

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 Lancaster County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	6523	Median	98.67
Total Sales Price	\$1,069,064,628	Mean	98.95
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,069,064,628	Wgt. Mean	98.77
Total Assessed Value	\$1,055,884,600	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$144,451
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$163,892	Avg. Assessed Value	\$161,871

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	98.54 to 98.80
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	98.62 to 98.91
95% Mean C.I	98.80 to 99.10
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	67.08
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.26
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.14

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	7,389	95	95
2010	6,976	95	95
2009	8,339	94	94
2008	9,828	96	96

2012 Commission Summary for Lancaster County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	297	Median	98.26
Total Sales Price	\$149,643,299	Mean	98.23
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$149,643,299	Wgt. Mean	85.87
Total Assessed Value	\$128,501,800	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$700,467
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$503,849	Avg. Assessed Value	\$432,666

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.30 to 98.93
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	74.24 to 97.51
95% Mean C.I	95.63 to 100.83
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	25.93
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.15
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.56

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	317	94	94
2010	351	92	92
2009	326	92	92
2008	413	96	96

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Lancaster County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	99	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	98	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of Agricultural Land	75	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Lancaster County

The County completed a complete reappraisal for the residential class of property for 2012. This reappraisal consisted of the remodeling of all properties utilizing the three approaches to value. It included an on-site property inspection of all sales and pickup work, and a general site review of more than one sixth of the data base as well as a complete drive by review of all parcels in the county to set final values. The County continuously verified sales, within the month that they were filed.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessors appraisal staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Average-City of Lincoln intermediate valued dwellings
	02	Hi-rise-Condominiums
	03	High-High end dwellings approximately values of 350,000 and up
	04	Rural- Acreages and Ag dwellings
	05	Townhouses
	06	Villages-Small towns
	07	Low- low end properties in City of Lincoln
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Market comparison approach to value is used by the county to establish the assessed value for the residential properties, utilizing automated market modeling and multiple regression analysis.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The Cost approach is available in the counties CAMA program but is not relied on for assessment.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No, the County does not rely on the cost approach in determining market value.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	Each year the county conducts a lot value study	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	Market sales analysis and field rating of each parcels land characteristics tied to market value based tables.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	The County relies on the experience and opinion of the appraiser in making the determination if a parcel is substantially changed, and if the change has altered the market value of the property by a substantial amount.	

**55 Lancaster
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 : 6,523
 Total Sales Price : 1,069,064,628
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,069,064,628
 Total Assessed Value : 1,055,884,600
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 163,892
 Avg. Assessed Value : 161,871

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 99
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 04.33
 PRD : 100.18

COV : 06.29
 STD : 06.22
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 04.27
 MAX Sales Ratio : 176.47
 MIN Sales Ratio : 68.93

95% Median C.I. : 98.54 to 98.80
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 98.62 to 98.91
 95% Mean C.I. : 98.80 to 99.10

Printed:3/29/2012 3:22:33PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1,165	97.70	97.81	97.92	04.28	99.89	68.93	129.83	97.39 to 97.91	154,758	151,535
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	898	97.89	98.16	98.19	04.59	99.97	70.63	128.22	97.53 to 98.35	158,256	155,398
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	571	98.76	99.13	99.15	04.05	99.98	78.95	131.00	98.38 to 99.08	171,227	169,777
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1,292	98.31	98.59	98.41	04.03	100.18	71.62	137.00	98.07 to 98.57	157,208	154,714
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	613	98.89	99.16	98.85	04.26	100.31	70.81	135.76	98.39 to 99.20	181,004	178,919
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	595	99.56	99.89	99.28	04.33	100.61	78.51	128.22	99.11 to 100.06	171,593	170,349
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	471	99.68	100.28	99.85	04.31	100.43	78.18	133.67	99.18 to 100.27	165,918	165,669
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	918	99.52	100.15	99.57	04.42	100.58	69.75	176.47	99.19 to 99.79	168,380	167,648
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	3,926	98.12	98.34	98.34	04.25	100.00	68.93	137.00	97.94 to 98.26	158,760	156,118
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	2,597	99.37	99.88	99.37	04.35	100.51	69.75	176.47	99.19 to 99.56	171,650	170,568
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	3,071	98.71	99.06	98.82	04.16	100.24	70.81	137.00	98.55 to 98.87	167,352	165,376
<u>ALL</u>	6,523	98.67	98.95	98.77	04.33	100.18	68.93	176.47	98.54 to 98.80	163,892	161,871

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	3,460	98.84	99.20	98.94	03.75	100.26	79.83	176.47	98.70 to 98.99	158,456	156,771
02	166	97.87	98.28	98.13	05.70	100.15	76.36	137.00	96.34 to 98.87	92,638	90,907
03	439	100.00	100.03	99.67	04.00	100.36	84.55	131.00	99.38 to 100.63	341,227	340,114
04	243	99.26	99.36	98.87	04.47	100.50	81.55	124.83	98.53 to 99.96	249,931	247,112
05	1,083	98.29	98.21	98.06	03.61	100.15	81.10	129.83	98.09 to 98.52	147,969	145,092
06	294	98.00	98.53	98.18	04.42	100.36	80.98	125.79	97.53 to 98.59	147,221	144,541
07	838	97.56	98.51	97.83	07.28	100.70	68.93	145.95	97.00 to 98.13	109,026	106,655
<u>ALL</u>	6,523	98.67	98.95	98.77	04.33	100.18	68.93	176.47	98.54 to 98.80	163,892	161,871

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	6,523	98.67	98.95	98.77	04.33	100.18	68.93	176.47	98.54 to 98.80	163,892	161,871
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	6,523	98.67	98.95	98.77	04.33	100.18	68.93	176.47	98.54 to 98.80	163,892	161,871

**55 Lancaster
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 : 6,523
 Total Sales Price : 1,069,064,628
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,069,064,628
 Total Assessed Value : 1,055,884,600
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 163,892
 Avg. Assessed Value : 161,871

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 99
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 04.33
 PRD : 100.18

COV : 06.29
 STD : 06.22
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 04.27
 MAX Sales Ratio : 176.47
 MIN Sales Ratio : 68.93

95% Median C.I. : 98.54 to 98.80
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 98.62 to 98.91
 95% Mean C.I. : 98.80 to 99.10

Printed:3/29/2012 3:22:33PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000												
Less Than 30,000	8	101.10	103.23	103.10	08.68	100.13	88.73	126.15	88.73 to 126.15	26,188	27,000	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	6,523	98.67	98.95	98.77	04.33	100.18	68.93	176.47	98.54 to 98.80	163,892	161,871	
Greater Than 14,999	6,523	98.67	98.95	98.77	04.33	100.18	68.93	176.47	98.54 to 98.80	163,892	161,871	
Greater Than 29,999	6,515	98.67	98.95	98.77	04.32	100.18	68.93	176.47	98.54 to 98.79	164,061	162,037	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999												
15,000 TO 29,999	8	101.10	103.23	103.10	08.68	100.13	88.73	126.15	88.73 to 126.15	26,188	27,000	
30,000 TO 59,999	110	100.00	102.76	102.57	09.24	100.19	70.00	145.95	98.00 to 102.16	49,395	50,664	
60,000 TO 99,999	901	98.89	100.03	99.86	06.81	100.17	68.93	176.47	98.25 to 99.33	84,328	84,209	
100,000 TO 149,999	2,666	98.54	98.69	98.68	04.02	100.01	71.62	137.00	98.29 to 98.71	124,978	123,332	
150,000 TO 249,999	2,023	98.73	98.76	98.74	03.55	100.02	76.36	128.22	98.51 to 98.93	187,253	184,900	
250,000 TO 499,999	763	98.79	98.59	98.60	03.71	99.99	81.55	119.40	98.47 to 99.18	318,338	313,885	
500,000 TO 999,999	51	97.84	98.10	97.97	04.76	100.13	85.21	115.52	95.79 to 100.45	615,340	602,839	
1,000,000 +	1	96.96	96.96	96.96	00.00	100.00	96.96	96.96	N/A	1,165,000	1,129,600	
___ ALL ___	6,523	98.67	98.95	98.77	04.33	100.18	68.93	176.47	98.54 to 98.80	163,892	161,871	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

A. Residential Real Property

Lancaster County is located in southeast Nebraska. The county seat of Lincoln is home for both County and State government as well as the main campus of the University of Nebraska. Lancaster County has seen a gradual increase in population and boasts of one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country. The county has maintained a pattern of growth in the residential class of property.

The residential sales file consists of 6,523 qualified sales. This sample of sales is considered adequate and reliable for the residential class of property. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range at 99 percent. Both of the qualitative measurements namely the COD and PRD are also within the recommended range. All of the valuation groupings fall within the acceptable range and the qualitative statistics for each group are also within the recommended range.

The county maintains a consistent procedure for sales verification, by verifying sales within a month of filing. The appraisal staff indicates the usability of the sale as well as reviewing present use of the property. The County utilizes an acceptable portion of available sales and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

The county revalued the residential class of property for the 2012 assessment year. The County annually conducts various analyses for the class on an annual basis. Even with ongoing budget constraints the County has continued an aggressive valuation process. The County is progressive in the use of technology to increase efficiency for the office practices. The County maintains a web site for parcel searches as well as transfers of properties.

The sample size and qualitative statistics, demonstrate that the statistics can be relied on as a representative sample of the residential class of property. The known assessment practices are reliable and consistent and demonstrate that the residential class is treated uniformly and proportionately.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 99% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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 Lancaster County

The County completed a complete reappraisal for the commercial class of property for 2012. This reappraisal consisted of the remodeling of all properties utilizing the three approaches to value. It included an on-site property inspection of all sales and pickup work, and a general site review of more than one sixth of the data base as well as a complete drive by review of all parcels in the county to set final values. The County continuously verified sales, within the month that they were filed.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The assessors appraisal staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u> The County uses Primary use as a valuation group. This is not a characteristic that is captured in the sales file.
	01	Lancaster County is considered as one valuation group.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Lancaster County uses the cost and income approaches for the valuation of all commercial properties.	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	The county relies on appraisers in their office that have the experience to value the unique properties in the County.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The county develops a depreciation model during each reappraisal cycle.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	N/A	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Market sales analysis and field rating of each parcels land characteristics tied to market value based tables.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	The County relies on the experience and opinion of the appraiser. If a change affects the market value of the property they would mark the parcel as substantially changed.	

55 Lancaster

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 : 297
 Total Sales Price : 149,643,299
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 149,643,299
 Total Assessed Value : 128,501,800
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 503,849
 Avg. Assessed Value : 432,666

MEDIAN : 98
 WGT. MEAN : 86
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 12.55
 PRD : 114.39

COV : 23.24
 STD : 22.83
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.33
 MAX Sales Ratio : 300.37
 MIN Sales Ratio : 06.03

95% Median C.I. : 97.30 to 98.93
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.24 to 97.51
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.63 to 100.83

Printed:3/29/2012 3:22:34PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	30	97.73	97.42	95.33	08.70	102.19	62.65	136.93	92.51 to 98.93	327,732	312,440	
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	17	93.89	91.85	85.71	08.66	107.16	67.51	118.13	86.04 to 99.23	443,812	380,412	
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	27	95.83	94.28	81.46	10.30	115.74	60.56	114.85	90.63 to 101.86	377,570	307,581	
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	25	95.93	98.87	94.20	13.10	104.96	73.75	155.96	91.14 to 105.97	476,748	449,104	
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	31	97.48	95.23	93.08	11.62	102.31	48.40	150.21	89.00 to 100.64	553,125	514,858	
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	101.82	96.01	88.41	09.60	108.60	18.74	111.62	95.76 to 105.71	352,696	311,805	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	11	97.34	102.38	100.85	17.00	101.52	62.18	198.91	85.81 to 107.90	226,192	228,109	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	34	97.90	97.99	97.82	09.87	100.17	50.18	131.35	93.19 to 103.11	500,934	490,026	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	20	102.34	101.37	87.61	12.66	115.71	23.82	157.37	97.38 to 108.70	423,041	370,625	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	24	98.87	96.34	95.87	07.95	100.49	61.99	117.98	91.00 to 103.62	658,681	631,450	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	21	97.55	97.21	96.88	11.70	100.34	17.07	145.44	94.48 to 101.13	486,933	471,757	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	35	101.25	107.72	59.76	23.31	180.25	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 107.06	892,360	533,277	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	99	95.83	95.97	89.57	10.39	107.15	60.56	155.96	93.18 to 98.26	398,887	357,298	
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	98	98.20	97.16	94.52	11.37	102.79	18.74	198.91	95.76 to 100.35	453,327	428,473	
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	100	100.03	101.51	77.80	15.42	130.48	06.03	300.37	97.57 to 102.48	657,274	511,389	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	105	97.92	96.01	90.07	11.39	106.59	18.74	155.96	95.34 to 99.82	447,803	403,358	
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	89	98.91	98.85	95.31	11.15	103.71	23.82	198.91	96.70 to 101.26	492,012	468,960	
<u>ALL</u>	297	98.26	98.23	85.87	12.55	114.39	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 98.93	503,849	432,666	

VALUATION GROUPING											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
01	297	98.26	98.23	85.87	12.55	114.39	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 98.93	503,849	432,666	
<u>ALL</u>	297	98.26	98.23	85.87	12.55	114.39	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 98.93	503,849	432,666	

PROPERTY TYPE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
02												
03	297	98.26	98.23	85.87	12.55	114.39	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 98.93	503,849	432,666	
04												
<u>ALL</u>	297	98.26	98.23	85.87	12.55	114.39	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 98.93	503,849	432,666	

55 Lancaster
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 : 297
 Total Sales Price : 149,643,299
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 149,643,299
 Total Assessed Value : 128,501,800
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 503,849
 Avg. Assessed Value : 432,666

MEDIAN : 98
 WGT. MEAN : 86
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 12.55
 PRD : 114.39

COV : 23.24
 STD : 22.83
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.33
 MAX Sales Ratio : 300.37
 MIN Sales Ratio : 06.03

95% Median C.I. : 97.30 to 98.93
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.24 to 97.51
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.63 to 100.83

Printed:3/29/2012 3:22:34PM

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												
Less Than 15,000	2	99.00	99.00	99.00	07.07	100.00	92.00	106.00	N/A	10,000	9,900	
Less Than 30,000	6	99.05	99.12	98.10	21.49	101.04	48.40	150.21	48.40 to 150.21	19,333	18,967	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	297	98.26	98.23	85.87	12.55	114.39	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 98.93	503,849	432,666	
Greater Than 14,999	295	98.26	98.23	85.87	12.59	114.39	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 98.93	507,198	435,532	
Greater Than 29,999	291	98.26	98.21	85.86	12.37	114.38	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 98.93	513,840	441,196	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	2	99.00	99.00	99.00	07.07	100.00	92.00	106.00	N/A	10,000	9,900	
15,000 TO 29,999	4	99.05	99.18	97.92	28.70	101.29	48.40	150.21	N/A	24,000	23,500	
30,000 TO 59,999	4	97.22	99.27	102.21	14.89	97.12	76.00	126.63	N/A	45,300	46,300	
60,000 TO 99,999	15	98.93	111.50	111.59	18.82	99.92	79.24	173.03	97.38 to 123.67	80,467	89,793	
100,000 TO 149,999	42	97.72	97.35	97.46	05.09	99.89	80.48	114.85	94.91 to 99.23	123,123	119,990	
150,000 TO 249,999	86	98.33	97.69	97.24	09.11	100.46	62.18	198.91	96.11 to 100.35	192,758	187,429	
250,000 TO 499,999	71	100.17	103.59	103.52	13.43	100.07	45.75	300.37	95.68 to 103.47	336,968	348,830	
500,000 TO 999,999	38	97.58	95.94	95.89	14.39	100.05	17.07	155.96	92.51 to 101.98	702,000	673,179	
1,000,000 +	35	90.37	86.27	73.03	21.15	118.13	06.03	162.00	81.36 to 98.89	2,165,429	1,581,420	
<u>ALL</u>	297	98.26	98.23	85.87	12.55	114.39	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 98.93	503,849	432,666	

55 Lancaster
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 : 297
Total Sales Price : 149,643,299
Total Adj. Sales Price : 149,643,299
Total Assessed Value : 128,501,800
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 503,849
Avg. Assessed Value : 432,666

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 86
MEAN : 98
COD : 12.55
PRD : 114.39

COV : 23.24
STD : 22.83
Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.33
MAX Sales Ratio : 300.37
MIN Sales Ratio : 06.03

95% Median C.I. : 97.30 to 98.93
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.24 to 97.51
95% Mean C.I. : 95.63 to 100.83

Printed:3/29/2012 3:22:34PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
157	8	95.01	88.79	68.44	17.68	129.73	23.82	119.37	23.82 to 119.37	367,909	251,813
300	2	100.93	100.93	101.56	01.68	99.38	99.23	102.63	N/A	186,000	188,900
304	1	107.06	107.06	107.06	00.00	100.00	107.06	107.06	N/A	650,000	695,900
309	3	115.15	172.73	144.60	57.23	119.45	102.67	300.37	N/A	530,000	766,400
326	1	94.07	94.07	94.07	00.00	100.00	94.07	94.07	N/A	135,000	127,000
336	1	99.21	99.21	99.21	00.00	100.00	99.21	99.21	N/A	190,000	188,500
341	3	100.18	110.86	118.83	30.48	93.29	70.40	162.00	N/A	1,037,879	1,233,333
343	1	73.53	73.53	73.53	00.00	100.00	73.53	73.53	N/A	1,700,000	1,250,000
344	34	99.36	98.68	71.22	13.27	138.56	06.03	150.21	93.15 to 105.71	829,456	590,703
349	8	101.85	111.36	107.59	24.59	103.50	62.33	198.91	62.33 to 198.91	412,202	443,488
350	3	90.17	85.33	81.98	11.39	104.09	67.51	98.31	N/A	1,200,000	983,700
351	2	96.84	96.84	95.78	01.84	101.11	95.06	98.62	N/A	160,000	153,250
352	93	99.57	100.30	83.87	08.27	119.59	46.80	153.29	98.46 to 102.08	374,462	314,056
353	11	98.92	101.23	99.72	13.86	101.51	77.71	155.96	81.48 to 122.79	713,000	711,018
356	1	70.77	70.77	70.77	00.00	100.00	70.77	70.77	N/A	175,500	124,200
381	1	93.21	93.21	93.21	00.00	100.00	93.21	93.21	N/A	577,500	538,300
386	1	95.28	95.28	95.28	00.00	100.00	95.28	95.28	N/A	1,187,500	1,131,500
387	1	157.37	157.37	157.37	00.00	100.00	157.37	157.37	N/A	415,000	653,100
391	12	92.42	102.79	103.92	22.20	98.91	48.40	173.03	90.63 to 123.67	207,567	215,708
406	9	96.44	93.07	86.90	06.52	107.10	81.08	102.96	81.36 to 101.10	544,213	472,922
412	2	92.91	92.91	95.03	03.10	97.77	90.03	95.78	N/A	1,177,500	1,119,000
423	1	100.87	100.87	100.87	00.00	100.00	100.87	100.87	N/A	310,000	312,700
426	3	96.70	96.92	96.47	00.62	100.47	96.12	97.93	N/A	367,000	354,033
436	1	117.74	117.74	117.74	00.00	100.00	117.74	117.74	N/A	350,000	412,100
442	3	83.88	86.71	85.04	06.07	101.96	80.48	95.76	N/A	881,667	749,800
453	11	95.78	88.53	70.45	14.16	125.66	17.07	110.16	67.22 to 106.04	370,546	261,055
455	1	98.93	98.93	98.93	00.00	100.00	98.93	98.93	N/A	1,900,000	1,879,600
483	3	111.23	108.08	107.06	03.42	100.95	100.80	112.21	N/A	608,333	651,267
494	4	101.80	107.38	105.84	08.77	101.46	97.67	128.27	N/A	859,038	909,175
496	1	60.56	60.56	60.56	00.00	100.00	60.56	60.56	N/A	4,250,000	2,573,600
528	2	91.46	91.46	90.53	02.33	101.03	89.33	93.58	N/A	94,000	85,100
529	1	84.67	84.67	84.67	00.00	100.00	84.67	84.67	N/A	330,000	279,400
531	5	85.37	93.02	79.88	28.14	116.45	50.18	136.93	N/A	987,000	788,420
534	35	97.73	94.29	93.56	09.18	100.78	45.75	126.63	92.68 to 101.13	299,221	279,937
554	26	96.06	91.53	88.50	10.87	103.42	18.74	110.35	91.14 to 100.13	381,123	337,312
582	1	76.00	76.00	76.00	00.00	100.00	76.00	76.00	N/A	35,000	26,600
588	1	82.11	82.11	82.11	00.00	100.00	82.11	82.11	N/A	3,000,000	2,463,400

55 Lancaster
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 : 297
 Total Sales Price : 149,643,299
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 149,643,299
 Total Assessed Value : 128,501,800
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 503,849
 Avg. Assessed Value : 432,666

MEDIAN : 98
 WGT. MEAN : 86
 MEAN : 98
 COD : 12.55
 PRD : 114.39

COV : 23.24
 STD : 22.83
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.33
 MAX Sales Ratio : 300.37
 MIN Sales Ratio : 06.03

95% Median C.I. : 97.30 to 98.93
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 74.24 to 97.51
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.63 to 100.83

Printed:3/29/2012 3:22:34PM

ALL	297	98.26	98.23	85.87	12.55	114.39	06.03	300.37	97.30 to 98.93	503,849	432,666
-----	-----	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	-------	--------	----------------	---------	---------

**2012 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Lancaster County is located in southeast Nebraska. The county seat of Lincoln is home for both County and State government as well as the main campus of the University of Nebraska. The County has seen an increase in population of over 35,000 since 2000. The economic trend is stable in the area and the county boasts relatively low unemployment.

The 2012 Lancaster County commercial statistical profile reveals a total of 297 qualified sales to be used as a sample for the three-year study period. The calculated median is 98. The profile indicates that two of the three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, with only the weighted mean being outside the range. The qualitative statistics reveal that the PRD is above the recommended range with the COD being within the range.

The valuation for commercial properties in Lancaster County is based on the primary or present use of the parcel. In analyzing the sales by occupancy all with adequate representation are within the acceptable range. The entirety of the county is considered as one valuation group in the commercial class of property. A complete reappraisal for the commercial class of property was conducted for the 2012 assessment year. The reappraisal consisted of the remodeling of all properties utilizing the three approaches to value. On-site inspections of all sales and pickup work along with a general site review of more than one sixth of the data base, as well as a drive by review of parcels.

Lancaster County has a consistent procedure for sales verification. The county verifies sales within a month of filing. The appraisal staff indicates the usability of the sale as well as reviewing present use of the property.

The sales file has been determined to be representative of the commercial class of property. It is believed that the assessment practices of the County produce an overall uniform and proportionate treatment of the commercial property.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 98% of market value for the commercial class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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 Lancaster County

The County utilizes Special value on all agricultural properties for the agricultural land portion of the parcel. The county completed an analysis of the agricultural sales from comparable counties that do not have other than agricultural use for the parcels. The County continuously updates land use in the agricultural class from GIS imagery FSA maps and physical inspections. The County completed permit and pickup work for the agricultural class of property.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessors appraisal staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	The agricultural special value land is one market area.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Class or subclass includes, but not limited to , the classifications of agricultural land listed in section 77-1363, parcel use, parcel type, location, geographic characteristics, zoning, city size , parcel size and market characteristics.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Present use of the parcel is the deciding factor in determining the differences.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	Market areas are recognized for the sites and improvements based on sales analysis. The differences that are recognized are location factors that affect the market.	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	GIS imagery, Field inspection, and FSA maps as supplied by parcel owners.	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	The County continually reviews and verifies sales to determine if there are influences other than for agricultural use. The County than compares the sales to similar sales from non-influenced counties with the same general land capabilities.	
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	Yes, Yes	
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	The county relies on the experience and the opinion of the appraiser in making the determination. The appraiser will determine if the change was substantial enough to affect the market value of the property.	

Lancaster County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
55.10	Lancaster	1	3,734	3,750	3,747	3,744	3,000	2,986	2,623	2,616	3,493
34.10	Gage	1	2,848	2,872	2,566	2,575	2,303	2,309	2,130	2,113	2,609
76.30	Saline	3	3,746	3,749	3,695	3,668	3,297	2,600	2,599	2,550	3,583
78.10	Saunders	1	3,725	3,432	3,349	2,858	2,420	2,100	1,799	1,730	2,712
13.27	Cass	27	3,510	3,400	2,990	2,990	2,430	2,430	2,200	1,740	2,667
66.70	Otoe	7000	3,240	2,910	2,910	2,010	1,890	#DIV/0!	1,740	850	2,194
66.80	Otoe	8000	3,630	3,630	3,360	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,090	1,210	2,895
49.10	Johnson	1	3,331	3,103	3,100	2,632	2,500	#DIV/0!	1,556	1,300	2,626

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Lancaster	1	3,371	3,375	2,845	2,847	2,250	2,248	1,649	1,647	2,649
	Gage	1	2,205	2,205	1,860	1,860	1,575	1,575	1,400	1,400	1,780
	Saline	3	2,694	2,687	2,297	2,140	1,895	1,525	1,522	1,425	2,262
	Saunders	1	3,415	3,139	3,061	2,642	2,295	1,850	1,590	1,599	2,201
	Cass	27	2,790	2,768	2,660	2,369	2,250	2,249	2,310	1,898	2,422
	Otoe	7000	2,950	2,650	2,650	1,830	1,720	#DIV/0!	1,580	770	1,841
	Otoe	8000	3,300	3,300	3,050	2,500	2,500	2,500	1,900	1,100	2,581
	Johnson	1	2,465	2,276	2,310	1,882	1,950	1,962	1,185	1,000	1,798

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Lancaster	1	1,860	2,017	1,707	1,786	1,440	1,451	1,052	996	1,401
	Gage	1	786	1,097	935	1,105	984	885	885	641	889
	Saline	3	1,047	1,224	1,002	1,230	1,148	959	1,008	752	978
	Saunders	1	1,324	1,166	1,511	1,495	1,737	1,126	788	675	1,117
	Cass	27	1,030	1,060	970	790	860	860	830	630	778
	Otoe	7000	1,006	1,106	1,026	1,157	992	#DIV/0!	996	677	1,016
	Otoe	8000	1,217	1,232	1,174	1,282	1,140	1,111	1,037	729	1,084
	Johnson	1	1,288	1,666	1,453	1,204	1,251	1,236	940	679	1,039

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

2012 Special Value Methodology for Lancaster County:

Lancaster County focused on using generally accepted appraisal practices in establishing its special valuations on agricultural land. Utilizing sales supplied by the Property Assessment Division of the Nebraska Department of Revenue from similar surrounding uninfluenced counties, namely Gage, Johnson, Nemaha, Otoe, Pawnee, and Saline. The county analyzed the sales using statistical studies and market analysis of the sales with predominately the same general classification to determine a value for the four productivity levels of each of the three major majority land uses.

COUNTY REPORT OF THE 2012 SPECIAL VALUATION PROCESS

Lancaster

2011 ABSTRACT DATA		2012 ABSTRACT DATA		Rates Used	
MAJOR AGLAND USE	2011 % of ALL CLASSIFIED AGLAND	2011 ABSTRACT ACRES	2012 % of ALL CLASSIFIED AGLAND	2012 ABSTRACT ACRES	ESTIMATED CORRELATED RATE (for each major land use)
Irrigated	4.58%	17,971	4.58%	18,032	IRRIGATED RATE 6.00%
Dryland	74.63%	293,092	70.89%	279,062	DRYLAND RATE 4.10%
Grassland	14.51%	56,980	18.15%	71,454	GRASS RATE 3.00%
* Waste	6.28%	24,680	6.38%	25,125	
* Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	
All Agland	100.00%	392,722	100.00%	393,672	
Non-Agland		0			

PRELIMINARY LEVEL OF VALUE BASED ON THE 2011 ABSTRACT

Estimated Rent	2011 ADJ Assessed Value	USE	Estimated Value	Average Rent per Acre	Preliminary Indicated Level of Value
4,673,518	47,130,272	IRRIGATED	77,891,958	260.06	60.51%
43,954,688	615,699,479	DRYLAND	1,072,065,560	149.97	57.43%
2,979,699	57,104,875	GRASSLAND	99,323,290	52.29	57.49%
51,607,904	719,934,626	All IRR-DRY-GRASS	1,249,280,809	140.22	57.63%

ESTIMATED LEVEL OF VALUE BASED ON THE 2012 ABSTRACT

Estimated Rent	2012 ADJ Assessed Value	USE	Estimated Value	Average Rent per Acre	2012 Indicated Level of Value
4,689,407	62,989,621	IRRIGATED	78,156,791	260.06	80.59%
41,850,676	739,149,527	DRYLAND	1,020,748,201	149.97	72.41%
3,234,988	100,076,413	GRASSLAND	107,832,921	52.29	92.81%
49,775,071	902,215,561	All IRR-DRY-GRASS	1,206,737,913	140.22	74.76%

CHANGES BY AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE FOR EACH MAJOR USE

Average Value Per Acre of IRRIGATED Agricultural Land - Special Valuation		
2011	@ \$	2,622.63
2012	@ \$	3,493.27
PERCENT CHANGE	=	33.20%

Average Value Per Acre of DRY Agricultural Land - Special Valuation		
2011	@ \$	2,100.71
2012	@ \$	2,648.69
PERCENT CHANGE	=	26.09%

Average Value Per Acre of GRASS Agricultural Land - Special Valuation		
2011	@ \$	1,002.20
2012	@ \$	1,400.58
PERCENT CHANGE	=	39.75%

NOTES:

* Waste and other classes are excluded from the measurement process.

2012 Correlation Section for Lancaster County

A. Agricultural Land

Agricultural Land in Lancaster County is determined to be completely influenced by non-agricultural factors and valued primarily using special valuation. Therefore, measurement is not conducted on the influenced valuation for agricultural land.

A1. Correlation for Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

The special valuation in Lancaster County was analyzed using assessment-to-sales ratios developed using sale data from uninfluenced counties considered comparable to Lancaster County. Income rental rates, production factors, topography, typical farming practices, proximity, and other factors were considered to determine general areas of comparability. The 2012 assessed values established by Lancaster County were used to estimate value for the uninfluenced sales and the results were analyzed against the sale prices.

Analysis is also conducted of the rental rates in the comparable counties and used to estimate the total rents per land capability grouping for the county being measured. Gross rent multipliers are determined based on an analysis of rental information from the comparable counties and market values indicated from sale prices. An assessment level is estimated by the ratio of special valuation assessment divided by the estimated agricultural land market value determination.

In comparing the average assessed values by LCG of Lancaster County to adjacent counties the comparison demonstrates the values are generally equalized. Based on this analysis it is the opinion of the PTA that the level of value of Agricultural Special Value in Lancaster County is 75%.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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 Lancaster County**

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 104,948	Value : 19,347,441,345	Growth 224,258,896	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	4,731	188,253,700	0	0	0	0	4,731	188,253,700	
02. Res Improve Land	83,148	3,187,077,300	0	0	0	0	83,148	3,187,077,300	
03. Res Improvements	85,115	9,603,030,712	0	0	0	0	85,115	9,603,030,712	
04. Res Total	89,846	12,978,361,712	0	0	0	0	89,846	12,978,361,712	148,871,674
% of Res Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	85.61	67.08	66.38
05. Com UnImp Land	1,264	239,246,300	0	0	0	0	1,264	239,246,300	
06. Com Improve Land	5,888	1,361,817,800	0	0	0	0	5,888	1,361,817,800	
07. Com Improvements	5,897	3,414,982,533	0	0	0	0	5,897	3,414,982,533	
08. Com Total	7,161	5,016,046,633	0	0	0	0	7,161	5,016,046,633	67,245,234
% of Com Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.82	25.93	29.99
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	89,846	12,978,361,712	0	0	0	0	89,846	12,978,361,712	148,871,674
% of Res & Rec Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	85.61	67.08	66.38
Com & Ind Total	7,161	5,016,046,633	0	0	0	0	7,161	5,016,046,633	67,245,234
% of Com & Ind Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.82	25.93	29.99
17. Taxable Total	97,007	17,994,408,345	0	0	0	0	97,007	17,994,408,345	216,116,908
% of Taxable Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	92.43	93.01	96.37

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	1,287	53,431,112	44,347,788	0	0	0
19. Commercial	661	173,252,833	200,321,567	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	1,287	53,431,112	44,347,788
19. Commercial	0	0	0	661	173,252,833	200,321,567
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1,948	226,683,945	244,669,355

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	2,607	0	69	2,676

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	4,259	621,598,100	0	0	0	0	4,259	621,598,100
28. Ag-Improved Land	2,407	358,759,200	0	0	0	0	2,407	358,759,200
29. Ag Improvements	3,682	372,675,700	0	0	0	0	3,682	372,675,700
30. Ag Total							7,941	1,353,033,000

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	11	0.00	323,700	11	0.00	323,700	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	2,098	0.00	69,922,800	2,098	0.00	69,922,800	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2,068	0.00	341,508,500	2,068	0.00	341,508,500	8,141,988
34. HomeSite Total				2,079	0.00	411,755,000	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	77	0.00	408,100	77	0.00	408,100	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	332	0.00	1,831,300	332	0.00	1,831,300	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,605	0.00	28,562,900	1,605	0.00	28,562,900	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,682	0.00	30,802,300	
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	6,378,800	0	0.00	6,378,800	
41. Total Section VI				3,761	0.00	448,936,100	8,141,988

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	6,555	0.00	904,096,900	6,555	0.00	904,096,900
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,914.99	10.62%	7,150,302	11.35%	3,733.86
46. 1A	5,095.29	28.26%	19,106,877	30.33%	3,749.91
47. 2A1	1,398.65	7.76%	5,241,144	8.32%	3,747.29
48. 2A	4,593.10	25.47%	17,198,058	27.30%	3,744.32
49. 3A1	2,563.56	14.22%	7,690,130	12.21%	2,999.79
50. 3A	376.65	2.09%	1,124,646	1.79%	2,985.92
51. 4A1	1,690.05	9.37%	4,433,773	7.04%	2,623.46
52. 4A	399.41	2.22%	1,044,691	1.66%	2,615.59
53. Total	18,031.70	100.00%	62,989,621	100.00%	3,493.27
Dry					
54. 1D1	18,604.16	6.67%	62,722,772	8.49%	3,371.44
55. 1D	58,846.04	21.09%	198,577,097	26.87%	3,374.52
56. 2D1	11,617.23	4.16%	33,050,855	4.47%	2,844.99
57. 2D	62,437.01	22.37%	177,781,963	24.05%	2,847.38
58. 3D1	71,713.24	25.70%	161,334,803	21.83%	2,249.72
59. 3D	22,688.46	8.13%	51,003,192	6.90%	2,247.98
60. 4D1	29,156.55	10.45%	48,090,395	6.51%	1,649.39
61. 4D	3,999.21	1.43%	6,588,450	0.89%	1,647.44
62. Total	279,061.90	100.00%	739,149,527	100.00%	2,648.69
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,677.86	2.35%	3,120,869	3.12%	1,860.03
64. 1G	6,436.49	9.01%	12,983,870	12.97%	2,017.23
65. 2G1	2,798.34	3.92%	4,776,911	4.77%	1,707.05
66. 2G	8,369.21	11.71%	14,951,578	14.94%	1,786.50
67. 3G1	21,451.62	30.02%	30,882,471	30.86%	1,439.63
68. 3G	4,081.80	5.71%	5,922,111	5.92%	1,450.86
69. 4G1	16,088.74	22.52%	16,928,378	16.92%	1,052.19
70. 4G	10,549.50	14.76%	10,510,225	10.50%	996.28
71. Total	71,453.56	100.00%	100,076,413	100.00%	1,400.58
Irrigated Total					
	18,031.70	4.58%	62,989,621	6.97%	3,493.27
Dry Total					
	279,061.90	70.89%	739,149,527	81.76%	2,648.69
Grass Total					
	71,453.56	18.15%	100,076,413	11.07%	1,400.58
72. Waste	25,124.74	6.38%	1,881,339	0.21%	74.88
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	393,671.90	100.00%	904,096,900	100.00%	2,296.57

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	18,031.70	62,989,621	18,031.70	62,989,621
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	279,061.90	739,149,527	279,061.90	739,149,527
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	71,453.56	100,076,413	71,453.56	100,076,413
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	25,124.74	1,881,339	25,124.74	1,881,339
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	393,671.90	904,096,900	393,671.90	904,096,900

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	18,031.70	4.58%	62,989,621	6.97%	3,493.27
Dry Land	279,061.90	70.89%	739,149,527	81.76%	2,648.69
Grass	71,453.56	18.15%	100,076,413	11.07%	1,400.58
Waste	25,124.74	6.38%	1,881,339	0.21%	74.88
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	393,671.90	100.00%	904,096,900	100.00%	2,296.57

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

55 Lancaster

	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	12,387,680,348	12,978,361,712	590,681,364	4.77%	148,871,674	3.57%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	328,297,000	411,755,000	83,458,000	25.42%	8,141,988	22.94%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	12,715,977,348	13,390,116,712	674,139,364	5.30%	157,013,662	4.07%
05. Commercial	4,609,183,301	5,016,046,633	406,863,332	8.83%	67,245,234	7.37%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	96,004,000	30,802,300	-65,201,700	-67.92%	0	-67.92%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	4,705,187,301	5,046,848,933	341,661,632	7.26%	67,245,234	5.83%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	17,421,164,649	18,443,344,445	1,022,179,796	5.87%	224,258,896	4.58%
11. Irrigated	47,213,106	62,989,621	15,776,515	33.42%		
12. Dryland	614,469,577	739,149,527	124,679,950	20.29%		
13. Grassland	57,404,893	100,076,413	42,671,520	74.33%		
14. Wasteland	1,849,124	1,881,339	32,215	1.74%		
15. Other Agland	1,979,900	0	-1,979,900	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	722,916,600	904,096,900	181,180,300	25.06%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	18,144,081,249	19,347,441,345	1,203,360,096	6.63%	224,258,896	5.40%

Lancaster County's Three Year Assessment Plan

Norman H. Agena, Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds

Introduction

Pursuant to 77-1311.02, the following Three Year Assessment Plan has been prepared by Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds Office.

Tax Year 2012

A complete reappraisal of all property will be completed for this year. This reappraisal consists of remodeling of all properties utilizing the three approaches to value. It includes an on-site property inspection of all sales and pickup work, and a general site review of more than one sixth of the data base as well as a complete drive by review of all parcels in the county to set final values. We expect the statistical ratios for residential and commercial properties to be near the 100% mark and the quality stats to be within the acceptable range.

Tax Year 2013

We anticipate this to be a "clean up" year. In addition to the routine annual work, we will be focusing on properties that may have slipped through the cracks, as well as conduct a close review of the 2012 protests to see if we concur with changes made by the referees. We will continue field inspections of one sixth of the properties in all classes. This review will allow the data collection and review to be at as current a level as possible. Pickup work and sales verification will continue annually, but is not considered part of the annual review. Based on our annual review process we should be able to remodel all classes of property every third year, and monitor market and ratio trends for all classes on an annual basis.

Tax Year 2014

A complete reappraisal of all property will be initiated this year for application in 2015. We will continue field inspections of one sixth of the properties in all classes. This review will allow the data collection and review to be at as current a level as possible. Pickup work and sales verification will continue annually, but is not considered part of the annual review. Based on our annual review process we should be able to remodel all classes of property every third year, and monitor market and ratio trends for all classes during the intervening years.

2012 Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	2
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	12
3.	Other full-time employees:
	27 includes 5 ROD
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	3904757
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	3,859,986
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	Software and information 200,086
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	13,000
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	9600

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	Yes
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Office staff
8.	Personal Property software:
	Orion

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All cities and incorporated villages are zoned
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	Unsure of exact date but estimated to have occurred over 30 years ago

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	In house
2.	Other services:
	Orion

2012 Certification for Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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

