

# 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 Frontier County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	58	Median	97.71
Total Sales Price	\$4,180,664	Mean	101.95
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,180,664	Wgt. Mean	97.37
Total Assessed Value	\$4,070,718	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$47,002
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$72,080	Avg. Assessed Value	\$70,185

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.91 to 102.03
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.84 to 102.90
95% Mean C.I	95.18 to 108.72
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	11.72
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.98
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.44

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	56	100	100
2010	55	99	99
2009	81	98	98
2008	89	92	92

## 2012 Commission Summary for Frontier County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	12	Median	98.26
Total Sales Price	\$523,800	Mean	105.91
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$523,800	Wgt. Mean	101.36
Total Assessed Value	\$530,935	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$89,198
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$43,650	Avg. Assessed Value	\$44,245

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.85 to 103.31
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	96.22 to 106.50
95% Mean C.I	90.20 to 121.62
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.69
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.22
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.08

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	16		97
2010	9	100	96
2009	11	92	92
2008	16	93	93



## 2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Frontier 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
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>98</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>71</b>	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*

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





## **2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Frontier County**

A reappraisal of the properties within the Lakes Valuation Grouping was completed for 2012. The reappraisal included a physical inspection of all properties. New pictures were taken and measurements were checked where necessary. Because the assessor has discovered numerous inconsistencies in the quality ratings during this appraisal cycle, the quality of each home was reviewed to ensure consistency within the class. Condition was updated where warranted. Sketches of improvements were corrected where necessary.

There are two different Lakes within this valuation grouping, the Medicine Creek Reservoir near Cambridge and the Hugh Butler Lake near McCook. Each lake contains an area of mobile homes, and an area(s) that contains stick built homes or cabins. Due to the limited number of sales data available, the assessor developed a depreciation table for the mobile homes, but used the rural residential depreciation table for the cabins and homes at the Lakes. After applying the new depreciation, it was evident that the properties were still somewhat under assessed. A sales study was conducted and a leasehold value was established, the leasehold values vary by location.

The reappraisal of the lakes completed an appraisal cycle in Frontier County; the cycle began in 2009.

Within the rest of the class, a sales study was completed. The study indicated that properties within the town of Eustis were somewhat over assessed. Since the sales in Eustis have been trending slightly downward over the past few years, the assessor decided to make adjustments to the depreciation table for Eustis this year.

Only routine maintenance was completed in the rest of the class; the pickup work was completed timely.

## 2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Frontier County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The assessor and the deputy	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Curtis is the largest town in the County and is home to the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. The college brings jobs, commerce and a demand for housing that is not found in other parts of the county.
	02	Eustis is within easy community distance of the larger communities in Dawson County, which provide jobs and shopping opportunities. The real estate market in Eustis is strong, but generally somewhat softer than the market in Curtis.
	03	Small Villages – this group consists of the Villages of Maywood, Stockville and Moorefield. There is less demand in these areas, and generally the market will be less organized.
	04	Lake Properties – this group consists of properties at the Medicine Creek Reservoir and the Hugh Butler Lake. These properties receive a recreational influence that is not found in other parts of the county.
	05	Rural – includes all parcels not located within the political boundaries of the villages excluding those around the lakes. Demand for rural housing remains strong in Frontier County, and homes will generally sell for a premium.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Only the cost approach is used to value property in the residential class. There is insufficient sales activity to establish the sales comparison approach.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June 2008 for the entire class	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Depreciation tables are developed by the assessor using local market information.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes, except the Lake properties are valued using the Rural depreciation, plus a leasehold value.	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	A depreciation study was completed for the villages in 2009, adjustments have been made to the Curtis (2010) and Eustis (2011) tables since. The rural depreciation study was completed for 2011 and was implemented in the lake grouping for 2012.	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	

	For the villages (groups 1-3) for 2009, the rural for 2011, and the lakes for 2012.
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>
	Lot values are established by completing a sales study using a cost per square foot analysis.
10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>
	Generally, a parcel is considered substantially changed when an improvement is added to or removed from a parcel. Improvements with additions or major remodels are reviewed during pickup work and may constitute being coded out as substantially changed.

**32 Frontier  
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 : 58  
 Total Sales Price : 4,180,664  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,180,664  
 Total Assessed Value : 4,070,718  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 72,080  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 70,185

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 102  
 COD : 18.10  
 PRD : 104.70

COV : 25.79  
 STD : 26.29  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.69  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 202.48  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 47.56

95% Median C.I. : 93.91 to 102.03  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.84 to 102.90  
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.18 to 108.72

Printed:3/29/2012 3:06:49PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	12	96.93	101.73	103.96	14.29	97.85	63.72	133.40	89.82 to 120.44	73,400	76,307
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	103.97	106.87	100.42	15.27	106.42	68.60	156.40	68.60 to 156.40	63,433	63,699
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	102.03	110.53	107.62	17.36	102.70	89.09	174.05	89.09 to 174.05	68,557	73,781
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	92.83	99.46	86.66	22.98	114.77	68.19	133.44	N/A	71,400	61,876
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	89.19	80.98	89.86	15.60	90.12	47.56	99.05	N/A	77,300	69,462
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	7	125.18	127.12	113.19	19.77	112.31	90.76	202.48	90.76 to 202.48	38,429	43,497
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	8	98.61	94.48	93.25	07.17	101.32	68.82	104.57	68.82 to 104.57	107,688	100,415
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	6	83.52	85.96	83.12	20.33	103.42	63.65	115.71	63.65 to 115.71	73,083	60,748
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	32	99.69	104.58	101.17	17.13	103.37	63.72	174.05	92.47 to 113.96	69,536	70,348
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	26	96.38	98.70	93.05	19.03	106.07	47.56	202.48	89.19 to 101.01	75,212	69,984
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	24	96.96	106.90	99.01	23.78	107.97	47.56	202.48	89.87 to 122.11	62,183	61,568
<u>ALL</u>	58	97.71	101.95	97.37	18.10	104.70	47.56	202.48	93.91 to 102.03	72,080	70,185

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	25	97.11	98.78	94.63	10.19	104.39	68.19	133.44	92.47 to 101.01	63,458	60,050
02	12	98.56	99.93	99.45	15.09	100.48	68.60	133.40	89.09 to 115.71	88,000	87,516
03	10	97.14	111.32	97.14	25.60	114.60	71.48	202.48	80.73 to 156.40	70,790	68,767
04	5	129.97	110.56	124.89	30.82	88.53	47.56	174.05	N/A	42,760	53,403
05	6	101.50	96.40	91.58	18.95	105.26	63.65	128.96	63.65 to 128.96	102,750	94,100
<u>ALL</u>	58	97.71	101.95	97.37	18.10	104.70	47.56	202.48	93.91 to 102.03	72,080	70,185

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	51	97.53	100.93	95.62	15.39	105.55	63.65	202.48	93.91 to 101.01	76,625	73,267
06	5	129.97	110.56	124.89	30.82	88.53	47.56	174.05	N/A	42,760	53,403
07	2	106.33	106.33	113.74	13.27	93.49	92.22	120.44	N/A	29,500	33,555
<u>ALL</u>	58	97.71	101.95	97.37	18.10	104.70	47.56	202.48	93.91 to 102.03	72,080	70,185

**32 Frontier  
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 : 58  
 Total Sales Price : 4,180,664  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,180,664  
 Total Assessed Value : 4,070,718  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 72,080  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 70,185

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 102  
 COD : 18.10  
 PRD : 104.70

COV : 25.79  
 STD : 26.29  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.69  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 202.48  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 47.56

95% Median C.I. : 93.91 to 102.03  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.84 to 102.90  
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.18 to 108.72

Printed:3/29/2012 3:06:49PM

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	1	125.18	125.18	125.18	00.00	100.00	125.18	125.18	N/A	4,500	5,633	
Less Than 15,000	4	110.97	129.16	121.84	31.24	106.01	92.22	202.48	N/A	10,125	12,336	
Less Than 30,000	8	116.56	119.21	114.97	27.74	103.69	47.56	202.48	47.56 to 202.48	16,938	19,473	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	57	97.53	101.54	97.34	17.96	104.31	47.56	202.48	93.58 to 102.03	73,266	71,317	
Greater Than 14,999	54	97.71	99.93	97.13	16.83	102.88	47.56	174.05	93.58 to 102.03	76,670	74,470	
Greater Than 29,999	50	97.32	99.19	96.78	15.22	102.49	63.65	174.05	92.83 to 101.01	80,903	78,299	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	125.18	125.18	125.18	00.00	100.00	125.18	125.18	N/A	4,500	5,633	
5,000 TO 14,999	3	96.75	130.48	121.42	37.98	107.46	92.22	202.48	N/A	12,000	14,571	
15,000 TO 29,999	4	116.56	109.27	112.04	25.73	97.53	47.56	156.40	N/A	23,750	26,610	
30,000 TO 59,999	19	103.99	106.57	106.31	14.83	100.24	63.72	137.51	94.87 to 120.44	43,356	46,093	
60,000 TO 99,999	16	93.21	95.74	94.88	14.94	100.91	68.60	174.05	80.73 to 100.94	77,525	73,553	
100,000 TO 149,999	11	94.17	92.41	92.76	15.75	99.62	63.65	133.40	68.19 to 112.12	120,636	111,900	
150,000 TO 249,999	4	98.29	96.52	96.55	02.90	99.97	89.82	99.68	N/A	163,500	157,853	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	58	97.71	101.95	97.37	18.10	104.70	47.56	202.48	93.91 to 102.03	72,080	70,185	



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Frontier County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

The residential market in Frontier County is influenced by the local agriculturally based economy. Additionally the town of Curtis is influenced by the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. The demand for housing by educators, support staff, and students has kept the real estate market stable with steady growth annually. The market in the smaller communities is generally less active and has been stable to slightly decreasing. Rural residential and recreational parcels in the county continue to have strong demand with a slightly increasing market. These economic conditions support the use of the five valuation groupings that have been identified in the residential class.

The sales verification process employed by the county involves sending a sales questionnaire to both the buyer and seller of each sold parcel. When necessary, interviews are conducted with buyers, sellers, and real estate professionals to determine sale terms and influences. A review of the qualified and non-qualified sales roster revealed that there was no apparent bias in the qualification determinations.

All residential appraisal work is completed in-house using a four year appraisal cycle. This year's reappraisal of the lake valuation grouping completed a cycle. Each year a land value study, physical review, and depreciation study are completed for the area being reappraised. A creditable effort is made by the county assessor to openly and thoroughly explain the valuation process to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division; the County Board of Equalization; and the taxpayers within the county.

Analysis of the sold properties suggests that residential assessments are acceptable. Both the median and weighted mean are within the acceptable range. The mean is slightly high and is affected by outliers. The qualitative statistics support the use of the median in determining the level of value of residential parcels, and also support that assessments have been applied uniformly. Only valuation group 01 has enough sales to adequately represent the population. Since the appraisal process is applied consistently throughout the class and because the quality statistics support appraisal uniformity, it is believed that all valuation groupings have been assessed within the acceptable range.

The analysis supports that residential assessments are at uniform portions of market value, and that the appraisal techniques employed by the county meet generally accepted mass appraisal standards. Based on a review of all available information, the level of value of residential property in Frontier County is determined to be 98%.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier County**

Only routine maintenance was completed within the commercial class. A reappraisal of commercial property in Frontier County was completed for 2010; the property listings are still current and there is insufficient data to warrant adjustments to the appraisal tables. The pickup work was completed timely.

## 2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Frontier County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The assessor and the deputy assessor	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	The assessor does not differentiate valuation groupings within the commercial class. The commercial market in Frontier County is sporadic and unorganized. There are so few sales in the three year study period that it would be inappropriate to stratify them further.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	All three approaches to values were developed and considered when the commercial reappraisal was completed for 2010. Because of the limited market information, the cost approach was relied upon to establish the commercial values.	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.</b>	
	Because there is so little sales data in Frontier County, all commercial structures are costed using a few general occupancy codes which relate more to the highest and best use of the structure than the current use. Depreciation is established using all sales based on age and condition. The commercial appraiser also used sales information from other counties in completing the 2010 reappraisal.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June 2009	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Depreciation tables are developed using local market information.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	There are no valuation groupings within the class; one depreciation table is used.	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Lot values are established by completing a sales study using a cost per square foot analysis.	
10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>	
	A parcel is substantially changed when an improvement is added to or removed from a parcel. Improvements with major remodels and additions are reviewed during pickup work and may constitute being coded out as substantially changed.	

**32 Frontier  
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 : 12  
 Total Sales Price : 523,800  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 523,800  
 Total Assessed Value : 530,935  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 43,650  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 44,245

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 101  
 MEAN : 106  
 COD : 09.81  
 PRD : 104.49

COV : 23.35  
 STD : 24.73  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.64  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 183.30  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 91.93

95% Median C.I. : 96.85 to 103.31  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 96.22 to 106.50  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.20 to 121.62

Printed:3/29/2012 3:06:50PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Qtrrs</b>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	96.35	96.35	95.98	00.69	100.39	95.69	97.01	N/A	22,500	21,596
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	97.39	97.39	97.79	00.55	99.59	96.85	97.92	N/A	27,400	26,795
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	98.31	97.58	99.02	01.89	98.55	91.93	101.05	N/A	73,300	72,584
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	183.30	183.30	183.30	00.00	100.00	183.30	183.30	N/A	12,000	21,996
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	106.11	106.11	108.22	02.64	98.05	103.31	108.90	N/A	22,750	24,620
<b>Study Yrs</b>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	96.93	96.87	96.97	00.62	99.90	95.69	97.92	N/A	24,950	24,195
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	6	98.35	111.86	101.69	15.98	110.00	91.93	183.30	91.93 to 183.30	63,083	64,152
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	2	106.11	106.11	108.22	02.64	98.05	103.31	108.90	N/A	22,750	24,620
<b>Calendar Yrs</b>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	98.20	97.52	98.86	01.61	98.64	91.93	101.05	91.93 to 101.05	60,186	59,501
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	183.30	183.30	183.30	00.00	100.00	183.30	183.30	N/A	12,000	21,996
<b>ALL</b>	12	98.26	105.91	101.36	09.81	104.49	91.93	183.30	96.85 to 103.31	43,650	44,245

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	12	98.26	105.91	101.36	09.81	104.49	91.93	183.30	96.85 to 103.31	43,650	44,245
<b>ALL</b>	12	98.26	105.91	101.36	09.81	104.49	91.93	183.30	96.85 to 103.31	43,650	44,245

**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	12	98.26	105.91	101.36	09.81	104.49	91.93	183.30	96.85 to 103.31	43,650	44,245
04											
<b>ALL</b>	12	98.26	105.91	101.36	09.81	104.49	91.93	183.30	96.85 to 103.31	43,650	44,245

**32 Frontier  
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 : 12  
 Total Sales Price : 523,800  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 523,800  
 Total Assessed Value : 530,935  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 43,650  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 44,245

MEDIAN : 98  
 WGT. MEAN : 101  
 MEAN : 106  
 COD : 09.81  
 PRD : 104.49

COV : 23.35  
 STD : 24.73  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.64  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 183.30  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 91.93

95% Median C.I. : 96.85 to 103.31  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 96.22 to 106.50  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.20 to 121.62

Printed:3/29/2012 3:06:50PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<b>Low \$ Ranges</b>												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	5	98.20	115.73	121.85	18.89	94.98	96.85	183.30	N/A	8,700	10,601	
Less Than 30,000	6	97.61	111.77	110.93	16.90	100.76	91.93	183.30	91.93 to 183.30	11,417	12,664	
<b>Ranges Excl. Low \$</b>												
Greater Than 4,999	12	98.26	105.91	101.36	09.81	104.49	91.93	183.30	96.85 to 103.31	43,650	44,245	
Greater Than 14,999	7	98.31	98.88	99.51	03.32	99.37	91.93	108.90	91.93 to 108.90	68,614	68,276	
Greater Than 29,999	6	98.35	100.04	99.92	02.79	100.12	95.69	108.90	95.69 to 108.90	75,883	75,825	
<b>Incremental Ranges</b>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	5	98.20	115.73	121.85	18.89	94.98	96.85	183.30	N/A	8,700	10,601	
15,000 TO 29,999	1	91.93	91.93	91.93	00.00	100.00	91.93	91.93	N/A	25,000	22,983	
30,000 TO 59,999	4	98.12	100.21	100.18	03.47	100.03	95.69	108.90	N/A	41,825	41,900	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999	1	98.39	98.39	98.39	00.00	100.00	98.39	98.39	N/A	138,000	135,782	
150,000 TO 249,999	1	101.05	101.05	101.05	00.00	100.00	101.05	101.05	N/A	150,000	151,568	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<b>ALL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>98.26</b>	<b>105.91</b>	<b>101.36</b>	<b>09.81</b>	<b>104.49</b>	<b>91.93</b>	<b>183.30</b>	<b>96.85 to 103.31</b>	<b>43,650</b>	<b>44,245</b>	

<b>OCCUPANCY CODE</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
326	1	183.30	183.30	183.30	00.00	100.00	183.30	183.30	N/A	12,000	21,996	
344	1	98.20	98.20	98.20	00.00	100.00	98.20	98.20	N/A	9,500	9,329	
350	1	101.05	101.05	101.05	00.00	100.00	101.05	101.05	N/A	150,000	151,568	
352	1	98.39	98.39	98.39	00.00	100.00	98.39	98.39	N/A	138,000	135,782	
353	4	97.39	97.50	96.43	03.19	101.11	91.93	103.31	N/A	21,325	20,564	
468	1	97.01	97.01	97.01	00.00	100.00	97.01	97.01	N/A	10,000	9,701	
470	2	102.30	102.30	102.73	06.46	99.58	95.69	108.90	N/A	37,500	38,524	
543	1	98.31	98.31	98.31	00.00	100.00	98.31	98.31	N/A	44,000	43,256	
<b>ALL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>98.26</b>	<b>105.91</b>	<b>101.36</b>	<b>09.81</b>	<b>104.49</b>	<b>91.93</b>	<b>183.30</b>	<b>96.85 to 103.31</b>	<b>43,650</b>	<b>44,245</b>	





**2012 Correlation Section  
for Frontier County**

---

**A. Commercial Real Property**

The commercial population in Frontier County primarily lies within the towns of Curtis and Eustis. Both communities have a fairly active business district for towns of their size and generally have similar economic conditions. The market for commercial properties in these towns is sporadic and unorganized, as is typical in rural Nebraska. Properties within Maywood, Stockville, and Moorefield will typically be less desirable than comparable properties in Curtis or Eustis. Since there are usually very few sales of commercial property in the county, commercial parcels are depreciated using the same table countywide. Market differences between the two larger towns and the rest of the county are accounted for in the land values. Due to the limited sales data and the ability to proportionately value property with adjustments to land values, the county assessor does not recognize valuation groupings within the commercial class.

The sale verification procedure in Frontier County involves sending a detailed questionnaire to both the buyer and the seller of commercial property. The document includes questions that try to determine how the selling price was established and whether the established price included any personal property or business value. Interviews are conducted with buyers and sellers when necessary to gather additional information. A review of qualified and non-qualified sales rosters revealed no bias in the qualification determinations.

All commercial parcels in the county were reappraised for assessment year 2010. The contract appraiser physically inspected all commercial properties and conducted interior reviews and interviews with property owners whenever possible. After collecting data, the appraiser considered all three approaches of values using four years of county sales data and sales from outside the county to develop the appraisal tables.

The sample of sales available for the measurement of the commercial class is very small; based on the sample size it is unlikely that the sample could proportionately represent the types of commercial properties that exist in the class. The coefficient of dispersion (COD) is quite low, at only 10%. However, only three of the sales in the current sample have sold since the 2010 reappraisal. Since the majority of the sales were used to establish the depreciation tables it is not uncommon that the sample is producing a very low COD. Because the commercial market is unorganized, it is unlikely that the COD would be so low had more than three qualified sales occurred since the reappraisal. The low COD does not provide support for using the measures of central tendency as an indication of the level of value of the class.

Based on the assessment practices employed by the county assessor, it is believed that assessments are uniform and proportionate within the commercial class. There is no reliable information available with which to determine a level of value for commercial parcels within Frontier County.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier County**

Only routine maintenance was completed for the agricultural improvements. A reappraisal of the ag improvements was just completed for 2011.

A sales study was completed for agricultural land within the county. Adjustments were made to all subclasses. The irrigated and dry land LCG values were restructured resulting in larger increases to some subclasses than others. On average irrigated and dry land increased about 33% and grass land increased about 1%.



## 2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Frontier County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>				
	The assessor and the deputy assessor				
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">Market Area</th> <th>Description of unique characteristics</th> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">01</td> <td>There are no market areas in Frontier County.</td> </tr> </table>	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics	01	There are no market areas in Frontier County.
Market Area	Description of unique characteristics				
01	There are no market areas in Frontier County.				
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>				
	n/a				
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>				
	The primary use of the parcel is determined by physical inspection, sales verification, reviewing GIS imagery, and other means of normal discovery. Currently, the only recreational parcels within the county are those that have been enrolled in the WRP Program.				
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?</b>				
	Farm home sites and rural residential home sites are valued the same.				
6.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>				
	Land use is updated using GIS imagery, as well as information received from tax payers and the NRD, with some physical inspection.				
7.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>				
	Sales are plotted annually to monitor for non-agricultural influences. The sales verification procedure also includes questions to help the assessor determine whether there was a non-agricultural influence in the sales price.				
8.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>				
	No				
9.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>				
	Generally, a parcel is considered substantially changed when an improvement is added to or removed from a parcel. Improvements with additions or major remodels are reviewed during pickup work and may constitute a sale being coded out as substantially changed. In the agricultural class, land use changes will also be considered substantially changed.				

**32 Frontier**  
**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 : 53  
Total Sales Price : 12,939,774  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 12,939,774  
Total Assessed Value : 9,891,401  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 244,147  
Avg. Assessed Value : 186,630

MEDIAN : 71  
WGT. MEAN : 76  
MEAN : 78  
COD : 21.59  
PRD : 101.60

COV : 27.57  
STD : 21.41  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.29  
MAX Sales Ratio : 151.03  
MIN Sales Ratio : 44.73

95% Median C.I. : 67.61 to 79.41  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 69.20 to 83.68  
95% Mean C.I. : 71.90 to 83.42

Printed:3/29/2012 3:06:51PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	109.10	109.10	109.10	00.00	100.00	109.10	109.10	N/A	55,000	60,003
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	103.45	106.82	81.14	28.94	131.65	69.65	151.03	N/A	180,000	146,044
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	73.52	73.24	73.63	22.31	99.47	53.39	94.05	53.39 to 94.05	163,955	120,719
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	9	68.59	73.18	78.25	10.50	93.52	60.04	96.71	66.58 to 87.71	306,840	240,117
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	98.65	103.71	93.97	11.50	110.37	89.22	123.25	N/A	287,667	270,331
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	94.00	89.73	91.58	12.15	97.98	55.73	108.64	N/A	332,422	304,448
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	68.43	68.49	67.25	02.76	101.84	65.69	71.35	N/A	288,000	193,672
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	68.88	69.63	70.29	12.35	99.06	55.65	86.15	N/A	319,000	224,226
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	65.93	66.97	68.81	06.80	97.33	61.18	79.41	N/A	106,500	73,282
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	68.11	68.40	70.37	13.29	97.20	52.56	81.94	52.56 to 81.94	298,704	210,212
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	69.47	63.18	59.39	15.13	106.38	44.73	76.59	N/A	186,130	110,551
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	21	70.83	82.92	78.20	26.19	106.04	53.39	151.03	67.61 to 94.05	223,823	175,028
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	16	80.45	82.09	80.96	20.75	101.40	55.65	123.25	65.69 to 97.22	311,507	252,211
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	16	66.09	66.32	66.98	12.56	99.01	44.73	81.94	61.18 to 76.59	203,461	136,277
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	23	85.00	80.78	83.23	19.02	97.06	53.39	123.25	67.61 to 94.00	272,626	226,895
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	13	66.24	68.34	69.15	08.80	98.83	55.65	86.15	62.08 to 74.75	230,115	159,120
<u>ALL</u>	53	70.83	77.66	76.44	21.59	101.60	44.73	151.03	67.61 to 79.41	244,147	186,630

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	53	70.83	77.66	76.44	21.59	101.60	44.73	151.03	67.61 to 79.41	244,147	186,630
<u>ALL</u>	53	70.83	77.66	76.44	21.59	101.60	44.73	151.03	67.61 to 79.41	244,147	186,630

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Dry</u>											
County	5	68.88	73.48	73.64	15.10	99.78	61.18	98.65	N/A	130,100	95,805
1	5	68.88	73.48	73.64	15.10	99.78	61.18	98.65	N/A	130,100	95,805
<u>Grass</u>											
County	9	69.47	70.67	70.49	11.82	100.26	52.56	94.05	62.03 to 81.94	144,861	102,110
1	9	69.47	70.67	70.49	11.82	100.26	52.56	94.05	62.03 to 81.94	144,861	102,110
<u>ALL</u>	53	70.83	77.66	76.44	21.59	101.60	44.73	151.03	67.61 to 79.41	244,147	186,630

**32 Frontier**  
**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 : 53  
Total Sales Price : 12,939,774  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 12,939,774  
Total Assessed Value : 9,891,401  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 244,147  
Avg. Assessed Value : 186,630

MEDIAN : 71  
WGT. MEAN : 76  
MEAN : 78  
COD : 21.59  
PRD : 101.60

COV : 27.57  
STD : 21.41  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.29  
MAX Sales Ratio : 151.03  
MIN Sales Ratio : 44.73

95% Median C.I. : 67.61 to 79.41  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 69.20 to 83.68  
95% Mean C.I. : 71.90 to 83.42

Printed:3/29/2012 3:06:51PM

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	1	55.65	55.65	55.65	00.00	100.00	55.65	55.65	N/A	369,999	205,901
1	1	55.65	55.65	55.65	00.00	100.00	55.65	55.65	N/A	369,999	205,901
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	9	68.59	70.11	69.34	11.96	101.11	55.10	98.65	61.18 to 76.59	119,668	82,979
1	9	68.59	70.11	69.34	11.96	101.11	55.10	98.65	61.18 to 76.59	119,668	82,979
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	14	70.41	72.70	75.40	13.11	96.42	52.56	94.05	62.03 to 86.15	170,495	128,562
1	14	70.41	72.70	75.40	13.11	96.42	52.56	94.05	62.03 to 86.15	170,495	128,562
<b>_____ALL_____</b>											
	53	70.83	77.66	76.44	21.59	101.60	44.73	151.03	67.61 to 79.41	244,147	186,630

## Frontier County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
32.10	Frontier	1	1,300	1,299	1,218	1,246	1,200	1,200	1,148	1,121	1,273
56.40	Lincoln	4	1,375	1,366	1,276	1,375	1,293	1,325	1,225	1,263	1,323
24.20	Dawson	2	#DIV/0!	1,615	1,565	1,345	927	#DIV/0!	700	700	1,480
37.10	Gosper	1	#DIV/0!	2,450	2,050	1,710	1,591	1,540	1,480	1,368	2,351
37.40	Gosper	4	#DIV/0!	2,050	1,780	1,400	1,295	#DIV/0!	975	905	1,661
33.10	Furnas	1	2,440	2,105	1,830	1,740	1,325	1,230	1,040	855	1,884
73.10	Red Willow	1	1,750	1,575	1,390	1,262	1,139	1,002	888	758	1,489
44.90	Hitchcock	90	1,600	1,600	1,450	1,450	1,300	1,300	1,200	1,200	1,541
43.10	Hayes	1	1,500	1,500	1,400	1,400	1,300	1,300	1,200	1,200	1,389

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Frontier	1	790	790	740	740	690	690	640	640	760
	Lincoln	4	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
	Dawson	2	#DIV/0!	770	720	600	550	#DIV/0!	445	415	593
	Gosper	1	#DIV/0!	800	750	700	640	550	530	530	748
	Gosper	4	#DIV/0!	800	749	700	640	#DIV/0!	530	530	740
	Furnas	1	915	900	775	700	670	580	550	500	795
	Red Willow	1	760	760	625	575	540	465	425	410	691
	Hitchcock	90	735	736	602	600	475	475	411	411	681
	Hayes	1	600	600	600	500	500	500	450	450	562

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Frontier	1	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350
	Lincoln	4	400	400	400	400	400	380	380	380	382
	Dawson	2	#DIV/0!	640	560	475	475	#DIV/0!	365	365	400
	Gosper	1	#DIV/0!	557	494	441	407	487	400	396	412
	Gosper	4	#DIV/0!	550	490	440	400	#DIV/0!	396	395	408
	Furnas	1	600	595	565	460	415	405	385	380	403
	Red Willow	1	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350
	Hitchcock	90	420	310	310	317	310	310	312	310	310
	Hayes	1	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280

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



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Frontier County**

---

**A. Agricultural Land**

Agricultural land in Frontier County consists of rolling plains with moderate to steep slopes. The majority of the county is grass land and dry cropland with little irrigation. The majority of parcels in the county are mixed use; nearly every sale will contain some portion of dry and grass acres. The county is in the Middle Republican Natural Resource District (NRD), which imposes water allocation restrictions on irrigated parcels. In general, the counties adjoining Frontier are comparable markets. Exceptions exist with irrigated land in Dawson and portions of Gosper counties due to NRD differences, and the north east corner of Hayes County where soil differences exist at the county line.

In analyzing the agricultural sales within Frontier County, the sales were not proportionately distributed among the study period years. The sample was expanded using sales from the defined comparable area. The resulting sample is proportionately distributed, representative of the majority land uses found in the population and large enough to produce a reliable measurement. The statistical profile suggests that values are within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion does not reflect an abnormal amount of dispersion in the sample, and lends support to using the calculated median to represent the level of value.

The majority land use samples are quite small, but generally suggest values within the acceptable range. Since the majority of parcels in the county are mixed use, samples of dry and grassland sales of 50-75% majority land use were evaluated. This analysis consistently produced medians of dry and grass land sales between 69-71%. A comparison Frontier's land values to the adjoining counties also supports that the dry and grass land values are within an acceptable range. Irrigated values in Frontier County are slightly lower, but reasonably comparable to the other Republican Basin NRD counties. The county has attempted to increase the irrigated values with the market. This year irrigation received a 33% increase. A comparison of irrigated and dry land value movements since 2001 shows that irrigated land has increased at a slightly higher rate than dry land; this provides further supports that the irrigated values are acceptable.

The analysis supports that all agricultural subclasses have been assessed at uniform portions of market value and are generally equalized with adjoining counties. Based on a review of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Frontier County is determined to be 71%.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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.



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 4,053</b>	<b>Value : 466,795,128</b>	<b>Growth 1,207,977</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	72	322,264	14	101,921	10	88,850	96	513,035	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	716	3,541,947	45	470,700	79	1,490,626	840	5,503,273	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	722	33,554,099	46	3,816,174	86	5,727,314	854	43,097,587	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	794	37,418,310	60	4,388,795	96	7,306,790	950	49,113,895	267,971
<b>% of Res Total</b>	83.58	76.19	6.32	8.94	10.11	14.88	23.44	10.52	22.18
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	21	91,790	1	4,391	5	82,760	27	178,941	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	122	537,275	3	16,871	14	212,361	139	766,507	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	133	12,864,588	5	137,839	28	3,267,360	166	16,269,787	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	154	13,493,653	6	159,101	33	3,562,481	193	17,215,235	282,322
<b>% of Com Total</b>	79.79	78.38	3.11	0.92	17.10	20.69	4.76	3.69	23.37
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	10	159,447	10	159,447	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	196	1,570,460	196	1,570,460	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	204	3,866,333	204	3,866,333	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	214	5,596,240	214	5,596,240	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	5.28	1.20	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	794	37,418,310	60	4,388,795	310	12,903,030	1,164	54,710,135	267,971
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	68.21	68.39	5.15	8.02	26.63	23.58	28.72	11.72	22.18
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	154	13,493,653	6	159,101	33	3,562,481	193	17,215,235	282,322
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	79.79	78.38	3.11	0.92	17.10	20.69	4.76	3.69	23.37
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	948	50,911,963	66	4,547,896	343	16,465,511	1,357	71,925,370	550,293
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	69.86	70.78	4.86	6.32	25.28	22.89	33.48	15.41	45.55

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	3	43,938	1,377,672	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	3	43,938	1,377,672
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				3	43,938	1,377,672

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	8	5,752,280	8	5,752,280	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	8	5,752,280	8	5,752,280	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	98	1	271	370

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	7	74,964	0	0	2,005	232,740,377	2,012	232,815,341
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	1	13,643	645	117,907,026	646	117,920,669
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	1	155,109	675	38,226,359	676	38,381,468
30. Ag Total							2,688	389,117,478

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	7,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	138,287	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	2.88	5,645	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	16,822	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	2	2.00	14,000	2	2.00	14,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	374	386.00	2,702,000	375	387.00	2,709,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	374	380.00	22,793,403	375	381.00	22,931,690	657,684
34. HomeSite Total				377	389.00	25,654,690	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	52	148.48	290,487	52	148.48	290,487	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	624	3,133.65	5,386,517	625	3,136.53	5,392,162	
37. FarmSite Improvements	656	0.00	15,432,956	657	0.00	15,449,778	0
38. FarmSite Total				709	3,285.01	21,132,427	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,653.87	0	0	5,653.87	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,086	9,327.88	46,787,117	657,684

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	141.35	0.19%	183,755	0.19%	1,300.00
46. 1A	59,485.60	79.50%	77,243,421	81.12%	1,298.52
47. 2A1	1,887.14	2.52%	2,298,296	2.41%	1,217.87
48. 2A	941.38	1.26%	1,172,754	1.23%	1,245.78
49. 3A1	5,375.81	7.18%	6,449,672	6.77%	1,199.76
50. 3A	9.56	0.01%	11,472	0.01%	1,200.00
51. 4A1	1,537.27	2.05%	1,764,839	1.85%	1,148.03
52. 4A	5,443.26	7.28%	6,101,888	6.41%	1,121.00
53. Total	74,821.37	100.00%	95,226,097	100.00%	1,272.71
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	723.75	0.46%	571,764	0.48%	790.00
55. 1D	115,894.00	73.67%	91,556,458	76.56%	790.00
56. 2D1	2,221.11	1.41%	1,643,621	1.37%	740.00
57. 2D	1,304.67	0.83%	965,448	0.81%	739.99
58. 3D1	21,280.50	13.53%	14,683,614	12.28%	690.00
59. 3D	1.63	0.00%	1,125	0.00%	690.18
60. 4D1	4,977.83	3.16%	3,185,803	2.66%	640.00
61. 4D	10,915.32	6.94%	6,985,795	5.84%	640.00
62. Total	157,318.81	100.00%	119,593,628	100.00%	760.20
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	575.30	0.16%	201,368	0.16%	350.02
64. 1G	29,611.16	8.13%	10,364,947	8.13%	350.04
65. 2G1	2,583.13	0.71%	904,160	0.71%	350.02
66. 2G	978.72	0.27%	342,606	0.27%	350.06
67. 3G1	5,028.12	1.38%	1,760,107	1.38%	350.05
68. 3G	0.92	0.00%	322	0.00%	350.00
69. 4G1	7,586.72	2.08%	2,655,620	2.08%	350.04
70. 4G	317,944.23	87.27%	111,281,506	87.27%	350.00
71. Total	364,308.30	100.00%	127,510,636	100.00%	350.01
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	74,821.37	12.54%	95,226,097	27.82%	1,272.71
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	157,318.81	26.38%	119,593,628	34.94%	760.20
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	364,308.30	61.08%	127,510,636	37.25%	350.01
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	160.41	0.03%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	596,448.48	100.00%	342,330,361	100.00%	573.95



Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.88	1,100	0.00	0	74,820.49	95,224,997	74,821.37	95,226,097
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	87.96	67,204	0.00	0	157,230.85	119,526,424	157,318.81	119,593,628
<b>78. Grass</b>	19.02	6,660	2.85	998	364,286.43	127,502,978	364,308.30	127,510,636
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.91	0	159.50	0	160.41	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>107.86</b>	<b>74,964</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>998</b>	<b>596,337.77</b>	<b>342,254,399</b>	<b>596,448.48</b>	<b>342,330,361</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	74,821.37	12.54%	95,226,097	27.82%	1,272.71
<b>Dry Land</b>	157,318.81	26.38%	119,593,628	34.94%	760.20
<b>Grass</b>	364,308.30	61.08%	127,510,636	37.25%	350.01
<b>Waste</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	160.41	0.03%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>596,448.48</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>342,330,361</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>573.95</b>

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

32 Frontier

	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	49,353,023	49,113,895	-239,128	-0.48%	267,971	-1.03%
02. Recreational	3,699,048	5,596,240	1,897,192	51.29%	0	51.29%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	25,451,145	25,654,690	203,545	0.80%	657,684	-1.78%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>78,503,216</b>	<b>80,364,825</b>	<b>1,861,609</b>	<b>2.37%</b>	<b>925,655</b>	<b>1.19%</b>
05. Commercial	16,950,620	17,215,235	264,615	1.56%	282,322	-0.10%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	20,716,088	21,132,427	416,339	2.01%	0	2.01%
08. Minerals	3,359,410	5,752,280	2,392,870	71.23	0	71.23
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>41,026,118</b>	<b>44,099,942</b>	<b>3,073,824</b>	<b>7.49%</b>	<b>282,322</b>	<b>6.80%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>119,529,334</b>	<b>124,464,767</b>	<b>4,935,433</b>	<b>4.13%</b>	<b>1,207,977</b>	<b>3.12%</b>
11. Irrigated	71,575,751	95,226,097	23,650,346	33.04%		
12. Dryland	90,167,033	119,593,628	29,426,595	32.64%		
13. Grassland	125,663,703	127,510,636	1,846,933	1.47%		
14. Wasteland	0	0	0			
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>287,406,487</b>	<b>342,330,361</b>	<b>54,923,874</b>	<b>19.11%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>406,935,821</b>	<b>466,795,128</b>	<b>59,859,307</b>	<b>14.71%</b>	<b>1,207,977</b>	<b>14.41%</b>

## FRONTIER COUNTY ASSESSOR'S 3-YEAR PLAN

The following is a revised 3-year plan of assessment for years 2012, 2013, and 2014 pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB170, Section 5 and directive 05-4. The purpose of this plan is to update and inform the County Board of Equalization and the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division of the progress this county has achieved from year to year. The plan and any updates shall examine the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment within Frontier County.

### Property Summary in Frontier County (Parcel Summary):

#### Personal Property

Property Type	Total Parcel Count	Percent Of Parcels	Total Value	Percent Of Total Value
Commercial	145	30%	3,081,253	11%
Agricultural	348	70%	25,843,178	89%
2011 Total	493		28,924,431	

**2010 totals:** Parcel count: 514 Total value: \$25,112,420 increase in value for '11 by \$3,812,011

#### Real Property

Property Type	Taxable Acres	Unimproved Parcels	Improved Parcels	Total Parcel Count	Percent Of Parcels	Total Value	Percent Total Value
Commercial		25	165	190	4.72%	16,990,258	4.21%
Agricultural	596,341	2006	678	2684	66.67% Irrigated= 13% Dry= 26% Grass= 61%	333,764,997	82.65%
Residential	112	90	851	941	23.38%	49,350,055	12.22%
Recreational	0	6	205	211	5.25%	3,766,864	.94%
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Val	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011 Total	596,453	2127	1899	4026	100%	403,872,174	100%

**2010 totals:**

**Parcel count:** 4,025 - increase of 1 for '11

**Commercial:** \$18,533,340 – decrease of \$16,990,258 for '11

**Agricultural:** \$295,839,732 – increase of \$37,925,265 for '11

**Residential:** \$48,931,094 – increase of \$418,961 for '11

**Recreational:** \$3,763,125 – increase of \$3,739 for '11

**Total value for '10:** \$367,067,381 increase of \$36,804,793 for '11

**Misc. Parcel Counts**

Property Type	Total Parcel Count	Total Value
TIF	3	Excess= 1,377,672 Base=43,938
Mineral / Oil Interest	6	3,359,410
Exempt	366	0
Homesteads Applications for 2010	129	5,613,661
Building / Zoning Info Applications for 2011	Permits = 18	

**2010 totals:** TIF Ex: \$1,377,672 – same for '11

Mineral: \$1,203,690 – increase of \$2,155,720 for '11

**Current Resources in Frontier County:**

**Budget:** Requested Budget for 2011-2012 = \$ 100,563  
 Requested Reappraisal Budget for 2011-2012 = \$ 0  
 Adopted Budget for 2011-2012 = \$ 100,563  
 Adopted Reappraisal Budget for 2010-2011 = \$ 0

**Staffing:** Assessor – Regina Andrijeski, full time,  
 Deputy Assessor – Starlin Russell

**Training:** The assessor has her assessor's certificate and is in good standing with the state and is completing continuing education to comply with required hours to be current through December 31, 2014, and to continue to further her education in every area of her job. So far the assessor has taken a total of 52 hours toward her required 60 hours for recertification.

The county just got a new deputy assessor, as of August 25<sup>th</sup>. Starlin Russell passed her assessor's exam and now has her assessor's certificate. So far the deputy assessor has taken a total of 10 hours toward her required 60 hours for recertification.

**Maps:** Frontier County has contracted with GIS Workshop for their GIS mapping program and January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008 it was fully implemented. The aerial maps and cadastral maps are no longer updated, due to the fact that all that information is now on the GIS system and kept current on there.

**CAMA:** Frontier County uses the TerraScan Administrative System. This county began using the system in 1999. As stated above the office is now contracting its mapping system with GIS Workshop. The office server is a Dell and was purchased in July of 2005. The office purchased a new Dell PC for the deputy assessor's workstation in 2007. The office updated to a new digital camera in 2010, that we

use for taking photos of improvements, upon which are later entered into the Terra-Scan electronic file. The office intends to continuously review and update our equipment as needed to keep our records accurate and the office running well.

**Web:** Frontier County, with system provider GIS Workshop, offers a basic web property information service. Any individual with access to the Internet will have access to county parcel information by going to the following site <http://frontier.gisworkshop.com>

### **Property Record Cards:**

The assessor and the deputy assessor update each property record file, as needed both electronically and with hard copies. Only the most recent data is kept in the record card. Historic information on each parcel is kept in a separate file cabinet from the current files. Each property record file is interrelated through codes and references and contains the following:

1. Parcel information.
  - ◆ Current owner and address
  - ◆ Ownership changes, sales information, splits or additions, and deed recordings
  - ◆ Legal description and situs
  - ◆ Property classification code, tax district, and school district
  - ◆ Current year and up to 4 years prior history of land and improvements assessed values
2. Ag-land land use and soil type worksheets.
3. Current copy of the electronic appraisal file worksheet.

### **Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:**

#### **Discover, List and Inventory all property:**

Sales review and procedures for processing 521's in Frontier County:

\* Current data available on sales file:

1. Agricultural land & Commercial = 3 years of data. July 1 – June 30
2. Residential = 2 years of data. July 1 – June 30

\* All sales are deemed to be qualified sales. For a sale to be considered non-qualified or if any adjustments are to be made to the selling price the sale is reviewed pursuant to professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques and through the review documenting sufficient and compelling information regarding the sale. Opinions are based on the results of returned questionnaires and/or conversations with buyers and/or sellers.

\* All 521's are entered into the computer, however, only the 521's with an amount stated for Documentary Stamp Tax greater than \$2.25 or consideration greater than \$100.00 is captured in the sales file database as a qualified sale.

\* If the stated value of personal property is more than 5% of the total sale price for residential property or more than 25% for commercial property, the sale is EXCLUDED unless the sales sample is small and there is strong evidence to support the value estimate of personal property.

\* Both the assessor and the deputy process sales. Every transfer statement has the following work done: Updates made to the property record card, electronic appraisal file, GIS if applicable, and sales book. All sales are now sent electronically to the PAD. Sales questionnaires are sent to BOTH buyer and seller of ALL types of property (Ag, residential, commercial). A physical improvements data confirmation sheet is also sent to either the buyer or the seller. When the data sheet is returned the information is compared to that already present in the appraisal file and updated as needed. A record is kept of all individuals receiving a questionnaire and all individuals returning the questionnaire. Our return rate on the verification questionnaires is at 33% this year. The office also initiates phone contact with the buyer and seller on any sales with questions or concerns. All sales whether qualified or not are recorded in the TerraScan computer sales file. The Treasurer's office, FSA, and the NRD office are informed of ownership changes. Lastly the offices sales spreadsheet, used to determine sales ratios, is updated.

#### Building Permits / Information Sheets:

\* No building amounting to a value of \$2,500 or more shall be erected, or structurally altered or repaired, and no electrical, heating, plumbing, or other installation or connection, or other improvement to real property, amounting to a value of \$2,500 or more, shall hereafter be made until an information statement or building permit has been filed with the assessor.

\* Urban Zoning regulations in place in: Curtis, Eustis, and Maywood. No zoning regulations in place in: Stockville and Moorefield. Entire rural areas of the county require a zoning permit when changes are made to the property.

\* When there is an increase in square footage of a current improvement or the addition of another improvement to an urban property a building permit is required in the towns of Curtis and Eustis. Information sheets shall be used in a city or village that does not require a building permit under its zoning laws.

\* All permits and information sheets are reviewed for percentage of completion and value changes in the fall (December), prior to January 1, of the year the permits were turned into the assessors' office.

\* Frontier County data logs include: Excel spreadsheet of building permits, permit collection envelope, and the electronic Terra-scan permits file.

### **Data Collection:**

\* Real Property Improvements:

Appraisal work is being done on a continuing basis. Our office uses data gathered from sales questionnaires as well as detailed reviews and updates. Detailed reviews include an on-site physical inspection of all improvements, by the county assessor & deputy, interior inspections when possible, new digital photographs and any needed updating of improvement sketches. Frontier County is scheduling detailed reviews to be performed on all property types with improvements throughout the entire County on a 4-year cycle. Lake and cabin properties are scheduled to be done for the tax year 2012, residential properties for 2013, commercial properties for 2014, rural properties and all Ag parcels for 2015 and then the process starts again. Either the county assessor or deputy completes updates annually. All property types are reviewed on the computer for correctness of parcel information/ appraisal record data.

\* Personal Property:

Currently data is gathered primarily from the taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule and previous personal property schedules. Occasionally owners will report new property themselves and we review all copies of any UCC filing statements and zoning permits that are recorded in the clerk's office. Our office mails out reminders one month prior to the May first deadline as well as make phone calls to remind those that have not filed a week prior to the May 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.

\* Ag land:

January 1<sup>st</sup> 2008 Frontier County fully implemented the GIS system and it is now used to keep all of our land use current by viewing the current satellite imagery for Frontier County.

\* Improvements on Leased Land:

Improvements on leased land have been inspected using the same methods as those used with other real property improvements.

## **Assessment sales ratios and assessment actions:**

\* Our office now performs three review assessments. Two prior to the AVU and abstract submission and one after the Reports and Opinions has been released.

\* Reviews of the level of value for all types of property are done using the sales rosters provided by the state as well as using our in house “what if’s” spread sheets. The office also utilizes our field liaison when needed. We understand that the reliability of the ratio studies depends on representativeness of the sample. Therefore, when information is entered into the sales file and the rosters they are reviewed for correctness several times.

\* The appraisal uniformity guide our offices employs and strives to be in compliance with is:

1. Mean / Median / Aggregate lie between:

- \* 92-100% for residential properties
- \* 92-100% for commercial properties
- \* 69-75% for Agland
- \* In normal distribution all 3 should be equal

2. COD lies between:

- \* <15 for residential
- \* <20 for Agland & commercial
- \* <5 considered extremely low, maybe a flawed study

3. PRD lies between:

- \* 98-103% for all types of properties
- \* PRD <98 means high value parcels are over appraised
- \* PRD >103 means high valued parcels are under appraised and low valued parcels are overappraised

4. Fairness and uniformity between sold and unsold properties equals a trended preliminary ratio that correlates closely with the R & O median ratio and a percentage change in the sales file and the assessed base would be similar.

## **Approaches to value:**

\* Land valuation process in Frontier County is based upon site date and the market (sales) approach for land.

1. Site data

- a. Lots evaluated per use, square-foot, acre, neighborhood, size and shape, road type and access, topography, improved



or unimproved, and zoning. Evaluated through onsite review and measurement (tape measure and GIS), city maps, property record card, and owner.

b. Agland evaluated per acre, class (use), and subclass. Evaluated through GIS satellite imagery, GIS soil layer and land use calculator, property record card, and landowner.

## 2. Market sales data

a. Lots. Use comparable sales within a 2-year period for residential lots and a 3-year period for commercial lots. Only arms lengths transactions used (based upon 521 and questionnaire information). All assessments must be done on or before March 19 of each year. Review ratio studies (mean, median, aggregate, COD, and PRD)

b. Agland. Valued at 75% of actual value. Use unimproved comparable sales within a 3-year period. Use only arms lengths transactions (based upon 521 and questionnaire information). All assessments must be done on or before March 19 of each year. Review ratio studies (mean, median, aggregate, COD, and PRD)

\* Real property, improvement valuation process in Frontier County is based upon the cost approach (physical data), and the sales approach.

1. Improvements data noted includes conforming to highest and best use for site, size, style, construction characteristics, actual age / remaining life / effective age, plus any rehabilitation, modernization and or remodeling

2. Physical data evaluated through onsite physical inspection by assessor and/or deputy, photographs, owner, property record card, and questionnaires.

## 4. Cost approach.

- Estimate replacement cost of improvements using Marshall & Swift cost handbook for year 2008 for residential and Ag improvements, 2009 for commercial, and 2004 for lake properties.
- Deduct for physical depreciation and or economic depreciation. For residential, percent depreciation was reviewed and rebuilt in 2009 by the assessor. For commercial, percent depreciation was reviewed and rebuilt in 2010 by appraiser Larry Rexroth. For rural residential, percent depreciation was reviewed and rebuilt in 2011 by the assessor.
- Age / life components, income loss, cost to correct, completion of improvements, questionnaires, property record card, and the market.

4. Sales approach. Use comparable sales within a 2-year period. Only arm's lengths transactions used (based upon 521 information, owner/buyer questionnaires or one on one contact with owner/buyer). Valued at 100% of actual value. Review of ratio studies (mean/median/aggregate/COD/PRD).

**Customer service, Notices and Public relations:**

\* Our office regularly aids realtors, appraisers, insurance agents, title insurance agents, and property owners in locating parcel information by the availability of all our parcel information online. In order to access sales information and more detailed information about a parcel, we have also implemented a premium parcel information portion on our website, that requires a \$200/year subscription. This allows realtors, appraisers and others access to sales information, GIS images and other information not available to the general public on the website. This has helped in reducing phone calls to the office as well as having to copy and fax parcel information to these people. We currently have 4 premium subscribers.

\* In addition to the required publications our office has begun to publish reminders and notices regarding several issues. Such topics include personal property schedule reminders and homestead application reminders.

\* In an attempt to educate and inform taxpayers, thus increasing public relations, the assessor produces property information newsletters. One newsletter is mailed to all property owners in their valuation change notice and another in their tax statement notice. We also publish some of these informational items as articles in our local paper.

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2011:**

<b>Property Class</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
Residential	100% (92-100)	24.06 (<15)	112.27 (98-103)
Commercial	NA (92-100)	NA (<20)	NA (98-103)
Ag-land	75.00% (69-75)	23.89 (<20)	107.47 (98-103)

**Functions performed by the Assessor's Office:**

Along with the sales reviews, property record keeping, mapping updates, ownership changes and valuing property, the assessor's office will annually:

1. Administer Homestead Exemption Applications. Carry out the approval or denial process. Provide taxpayer assistance and notification.
2. Administer Organization Exemptions & Affidavits to PAD. Administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to the county board.
3. Review government owned property not used for public purpose and send notices of intent to tax.
4. File personal property schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and apply penalties as required.
5. Review the level of value for all types of property and adjust by proper percentage to achieve the standards set out by TERC.
6. When applicable prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
7. When applicable attend TERC Statewide Equalization hearings to defend values, and or implement orders of the TERC.
8. Prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
9. Complete valuation reports due to each subdivision for levy setting.
10. Prepare and certify tax lists to the county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Review centrally assessed values, establish assessment records and tax billing for the tax list.
12. Management of properties in the community redevelopment projects, TIF properties, for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
13. Management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information.
14. Review of Sales and Sales Ratios especially noting the median, the COD, PRD, and aggregate.
15. Review the level of value for all Agland types and adjust by proper amount to achieve the standards set out TERC.

16. Attend CBE hearings. Prior to hearings assessor will re-inspect all protest properties and bring to the hearings recommendations. Assessor will attend CBE meetings for valuation protests, assemble and provide all needed information by the CBE.

17. Perform pickup work. Review improvements or changes that have been reported by individuals or have been found by driving by or have received building or zoning permits on or found on sales questionnaires. The assessor and deputy complete the pickup work. Pickup work is usually done in December and is completed by January 1.

18. Send out a notice of valuation change to every owner of real property where there has been either an increase or decrease in value.

19. Attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

20. Complete administrative reports due to PAD. Reports include the Real Property Abstract, Personal Property Abstract, School District Taxable Value Report, Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Summary certificate, Certificate of Taxable values, and the Certificate of Taxes Levied Report, Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions, Assessed Value Update, Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands and Funds, the Annual Plan of Assessment Report, and the Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property.

21. Re-grade land at owners request or because of changes noticed upon evaluation of GIS maps.

### **3-Year Appraisal Plan**

#### **2012:**

**Residential.** A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy will be completed in 2012 for the tax year 2013 on all residential properties in the towns of Curtis, Maywood, Eustis, Moorefield and Stockville. All properties will be physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken, measured and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sales value approaches will be used whenever applicable to the property

**Commercial.** Appraisal maintenance will only be performed for commercial properties located in the county for the 2012 tax year. Maintenance appraisal includes an evaluation of all residential records for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files. Updates also include any information picked up from sales questionnaires, physical facility questionnaires and or building permits or information sheets

**Ag-improvements.** A complete review (reappraisal) was completed for tax year 2011 on all Ag improvements located in the county. Therefore this year a maintenance appraisal will be done. Maintenance appraisals include an evaluation of all physical property and site data for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files as well as information gained from pickup work or sales questionnaires.

**Ag-land.** A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. The office uses the sales approach when determining value. The office plots land sales on a large county map, visible to all visitors, to help determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales.

**Recreational improvements.** A complete review (reappraisal) was completed by the assessor and deputy on all recreational properties in 2011 for the 2012 tax year. All properties were physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sale value approaches were also used whenever applicable to the property.

**2013:**

**Residential.** A complete review (reappraisal) was completed by the assessor and deputy on all residential properties in the towns of Curtis, Maywood, Eustis, Moorefield and Stockville in 2012 for the 2013 tax year. All properties were physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sale value approaches were also used whenever applicable to the property.

**Commercial.** A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy will be completed in 2013 for the tax year 2014 on all commercial properties in the county. All properties will be physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken, measured and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sales value approaches will be used whenever applicable to the property.

**Ag-land.** A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. The office uses the sales approach when determining value. The office plots land sales on a large county map, visible to all visitors, to help determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales.

**Ag-improvements.** Appraisal maintenance will only be performed for the Ag improvements in the county for the 2013 tax year. Maintenance appraisal includes an evaluation of all Ag improvement records for accuracy

in the computer and hard copy appraisal files. Updates also include any information picked up from sales questionnaires, physical facility questionnaires and or building permits or information sheets.

**Recreational improvements.** A complete review (reappraisal) was completed for tax year 2012 on all recreational properties located in the county. Therefore this year a maintenance appraisal will be done. Maintenance appraisals include an evaluation of all physical property and site data for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files as well as information gained from pickup work or sales questionnaires.

**2014:**

**Residential.** A complete review (reappraisal) was completed for tax year 2013 on all residential properties located in the towns of Curtis, Maywood, Eustis, Moorefield & Stockville. Therefore this year a maintenance appraisal will be done. Maintenance appraisals include an evaluation of all physical property and site data for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files as well as information gained from pickup work or sales questionnaires.

**Commercial.** A complete review (reappraisal) was completed by the assessor and deputy on all commercial properties in the county in 2013 for the 2014 tax year. All properties were physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sale value approaches were also used whenever applicable to the property. updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost, sales and income value approaches will be used whenever applicable to the property.

**Ag-land.** A complete review will be completed by the assessor and deputy on all Ag parcels in 2014 for the tax year 2015. Land use maps for each Ag parcel will be printed from the GIS and mailed to all landowners for their review of their current land classifications. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. The office uses the sales approach when determining value. The office plots land sales on a large county map, visible to all visitors, to help determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales.

**Ag-improvements.** A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy will be completed in 2014 for the tax year 2015 on all Ag improvements in the county. All properties will be physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken, measured and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed.

The cost and sales value approaches will be used whenever applicable to the property.

**Recreational improvements.** Appraisal maintenance will only be performed for recreational improvements in the county for the 2014 tax year. Maintenance appraisal includes an evaluation of all recreational records for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files. Updates also include any information picked up from sales questionnaires, physical facility questionnaires and or building permits or information sheets.

<b>CLASS</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
<b>Residential</b>	Appraisal maintenance	Complete reappraisal of all residential parcels in the county <b>for tax year 2013.</b>	Appraisal maintenance
<b>Recreational / lake MH</b>	Complete reappraisal of all recreational parcels in the county <b>for tax year 2012</b>	Appraisal maintenance	Appraisal maintenance
<b>Commercial</b>	Appraisal maintenance	Appraisal maintenance	Complete reappraisal of all commercial parcels in the county <b>for tax year 2014.</b>
<b>Agricultural Land &amp; Improvements</b>	Market analysis by land classification groupings  Appraisal maintenance of ag-improvements	Market analysis by land classification groupings  Appraisal maintenance of ag-improvements	Market analysis by land classification groupings  Appraisal maintenance of ag-improvements

### **Miscellaneous Accomplishments for 2010-2011**

- \* Created and mailed out information letters to go along with the valuation changes notices and tax statements.
- \* As a public service the office began having announcements regarding homestead exemptions, personal property schedule and various information articles published in the local newspaper.
- \* In regards to the homestead exemption application process our office provides personal assistance not only in our office but also in three other locations throughout the county to better serve this group of individuals.
- \* Have a web page up and running that contains parcel and sales information.  
<http://frontier.gisworkshop.com>
- \* Continue to update and modify features in Terrascan to make office more efficient and up to date.

- \* Have an in office sales book for appraisers that contain current copies of sales sheets for the current year and prior year. Sales are filed by valuation groupings.
- \* Post in our office a large county plat map with the agricultural sales appropriately mapped for taxpayers to effortlessly view recent markets trends.
- \* Attached a GIS land use image of all Ag parcels to the appropriate Terrascan record and made them viewable to all website subscribers.
- \* Scan all new 521's, deeds and mobile home transfers and attach to appropriate Terrascan record.
- \* Created a farm site for each improved Ag parcels and electronically attach to appropriate Terrascan record.



## 2012 Assessment Survey for Frontier County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	0
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$100,563
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	Same
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$300 for the oil and gas mineral appraisal
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	There is not a separate fund; however, mileage and some miscellaneous expense incurred during the cyclical reappraisal are covered by the County General fund not through the assessor's budget.
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$13,100 for the CAMA and GIS systems
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$2,550
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	None
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$22,189

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	TerraScan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	TerraScan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	No
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	n/a

5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?</b>
	Yes; Frontier County Assessor Property Search and Mapping; maintained by GIS Workshop
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	The assessor
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Curtis, Eustis, and Maywood
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2001

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Pritchard & Abbott are contracted to do the oil and gas mineral appraisal annually.
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None



# 2012 Certification for Frontier 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 Frontier 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



