

Table of Contents

2012 Commission Summary

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

Residential Correlation

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

Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Statistics

Commercial Correlation

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Special Valuation Methodology, if applicable
- Special Valuation Statistics, if applicable

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

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

County Reports

- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2012 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2011 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

Valuation History Charts

2012 Commission Summary for Dixon County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	81	Median	95.98
Total Sales Price	\$6,070,671	Mean	102.81
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,070,671	Wgt. Mean	95.01
Total Assessed Value	\$5,767,857	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$53,457
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$74,947	Avg. Assessed Value	\$71,208

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.94 to 98.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.06 to 97.97
95% Mean C.I	94.35 to 111.27
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	14.64
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.62
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.83

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	101	96	96
2010	91	98	98
2009	101	97	97
2008	118	96	96

2012 Commission Summary for Dixon County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	18	Median	97.47
Total Sales Price	\$397,500	Mean	144.97
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$397,500	Wgt. Mean	94.04
Total Assessed Value	\$373,815	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$125,698
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$22,083	Avg. Assessed Value	\$20,768

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.20 to 151.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	70.88 to 117.20
95% Mean C.I	82.31 to 207.63
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.39
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.14
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.85

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	27	96	96
2010	38	95	95
2009	43	96	96
2008	45	97	97

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Dixon County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 (2011). 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 these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	70	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 9th day of April, 2012.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Dixon County

Newcastle – A complete reappraisal was done in Newcastle. Many of the smaller, worn out condition homes were lowered and the larger two story homes were increased. The market in Newcastle is very up and down. We also may see more inconsistencies in the market there depending on what direction the School District takes with consolidation issues.

Rural Homes – We revalued the homes along Hwy 9 and Hwy 12, leading to Ponca. The market along this corridor has been very active in the last two years. Homes right on the highway had a faster selling time and have brought more in the market than properties on gravel and setting off the highway.

We received our new CAMA and Administrative package at the end of September. There have been many issues with regards to pricing and our learning the program. We did not price Area 1 & Area 2 rural homes. We will reprice all our residential properties for 2012, once we are confident we fully understand the new system, and become more proficient with the new system.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Dixon County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor & Deputy	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Ponca
	5	Wakefield
	10	Emerson
	15	Allen
	20	Newcastle
	25	Concord, Dixon, Maskell, Martinsburg and Waterbury
	30	Rural
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Cost approach is used. The depreciation is gathered from the market in each location.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2006 and 2011	
5.	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?	
	We have developed our own economic depreciations, and had always used CAMA vendors physical, except for remodeling. With the new program we currently developed physical and economic from the market.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	The depreciation tables were updated for each valuation group when that particular group was reviewed.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	Lot values were studied during each valuation grouping review.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	We currently use square foot method on residential lot valuation and vacant lots were used to set these values.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	We send sales reviews and visit many of the sold parcels, since we are small community; many times we are made aware of the changes by the taxpayers. We do not have county zoning.	

26 Dixon
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 81
Total Sales Price : 6,070,671
Total Adj. Sales Price : 6,070,671
Total Assessed Value : 5,767,857
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 74,947
Avg. Assessed Value : 71,208

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 95
MEAN : 103
COD : 17.21
PRD : 108.21

COV : 37.80
STD : 38.86
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.52
MAX Sales Ratio : 362.25
MIN Sales Ratio : 52.83

95% Median C.I. : 92.94 to 98.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.06 to 97.97
95% Mean C.I. : 94.35 to 111.27

Printed:4/5/2012 11:46:56AM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	18	99.65	102.96	100.32	11.44	102.63	71.38	152.57	95.26 to 106.96	70,542	70,768
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	98.26	94.60	96.95	07.42	97.58	68.62	107.36	68.62 to 107.36	89,604	86,869
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	92.93	93.39	92.16	06.57	101.33	79.67	103.02	79.67 to 103.02	108,029	99,556
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	17	94.83	95.13	91.76	15.20	103.67	52.83	153.05	79.61 to 100.58	73,941	67,847
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	7	95.28	96.90	91.00	12.74	106.48	77.72	136.18	77.72 to 136.18	56,000	50,959
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	9	92.91	105.06	97.78	16.73	107.45	84.64	156.64	86.51 to 124.51	65,278	63,827
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	7	93.91	94.31	94.11	03.35	100.21	90.12	100.81	90.12 to 100.81	78,557	73,932
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	10	94.69	135.18	93.50	55.26	144.58	69.15	362.25	80.42 to 267.38	72,070	67,383
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	48	97.62	97.74	95.41	11.81	102.44	52.83	153.05	92.94 to 99.90	79,595	75,945
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	33	93.91	110.18	94.33	24.93	116.80	69.15	362.25	90.74 to 99.05	68,185	64,318
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	40	93.88	97.37	92.94	13.76	104.77	52.83	156.64	91.00 to 99.43	74,818	69,536
<u>ALL</u>	81	95.98	102.81	95.01	17.21	108.21	52.83	362.25	92.94 to 98.50	74,947	71,208

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	20	95.50	105.61	92.08	28.04	114.69	52.83	267.38	80.42 to 107.36	76,518	70,454
05	15	96.19	103.52	99.16	12.17	104.40	84.66	156.64	92.70 to 106.96	78,747	78,089
10	3	93.91	94.50	90.74	14.02	104.14	75.04	114.54	N/A	64,467	58,500
15	11	99.90	98.39	98.03	12.71	100.37	68.62	124.51	71.38 to 118.23	61,382	60,170
20	15	94.83	94.77	94.33	03.93	100.47	82.62	101.64	92.18 to 99.43	52,600	49,618
25	2	226.98	226.98	136.79	59.60	165.93	91.70	362.25	N/A	6,000	8,208
30	15	95.28	94.75	94.07	07.09	100.72	79.67	118.80	86.65 to 99.05	112,635	105,959
<u>ALL</u>	81	95.98	102.81	95.01	17.21	108.21	52.83	362.25	92.94 to 98.50	74,947	71,208

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	78	96.09	103.12	94.97	17.69	108.58	52.83	362.25	92.93 to 98.61	76,938	73,067
06	1	91.00	91.00	91.00	00.00	100.00	91.00	91.00	N/A	2,500	2,275
07	2	96.38	96.38	98.99	03.57	97.36	92.94	99.81	N/A	33,500	33,160
<u>ALL</u>	81	95.98	102.81	95.01	17.21	108.21	52.83	362.25	92.94 to 98.50	74,947	71,208

26 Dixon
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 81
Total Sales Price : 6,070,671
Total Adj. Sales Price : 6,070,671
Total Assessed Value : 5,767,857
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 74,947
Avg. Assessed Value : 71,208

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 95
MEAN : 103
COD : 17.21
PRD : 108.21

COV : 37.80
STD : 38.86
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.52
MAX Sales Ratio : 362.25
MIN Sales Ratio : 52.83

95% Median C.I. : 92.94 to 98.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.06 to 97.97
95% Mean C.I. : 94.35 to 111.27

Printed:4/5/2012 11:46:56AM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	2	226.63	226.63	211.56	59.85	107.12	91.00	362.25	N/A	2,250	4,760	
Less Than 15,000	5	92.94	181.05	168.72	96.18	107.31	91.00	362.25	N/A	6,900	11,642	
Less Than 30,000	12	106.81	141.14	124.91	43.93	112.99	91.00	362.25	91.70 to 136.18	14,188	17,722	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	79	95.98	99.67	94.93	14.07	104.99	52.83	267.38	92.94 to 98.50	76,787	72,890	
Greater Than 14,999	76	96.09	97.66	94.59	12.16	103.25	52.83	156.64	92.93 to 98.61	79,423	75,127	
Greater Than 29,999	69	95.28	96.14	94.15	11.57	102.11	52.83	156.64	92.70 to 98.20	85,513	80,510	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	2	226.63	226.63	211.56	59.85	107.12	91.00	362.25	N/A	2,250	4,760	
5,000 TO 14,999	3	92.94	150.67	162.30	63.01	92.83	91.70	267.38	N/A	10,000	16,230	
15,000 TO 29,999	7	113.81	112.62	113.78	11.96	98.98	91.25	136.18	91.25 to 136.18	19,393	22,064	
30,000 TO 59,999	22	96.74	99.99	97.17	20.44	102.90	52.83	156.64	82.62 to 114.54	43,586	42,353	
60,000 TO 99,999	28	95.29	95.49	95.24	07.59	100.26	75.04	118.80	92.91 to 99.62	75,393	71,807	
100,000 TO 149,999	9	98.02	95.47	95.46	04.71	100.01	77.72	101.97	90.12 to 101.90	123,947	118,324	
150,000 TO 249,999	10	92.44	90.10	90.26	07.67	99.82	75.07	103.02	79.67 to 97.64	171,500	154,791	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	81	95.98	102.81	95.01	17.21	108.21	52.83	362.25	92.94 to 98.50	74,947	71,208	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

A. Residential Real Property

The residential sales file for Dixon County consists of 81 qualified arm's length sales. The sample is considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. The relationship between all three measures of central tendency is reasonably close and the calculated median is 96%. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are slightly outside of the acceptable levels. There are two sales in the sales file that are distorting the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential, both are low dollar sales.

Dixon County reported a complete reappraisal in the village of Newcastle and an analysis of the rural residential homes. Adjustments were made to the rural residential homes based on location to the main highways in the county. The county continues to verify sales and monitor the market activity in the county.

Based on all available information and the assessment actions of the county, the level of value is determined to be 96% of market value for the residential class of real property.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) 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 (2010), 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO 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 on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

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. 239.

2012 Commercial Assessment Actions for Dixon County

Newcastle – Lowered brick commercial buildings along the main street area by 5%, excluding the gas station and bank. Currently, the only viable businesses on Main Street are two bars and a bank. All the buildings are old brick and when they sell they are selling as storage.

Ponca - Lowered our Beauty Salons 20%. There are three and two of the three have sold and the sale prices are showing the market is not what it had been for these types of businesses in Ponca.

Carwashes were revalued. There are three in the county, one in Newcastle, one in Wakefield and one in Ponca. All three of these were increased as the sales showed our assessed value was too low.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Dixon County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	County Assessor & Clerks.	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Ponca
	5	Wakefield
	10	Emerson
	15	Allen
	20	Newcastle
	25	Concord, Dixon, Maskell, Martinsburg and Waterbury
	30	Rural
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	We currently use cost approach. The majority of our commercial properties are owned and occupied by the same people, we have very little rental commercial properties. The only commercial properties which are rented are apartments.	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	We use Marshall & Swift costing and contact other counties & our field liason for sales of like properties.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	Costing is the same for each grouping, unless changes have been made to the property. The valuation groupings do not all have the same costing, as it is based on when they were last updated.	
5.	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?	
	We develop our own economic & functional depreciations, and use vendor tables for physical depreciation,	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Depreciation tables were developed with the towns were reviewed.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	The lot values have been studied each time a town is reviewed and been adjusted according to the market.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	We currently use front foot for commercial property, we are trying to move to the sq ft method as we have few commercial sales and in failing communities street front is not important as many of the buildings sell for storage.	

10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	We send sales review questionnaires to all sold properties and visit the majority of sale properties.

26 Dixon
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 18
Total Sales Price : 397,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 397,500
Total Assessed Value : 373,815
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 22,083
Avg. Assessed Value : 20,768

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 145
COD : 71.20
PRD : 154.16

COV : 86.91
STD : 126.00
Avg. Abs. Dev : 69.40
MAX Sales Ratio : 470.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 29.00

95% Median C.I. : 91.20 to 151.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 70.88 to 117.20
95% Mean C.I. : 82.31 to 207.63

Printed:4/5/2012 11:46:57AM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	100.38	100.38	100.38	00.00	100.00	100.38	100.38	N/A	4,000	4,015
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	92.86	92.86	94.22	01.79	98.56	91.20	94.52	N/A	27,500	25,910
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	107.86	110.70	98.22	30.01	112.71	62.50	164.57	N/A	18,375	18,048
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	151.33	151.33	151.33	00.00	100.00	151.33	151.33	N/A	15,000	22,700
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	99.96	136.60	113.44	39.99	120.42	94.97	214.88	N/A	33,000	37,435
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	70.48	70.48	70.48	00.00	100.00	70.48	70.48	N/A	32,000	22,555
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	50.00	50.00	50.00	00.00	100.00	50.00	50.00	N/A	25,000	12,500
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	29.00	29.00	29.00	00.00	100.00	29.00	29.00	N/A	50,000	14,500
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	470.50	470.50	470.50	00.00	100.00	470.50	470.50	N/A	2,000	9,410
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	135.67	233.16	123.38	92.67	188.98	93.32	470.50	N/A	14,000	17,273
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	8	97.45	110.03	102.19	25.07	107.67	62.50	164.57	62.50 to 164.57	18,438	18,841
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	5	94.97	106.06	94.46	40.93	112.28	50.00	214.88	N/A	31,200	29,472
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	5	135.67	239.80	80.56	120.69	297.67	29.00	470.50	N/A	18,800	15,146
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	99.96	119.38	104.67	36.70	114.05	62.50	214.88	70.48 to 164.57	24,389	25,528
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	39.50	39.50	36.00	26.58	109.72	29.00	50.00	N/A	37,500	13,500
<u>ALL</u>	18	97.47	144.97	94.04	71.20	154.16	29.00	470.50	91.20 to 151.33	22,083	20,768

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	94.75	99.75	98.92	06.07	100.84	93.32	121.56	93.32 to 121.56	35,667	35,282
05	4	56.25	73.21	56.55	59.93	129.46	29.00	151.33	N/A	27,500	15,550
10	2	470.50	470.50	470.50	00.00	100.00	470.50	470.50	N/A	2,000	9,410
15	2	153.04	153.04	180.53	40.41	84.77	91.20	214.88	N/A	9,000	16,248
20	3	100.38	102.18	89.27	21.65	114.46	70.48	135.67	N/A	16,000	14,283
25	1	164.57	164.57	164.57	00.00	100.00	164.57	164.57	N/A	3,500	5,760
<u>ALL</u>	18	97.47	144.97	94.04	71.20	154.16	29.00	470.50	91.20 to 151.33	22,083	20,768

26 Dixon
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 18
Total Sales Price : 397,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 397,500
Total Assessed Value : 373,815
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 22,083
Avg. Assessed Value : 20,768

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 145
COD : 71.20
PRD : 154.16

COV : 86.91
STD : 126.00
Avg. Abs. Dev : 69.40
MAX Sales Ratio : 470.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 29.00

95% Median C.I. : 91.20 to 151.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 70.88 to 117.20
95% Mean C.I. : 82.31 to 207.63

Printed:4/5/2012 11:46:57AM

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	18	97.47	144.97	94.04	71.20	154.16	29.00	470.50	91.20 to 151.33	22,083	20,768
04											
<u>ALL</u>	18	97.47	144.97	94.04	71.20	154.16	29.00	470.50	91.20 to 151.33	22,083	20,768

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	4	317.54	301.49	248.65	53.22	121.25	100.38	470.50	N/A	2,875	7,149
Less Than 15,000	7	164.57	235.39	186.43	71.93	126.26	91.20	470.50	91.20 to 470.50	5,929	11,053
Less Than 30,000	13	121.56	170.81	114.28	70.62	149.47	50.00	470.50	91.20 to 214.88	13,808	15,779
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	14	94.34	100.25	89.44	31.97	112.09	29.00	214.88	62.50 to 135.67	27,571	24,659
Greater Than 14,999	11	94.16	87.44	83.27	24.82	105.01	29.00	151.33	50.00 to 121.56	32,364	26,950
Greater Than 29,999	5	94.52	77.79	77.38	20.20	100.53	29.00	99.96	N/A	43,600	33,737
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	4	317.54	301.49	248.65	53.22	121.25	100.38	470.50	N/A	2,875	7,149
5,000 TO 14,999	3	135.67	147.25	162.58	30.39	90.57	91.20	214.88	N/A	10,000	16,258
15,000 TO 29,999	6	93.74	95.48	92.58	28.66	103.13	50.00	151.33	50.00 to 151.33	23,000	21,293
30,000 TO 59,999	5	94.52	77.79	77.38	20.20	100.53	29.00	99.96	N/A	43,600	33,737
60,000 TO 99,999											
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	18	97.47	144.97	94.04	71.20	154.16	29.00	470.50	91.20 to 151.33	22,083	20,768

26 Dixon
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 18
Total Sales Price : 397,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 397,500
Total Assessed Value : 373,815
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 22,083
Avg. Assessed Value : 20,768

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 145
COD : 71.20
PRD : 154.16

COV : 86.91
STD : 126.00
Avg. Abs. Dev : 69.40
MAX Sales Ratio : 470.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 29.00

95% Median C.I. : 91.20 to 151.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 70.88 to 117.20
95% Mean C.I. : 82.31 to 207.63

Printed:4/5/2012 11:46:57AM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	3	99.96	199.82	73.48	147.23	271.94	29.00	470.50	N/A	35,333	25,963
001	1	470.50	470.50	470.50	00.00	100.00	470.50	470.50	N/A	2,000	9,410
041	1	93.32	93.32	93.32	00.00	100.00	93.32	93.32	N/A	28,000	26,130
055	1	135.67	135.67	135.67	00.00	100.00	135.67	135.67	N/A	12,000	16,280
344	3	62.50	70.96	59.21	26.86	119.84	50.00	100.38	N/A	16,333	9,672
350	1	214.88	214.88	214.88	00.00	100.00	214.88	214.88	N/A	13,000	27,935
352	2	108.27	108.27	106.63	12.28	101.54	94.97	121.56	N/A	28,500	30,390
353	1	151.33	151.33	151.33	00.00	100.00	151.33	151.33	N/A	15,000	22,700
406	3	91.20	108.75	81.17	34.39	133.98	70.48	164.57	N/A	13,500	10,958
477	1	94.52	94.52	94.52	00.00	100.00	94.52	94.52	N/A	50,000	47,260
528	1	94.16	94.16	94.16	00.00	100.00	94.16	94.16	N/A	25,000	23,540
<u>ALL</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>97.47</u>	<u>144.97</u>	<u>94.04</u>	<u>71.20</u>	<u>154.16</u>	<u>29.00</u>	<u>470.50</u>	<u>91.20 to 151.33</u>	<u>22,083</u>	<u>20,768</u>

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Dixon County utilized as many sales as possible to represent the commercial market in the county. There are 18 qualified sales in the statistical analysis. Those 18 sales are distributed amongst six valuation groupings. The occupancy codes represented are numerous and do not support any one type of property.

Dixon County worked on a commercial reappraisal finishing it in 2010. Since that time the appraisal maintenance in the commercial class has been reactive to the statistical information available for the county. In the 2012 assessment year the county reported adjustments to the village of Newcastle, Ponca and Wakefield specific to the occupancy.

The main employer in the county is located in Wakefield, the Michael Foods Company. The villages of Emerson(10), Ponca(01) and Wakefield(05) are the only towns that have active commercial property. Many of the other valuation groupings have minimal operating businesses.

The median and weighted mean are the only statistical information in an acceptable range. The wide coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are outside of the acceptable level. The diversity of the available market information gives little support to the statistical profile.

Therefore, based on the available information, a level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of property for Dixon County.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) 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 (2010), 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO 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 on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

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. 239.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Dixon County

All agricultural land except waste ground in Dixon County was increased significantly due to the sales which took place in the county. Residential rural and Homesites were also increased to \$11,500; no other site values were increased.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Dixon County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	County Assessor & Clerks	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Generally more flat land, larger fields. Areas of hills are more rolling than steep, soil types are typically better. More irrigation is used in this area as topography makes irrigation easier.
	2	Hills are steep, tree cover in northern areas is becoming more dense in many hilly areas allow the river bluffs. Soils are of lesser quality and the northern area has more pasture land than southern areas. Field sizes are typically smaller in Area 2
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Monitor the sales which occur in each area & review land uses in each area.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Our recreational land has consistently been along the river and is made up of small mobile home parks. Our rural residential has been classified as under 20 acres. Since the valuations continue to be the same for rural res. & home sites we do have any issues using this method.	
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?	
	We currently use the same value for farm sites and rural residents.	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	We use GIS, FSA & physical inspection to update our land use.	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	We review all sales and have virtually no non-ag activity which influences the market.	
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	We send sales reviews and visit many of the sold parcels, since we are a same community; many times we are made aware of changes by tax payers. We do not zoning.	

26 Dixon
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 61
Total Sales Price : 22,703,814
Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,703,814
Total Assessed Value : 14,762,841
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 372,194
Avg. Assessed Value : 242,014

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 65
MEAN : 71
COD : 23.35
PRD : 109.09

COV : 32.10
STD : 22.77
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.30
MAX Sales Ratio : 155.38
MIN Sales Ratio : 31.75

95% Median C.I. : 61.60 to 74.06
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.45 to 69.60
95% Mean C.I. : 65.22 to 76.64

Printed:4/5/2012 11:46:58AM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	5	71.02	82.52	77.60	17.33	106.34	69.93	113.34	N/A	301,818	234,197
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	74.29	73.13	70.60	17.16	103.58	39.44	90.23	39.44 to 90.23	433,113	305,784
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	64.53	61.28	69.45	16.10	88.24	40.17	75.88	N/A	265,003	184,036
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	78.35	77.95	84.01	23.50	92.79	31.75	120.83	31.75 to 120.83	181,500	152,473
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	63.96	63.96	63.28	13.27	101.07	55.47	72.45	N/A	287,000	181,623
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	94.28	95.75	81.33	24.68	117.73	64.25	155.38	N/A	185,045	150,497
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	58.58	62.86	59.57	23.10	105.52	33.62	115.70	33.62 to 115.70	373,261	222,338
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	94.45	94.45	86.19	25.71	109.58	70.17	118.73	N/A	186,510	160,745
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	61.52	60.06	66.95	20.01	89.71	40.86	77.79	N/A	427,373	286,126
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	63.27	68.04	64.20	16.44	105.98	51.37	90.61	51.37 to 90.61	535,483	343,774
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	48.65	50.67	48.35	19.47	104.80	40.47	67.48	40.47 to 67.48	715,156	345,767
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	73.87	71.18	67.03	10.83	106.19	55.78	81.19	N/A	279,293	187,206
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	23	74.06	74.58	74.44	20.08	100.19	31.75	120.83	67.46 to 84.68	298,756	222,388
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	17	67.61	76.38	66.19	30.65	115.40	33.62	155.38	56.63 to 95.04	285,784	189,172
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	21	61.52	62.53	58.61	19.15	106.69	40.47	90.61	55.37 to 76.47	522,576	306,285
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	72.13	77.64	76.22	26.30	101.86	31.75	155.38	64.25 to 94.28	212,763	162,177
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	21	61.58	67.44	63.96	23.14	105.44	33.62	118.73	58.10 to 76.47	425,004	271,846
<u>ALL</u>	61	69.81	70.93	65.02	23.35	109.09	31.75	155.38	61.60 to 74.06	372,194	242,014

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
1	30	68.77	69.81	66.17	17.64	105.50	39.44	95.22	61.58 to 77.79	389,035	257,432
2	31	69.81	72.02	63.81	29.14	112.87	31.75	155.38	57.58 to 76.47	355,896	227,093
<u>ALL</u>	61	69.81	70.93	65.02	23.35	109.09	31.75	155.38	61.60 to 74.06	372,194	242,014

26 Dixon
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 61
Total Sales Price : 22,703,814
Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,703,814
Total Assessed Value : 14,762,841
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 372,194
Avg. Assessed Value : 242,014

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 65
MEAN : 71
COD : 23.35
PRD : 109.09

COV : 32.10
STD : 22.77
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.30
MAX Sales Ratio : 155.38
MIN Sales Ratio : 31.75

95% Median C.I. : 61.60 to 74.06
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.45 to 69.60
95% Mean C.I. : 65.22 to 76.64

Printed:4/5/2012 11:46:58AM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Dry_____											
County	28	72.13	76.03	72.11	18.29	105.44	51.37	120.83	65.66 to 77.79	293,869	211,903
1	15	67.61	69.80	67.28	12.94	103.75	51.37	95.04	61.52 to 77.79	302,596	203,585
2	13	76.47	83.22	78.05	21.38	106.62	55.37	120.83	64.25 to 113.34	283,800	221,501
_____Grass_____											
County	2	69.98	69.98	70.20	11.97	99.69	61.60	78.35	N/A	131,500	92,312
2	2	69.98	69.98	70.20	11.97	99.69	61.60	78.35	N/A	131,500	92,312
_____ALL_____	61	69.81	70.93	65.02	23.35	109.09	31.75	155.38	61.60 to 74.06	372,194	242,014

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	3	58.10	57.27	57.70	01.58	99.25	55.47	58.23	N/A	594,300	342,894
1	1	58.10	58.10	58.10	00.00	100.00	58.10	58.10	N/A	746,900	433,966
2	2	56.85	56.85	57.41	02.43	99.02	55.47	58.23	N/A	518,000	297,358
_____Dry_____											
County	39	72.45	77.57	69.05	22.24	112.34	40.47	155.38	67.46 to 81.19	355,598	245,536
1	20	70.05	72.58	69.71	14.65	104.12	51.37	95.22	63.22 to 81.19	334,932	233,472
2	19	74.29	82.84	68.43	29.30	121.06	40.47	155.38	64.25 to 113.34	377,352	258,236
_____Grass_____											
County	2	69.98	69.98	70.20	11.97	99.69	61.60	78.35	N/A	131,500	92,312
2	2	69.98	69.98	70.20	11.97	99.69	61.60	78.35	N/A	131,500	92,312
_____ALL_____	61	69.81	70.93	65.02	23.35	109.09	31.75	155.38	61.60 to 74.06	372,194	242,014

Dixon County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
26.10	Dixon	1	3,210	3,150	3,000	2,900	2,700	2,650	2,450	2,350	2,885
26.20	Dixon	2	3,200	3,150	3,000	2,900	2,700	2,650	2,450	2,350	2,827
14.10	Cedar	1	3,740	3,740	3,690	3,690	3,260	3,260	2,830	2,830	3,309
14.20	Cedar	2	3,865	3,865	3,725	3,725	3,670	3,670	2,970	2,970	3,520
22.20	Dakota	2	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
87.10	Thurston	1	3,000	2,990	2,760	2,705	2,645	2,640	2,415	2,185	2,817
87.20	Thurston	2	3,000	2,990	2,760	2,705	2,645	2,640	2,415	2,185	2,717
90.10	Wayne	10	3,885	3,885	3,850	3,850	2,940	2,355	2,235	2,110	3,084

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Dixon	1	2,910	2,715	2,620	2,520	2,375	2,230	2,135	1,940	2,411
	Dixon	2	2,860	2,700	2,700	2,600	2,400	2,300	2,100	2,100	2,384
	Cedar	1	2,704	2,704	2,675	2,670	2,642	2,642	1,999	2,000	2,424
	Cedar	2	3,415	3,415	3,305	3,305	3,220	3,220	2,520	2,520	3,101
	Dakota	2	2,921	2,898	2,863	2,850	2,699	2,650	2,549	2,498	2,651
	Thurston	1	2,900	2,850	2,575	2,575	2,575	2,500	2,300	2,000	2,580
	Thurston	2	2,750	2,690	2,530	2,250	2,190	2,190	2,065	2,045	2,266
	Wayne	10	3,470	3,295	3,060	2,820	2,575	2,335	2,090	1,855	2,717

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Dixon	1	1,690	1,600	1,375	1,250	1,125	1,000	875	750	1,202
	Dixon	2	1,543	1,570	1,343	1,250	1,103	998	896	752	988
	Cedar	1	1,197	1,356	1,163	1,253	1,103	1,163	1,009	841	1,014
	Cedar	2	1,408	1,408	1,278	1,290	1,162	1,154	1,040	1,038	1,182
	Dakota	2	1,330	1,570	1,372	1,798	1,566	1,614	1,379	879	1,215
	Thurston	1	714	696	649	656	568	564	555	510	620
	Thurston	2	659	624	538	593	497	502	490	396	488
	Wayne	10	2,051	2,013	1,785	1,703	1,708	1,447	1,334	1,060	1,671

*Land capability grouping averages calculated using data reported on the 2012 Form 45, Abstract of Assessment

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

A. Agricultural Land

Dixon County is currently divided into two market areas. Annually the county reviews the market information to verify the need to have the two areas. Dixon County is bordered on the north by the Missouri River. The recent flooding of the river has caused concern to the taxpayers of the county. To determine the impact of the flooding the county used the GIS and followed the river to identify landowners affected by the flood. Letters were sent to the landowners asking them to come in with maps from the FSA office and report the areas affected. Several landowners responded and the county considered the information provided to them and adjusted accordingly.

All adjoining counties have land characteristics similar to Dixon County, and were considered comparable. The analysis of the agricultural sales sample revealed that the county was lacking sales to proportionately distribute sales by time; the area two samples were also too small to be reliable. The agricultural land sales sample was expanded by 21 sales and resulted in 61 qualified arm's length sales. All measures were taken to utilize comparable sales and the thresholds are met for majority land use.

The county increased values in both market areas for the 2012 assessment year. The increase for Dixon County for the 2012 assessment year resulted in a 29% increase in the agricultural total value as reported on the County Abstract compared to the 2011 Certificate of Taxes Levied. This increase was anticipated in 2011 and a non-binding recommendation to increase agricultural land in Dixon County by 15% was made, but no action was taken. The increases made for the 2012 assessment year results in agricultural land values that are reasonably comparable to all adjoining counties. The statistics support that the two market areas have been assessed at similar portions of market value. The average crop land values for the two markets are also very close, within 2%, suggesting that the market may no longer recognize the market characteristics that define the market areas. Where sufficient sales exist, the majority land use substrata statistics support acceptable assessments. There is some dispersion between the 95% and 80% MLU stats in the area one dry land sample; the difference is minimally and suggest that Dixon County has achieved dry land values at the low end of the acceptable range. The Area 2 samples have a high COD; because a comparison of the Area 2 values to adjoining Dakota Area 2 and Cedar Area 1 also supports acceptable assessments, the sample is determined to be reliable.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value of property in the agricultural class is determined to be 70%; all subclasses are in the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) 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 (2010), 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO 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 on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

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. 239.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 5,587	Value : 816,269,880	Growth 2,805,639	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	191	661,185	85	272,695	15	97,780	291	1,031,660	
02. Res Improve Land	1,304	6,179,895	189	1,647,140	296	4,041,210	1,789	11,868,245	
03. Res Improvements	1,331	64,452,690	190	15,254,480	308	25,646,690	1,829	105,353,860	
04. Res Total	1,522	71,293,770	275	17,174,315	323	29,785,680	2,120	118,253,765	862,615
% of Res Total	71.79	60.29	12.97	14.52	15.24	25.19	37.95	14.49	30.75
05. Com UnImp Land	57	115,915	14	38,755	10	1,043,430	81	1,198,100	
06. Com Improve Land	205	712,290	30	273,575	12	1,778,995	247	2,764,860	
07. Com Improvements	209	7,685,920	30	4,122,260	17	1,177,680	256	12,985,860	
08. Com Total	266	8,514,125	44	4,434,590	27	4,000,105	337	16,948,820	97,305
% of Com Total	78.93	50.23	13.06	26.16	8.01	23.60	6.03	2.08	3.47
09. Ind UnImp Land	1	4,035	2	41,795	0	0	3	45,830	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	3	51,425	7	1,031,865	10	1,083,290	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	3	8,500,760	7	17,415,595	10	25,916,355	
12. Ind Total	1	4,035	5	8,593,980	7	18,447,460	13	27,045,475	0
% of Ind Total	7.69	0.01	38.46	31.78	53.85	68.21	0.23	3.31	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	4	53,805	4	53,805	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	115	1,169,115	115	1,169,115	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	115	1,222,920	115	1,222,920	46,025
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	2.06	0.15	1.64
Res & Rec Total	1,522	71,293,770	275	17,174,315	438	31,008,600	2,235	119,476,685	908,640
% of Res & Rec Total	68.10	59.67	12.30	14.37	19.60	25.95	40.00	14.64	32.39
Com & Ind Total	267	8,518,160	49	13,028,570	34	22,447,565	350	43,994,295	97,305
% of Com & Ind Total	76.29	19.36	14.00	29.61	9.71	51.02	6.26	5.39	3.47
17. Taxable Total	1,789	79,811,930	324	30,202,885	472	53,456,165	2,585	163,470,980	1,005,945
% of Taxable Total	69.21	48.82	12.53	18.48	18.26	32.70	46.27	20.03	35.85

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	52	894,605	295,270	6	71,910	1,655
19. Commercial	9	70,610	3,875	1	47,745	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	58	966,515	296,925
19. Commercial	0	0	0	10	118,355	3,875
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				68	1,084,870	300,800

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	234	43	293	570

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	12	20,850	79	3,224,950	2,012	384,983,395	2,103	388,229,195
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	56	4,171,135	996	209,838,245	1,052	214,009,380
29. Ag Improvements	5	31,895	41	2,778,600	853	47,749,830	899	50,560,325
30. Ag Total							3,002	652,798,900

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	11,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	32	32.25	370,875	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	34	0.00	2,625,015	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	13	27.99	15,395	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	23	67.53	37,145	
37. FarmSite Improvements	5	0.00	31,895	24	0.00	153,585	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	37	43.58	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	4	10.66	38,715	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	22	22.00	253,000	23	23.00	264,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	527	532.03	6,118,345	559	564.28	6,489,220	
33. HomeSite Improvements	540	0.00	31,861,305	574	0.00	34,486,320	441,029
34. HomeSite Total				597	587.28	41,240,040	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	120	425.42	234,025	133	453.41	249,420	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	655	3,227.88	1,775,500	678	3,295.41	1,812,645	
37. FarmSite Improvements	734	0.00	15,888,525	763	0.00	16,074,005	1,358,665
38. FarmSite Total				896	3,748.82	18,136,070	
39. Road & Ditches	2,393	5,431.99	0	2,430	5,475.57	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	3	8.97	26,185	7	19.63	64,900	
41. Total Section VI				1,493	9,831.30	59,441,010	1,799,694

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,375.11	16.11%	7,624,085	17.93%	3,209.99
46. 1A	2,416.48	16.39%	7,611,950	17.90%	3,150.02
47. 2A1	1,205.87	8.18%	3,617,610	8.51%	3,000.00
48. 2A	2,758.57	18.71%	7,999,870	18.81%	2,900.01
49. 3A1	2,853.06	19.36%	7,703,255	18.12%	2,700.00
50. 3A	1,478.71	10.03%	3,918,600	9.22%	2,650.01
51. 4A1	1,644.58	11.16%	4,029,260	9.48%	2,450.02
52. 4A	7.97	0.05%	18,730	0.04%	2,350.06
53. Total	14,740.35	100.00%	42,523,360	100.00%	2,884.83
Dry					
54. 1D1	3,266.76	4.23%	9,506,295	5.11%	2,910.01
55. 1D	15,266.15	19.79%	41,447,645	22.28%	2,715.00
56. 2D1	4,207.13	5.45%	11,022,655	5.93%	2,619.99
57. 2D	6,113.24	7.92%	15,405,395	8.28%	2,520.00
58. 3D1	20,110.39	26.07%	47,763,025	25.68%	2,375.04
59. 3D	9,298.16	12.05%	20,734,915	11.15%	2,230.00
60. 4D1	17,992.21	23.32%	38,413,410	20.65%	2,135.00
61. 4D	889.98	1.15%	1,726,555	0.93%	1,939.99
62. Total	77,144.02	100.00%	186,019,895	100.00%	2,411.33
Grass					
63. 1G1	173.68	2.27%	293,505	3.19%	1,689.92
64. 1G	1,350.71	17.65%	2,160,660	23.48%	1,599.65
65. 2G1	976.70	12.76%	1,342,655	14.59%	1,374.69
66. 2G	1,694.58	22.14%	2,118,440	23.02%	1,250.13
67. 3G1	956.00	12.49%	1,075,605	11.69%	1,125.11
68. 3G	548.95	7.17%	548,950	5.96%	1,000.00
69. 4G1	1,592.23	20.80%	1,392,505	15.13%	874.56
70. 4G	362.01	4.73%	271,555	2.95%	750.13
71. Total	7,654.86	100.00%	9,203,875	100.00%	1,202.36
Irrigated Total					
	14,740.35	14.74%	42,523,360	17.88%	2,884.83
Dry Total					
	77,144.02	77.14%	186,019,895	78.23%	2,411.33
Grass Total					
	7,654.86	7.65%	9,203,875	3.87%	1,202.36
72. Waste	471.99	0.47%	43,025	0.02%	91.16
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	100,011.22	100.00%	237,790,155	100.00%	2,377.63

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,051.97	7.75%	3,366,305	8.78%	3,200.00
46. 1A	2,585.00	19.05%	8,142,780	21.23%	3,150.01
47. 2A1	2,466.60	18.18%	7,399,800	19.29%	3,000.00
48. 2A	547.17	4.03%	1,586,790	4.14%	2,899.99
49. 3A1	2,832.40	20.87%	7,647,485	19.94%	2,700.00
50. 3A	1,085.05	8.00%	2,875,440	7.50%	2,650.05
51. 4A1	2,884.78	21.26%	7,067,795	18.43%	2,450.03
52. 4A	116.00	0.85%	272,595	0.71%	2,349.96
53. Total	13,568.97	100.00%	38,358,990	100.00%	2,826.96
Dry					
54. 1D1	4,584.59	4.06%	13,111,895	4.87%	2,859.99
55. 1D	22,172.88	19.64%	59,866,770	22.25%	2,700.00
56. 2D1	10,022.78	8.88%	27,061,525	10.06%	2,700.00
57. 2D	1,070.85	0.95%	2,784,215	1.03%	2,600.00
58. 3D1	24,462.01	21.67%	58,708,960	21.82%	2,400.01
59. 3D	6,720.07	5.95%	15,456,215	5.74%	2,300.01
60. 4D1	34,512.41	30.57%	72,476,035	26.93%	2,100.00
61. 4D	9,346.96	8.28%	19,628,555	7.29%	2,099.99
62. Total	112,892.55	100.00%	269,094,170	100.00%	2,383.63
Grass					
63. 1G1	398.52	0.83%	614,870	1.30%	1,542.88
64. 1G	6,072.37	12.67%	9,530,945	20.13%	1,569.56
65. 2G1	2,424.57	5.06%	3,255,245	6.88%	1,342.61
66. 2G	199.57	0.42%	249,510	0.53%	1,250.24
67. 3G1	5,901.11	12.32%	6,508,380	13.75%	1,102.91
68. 3G	1,227.77	2.56%	1,225,795	2.59%	998.39
69. 4G1	14,704.47	30.69%	13,179,470	27.84%	896.29
70. 4G	16,985.37	35.45%	12,780,545	26.99%	752.44
71. Total	47,913.75	100.00%	47,344,760	100.00%	988.12
Irrigated Total					
	13,568.97	7.50%	38,358,990	10.79%	2,826.96
Dry Total					
	112,892.55	62.40%	269,094,170	75.68%	2,383.63
Grass Total					
	47,913.75	26.48%	47,344,760	13.32%	988.12
72. Waste	6,539.29	3.61%	769,815	0.22%	117.72
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.01	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	180,914.56	100.00%	355,567,735	100.00%	1,965.39

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	154.55	463,310	28,154.77	80,419,040	28,309.32	80,882,350
77. Dry Land	8.05	20,850	1,917.03	4,757,050	188,111.49	450,336,165	190,036.57	455,114,065
78. Grass	0.00	0	1,633.02	1,692,975	53,935.60	54,855,660	55,568.62	56,548,635
79. Waste	0.00	0	88.19	9,120	6,923.09	803,720	7,011.28	812,840
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.01	0	0.01	0
82. Total	8.05	20,850	3,792.79	6,922,455	277,124.95	586,414,585	280,925.79	593,357,890

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	28,309.32	10.08%	80,882,350	13.63%	2,857.09
Dry Land	190,036.57	67.65%	455,114,065	76.70%	2,394.88
Grass	55,568.62	19.78%	56,548,635	9.53%	1,017.64
Waste	7,011.28	2.50%	812,840	0.14%	115.93
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.01	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	280,925.79	100.00%	593,357,890	100.00%	2,112.15

2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2011 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

26 Dixon

	2011 CTL County Total	2012 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2012 form 45 - 2011 CTL)	Percent Change	2012 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	114,444,520	118,253,765	3,809,245	3.33%	862,615	2.57%
02. Recreational	1,277,915	1,222,920	-54,995	-4.30%	46,025	-7.91%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	37,434,850	41,240,040	3,805,190	10.16%	441,029	8.99%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	153,157,285	160,716,725	7,559,440	4.94%	1,349,669	4.05%
05. Commercial	16,075,480	16,948,820	873,340	5.43%	97,305	4.83%
06. Industrial	27,007,940	27,045,475	37,535	0.14%	0	0.14%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	16,833,055	18,136,070	1,303,015	7.74%	1,358,665	-0.33%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	59,916,475	62,130,365	2,213,890	3.69%	1,455,970	1.26%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	213,073,760	222,911,990	9,838,230	4.62%	2,805,639	3.30%
11. Irrigated	59,697,730	80,882,350	21,184,620	35.49%		
12. Dryland	351,687,085	455,114,065	103,426,980	29.41%		
13. Grassland	47,072,835	56,548,635	9,475,800	20.13%		
14. Wasteland	774,075	812,840	38,765	5.01%		
15. Other Agland	6,000	0	-6,000	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	459,237,725	593,357,890	134,120,165	29.20%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	672,311,485	816,269,880	143,958,395	21.41%	2,805,639	21.00%

AMY WATCHORN DIXON COUNTY ASSESSOR

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

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

DIXON COUNTY 2011 3 YEAR PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

Purpose – Submit plan to the County Board of Equalization and the Department Of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31, 2011.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE COUNTY

In 2011 Dixon County has a total of 6198 parcels, of that approximately 6% are commercial and approximately industrial, 9% are exempt, approximately 35% are residential and 50% are agricultural. 533 Personal property schedules(not including centrally assessed schedules) were filed in the county this year and 259 Homesteads Applications were accepted. Dixon County's total valuation for 2011 is 713,023,530.

BUDGET

2011 General Budget = \$ 103,540.80
(Salaries for one clerk, county deputy and the county assessor salary, office supplies, mileage, schooling, postage, misc.)

2011 Reappraisal Budget = 42,910.40
(One clerks salary, postage, computer expense, mileage, schooling, dues, and supplies, GIS)

RESPONSIBILITES

The office currently has 3 employees besides myself. The Deputy Assessor duties include: assists with pickup work, enters information in the CAMA system, makes sales books for office and public use, prices out buildings using the Marshall & Swift pricing, she also prices out the commercial property and also assisting with personal property and homestead filings. The Deputy also works in the sales file.

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

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

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

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

RESIDENTIAL

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

We will continue to use the CAMA system to reappraise our towns as needed. Currently the median in our towns look pretty good, we will continue to monitor this and make the changes necessary to improve our assessment practices. We have valued lots using the square foot method at the same time we revalue the town so we can have a more accurate picture of the properties true market value. The CAMA pricing being used on all the houses is 6-1- 2005. We just received our rural flights, due to poor weather conditions they were unable to fly until spring 2010. We have our flight information completed, and as we now have our new CAMA we will be repricing the rural areas using the most current pricing available. We have decided to work on the rural residences again this yr as our information is the most updated due to review last year and get them all current in the new system first, as we will not need to go out and review them again.

2011 – Area 1 & 2 Rural Residence, (Updated cama pricing)

2012 – Wakefield, Concord, Dixon, Maskell

2013-Allen, Emerson, Waterbury, Newcastle

COMMERCIAL

A complete reappraisal of commercial properties was completed in 1999 by the Assessor's office staff. Industrial properties were reappraised in 2001. Pricing was done on the 1999 Marshall & Swift computer program. Final valuation is by the sales

comparison approach. Income and expense data was gathered but there was insufficient rental information to utilize the income approach to value. We have been working on Waldbaum's industrial plants. We have visited the sites and are currently reviewing our records for each of their facilities. Commercial properties will continue to be monitored and adjustments made when deemed necessary by the market.

2011 – Appraisal maintenance

2012 – Appraisal maintenance

2013-Appraisal Maintenance

AGRICULTURAL

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

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

2011 – Monitor market by LCG

2012 – Monitor market by LCG

2013 - Monitor market by LCG

SALES REVIEW

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

CONCLUSION

We will be put on the new MIPS program the 28th of September and will be working to go on line with our information as soon as we are confident that all our information has transferred. We also will need to take new photos because our photos are not currently in the computer. MIPS is not going to charge anything for our data to be put on line so this will save the county thousands of dollars. A GIS system for the county was purchased in late 2004. This has taken a majority of one of my Clerk's time. We feel this has made our office more efficient and accurate. Also, it will make it much easier to get the

taxpayer current maps. Due to the Missouri River flooding this summer, and the adjustments we may have to make, our commercial and residential may get behind our initial plans. We will also have to review all our recreational mobile homes and cabins as many of them were ruined from the flooding. Each year our office reviews all statistical information to ensure that our values are within the acceptable ranges. **We will also try to improve our PRD & COD on all types of property each year. We use a good deal of our sales throwing out only the sales we feel are not arms length transactions. This office does everything in-house with the number of employees that we have, we do all the TERC Appeal, County Board of Equalization Meetings, prepare tax lists, consolidate levies, etc. We also have exceeded the educational hours required every year since they were enacted.**

Sincerely,

Amy Watchorn
Dixon County Assessor

6 YEAR REVIEW CYCLE

**2011- AREA 1 & 2 RURAL RESIDENCE,
(UPDATED PRICING FOR CAMA)**

**2012- WAKEFIELD, CONCORD, DIXON,
MASKELL**

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

2014 – COMMERCIAL

2015 – PONCA & MARTINSBURG

2016 – RURAL RESIDENCE

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

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

2012 Assessment Survey for Dixon County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$146,451.20
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	NA
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$42,910.40
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	0
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$8,200.00
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$4,000.00
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	0
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	0 Used to repay for GIS

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	No
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS WORKSHOP AND DIXON COUNTY
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

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

D. Contracted Services

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

2012 Certification for Dixon County

This is to certify that the 2012 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

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

One copy by electronic transmission to the Dixon County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

