	Assessment manager is shared with Dodge County
6.	**Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:**
	$342,903
7.	**Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:**
	$342,903
8.	**Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:**
	$135,946
9.	**Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:**
	n/a
10.	**Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:**
	$21,612
11.	**Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:**
	n/a
12.	**Other miscellaneous funds:**
	0
13.	**Amount of last year's budget not used:**
	0

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	**Administrative software:**
	TerraScan
2.	**CAMA software:**
	TerraScan
3.	**Are cadastral maps currently being used?**
	Yes
4.	**If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?**

	Assessment Staff
5.	**Does the county have GIS software?**
	No
6.	**Who maintains the GIS software and maps?**
	n/a
7.	**Personal Property software:**
	TerraScan

C. Zoning Information

1.	**Does the county have zoning?**
	Yes
2.	**If so, is the zoning countywide?**
	Yes
3.	**What municipalities in the county are zoned?**
	Ashland, Cedar Bluffs, Ceresco, Colon, Ithaca, Leshara, Mead, Memphis, Morse Bluff, Prague, Valparaiso, Wahoo, Weston, and Yutan
4.	**When was zoning implemented?**
	Zoning was originally implemented in 1966, but the comprehensive plan has been updated since originally implemented.

D. Contracted Services

1.	**Appraisal Services:**
	none
2.	**Other services:**
	TerraScan is contracted for appraisal and administrative software maintenance. GIS Workshop is contracted for property record access via the county website and Agri Data Inc is contracted for counting the acres of the various soils as the county worked to implement the most recent soil survey from the USDA.

2011 Certification for Saunders 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 Saunders County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

STATE OF NEBRASKA
PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR
DEPT. OF REVENUE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT DIVISION