Table of Contents

Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification

Maps

Market Areas
Registered Wells > 500 GPM

Valuation History Charts

2012 Commission Summary

for Nuckolls County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	95	Median	97.18
Total Sales Price	$3,331,008	Mean	105.19
Total Adj. Sales Price	$3,331,008	Wgt. Mean	95.55
Total Assessed Value	$3,182,920	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$27,529
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$35,063	Avg. Assessed Value	$33,504

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.38 to 97.72
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.55 to 101.56
95% Mean C.I	97.37 to 113.01
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	8.38
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.71
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.74

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	120	97	97
2010	136	97	97
2009	147	98	98
2008	166	98	98

2012 Commission Summary

for Nuckolls County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	16	Median	103.25
Total Sales Price	$294,212	Mean	112.23
Total Adj. Sales Price	$294,212	Wgt. Mean	99.91
Total Assessed Value	$293,935	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$80,989
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$18,388	Avg. Assessed Value	$18,371

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	82.86 to 131.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	67.59 to 132.22
95% Mean C.I	83.32 to 141.14
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.78
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.09
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.93

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	14		97
2010	13	96	96
2009	16	93	93
2008	24	96	96

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Nuckolls 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	**97**	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	***NEI**	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	**72**	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 Nuckolls County

The Assessor and her staff are working toward finalizing boundary lines in the Land-use layer in GIS for all residential properties.

All sales are reviewed by the Assessor and her staff.

The Assessor and her staff, along with assistance from contract appraiser, complete on-sight inspections of new sales and any remodeling or new construction.

Nuckolls County contracts with Stanard Appraisal Services to reappraise residential properties in the County. A complete reappraisal of Nora, Oak, Ruskin and Hardy were completed for 2012 tax year. All field and data entry for reappraisal was completed in a timely manner.

All pick up work was completed timely.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Assessor, Staff and Contract Appraiser
2.	**In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
01	Nelson - is the county seat, on the highway, post office, churches, bank and a high school
02	Hardy- no schools, limited infrastructure, post office & churches, has some economic development
03	Lawrence - elementary school, bank, church, post office & some economic development
04	Nora - no school, church, post office or bank, limited infrastructure
05	Oak - no school, post office or bank, has church & limited infrastructure
06	Ruskin - no school, has churches, post office, bank & limited infrastructure, located on main highway
07	Superior - largest community, K -12 school system, multiple banks, churches, post office and active economy
08	Rural Acreage - located throughout the county not in urban area

3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.**
	Cost Approach – is entered in to the CAMA system and depreciation tables developed Sale Comparison/Market Analysis – Sales are verified, reviewed for accuracy, statistics are run comparable properties are identified.
4	**What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?**
	Marshall Swift costing for 06-2007
5.	**If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?**
	We use tables that are developed specifically for the County.
6.	**Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?**
	Depreciation tables are developed for each valuation grouping as a revaluation is completed for that grouping.
7.	**When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?**
	Lawrence and Nelson – 2005 & 2006 Rural acreages – West ½ of County – 2007-2008 East ½ of County – 2008-2009 Superior – 2009-2010 Hardy, Nora, Oak & Ruskin – 2011-2012
8.	**When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?**

	Same year as depreciation tables and review were completed. Lawrence and Nelson – 2005 & 2006 Rural acreages – West ½ of County – 2007-2008 East ½ of County – 2008-2009 Superior – 2009-2010 Hardy, Nora, Oak & Ruskin – 2011-2012
9.	**Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?**
	Front footage
10.	**How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?**
	Individual determination, but it generally has to be a substantial change such as a new building or house, additions to existing house or complete remodel.

65 Nuckolls

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 : 95	MEDIAN : 97	COV : 36.96	95% Median C.I. : 96.38 to 97.72
Total Sales Price : 3,331,008	WGT. MEAN : 96	STD : 38.88	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.55 to 101.56
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,331,008	MEAN : 105	Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.32	95% Mean C.I. : 97.37 to 113.01
Total Assessed Value : 3,182,920			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 35,063	COD : 15.76	MAX Sales Ratio : 341.46	
Avg. Assessed Value : 33,504	PRD : 110.09	MIN Sales Ratio : 29.30	*Printed:3/29/2012 3:27:20PM*

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	12	96.34	95.96	95.83	02.00	100.14	90.65	99.83	93.85 to 98.27	49,858	47,780
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	98.47	107.57	101.09	11.12	106.41	95.31	172.55	96.50 to 113.05	32,700	33,057
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	11	97.72	106.61	104.08	09.85	102.43	95.08	153.68	97.06 to 123.08	25,836	26,890
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	19	96.42	96.11	98.58	12.83	97.49	29.30	146.63	93.84 to 100.00	24,559	24,210
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	19	95.21	128.52	97.96	39.89	131.20	79.36	341.46	93.61 to 142.12	24,630	24,128
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	9	97.61	97.20	98.66	07.72	98.52	74.90	118.75	90.08 to 106.76	47,833	47,191
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	11	98.85	97.73	82.25	11.67	118.82	56.22	127.44	86.08 to 121.29	53,019	43,608
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	94.17	96.56	93.94	11.17	102.79	74.94	125.94	N/A	41,180	38,686
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	51	97.22	100.36	98.98	09.47	101.39	29.30	172.55	96.42 to 97.72	32,224	31,895
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	44	96.72	110.78	92.22	23.15	120.13	56.22	341.46	94.17 to 99.78	38,354	35,370
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	58	97.18	108.89	99.37	20.18	109.58	29.30	341.46	95.21 to 97.72	28,436	28,257
_____ALL_____	95	97.18	105.19	95.55	15.76	110.09	29.30	341.46	96.38 to 97.72	35,063	33,504

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	16	99.81	104.84	102.74	12.12	102.04	79.36	147.70	94.62 to 118.75	14,461	14,857
02	3	95.21	74.78	91.54	24.69	81.69	29.30	99.83	N/A	17,333	15,867
03	6	97.85	97.39	96.54	10.02	100.88	74.90	116.36	74.90 to 116.36	48,750	47,064
05	3	87.22	95.62	92.49	10.11	103.38	86.59	113.05	N/A	15,583	14,413
06	6	96.53	103.16	98.05	09.75	105.21	90.08	142.12	90.08 to 142.12	40,983	40,183
07	60	97.18	109.08	98.85	16.99	110.35	66.70	341.46	96.15 to 97.72	37,000	36,576
08	1	56.22	56.22	56.22	00.00	100.00	56.22	56.22	N/A	242,500	136,340
_____ALL_____	95	97.18	105.19	95.55	15.76	110.09	29.30	341.46	96.38 to 97.72	35,063	33,504

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	95	97.18	105.19	95.55	15.76	110.09	29.30	341.46	96.38 to 97.72	35,063	33,504
06											
07											
_____ALL_____	95	97.18	105.19	95.55	15.76	110.09	29.30	341.46	96.38 to 97.72	35,063	33,504

65 Nuckolls

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 :	95	MEDIAN :	97	COV :	36.96
Total Sales Price :	3,331,008	WGT. MEAN :	96	STD :	38.88
Total Adj. Sales Price :	3,331,008	MEAN :	105	Avg. Abs. Dev :	15.32
Total Assessed Value :	3,182,920				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	35,063	COD :	15.76	MAX Sales Ratio :	341.46
Avg. Assessed Value :	33,504	PRD :	110.09	MIN Sales Ratio :	29.30

95% Median C.I. :	96.38 to 97.72				
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	89.55 to 101.56				
95% Mean C.I. :	97.37 to 113.01				
					Printed:3/29/2012 3:27:20PM

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Low $ Ranges_____											
Less Than 5,000	7	100.00	134.13	130.99	39.71	102.40	91.32	341.46	91.32 to 341.46	2,650	3,471
Less Than 15,000	33	97.58	119.92	114.32	33.36	104.90	29.30	341.46	94.67 to 117.00	7,393	8,451
Less Than 30,000	57	96.91	110.93	104.11	22.60	106.55	29.30	341.46	95.21 to 98.80	12,558	13,074
__Ranges Excl. Low $__											
Greater Than 4,999	88	97.15	102.89	95.36	13.74	107.90	29.30	319.18	96.38 to 97.61	37,642	35,893
Greater Than 14,999	62	97.09	97.35	94.07	06.32	103.49	56.22	153.68	96.30 to 97.61	49,791	46,839
Greater Than 29,999	38	97.20	96.58	93.21	05.60	103.62	56.22	121.29	96.15 to 98.47	68,821	64,149
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999	7	100.00	134.13	130.99	39.71	102.40	91.32	341.46	91.32 to 341.46	2,650	3,471
5,000 TO 14,999	26	97.38	116.09	112.95	31.35	102.78	29.30	319.18	94.62 to 125.94	8,670	9,792
15,000 TO 29,999	24	96.46	98.56	98.83	07.44	99.73	74.94	153.68	94.50 to 97.72	19,660	19,431
30,000 TO 59,999	18	97.20	99.05	99.29	06.06	99.76	74.90	121.29	96.53 to 99.83	37,056	36,794
60,000 TO 99,999	13	97.12	96.80	96.61	03.12	100.20	90.65	106.76	93.61 to 99.19	76,415	73,822
100,000 TO 149,999	5	98.50	95.02	94.78	03.78	100.25	82.85	98.85	N/A	112,460	106,590
150,000 TO 249,999	2	76.92	76.92	72.04	26.91	106.77	56.22	97.61	N/A	196,250	141,378
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
_____ALL_____	95	97.18	105.19	95.55	15.76	110.09	29.30	341.46	96.38 to 97.72	35,063	33,504

A. Residential Real Property

Nuckolls County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The largest town is Superior and the county seat is Nelson. The county has two high schools; one in Superior and one consolidated high school, Lawrence-Nelson. Most of the county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline.

The statistical sampling of 95 qualified residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Nuckolls County. The measures of central tendency offer some support for each other as the weighted mean is within the acceptable range and the mean, being more susceptible to outliers, is above the range. The outliers are occurring in the lower priced residential sales. The calculated median is 97%. All, but two, valuation groupings are within the acceptable range. The two valuation groupings that are below the acceptable range represent the assessor locations of Oak and Rural Acreages but a reliable statistical inference would be difficult with the small number of sales in these two locations. The statistics reflect an influence on the COD and PRD due to low dollar sales. Thirty-three of the ninety-five sales are under $15,000.

Nuckolls County has in place a procedure with their sales verification. When a sale occurs, the information on the 521 is checked against the records for accuracy and a sales verification questionnaire is started. The contract appraiser completes the form with telephone calls to the knowledgeable parties and a physical inspection of the property.

Nuckolls County employs a four-year inspection cycle for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Nuckolls County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have continued to develop their GIS system, transfer their sales electronically, complete spreadsheet analyses and have updated their MIPS system.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

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.

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.

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

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 Nuckolls County

All new sales are reviewed by the Assessor and her staff.

Nuckolls County contracts with Stanard Appraisal Services for their commercial properties. All commercial properties were reappraised in 2009.

On-sight inspections of commercial properties are performed if there is a new sale, any remodeling or any new construction occurs.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Assessor, staff and contract appraiser
2.	**In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
01	Nelson - is the county seat, on the highway, post office, churches, bank and a high school
02	Hardy- no schools, limited infrastructure, post office & churches, has some economic development
03	Lawrence - elementary school, bank, church, post office & some economic development
04	Nora - no school, church, post office or bank, limited infrastructure
05	Oak - no school, post office or bank, has church & limited infrastructure
06	Ruskin - no school, has churches, post office, bank & limited infrastructure, located on main highway
07	Superior - largest community, K -12 school system, multiple banks, churches, post office and active economy
08	Rural Acreage - located throughout the county not in urban area

3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.**
	Cost Approach – is entered in to the CAMA system and depreciation tables developed Sale Comparison/Market Analysis – Sales are verified, reviewed for accuracy, statistics are run comparable properties are identified. Income Approach – if there is sufficient information available the contract appraiser will use the income approach to value a property.
3a.	**Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.**
	We will gather any information available to us and along with our contract appraiser, we will determine the best approach to use for each property.
4.	**What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?**
	2007
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 their own depreciation tables with the aid of the contract appraiser.
6.	**Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?**
	They are developed as needed by the contract appraiser.
7.	**When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?**
	The last time depreciation tables would have been updated would have been in

	2009-2010 as there was a complete revaluation of all the commercial properties in Nuckolls County done at that time.
8.	**When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?**
	2009-2010
9.	**Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.**
	Lot values are determined using square footage.
10.	**How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?**
	A follow-up to all sales is done by our contract appraiser. Questions asked during the follow-up as well as an inspection of the property are used to determine if there have been any major changes to the property. We look for any new construction or demolition that is taking place to the property.

65 Nuckolls

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 :	16	MEDIAN :	103	COV :	48.35
Total Sales Price :	294,212	WGT. MEAN :	100	STD :	54.26
Total Adj. Sales Price :	294,212	MEAN :	112	Avg. Abs. Dev :	33.16
Total Assessed Value :	293,935				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	18,388	COD :	32.12	MAX Sales Ratio :	246.46
Avg. Assessed Value :	18,371	PRD :	112.33	MIN Sales Ratio :	34.04

95% Median C.I. :	82.86 to 131.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	67.59 to 132.22
95% Mean C.I. :	83.32 to 141.14

Printed:3/29/2012 3:27:21PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	222.82	222.82	222.82	00.00	100.00	222.82	222.82	N/A	14,406	32,100
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	106.50	106.50	106.50	00.00	100.00	106.50	106.50	N/A	2,000	2,130
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	98.17	86.48	98.13	11.98	88.13	63.00	98.27	N/A	47,733	46,838
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	106.50	106.50	106.50	00.00	100.00	106.50	106.50	N/A	2,000	2,130
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	98.56	98.56	98.56	00.00	100.00	98.56	98.56	N/A	5,200	5,125
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	67.02	67.02	49.96	49.21	134.15	34.04	100.00	N/A	36,250	18,110
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	57.67	57.67	57.67	00.00	100.00	57.67	57.67	N/A	1,500	865
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	164.66	164.66	178.70	49.68	92.14	82.86	246.46	N/A	8,450	15,100
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	3	131.16	123.11	124.97	06.14	98.51	107.00	131.16	N/A	9,769	12,208
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	111.46	111.46	111.46	00.00	100.00	111.46	111.46	N/A	7,200	8,025
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	5	98.27	117.75	109.49	34.22	107.54	63.00	222.82	N/A	31,921	34,949
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	4	99.28	84.78	54.55	18.61	155.42	34.04	106.50	N/A	19,925	10,869
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	7	111.46	123.97	137.90	33.48	89.90	57.67	246.46	57.67 to 246.46	7,844	10,816
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	98.27	94.49	98.35	10.55	96.08	63.00	106.50	N/A	29,440	28,955
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	6	90.71	103.27	75.35	49.70	137.05	34.04	246.46	34.04 to 246.46	16,017	12,068
_____ALL_____	16	103.25	112.23	99.91	32.12	112.33	34.04	246.46	82.86 to 131.16	18,388	18,371

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	2	78.84	78.84	96.66	26.85	81.56	57.67	100.00	N/A	9,500	9,183
03	1	82.86	82.86	82.86	00.00	100.00	82.86	82.86	N/A	7,000	5,800
05	2	131.16	131.16	131.16	00.00	100.00	131.16	131.16	N/A	10,903	14,300
06	2	80.78	80.78	95.44	22.01	84.64	63.00	98.56	N/A	2,850	2,720
07	7	106.50	115.75	88.60	30.33	130.64	34.04	246.46	34.04 to 246.46	27,657	24,504
08	2	160.50	160.50	136.29	38.83	117.76	98.17	222.82	N/A	23,553	32,100
_____ALL_____	16	103.25	112.23	99.91	32.12	112.33	34.04	246.46	82.86 to 131.16	18,388	18,371

65 Nuckolls

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 :	16	MEDIAN :	103	COV :	48.35
Total Sales Price :	294,212	WGT. MEAN :	100	STD :	54.26
Total Adj. Sales Price :	294,212	MEAN :	112	Avg. Abs. Dev :	33.16
Total Assessed Value :	293,935				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	18,388	COD :	32.12	MAX Sales Ratio :	246.46
Avg. Assessed Value :	18,371	PRD :	112.33	MIN Sales Ratio :	34.04

95% Median C.I. :	82.86 to 131.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	67.59 to 132.22
95% Mean C.I. :	83.32 to 141.14

Printed:3/29/2012 3:27:21PM

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	16	103.25	112.23	99.91	32.12	112.33	34.04	246.46	82.86 to 131.16	18,388	18,371
04											
_____ALL_____	16	103.25	112.23	99.91	32.12	112.33	34.04	246.46	82.86 to 131.16	18,388	18,371

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Low $ Ranges_____											
Less Than 5,000	4	84.75	83.42	90.67	27.23	92.00	57.67	106.50	N/A	1,500	1,360
Less Than 15,000	12	106.75	122.10	148.73	33.96	82.10	57.67	246.46	82.86 to 131.16	6,584	9,793
Less Than 30,000	13	106.50	120.40	139.89	31.89	86.07	57.67	246.46	82.86 to 131.16	7,424	10,386
__Ranges Excl. Low $__											
Greater Than 4,999	12	103.50	121.83	100.10	35.28	121.71	34.04	246.46	98.17 to 131.16	24,018	24,041
Greater Than 14,999	4	98.22	82.62	81.98	16.82	100.78	34.04	100.00	N/A	53,800	44,105
Greater Than 29,999	3	98.17	76.83	80.38	21.81	95.58	34.04	98.27	N/A	65,900	52,973
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999	4	84.75	83.42	90.67	27.23	92.00	57.67	106.50	N/A	1,500	1,360
5,000 TO 14,999	8	121.31	141.44	153.50	34.19	92.14	82.86	246.46	82.86 to 246.46	9,127	14,009
15,000 TO 29,999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	17,500	17,500
30,000 TO 59,999	2	66.11	66.11	57.95	48.51	114.08	34.04	98.17	N/A	43,850	25,410
60,000 TO 99,999											
100,000 TO 149,999	1	98.27	98.27	98.27	00.00	100.00	98.27	98.27	N/A	110,000	108,100
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
_____ALL_____	16	103.25	112.23	99.91	32.12	112.33	34.04	246.46	82.86 to 131.16	18,388	18,371

65 Nuckolls

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 :	16	MEDIAN :	103	COV :	48.35
Total Sales Price :	294,212	WGT. MEAN :	100	STD :	54.26
Total Adj. Sales Price :	294,212	MEAN :	112	Avg. Abs. Dev :	33.16
Total Assessed Value :	293,935				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	18,388	COD :	32.12	MAX Sales Ratio :	246.46
Avg. Assessed Value :	18,371	PRD :	112.33	MIN Sales Ratio :	34.04

95% Median C.I. :	82.86 to 131.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	67.59 to 132.22
95% Mean C.I. :	83.32 to 141.14

Printed:3/29/2012 3:27:21PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	1	246.46	246.46	246.46	00.00	100.00	246.46	246.46	N/A	9,900	24,400
325	2	109.23	109.23	109.18	02.04	100.05	107.00	111.46	N/A	7,350	8,025
344	1	106.50	106.50	106.50	00.00	100.00	106.50	106.50	N/A	2,000	2,130
350	3	131.16	120.77	117.28	07.92	102.98	100.00	131.16	N/A	13,102	15,367
353	1	98.27	98.27	98.27	00.00	100.00	98.27	98.27	N/A	110,000	108,100
389	1	98.17	98.17	98.17	00.00	100.00	98.17	98.17	N/A	32,700	32,100
406	6	72.93	94.48	74.53	58.84	126.77	34.04	222.82	34.04 to 222.82	13,401	9,988
437	1	98.56	98.56	98.56	00.00	100.00	98.56	98.56	N/A	5,200	5,125
_____ALL_____	16	103.25	112.23	99.91	32.12	112.33	34.04	246.46	82.86 to 131.16	18,388	18,371

A. Commercial Real Property

Nuckolls County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The largest town is Superior and the county seat is Nelson. The county has two high schools; one in Superior and one consolidated high school, Lawrence-Nelson. Most of the county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline.

A review of the statistical analysis reveals only 16 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate the level of value is above the acceptable range, there are not a sufficient number of sales to have confidence in the calculated statistics. The calculated median is 103%. It will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Nuckolls County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality. The statistics reflect an influence on the COD and PRD due to low dollar sales. Twelve of the sixteen sales are under $15,000.

The sample is not representative of the population as a whole even though the assessor, with the assistance of the contracted appraisal company (Stanard Appraisal Services), has tried to utilize as many sales as possible without bias in the analysis of the commercial class; there is just not an active commercial market in Nuckolls County.

The 16 commercial sales can be further examined to reveal that six different valuation groupings and eight different occupancy codes are contained within the statistical profile. This diversity further gives credence that the market is unorganized and the statistics are not a reliable indicator of the level of value.

Nuckolls County has in place a procedure with their sales verification. When a sale occurs, the information on the 521 is checked against the records for accuracy and a sales verification questionnaire is started. The contract appraiser completes the form with telephone calls to the knowledgeable parties and a physical inspection of the property.

Nuckolls County employs a four-year inspection cycle for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Nuckolls County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have continued to develop their GIS system, transfer their sales electronically, complete spreadsheet analyses and have updated their MIPS system.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

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.

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.

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

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.

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

2012 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Nuckolls County

The Assessor and her staff are working towards finalizing the agland use layer in their GIS system. They have found some issues with boundary lines and are working towards getting them corrected and to complete the land-use layer. Once completed, they are planning on converting to GIS deeded acres.

The Assessor is continuing to audit the acres of land and the uses through GIS imagery. Several parcels have been identified as being reported incorrectly on land use. Changes to these parcels have been made in the system and the new values are being applied for the 2012 tax year.

All sales were plotted and geographic and economic characteristics were reviewed and a determination was made to have one market area across all of Nuckolls County.

A spreadsheet analysis was completed using current sales from Nuckolls County and surrounding comparable counties.

The County completed on-sight inspections and measurement of new construction (bins, buildings and any structures). The County contracts with Stanard Appraisal Services for assistance with this.

All sales are reviewed by Assessor and her staff.

All pick up work was completed timely.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

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

Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
01	Nuckolls County has one market area for ag, no real economic differences countywide have been determined.

3.	**Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.**
	Sale are plotted annually, NRD restrictions are reviewed, as well as all sales are reviewed.
4.	**Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.**
	No differences have been determined in Nuckolls County. They review land usage annually, they will review hunting leases if they are available.
5.	**Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?**
	Yes, they carry the same value. Sales are reviewed to determine if there is a premium being paid due to location of rural home or acreages.
6.	**What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)**
	Review of GIS, aerial imagery if available and FSA maps.
7.	**Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.**
	The County monitors and reviews all sales, paying attention to any outside influences, such as investors and also location of the sales.
8.	**Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.**
	No
9.	**How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?**
	Substantially changed property would be classified under land use changes or changes to the improvements.

65 Nuckolls

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 :	70	MEDIAN :	72	COV :	27.13
Total Sales Price :	24,402,934	WGT. MEAN :	65	STD :	19.29
Total Adj. Sales Price :	24,474,734	MEAN :	71	Avg. Abs. Dev :	14.48
Total Assessed Value :	15,962,197				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	349,639	COD :	20.25	MAX Sales Ratio :	136.82
Avg. Assessed Value :	228,031	PRD :	109.03	MIN Sales Ratio :	24.36

95% Median C.I. :	66.65 to 76.77
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	59.45 to 70.99
95% Mean C.I. :	66.59 to 75.63

Printed:3/29/2012 3:27:22PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	88.57	88.57	88.57	00.00	100.00	88.57	88.57	N/A	600,000	531,445
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	73.47	73.55	75.70	08.14	97.16	65.90	84.91	N/A	295,800	223,908
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	11	74.49	78.90	74.55	14.71	105.84	56.99	109.67	67.55 to 94.08	296,391	220,946
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	79.77	80.75	77.73	16.40	103.89	63.81	99.66	N/A	334,625	260,105
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	6	75.02	75.88	73.11	13.42	103.79	61.36	94.98	61.36 to 94.98	249,500	182,413
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	79.86	77.62	70.42	08.55	110.22	66.25	86.74	N/A	329,167	231,812
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	69.96	69.65	71.30	06.13	97.69	57.36	76.71	57.36 to 76.71	334,714	238,668
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	79.82	76.04	74.36	05.50	102.26	60.57	81.21	N/A	392,700	292,004
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	64.49	71.17	56.12	31.79	126.82	37.99	136.82	45.22 to 100.36	536,030	300,821
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	11	59.51	57.93	51.27	31.98	112.99	24.36	91.41	33.19 to 81.37	336,317	172,446
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	6	51.15	59.13	50.62	35.03	116.81	36.95	89.84	36.95 to 89.84	235,019	118,973
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	21	74.49	78.44	76.70	13.92	102.27	56.99	109.67	69.34 to 86.60	317,990	243,896
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	21	75.09	74.09	72.46	10.19	102.25	57.36	94.98	67.86 to 79.86	323,381	234,315
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	28	58.95	63.39	53.79	33.40	117.85	24.36	136.82	45.22 to 76.51	393,069	211,421
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	24	75.63	78.29	74.27	14.28	105.41	56.99	109.67	69.34 to 86.60	295,138	219,198
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	23	69.27	71.76	63.12	19.92	113.69	37.99	136.82	60.57 to 78.65	443,602	279,988
_____ALL_____	70	71.52	71.11	65.22	20.25	109.03	24.36	136.82	66.65 to 76.77	349,639	228,031

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	70	71.52	71.11	65.22	20.25	109.03	24.36	136.82	66.65 to 76.77	349,639	228,031
_____ALL_____	70	71.52	71.11	65.22	20.25	109.03	24.36	136.82	66.65 to 76.77	349,639	228,031

65 Nuckolls

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 :	70	MEDIAN :	72	COV :	27.13
Total Sales Price :	24,402,934	WGT. MEAN :	65	STD :	19.29
Total Adj. Sales Price :	24,474,734	MEAN :	71	Avg. Abs. Dev :	14.48
Total Assessed Value :	15,962,197				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	349,639	COD :	20.25	MAX Sales Ratio :	136.82
Avg. Assessed Value :	228,031	PRD :	109.03	MIN Sales Ratio :	24.36

95% Median C.I. :	66.65 to 76.77
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	59.45 to 70.99
95% Mean C.I. :	66.59 to 75.63

Printed:3/29/2012 3:27:22PM

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
_____Irrigated_____											
County	2	76.16	76.16	72.06	13.01	105.69	66.25	86.07	N/A	537,250	387,149
1	2	76.16	76.16	72.06	13.01	105.69	66.25	86.07	N/A	537,250	387,149
_____Dry_____											
County	10	71.31	70.88	64.80	19.67	109.38	41.89	94.98	42.40 to 91.41	198,800	128,821
1	10	71.31	70.88	64.80	19.67	109.38	41.89	94.98	42.40 to 91.41	198,800	128,821
_____Grass_____											
County	8	70.39	70.82	68.24	15.39	103.78	44.78	89.84	44.78 to 89.84	138,427	94,463
1	8	70.39	70.82	68.24	15.39	103.78	44.78	89.84	44.78 to 89.84	138,427	94,463
_____ALL_____	70	71.52	71.11	65.22	20.25	109.03	24.36	136.82	66.65 to 76.77	349,639	228,031

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	9	72.01	78.50	69.58	21.76	112.82	45.22	136.82	65.90 to 86.07	663,366	461,589
1	9	72.01	78.50	69.58	21.76	112.82	45.22	136.82	65.90 to 86.07	663,366	461,589
_____Dry_____											
County	16	72.40	71.57	70.08	20.06	102.13	37.79	100.36	61.36 to 88.57	228,716	160,289
1	16	72.40	71.57	70.08	20.06	102.13	37.79	100.36	61.36 to 88.57	228,716	160,289
_____Grass_____											
County	10	73.00	72.75	71.03	14.32	102.42	44.78	89.84	57.36 to 86.60	149,442	106,149
1	10	73.00	72.75	71.03	14.32	102.42	44.78	89.84	57.36 to 86.60	149,442	106,149
_____ALL_____	70	71.52	71.11	65.22	20.25	109.03	24.36	136.82	66.65 to 76.77	349,639	228,031

Nuckolls County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
65.10	Nuckolls	1	3,700	3,700	2,680	2,300	2,285	1,785	1,780	1,750	3,259
91.10	Webster	1	2,020	2,020	2,020	2,020	1,985	1,985	1,985	1,985	2,003
85.10	Thayer	1	3,340	3,340	3,275	2,875	2,725	2,602	2,570	2,550	3,124
85.30	Thayer	2	3,150	3,150	2,850	2,650	2,450	#DIV/0!	2,225	2,200	2,741
18.10	Clay	1	3,630	3,575	3,355	3,190	2,715	#DIV/0!	2,520	2,185	3,388
1.10	Adams	1	3,350	3,268	2,899	2,550	2,075	2,055	1,895	1,704	3,030
30.10	Fillmore	1	3,700	3,600	3,500	3,400	3,100	#DIV/0!	2,700	2,550	3,478

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Nuckolls	1	1,625	1,625	1,143	1,144	1,020	950	940	940	1,411
Webster	1	1,225	1,225	1,225	975	975	975	925	925	1,103
Thayer	1	2,075	2,075	1,900	1,775	1,650	1,525	1,525	1,500	1,881
Thayer	2	1,650	1,625	1,600	1,500	1,450	1,301	1,250	1,250	1,494
Clay	1	2,290	2,080	1,870	1,665	1,610	#DIV/0!	1,250	1,090	1,916
Adams	1	1,430	1,430	1,210	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,000	1,000	1,311
Fillmore	1	2,255	2,215	2,065	2,065	1,895	#DIV/0!	1,620	1,555	2,096

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Nuckolls	1	696	709	611	709	715	250	713	673	686
Webster	1	615	615	615	615	615	615	615	615	615
Thayer	1	958	1,049	926	907	937	884	909	867	913
Thayer	2	983	1,037	931	933	993	#DIV/0!	915	900	929
Clay	1	1,000	1,000	800	800	720	#DIV/0!	720	720	778
Adams	1	900	899	899	845	725	725	725	725	780
Fillmore	1	960	940	880	820	800	#DIV/0!	700	700	786

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

A. Agricultural Land

Nuckolls County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. Nuckolls County is comprised of approximately 18% irrigated land, 46% dry crop land and 36% grass/pasture land. Nuckolls County is part of the Central Loess Plains Major Land Resource Area. The average annual precipitation in this area is 23 to 36 inches. The dominant soil order in this MLRA is Mollisols. Nuckolls County is governed by both the Little Blue Natural Resource District and the Lower Republican Natural Resource District. Nuckolls County has one market area. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the one market area determination. The majority of agricultural land has steadily been increasing in value over the past several years.

Nuckolls County had 64 qualified agricultural land sales occurring in their county. These 64 sales equaled 2.8% of the county's acres sold, an adequate amount. However these sales were not representative for all three years of the statistical profile. Comparable sales existed within a six mile parameter of Nuckolls County and six were selected. One sale was added to the oldest year and five sales were added to the middle year of the sales study. The resulting statistical profile shows 70 sales with a calculated median of 72%, a COD of 20.25% and a PRD of 109.03%. The statistical sample is comprised of 20% irrigated sales, 46% dry sales and 33% grass sales. The acceptable thresholds for adequacy, time and majority land use were met.

The statistical profile also further breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use with the 80% majority land use providing a better indication of the level of value by majority land use. Only one subclass, 95% irrigated land is outside of the acceptable range but with only two qualified sales, no reliable statistical inference should be made.

A review, of the neighboring counties, shows that the 2012 values in Nuckolls County are higher than their neighbor to the west, Webster County. Thayer County borders on the East and Nuckolls' County's values average in between Thayer and Webster Counties. The Nuckolls County Assessor when reviewing the neighboring counties made the determination that she needed to narrow the valuations in each class between the top and bottom land capability groupings to better blend across county lines and to address the market in Nuckolls County. In response to the rapidly increasing irrigated and dry markets, irrigated values were increased 21% to 71%, dry values were increased 9% to 19% and grass values were unchanged. Indications support that Nuckolls County has achieved both inter- and intra-county equalization.

Although the PRD is above the acceptable range, the quality statistics support the level of value and give confidence to the reported assessment actions. The Nuckolls County Assessor has stated they are working toward finalizing the agland use layer in their GIS system and that they continue to audit the acres of land and the land use.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 72% of market value for the agricultural class of real property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range. Because the known assessment practices

are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

There will be no non-binding recommendation made for the agricultural class of property in Nuckolls 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.

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.

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

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

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

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

Total Real Property (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30) **Records :** 5,598 **Value :** 662,238,010 **Growth** 5,504,265 (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	275	163,685	0	0	21	2,120	296	165,805	
02. Res Improve Land	1,696	1,997,405	0	0	13	2,675	1,709	2,000,080	
03. Res Improvements	1,705	53,263,520	0	0	15	69,540	1,720	53,333,060	
04. Res Total	1,980	55,424,610	0	0	36	74,335	2,016	55,498,945	283,960
% of Res Total	98.21	99.87	0.00	0.00	1.79	0.13	36.01	8.38	5.16
05. Com UnImp Land	75	120,280	0	0	7	78,930	82	199,210	
06. Com Improve Land	275	602,400	0	0	14	66,960	289	669,360	
07. Com Improvements	282	23,786,520	0	0	19	5,839,975	301	29,626,495	
08. Com Total	357	24,509,200	0	0	26	5,985,865	383	30,495,065	4,006,320
% of Com Total	93.21	80.37	0.00	0.00	6.79	19.63	6.84	4.60	72.79
09. Ind UnImp Land	2	47,710	0	0	3	15,465	5	63,175	
10. Ind Improve Land	1	32,030	0	0	2	58,020	3	90,050	
11. Ind Improvements	1	145,295	0	0	2	873,125	3	1,018,420	
12. Ind Total	3	225,035	0	0	5	946,610	8	1,171,645	0
% of Ind Total	37.50	19.21	0.00	0.00	62.50	80.79	0.14	0.18	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	1,980	55,424,610	0	0	36	74,335	2,016	55,498,945	283,960
% of Res & Rec Total	98.21	99.87	0.00	0.00	1.79	0.13	36.01	8.38	5.16
Com & Ind Total	360	24,734,235	0	0	31	6,932,475	391	31,666,710	4,006,320
% of Com & Ind Total	92.07	78.11	0.00	0.00	7.93	21.89	6.98	4.78	72.79
17. Taxable Total	2,340	80,158,845	0	0	67	7,006,810	2,407	87,165,655	4,290,280
% of Taxable Total	97.22	91.96	0.00	0.00	2.78	8.04	43.00	13.16	77.94

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	0	0	0	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	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				**0**	**0**	**0**

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	240	0	634	874

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	87	843,910	0	0	1,996	348,114,790	2,083	348,958,700
28. Ag-Improved Land	14	185,680	0	0	996	171,995,335	1,010	172,181,015
29. Ag Improvements	11	120,170	0	0	1,097	53,812,470	1,108	53,932,640
30. Ag Total							**3,191**	**575,072,355**

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	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	1	3.40	1,700	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	11	0.00	120,170	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	1	4.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			**Total**			**Growth**
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	52	51.46	205,825	52	51.46	205,825	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	615	620.37	2,481,460	615	620.37	2,481,460	
33. HomeSite Improvements	657	0.00	37,056,675	657	0.00	37,056,675	387,375
34. HomeSite Total				**709**	**671.83**	**39,743,960**	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	170	404.90	160,805	170	404.90	160,805	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	804	2,695.93	1,304,310	805	2,699.33	1,306,010	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,043	0.00	16,755,795	1,054	0.00	16,875,965	826,610
38. FarmSite Total				**1,224**	**3,104.23**	**18,342,780**	
39. Road & Ditches	2,277	7,214.37	0	2,278	7,218.37	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	87	224.75	65,525	87	224.75	65,525	
41. Total Section VI				**1,933**	**11,219.18**	**58,152,265**	**1,213,985**

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	2	118.56	227,395	2	118.56	227,395

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	12,885.05	20.38%	47,674,690	23.14%	3,700.00
46. 1A	30,329.11	47.97%	112,217,685	54.47%	3,700.00
47. 2A1	6,186.01	9.78%	16,578,525	8.05%	2,680.00
48. 2A	8,225.41	13.01%	18,918,415	9.18%	2,300.00
49. 3A1	1,451.15	2.30%	3,316,030	1.61%	2,285.10
50. 3A	657.50	1.04%	1,173,680	0.57%	1,785.06
51. 4A1	1,464.98	2.32%	2,607,665	1.27%	1,780.00
52. 4A	2,022.64	3.20%	3,539,630	1.72%	1,750.00
53. Total	63,221.85	100.00%	206,026,320	100.00%	3,258.78
Dry					
54. 1D1	24,157.67	15.17%	39,257,060	17.47%	1,625.04
55. 1D	71,417.69	44.84%	116,056,900	51.65%	1,625.04
56. 2D1	5,568.06	3.50%	6,365,570	2.83%	1,143.23
57. 2D	39,557.00	24.84%	45,270,005	20.15%	1,144.42
58. 3D1	3,314.42	2.08%	3,380,705	1.50%	1,020.00
59. 3D	607.38	0.38%	577,010	0.26%	950.00
60. 4D1	10,260.02	6.44%	9,644,425	4.29%	940.00
61. 4D	4,390.33	2.76%	4,126,910	1.84%	940.00
62. Total	159,272.57	100.00%	224,678,585	100.00%	1,410.65
Grass					
63. 1G1	3,340.66	2.66%	2,324,865	2.70%	695.93
64. 1G	12,240.47	9.74%	8,673,325	10.07%	708.58
65. 2G1	6,539.92	5.21%	3,995,045	4.64%	610.87
66. 2G	33,604.65	26.75%	23,814,170	27.64%	708.66
67. 3G1	1,166.42	0.93%	833,915	0.97%	714.94
68. 3G	826.94	0.66%	206,895	0.24%	250.19
69. 4G1	14,577.22	11.60%	10,399,600	12.07%	713.41
70. 4G	53,349.35	42.46%	35,910,820	41.68%	673.13
71. Total	125,645.63	100.00%	86,158,635	100.00%	685.73
Irrigated Total	63,221.85	18.13%	206,026,320	39.86%	3,258.78
Dry Total	159,272.57	45.68%	224,678,585	43.46%	1,410.65
Grass Total	125,645.63	36.03%	86,158,635	16.67%	685.73
72. Waste	565.46	0.16%	56,550	0.01%	100.01
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	5.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	348,705.51	100.00%	516,920,090	100.00%	1,482.40

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	34.09	126,130	0.00	0	63,187.76	205,900,190	63,221.85	206,026,320
77. Dry Land	430.65	658,375	0.00	0	158,841.92	224,020,210	159,272.57	224,678,585
78. Grass	339.77	242,970	0.00	0	125,305.86	85,915,665	125,645.63	86,158,635
79. Waste	4.13	415	0.00	0	561.33	56,135	565.46	56,550
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	5.00	0	5.00	0
82. Total	**808.64**	**1,027,890**	**0.00**	**0**	**347,896.87**	**515,892,200**	**348,705.51**	**516,920,090**

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	63,221.85	18.13%	206,026,320	39.86%	3,258.78
Dry Land	159,272.57	45.68%	224,678,585	43.46%	1,410.65
Grass	125,645.63	36.03%	86,158,635	16.67%	685.73
Waste	565.46	0.16%	56,550	0.01%	100.01
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	5.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	**348,705.51**	100.00%	**516,920,090**	100.00%	1,482.40

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

65 Nuckolls

	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	54,941,130	55,498,945	557,815	1.02%	283,960	0.50%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	39,198,480	39,743,960	545,480	1.39%	387,375	0.40%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	**94,139,610**	**95,242,905**	**1,103,295**	**1.17%**	**671,335**	**0.46%**
05. Commercial	26,379,185	30,495,065	4,115,880	15.60%	4,006,320	0.42%
06. Industrial	1,110,990	1,171,645	60,655	5.46%	0	5.46%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	17,504,444	18,342,780	838,336	4.79%	826,610	0.07%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	**44,994,619**	**50,009,490**	**5,014,871**	**11.15%**	**4,832,930**	**0.40%**
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	**139,134,229**	**145,317,920**	**6,183,691**	**4.44%**	**5,504,265**	**0.49%**
11. Irrigated	161,875,195	206,026,320	44,151,125	27.27%		
12. Dryland	201,236,662	224,678,585	23,441,923	11.65%		
13. Grassland	86,967,539	86,158,635	-808,904	-0.93%		
14. Wasteland	28,205	56,550	28,345	100.50%		
15. Other Agland	55,705	0	-55,705	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	**450,163,306**	**516,920,090**	**66,756,784**	**14.83%**		
17. Total Value of all Real Property	**589,297,535**	**662,238,010**	**72,940,475**	**12.38%**	**5,504,265**	**11.44%**
(Locally Assessed)						

June 15, 2011
September 15, 2011
Nuckolls County

3 Year Plan of Assessment- Nuckolls County

Pursuant to section 77-1311.02 as amended by 2005 Neb. Laws LB263, section 9 and LB 334, section 64. Operative date July 1, 2007
The purpose of three-year plan is to inform the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 each year and the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year. Every three years and to update the plan between the adoption of each three-year plan.

Nuckolls County population base is 4,500 per the 2010 Census, this is a decline from the previous Census which indicated the Counties population base at 5,057.

The Assessor's office staff consists of the assessor, deputy assessor and a part-time clerk who works four days a week. All the staff works in every area, real estate, personal property, homesteads exemptions and GIS mapping. The Assessor and Deputy Assessor attend continuing education classes as required to remain certified.
The assessor is responsible for filing the reports as follows:
Abstract- due on or before March 19
Notice of Valuation Change- June 1
Certification of Values- due on or before August 20
School District Taxable Value Report- due on or before August 25
Three-year Plan of Assessment- July 31 and October 31
Generate Tax Roll and deliver to Treasurer on or before November 22
Certificate of Taxes Levied- due on or before December 1
Tax list corrections- reasons
The assessor maintains the Cadastral and GIS maps as needed due to any recorded property splits, etc. They are in good condition, kept current with ownership changes and descriptions. The property record cards are in good condition; include the required legal, ownership, classification codes, and valuation by year as required by regulation.
The assessor also completes the 521's as they are brought from the Clerk's Office. Procedure is to change name owner on property record cards, lots and lands books, plat books, computer generated records, treasurers books, sales file and to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. The City of Superior requested data as changes are made, now we can do this with computer generated information from the CAMA program. The assessor and/or contract appraiser verifies sales by telephone or questionnaire. Also the information that is provided by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation's reviewer is helpful.
Computers- MIPS PC Administration System/CAMA/GIS Workshop, 3 Dell T3500 PC's
Mips/County Solutions LLC is the current software vendors for Nuckolls County

Assessment Actions Year 2011–
CAMA system data has been entered on all improvements.
Digital pictures are being taken as a review is done and added to the CAMA system.
The assessor, staff and Stanard Appraisal Services do all the pick-up work, usually in September through February, so entry of data and pricing can be completed before March deadline. The Cities of Superior and Nelson submit building permits to the Assessor's office on a regular basis. Use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of

value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property. Nuckolls County has a maintenance contract with Darrel Stanard of Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. GIS Workshop developed a web site for Nuckolls County, data updated once a month by GIS Workshop. Aerial photography for Nuckolls County rural sites has been completed.

Residential

Nuckolls County Assessor, Stanard Appraisal Services inc. and staff completed all pick-up work in a timely manner. The Assessor and Darrel Stanard of Stanard Appraisal Services Inc are in the continuing process of verifying all residential sales. Stanard Appraisal has completed a complete revaluation of Superior residential properties.

Commercial

Nuckolls County Assessor, Stanard Appraisal Services Inc and staff assessed, priced and entered. Reappraisal of all Commercial property completed. MIPS CAMA Commercial software data has been entered by Nuckolls County staff and Stanard Appraisal. Stanard Appraisal Services Inc and the Assessor are in the continuing process of verifying all the sales.

Agricultural

Nuckolls County Assessor and staff reviewed some rural property, listing any new construction. All pick-up work was completed. After spreadsheet analysis and plotting sales on a map, no potential market areas were identified. After market analysis, all irrigated values were increased an overall average of 10%, dryland values increased 28% on average and grassland values were increased 6% and other increased 21%. Continuous updates are being made to the rural property record cards. Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable level of value, quality and uniformity countywide. Nuckolls County staff continues to work on GIS Data. Parcels entered, working on land use. The aerial photography was done by GIS Workshop, Inc. New soil conversion is in place. Continue with revaluation of residential properties in the remaining small towns in County and new values set for the 2012 tax year.

2012

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with contract appraisal service.

Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property. The County Board has a fund for GIS, continue to add to fund for maintenance of the GIS program. GIS data is being entered, aerial photography is complete. Do an analysis based on the RCN and sales to determine the valuation of residential properties. Utilize the CAMA system for sales analysis; continue to update programs each year. Review commercial sales, analysis for acceptable levels of quality and uniformity. Continue to correlate information for sales comparison of all properties.

Utilize GIS deeded acres for future. Utilize FSA or NRD's information. Do all pick-up work to be implemented by March 19, deadline. Continue to do sales analysis of commercial sales.

Take new digital photos, list and measure as necessary. Continue to do an analysis of the RCN and sales to determine the valuations and if any need for location factors to be applied.

Continue with the review and pick-up work. Continue work on GIS mapping.

Analysis of the ag land sales. Continue good assessment practices to insure acceptable level of value, quality and uniformity countywide.

2013

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with a contract appraisal service. Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property.
Complete all pick-up work, data entry in timely manner. Continue to request to add to fund for GIS maintenance. Continue to review all property as required by statute. Request County Board to budget for reappraisal of the residential properties to be done. Continue with the revaluation of all properties in the County.

2014

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with a contract appraisal service. Use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property.
Complete all pick-up work, data entry in a timely manner. Continue to fund GIS maintenance. Request continuing funding for all residential property in Nuckolls County, agland would be next in order.

Nuckolls County Assessor

Susan M Rogers

2012 Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	**Deputy(ies) on staff:**
	1
2.	**Appraiser(s) on staff:**
	0
3.	**Other full-time employees:**
	0
4.	**Other part-time employees:**
	1 (4/5 time)
5.	**Number of shared employees:**
	0
6.	**Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:**
	$162,644.77
7.	**Adopted budget, or granted budget *if different from above*:**
	$161,344.79
8.	**Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:**
	$20,700
9.	**If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:**
	0
10.	**Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:**
	$4,000 for data processing, remainder is in the county general fund, new computers in 2010
11.	**Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:**
	$1,500
12.	**Other miscellaneous funds:**
	0
13.	**Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:**
	$4,000 for data processing

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	**Administrative software:**
	MIPS PC
2.	**CAMA software:**
	MIPS
3.	**Are cadastral maps currently being used?**
	yes
4.	**If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?**
	Assessor and staff
5.	**Does the county have GIS software?**

	Yes, they are currently finishing up the land usage codes and will roll acreages to MIPS in 2012
6.	**Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?**
	Yes, Nuckolls.GIS Workshop.com
7.	**Who maintains the GIS software and maps?**
	GIS workshop
8.	**Personal Property software:**
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	**Does the county have zoning?**
	Yes
2.	**If so, is the zoning countywide?**
	No
3.	**What municipalities in the county are zoned?**
	Superior
4.	**When was zoning implemented?**
	Unknown

D. Contracted Services

1.	**Appraisal Services:**
	Stanard Appraisal
2.	**Other services:**
	GIS Workshop

2012 Certification for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator