

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 Rock County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	25	Median	96.87
Total Sales Price	\$956,530	Mean	113.18
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$956,030	Wgt. Mean	90.11
Total Assessed Value	\$861,455	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$32,881
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$38,241	Avg. Assessed Value	\$34,458

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	78.50 to 128.27
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	71.22 to 109.00
95% Mean C.I	78.65 to 147.71
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	7.38
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.36
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.52

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	38	97	97
2010	47	97	97
2009	39	97	97
2008	29	99	99

2012 Commission Summary for Rock County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	6	Median	97.36
Total Sales Price	\$510,500	Mean	155.55
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$510,500	Wgt. Mean	86.42
Total Assessed Value	\$441,160	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$49,953
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$85,083	Avg. Assessed Value	\$73,527

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	72.58 to 472.57
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	60.30 to 112.54
95% Mean C.I	-8.12 to 319.22
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.15
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.20
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.18

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	3		97
2010	6	100	99
2009	6	100	96
2008	6	100	94

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Rock 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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Rock County

For assessment year 2012 the rural residential properties were inspected and reviewed with changes being implemented for 2012.

Pickup work was completed and placed on the assessment roll.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Rock County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Deputy	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Bassett- all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of Bassett. The population is approximately 740. The City consists of various services and goods such as two banks, convenience/gas store, restaurants, hardware/lumberyard store, grocery store, local newspaper, and sale barn.
	02	Bassett Suburban and Bassett Suburban Vacant- all improved and unimproved properties located outside of the limits of the City of Bassett, but within the legal jurisdiction of the incorporated City.
	03	Newport, Newport Suburban- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Newport. Also, all improved and unimproved properties located outside of the limits of the Village of Newport, but within the legal jurisdiction of the incorporated Village. Newport's population is approximately 136 and consists of a convenience/gas station along HWY 20 and a post office.
	04	Rural- all improved and unimproved properties located outside the City limits in the rural areas.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
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?	
	Depreciation studies are based on local market information.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2004	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	A vacant land sales analysis was performed on five years' worth of sales.	

10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.

75 Rock
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 : 25
Total Sales Price : 956,530
Total Adj. Sales Price : 956,030
Total Assessed Value : 861,455
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 38,241
Avg. Assessed Value : 34,458

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 90
MEAN : 113
COD : 46.91
PRD : 125.60

COV : 73.91
STD : 83.65
Avg. Abs. Dev : 45.44
MAX Sales Ratio : 452.33
MIN Sales Ratio : 36.08

95% Median C.I. : 78.50 to 128.27
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 71.22 to 109.00
95% Mean C.I. : 78.65 to 147.71

Printed:3/30/2012 9:17:24AM

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	4	114.22	138.28	113.19	48.81	122.17	78.50	246.19	N/A	38,625	43,719
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	51.67	61.54	71.34	39.21	86.26	36.08	96.87	N/A	101,000	72,058
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	115.51	118.84	119.26	10.58	99.65	102.18	138.83	N/A	26,010	31,020
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	75.52	72.89	80.74	34.53	90.28	39.17	101.34	N/A	48,375	39,056
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	128.27	224.94	138.18	93.06	162.79	94.21	452.33	N/A	8,333	11,515
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	64.33	64.33	64.33	00.00	100.00	64.33	64.33	N/A	30,500	19,620
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	103.00	103.00	89.69	29.14	114.84	72.99	133.00	N/A	24,250	21,750
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	99.94	99.73	100.37	30.22	99.36	44.06	145.85	N/A	24,600	24,691
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	14	96.74	98.99	87.83	36.90	112.71	36.08	246.19	51.67 to 138.83	52,074	45,738
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	11	99.94	131.25	97.41	57.58	134.74	44.06	452.33	64.33 to 145.85	20,636	20,102
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	101.34	126.11	92.79	52.78	135.91	39.17	452.33	54.44 to 138.83	29,730	27,586
<u>ALL</u>	25	96.87	113.18	90.11	46.91	125.60	36.08	452.33	78.50 to 128.27	38,241	34,458

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	19	94.21	98.06	88.09	38.13	111.32	36.08	246.19	54.44 to 129.00	42,896	37,787
02	1	101.34	101.34	101.34	00.00	100.00	101.34	101.34	N/A	70,000	70,935
03	4	116.47	187.40	97.86	90.38	191.50	64.33	452.33	N/A	13,375	13,089
04	1	115.51	115.51	115.51	00.00	100.00	115.51	115.51	N/A	17,500	20,215
<u>ALL</u>	25	96.87	113.18	90.11	46.91	125.60	36.08	452.33	78.50 to 128.27	38,241	34,458

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	24	98.41	116.27	90.43	45.66	128.57	36.08	452.33	78.50 to 129.00	39,585	35,796
06											
07	1	39.17	39.17	39.17	00.00	100.00	39.17	39.17	N/A	6,000	2,350
<u>ALL</u>	25	96.87	113.18	90.11	46.91	125.60	36.08	452.33	78.50 to 128.27	38,241	34,458

**75 Rock
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 : 25
 Total Sales Price : 956,530
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 956,030
 Total Assessed Value : 861,455
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 38,241
 Avg. Assessed Value : 34,458

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 90
 MEAN : 113
 COD : 46.91
 PRD : 125.60

COV : 73.91
 STD : 83.65
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 45.44
 MAX Sales Ratio : 452.33
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.08

95% Median C.I. : 78.50 to 128.27
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 71.22 to 109.00
 95% Mean C.I. : 78.65 to 147.71

Printed:3/30/2012 9:17:24AM

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	3	129.00	211.00	175.00	103.53	120.57	51.67	452.33	N/A	1,833	3,208	
Less Than 15,000	10	97.08	136.81	116.30	77.55	117.64	39.17	452.33	44.06 to 246.19	6,200	7,211	
Less Than 30,000	12	107.73	134.32	118.21	61.64	113.63	39.17	452.33	51.67 to 133.00	8,000	9,457	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	22	96.74	99.85	89.62	33.04	111.41	36.08	246.19	72.99 to 128.27	43,206	38,720	
Greater Than 14,999	15	96.87	97.43	88.29	26.37	110.35	36.08	145.85	72.99 to 128.27	59,602	52,623	
Greater Than 29,999	13	96.60	93.67	86.97	26.50	107.70	36.08	145.85	64.33 to 138.83	66,156	57,536	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	3	129.00	211.00	175.00	103.53	120.57	51.67	452.33	N/A	1,833	3,208	
5,000 TO 14,999	7	94.21	105.01	110.58	48.13	94.96	39.17	246.19	39.17 to 246.19	8,071	8,926	
15,000 TO 29,999	2	121.89	121.89	121.71	05.23	100.15	115.51	128.27	N/A	17,000	20,690	
30,000 TO 59,999	7	102.18	108.95	111.62	26.93	97.61	64.33	145.85	64.33 to 145.85	37,576	41,943	
60,000 TO 99,999	4	83.18	80.53	80.72	16.13	99.76	54.44	101.34	N/A	74,250	59,936	
100,000 TO 149,999	1	36.08	36.08	36.08	00.00	100.00	36.08	36.08	N/A	125,000	45,095	
150,000 TO 249,999	1	96.87	96.87	96.87	00.00	100.00	96.87	96.87	N/A	175,000	169,530	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	25	96.87	113.18	90.11	46.91	125.60	36.08	452.33	78.50 to 128.27	38,241	34,458	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Rock County**

A. Residential Real Property

The statistical sampling of 25 residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of property in Rock County. The calculated median is 97%. The mean is above and the weighted mean is slightly below the acceptable ranges, the high mean can be attributed to outlier sales. The qualitative measures are also above the acceptable thresholds but can be attributed to low dollar sales. When hypothetically removing these sales from the analysis both these measures improve. Based on the known assessment practices it is believed the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

Residential sales are reviewed to determine if they are arms length transactions by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. Phone calls are also made when there are further questions regarding the sale. Many times sellers or buyers come to the assessor's office and details of the sale are discussed at that time.

The assessor has a documented process of tracking the six-year inspection and review cycle of properties in the county.

This past year the Division has implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties within the state to review assessment practices. Rock County was one of those selected for review in 2011. Based on the findings from that review it was determined the assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently to the residential class of property. All property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

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 property.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock County

The only changes made to the commercial file were those found through sales review and pick up work.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Rock County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Deputy	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Bassett- all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of Bassett. The population is approximately 740. The City consists of various services and goods such as two banks, convenience/gas store, restaurants, hardware/lumberyard store, grocery store, local newspaper, and sale barn.
	02	Suburban- all improved and unimproved properties located outside of the limits of the City of Bassett and Newport, but within the legal jurisdiction of the incorporated City.
	03	Newport- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Newport. Newport's population is approximately 136 and consists of a convenience/gas station along HWY 20, post office, and a grocery store.
	04	Rural- all improved and unimproved properties located outside the City limits in the rural areas.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	At this time the assessor hasn't had any unique properties to value. When the situation arises similar properties in surrounding counties would be used as comparables as well as properties statewide.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	
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 depreciation study is developed based on local market information.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	

9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.
	A vacant land sales analysis was performed.
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.

75 Rock
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 : 6
Total Sales Price : 510,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 510,500
Total Assessed Value : 441,160
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 85,083
Avg. Assessed Value : 73,527

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 86
MEAN : 156
COD : 74.97
PRD : 179.99

COV : 100.24
STD : 155.93
Avg. Abs. Dev : 72.99
MAX Sales Ratio : 472.57
MIN Sales Ratio : 72.58

95% Median C.I. : 72.58 to 472.57
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.30 to 112.54
95% Mean C.I. : -8.12 to 319.22

Printed:3/30/2012 9:17:25AM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	81.59	81.59	81.59	00.00	100.00	81.59	81.59	N/A	41,000	33,450
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	472.57	472.57	472.57	00.00	100.00	472.57	472.57	N/A	3,500	16,540
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	101.21	101.21	101.21	00.00	100.00	101.21	101.21	N/A	61,000	61,740
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	92.21	92.21	79.93	21.29	115.36	72.58	111.83	N/A	181,500	145,080
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	93.50	93.50	93.50	00.00	100.00	93.50	93.50	N/A	42,000	39,270
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	1	81.59	81.59	81.59	00.00	100.00	81.59	81.59	N/A	41,000	33,450
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	5	101.21	170.34	86.84	82.66	196.15	72.58	472.57	N/A	93,900	81,542
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	101.21	218.46	105.91	128.77	206.27	81.59	472.57	N/A	35,167	37,243
<u>ALL</u>	6	97.36	155.55	86.42	74.97	179.99	72.58	472.57	72.58 to 472.57	85,083	73,527

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	5	93.50	92.14	83.75	12.59	110.02	72.58	111.83	N/A	101,400	84,924
03	1	472.57	472.57	472.57	00.00	100.00	472.57	472.57	N/A	3,500	16,540
<u>ALL</u>	6	97.36	155.55	86.42	74.97	179.99	72.58	472.57	72.58 to 472.57	85,083	73,527

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
02	1	101.21	101.21	101.21	00.00	100.00	101.21	101.21	N/A	61,000	61,740
03	5	93.50	166.41	84.41	92.03	197.14	72.58	472.57	N/A	89,900	75,884
04											
<u>ALL</u>	6	97.36	155.55	86.42	74.97	179.99	72.58	472.57	72.58 to 472.57	85,083	73,527

**75 Rock
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 : 6
 Total Sales Price : 510,500
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 510,500
 Total Assessed Value : 441,160
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 85,083
 Avg. Assessed Value : 73,527

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 86
 MEAN : 156
 COD : 74.97
 PRD : 179.99

COV : 100.24
 STD : 155.93
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 72.99
 MAX Sales Ratio : 472.57
 MIN Sales Ratio : 72.58

95% Median C.I. : 72.58 to 472.57
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.30 to 112.54
 95% Mean C.I. : -8.12 to 319.22

Printed:3/30/2012 9:17:25AM

SALE PRICE *											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	1	472.57	472.57	472.57	00.00	100.00	472.57	472.57	N/A	3,500	16,540
Less Than 15,000	1	472.57	472.57	472.57	00.00	100.00	472.57	472.57	N/A	3,500	16,540
Less Than 30,000	1	472.57	472.57	472.57	00.00	100.00	472.57	472.57	N/A	3,500	16,540
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	5	93.50	92.14	83.75	12.59	110.02	72.58	111.83	N/A	101,400	84,924
Greater Than 14,999	5	93.50	92.14	83.75	12.59	110.02	72.58	111.83	N/A	101,400	84,924
Greater Than 29,999	5	93.50	92.14	83.75	12.59	110.02	72.58	111.83	N/A	101,400	84,924
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	472.57	472.57	472.57	00.00	100.00	472.57	472.57	N/A	3,500	16,540
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999											
30,000 TO 59,999	2	87.55	87.55	87.61	06.81	99.93	81.59	93.50	N/A	41,500	36,360
60,000 TO 99,999	2	106.52	106.52	106.81	04.98	99.73	101.21	111.83	N/A	64,500	68,893
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999	1	72.58	72.58	72.58	00.00	100.00	72.58	72.58	N/A	295,000	214,115
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	6	97.36	155.55	86.42	74.97	179.99	72.58	472.57	72.58 to 472.57	85,083	73,527

OCCUPANCY CODE											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	1	101.21	101.21	101.21	00.00	100.00	101.21	101.21	N/A	61,000	61,740
304	1	72.58	72.58	72.58	00.00	100.00	72.58	72.58	N/A	295,000	214,115
327	1	472.57	472.57	472.57	00.00	100.00	472.57	472.57	N/A	3,500	16,540
344	1	93.50	93.50	93.50	00.00	100.00	93.50	93.50	N/A	42,000	39,270
353	1	111.83	111.83	111.83	00.00	100.00	111.83	111.83	N/A	68,000	76,045
528	1	81.59	81.59	81.59	00.00	100.00	81.59	81.59	N/A	41,000	33,450
<u>ALL</u>	6	97.36	155.55	86.42	74.97	179.99	72.58	472.57	72.58 to 472.57	85,083	73,527

**2012 Correlation Section
for Rock County**

A. Commercial Real Property

The statistical sample for the commercial class of property is made up of 6 sales and will not be relied upon to determine a level of value for Rock County. Further stratification of the sample by occupancy codes displays one sale per code. With the diversity of sales the representativeness of the sample to the population is unreliable.

Commercial sales are reviewed to determine if they are arms length transactions by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. Phone calls are also made when there are further questions regarding the sale. Many times sellers or buyers come to the assessor's office and details of the sale are discussed at that time.

The assessor has a documented process of tracking the six-year inspection and review cycle of properties in the county.

This past year the Division has implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties within the state to review assessment practices. Rock County was one of those selected for review in 2011. Based on the findings from that review it was determined the assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently to the commercial class of property. All property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of property.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock County

For assessment year 2012 the assessor performed a market analysis on all qualified agricultural sales. Based on the analysis it was determined the irrigated, dry land and CRP values would be raised.

The Assessor and Deputy reviewed the 2011 aerial photos that were flown by GIS Workshop. All land use changes were physically reviewed and verified by the assessor. All rural improvements were also physically reviewed and inspected with June 2010 cost tables being implemented. Rock County would like to have the aerial photos flown every six years. This is a very helpful and time saving tool for the county.

All pick up work and sales verification was completed for assessment year 2012.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Rock County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Deputy	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	The majority is wet meadow, hay ground and pasture. Valentine, Tryon, Loup, and Elsmere soils which are predominately hay meadows.
	2	Mostly rolling sand hills with valentine soils.
	3	Pivot-valentine complex soils, associations related to pivot complex soils and hard grass pastures.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	The market areas are developed by similar topography, soil characteristics and geographic characteristics.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Land is classified as rural residential or recreational land based on the primary use of the parcel at assessment date. Rural residential land is directly associated with a residence and has no agricultural use. Recreational land is defined according to Regulation 10.001.05E.	
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, however if the site is located within the suburban area it does have a different value based on the market.	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	GIS 2010 aerial photos, physical inspections	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales are monitored and studied on a yearly basis to see if there are any non-agricultural characteristics.	
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?	
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added or land use changes that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.	

75 Rock
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 : 95
Total Sales Price : 32,170,026
Total Adj. Sales Price : 31,607,426
Total Assessed Value : 22,017,051
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 332,710
Avg. Assessed Value : 231,758

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 70
MEAN : 70
COD : 19.52
PRD : 101.06

COV : 25.58
STD : 18.01
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.09
MAX Sales Ratio : 138.44
MIN Sales Ratio : 20.19

95% Median C.I. : 63.36 to 77.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.93 to 75.38
95% Mean C.I. : 66.78 to 74.02

Printed:3/30/2012 9:17:26AM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	74.65	79.34	74.17	23.99	106.97	54.81	108.55	N/A	164,867	122,277
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	13	79.97	76.24	79.09	13.99	96.40	52.91	97.69	61.11 to 90.04	166,996	132,074
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	8	75.82	73.09	73.86	12.60	98.96	55.33	86.32	55.33 to 86.32	198,613	146,702
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	80.20	74.69	84.24	17.89	88.66	48.75	94.40	48.75 to 94.40	510,746	430,233
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	59.85	57.13	58.94	11.63	96.93	43.79	68.33	N/A	203,600	120,000
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	70.16	70.16	70.19	11.66	99.96	61.98	78.34	N/A	366,180	257,013
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	6	58.82	69.67	59.68	41.13	116.74	41.59	138.44	41.59 to 138.44	283,870	169,427
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	16	68.95	67.10	69.79	25.03	96.15	20.19	118.04	55.62 to 78.80	323,824	226,009
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	7	85.33	80.50	81.74	10.30	98.48	62.75	92.98	62.75 to 92.98	412,903	337,497
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	66.70	64.04	66.68	16.24	96.04	44.52	81.41	44.52 to 81.41	437,219	291,540
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	8	61.58	64.79	56.89	16.69	113.89	45.69	79.97	45.69 to 79.97	732,858	416,895
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	13	74.18	70.32	70.58	14.55	99.63	46.69	89.07	62.27 to 81.87	261,754	184,734
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	30	78.31	75.40	79.78	15.69	94.51	48.75	108.55	66.10 to 83.25	243,964	194,627
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	29	61.99	66.12	66.55	27.10	99.35	20.19	138.44	55.62 to 74.46	297,750	198,163
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	36	72.12	69.67	66.64	15.93	104.55	44.52	92.98	62.75 to 78.35	434,826	289,764
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	21	68.33	69.47	76.03	18.57	91.37	43.79	94.40	58.98 to 81.15	304,940	231,859
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	37	69.65	69.39	70.28	23.32	98.73	20.19	138.44	58.96 to 77.23	358,715	252,095
<u>ALL</u>	95	72.17	70.40	69.66	19.52	101.06	20.19	138.44	63.36 to 77.23	332,710	231,758

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	20	71.30	71.40	73.32	22.90	97.38	44.52	118.04	55.17 to 81.50	251,989	184,769
2	37	73.08	70.73	71.67	19.69	98.69	20.19	138.44	63.23 to 78.34	309,726	221,988
3	38	68.99	69.55	66.91	18.05	103.95	41.59	108.55	61.11 to 78.22	397,574	266,003
<u>ALL</u>	95	72.17	70.40	69.66	19.52	101.06	20.19	138.44	63.36 to 77.23	332,710	231,758

75 Rock
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 : 95
 Total Sales Price : 32,170,026
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 31,607,426
 Total Assessed Value : 22,017,051
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 332,710
 Avg. Assessed Value : 231,758

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 70
 COD : 19.52
 PRD : 101.06

COV : 25.58
 STD : 18.01
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.09
 MAX Sales Ratio : 138.44
 MIN Sales Ratio : 20.19

95% Median C.I. : 63.36 to 77.23
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.93 to 75.38
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.78 to 74.02

Printed:3/30/2012 9:17:26AM

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	64.05	64.05	63.89	03.22	100.25	61.99	66.10	N/A	265,450	169,605
1	2	64.05	64.05	63.89	03.22	100.25	61.99	66.10	N/A	265,450	169,605
Grass											
County	62	74.32	71.85	73.83	19.64	97.32	20.19	138.44	68.25 to 78.80	236,310	174,456
1	12	76.45	72.11	77.53	20.39	93.01	44.52	97.69	51.71 to 90.07	273,867	212,334
2	31	74.46	71.74	73.52	19.41	97.58	20.19	138.44	63.23 to 78.35	279,195	205,255
3	19	73.74	71.87	70.31	19.23	102.22	45.48	108.55	58.98 to 84.13	142,619	100,282
ALL	95	72.17	70.40	69.66	19.52	101.06	20.19	138.44	63.36 to 77.23	332,710	231,758

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	11	61.99	66.92	63.14	16.70	105.99	45.05	118.04	55.62 to 78.22	540,518	341,268
1	3	66.10	82.04	74.41	28.26	110.25	61.99	118.04	N/A	219,633	163,432
2	2	56.86	56.86	52.19	20.77	108.95	45.05	68.67	N/A	554,000	289,145
3	6	60.92	62.72	64.26	08.22	97.60	55.62	78.22	55.62 to 78.22	696,466	447,561
Dry											
County	1	61.11	61.11	61.11	00.00	100.00	61.11	61.11	N/A	58,000	35,441
3	1	61.11	61.11	61.11	00.00	100.00	61.11	61.11	N/A	58,000	35,441
Grass											
County	76	73.96	71.15	73.81	19.25	96.40	20.19	138.44	68.25 to 78.72	260,231	192,075
1	17	74.18	69.52	73.16	20.81	95.02	44.52	97.69	51.71 to 81.87	257,699	188,535
2	34	74.56	72.00	74.09	18.91	97.18	20.19	138.44	63.23 to 79.97	299,113	221,605
3	25	73.74	71.12	73.81	18.36	96.36	41.59	108.55	60.18 to 81.01	209,073	154,321
ALL	95	72.17	70.40	69.66	19.52	101.06	20.19	138.44	63.36 to 77.23	332,710	231,758

Rock County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
75.30	Rock	3	#DIV/0!	1,800	1,700	1,700	1,675	1,646	1,600	1,360	1,627
9.10	Brown	1	#DIV/0!	1,787	1,854	1,911	1,509	1,527	1,341	1,426	1,650
52.10	Keya Paha	1	1,300	1,300	1,199	1,200	1,170	1,170	1,150	1,150	1,176
36.10	Garfield	1	#DIV/0!	2,390	2,080	1,810	1,775	1,700	1,075	1,040	1,599
58.10	Loup	1	#DIV/0!	1,800	#DIV/0!	1,600	1,265	1,155	1,155	675	1,416
75.10	Rock	1	#DIV/0!	1,250	1,250	1,250	1,150	1,150	1,050	1,000	1,113
45.10	Holt	1	3,066	3,082	2,922	2,921	2,612	2,604	1,896	1,902	2,517
75.20	Rock	2	#DIV/0!	950	#DIV/0!	900	875	850	825	775	832
5.10	Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	590	#DIV/0!	590	575	560	500	465	516

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Rock	3	#DIV/0!	500	500	500	480	480	450	450	475
	Brown	1	#DIV/0!	600	600	600	550	450	395	395	517
	Keya Paha	1	600	600	570	570	550	550	520	520	561
	Garfield	1	#DIV/0!	930	825	790	715	645	575	505	696
	Loup	1	#DIV/0!	670	#DIV/0!	450	435	375	230	230	378
	Rock	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	600	#DIV/0!	550	550	520	520	561
	Holt	1	1,034	1,016	944	945	905	919	620	620	891
	Rock	2	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	400	400	380	370	388
	Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	465	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	290	290	290	290	293

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Rock	3	#DIV/0!	467	456	467	399	380	321	329	348
	Brown	1	#DIV/0!	451	451	451	423	340	260	260	280
	Keya Paha	1	500	500	480	480	450	450	430	430	439
	Garfield	1	#DIV/0!	535	535	535	495	471	419	343	370
	Loup	1	#DIV/0!	605	#DIV/0!	465	330	330	305	290	295
	Rock	1	#DIV/0!	560	560	561	559	520	498	449	534
	Holt	1	657	676	679	677	642	682	547	429	544
	Rock	2	#DIV/0!	400	400	398	398	350	275	261	299
	Blaine	1	#DIV/0!	290	#DIV/0!	290	290	290	290	290	290

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

2012 Correlation Section for Rock County

A. Agricultural Land

Rock County is located in north central Nebraska with Bassett being the county seat. The county is comprised of approximately 8% irrigated, 1% dry crop and 89% grass/pasture land. Rock County has three market areas. In area 1 the majority is hay meadow and pasture, area 2 consists of sand hills, and market area 3 is more of a mixture of hard grassland and irrigated. Generally, all of Brown, Keya Paha, Holt, northwest Garfield, Loup and northeast Blaine Counties are comparable to Rock. These areas share characteristics with Rock County that are comparable in soils and topography. Four Natural Resource Districts split this county. The Lower Niobrara NRD governs the very northern part of the county; the Middle Niobrara governs a very small portion in the northwest and does have a moratorium and well restrictions. The Lower Loup NRD governs the southwest part of the county, while the Upper Elkhorn governs the largest part of the county and currently has a 2500 acre annual new well maximum.

Agricultural sales are reviewed to determine if they are arms length transactions by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. Phone calls are also made when there are further questions regarding the sale. Many times sellers or buyers come to the assessor's office and details of the sale are discussed at that time.

In analyzing the agricultural sales within Rock County the land use of the sales in each market area generally matched the County as a whole with exception to market area 3. In both market 1 and 3 the sales were proportionately distributed among the study years. However both samples were expanded using sales from the comparable areas to maximize the sample sizes while maintaining appropriate thresholds for land use representation. In market 2 even though the land use of the sales matched the market area as a whole the sample of sales are more heavily weighted with new sales. The way the sales are distributed over the study period may cause this area to be compared to a different time standard than others as the first and second years of the study period are under-represented in comparison to the third year. Therefore the sample of market 2 was expanded using sales from the comparable markets.

The resulting sample for each of the three market areas are now proportionately distributed, representative of the majority land uses found in the population and large enough to produce a reliable measurement. The overall statistics are a result of 95 total sales with 20 sales in area 1, 37 sales in area 2 and 38 sales in area 3. All statistical indications support that assessments are acceptable and values are within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion is low enough to suggest the statistics are reliable and lends support to using the calculated median to represent the level of value.

From the assessor's analysis of the agricultural market the grassland values countywide received very minimal changes. In comparison with adjoining counties grassland the values are reasonably similar to the comparable markets. Further analysis of the irrigated values in all three areas resulted in upward adjustments. Area 3 which contains the most irrigation received the biggest increase; however the assessor recognized the movement in the market and adjusted irrigated values upward in the other two areas as well. Even though there are not a lot of dry crop acres or sales the assessor has attempted to increase the values with the

**2012 Correlation Section
for Rock County**

market. Rock County has a consistent method of assigning and implementing agricultural land values, it is believed that the assessments are uniform and proportionate. When comparing these values to the similar adjoining county markets the indication is relatively similar movement in the market and the values appear fairly equalized across county lines.

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 : 3,038	Value : 332,066,535	Growth 783,350	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	63	97,590	35	101,245	6	21,300	104	220,135	
02. Res Improve Land	461	909,995	96	509,805	47	549,245	604	1,969,045	
03. Res Improvements	469	11,832,255	96	6,326,190	59	3,407,820	624	21,566,265	
04. Res Total	532	12,839,840	131	6,937,240	65	3,978,365	728	23,755,445	318,650
% of Res Total	73.08	54.05	17.99	29.20	8.93	16.75	23.96	7.15	40.68
05. Com UnImp Land	14	48,470	5	185,570	5	15,180	24	249,220	
06. Com Improve Land	83	378,200	12	124,055	16	199,900	111	702,155	
07. Com Improvements	84	3,814,520	13	508,780	22	1,868,590	119	6,191,890	
08. Com Total	98	4,241,190	18	818,405	27	2,083,670	143	7,143,265	135,505
% of Com Total	68.53	59.37	12.59	11.46	18.88	29.17	4.71	2.15	17.30
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	10	404,495	10	404,495	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	4	93,085	4	93,085	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	7	243,300	7	243,300	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	17	740,880	17	740,880	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.56	0.22	0.00
Res & Rec Total	532	12,839,840	131	6,937,240	82	4,719,245	745	24,496,325	318,650
% of Res & Rec Total	71.41	52.42	17.58	28.32	11.01	19.27	24.52	7.38	40.68
Com & Ind Total	98	4,241,190	18	818,405	27	2,083,670	143	7,143,265	135,505
% of Com & Ind Total	68.53	59.37	12.59	11.46	18.88	29.17	4.71	2.15	17.30
17. Taxable Total	630	17,081,030	149	7,755,645	109	6,802,915	888	31,639,590	454,155
% of Taxable Total	70.95	53.99	16.78	24.51	12.27	21.50	29.23	9.53	57.98

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	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
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	43	12	191	246

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	24	2,013,940	1,756	219,227,560	1,780	221,241,500
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	10	659,390	357	61,062,400	367	61,721,790
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	10	260,905	360	17,202,750	370	17,463,655
30. Ag Total							2,150	300,426,945

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	2	2.00	12,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	2	2.00	139,525	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	5.90	4,450	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	9	34.00	43,000	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	10	0.00	121,380	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	28.76	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	7	7.00	32,000	7	7.00	32,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	254	305.50	1,833,000	256	307.50	1,845,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	249	288.50	10,334,930	251	290.50	10,474,455	329,195
34. HomeSite Total				258	314.50	12,351,455	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	62	269.05	264,050	64	274.95	268,500	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	326	1,690.34	2,835,340	335	1,724.34	2,878,340	
37. FarmSite Improvements	333	0.00	6,867,820	343	0.00	6,989,200	0
38. FarmSite Total				407	1,999.29	10,136,040	
39. Road & Ditches	0	3,044.76	0	0	3,073.52	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				665	5,387.31	22,487,495	329,195

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	10	907.00	254,430	10	907.00	254,430

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	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	155.08	3.73%	193,850	4.19%	1,250.00
47. 2A1	55.00	1.32%	68,750	1.49%	1,250.00
48. 2A	256.25	6.16%	320,315	6.92%	1,250.01
49. 3A1	953.78	22.93%	1,096,845	23.70%	1,150.00
50. 3A	745.00	17.91%	856,750	18.51%	1,150.00
51. 4A1	1,965.00	47.25%	2,063,250	44.57%	1,050.00
52. 4A	29.00	0.70%	29,000	0.63%	1,000.00
53. Total	4,159.11	100.00%	4,628,760	100.00%	1,112.92
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	59.00	31.89%	35,400	34.12%	600.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	13.00	7.03%	7,150	6.89%	550.00
59. 3D	81.00	43.78%	44,550	42.94%	550.00
60. 4D1	2.00	1.08%	1,040	1.00%	520.00
61. 4D	30.00	16.22%	15,600	15.04%	520.00
62. Total	185.00	100.00%	103,740	100.00%	560.76
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	17,470.30	14.91%	9,781,325	15.63%	559.88
65. 2G1	73.00	0.06%	40,880	0.07%	560.00
66. 2G	9,866.35	8.42%	5,533,195	8.84%	560.81
67. 3G1	49,916.93	42.61%	27,926,275	44.61%	559.45
68. 3G	5,067.84	4.33%	2,637,550	4.21%	520.45
69. 4G1	21,757.30	18.57%	10,845,750	17.33%	498.49
70. 4G	13,001.45	11.10%	5,833,695	9.32%	448.70
71. Total	117,153.17	100.00%	62,598,670	100.00%	534.33
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	4,159.11	3.33%	4,628,760	6.78%	1,112.92
Dry Total					
Dry Total	185.00	0.15%	103,740	0.15%	560.76
Grass Total					
Grass Total	117,153.17	93.74%	62,598,670	91.73%	534.33
72. Waste	2,349.10	1.88%	234,910	0.34%	100.00
73. Other	1,131.60	0.91%	678,960	0.99%	600.00
74. Exempt	534.63	0.43%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	124,977.98	100.00%	68,245,040	100.00%	546.06

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	67.00	0.71%	63,650	0.81%	950.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	679.49	7.16%	611,540	7.74%	900.00
49. 3A1	1,089.60	11.48%	953,400	12.06%	875.00
50. 3A	725.40	7.64%	616,590	7.80%	850.00
51. 4A1	5,715.26	60.19%	4,715,100	59.65%	825.00
52. 4A	1,217.85	12.83%	943,840	11.94%	775.01
53. Total	9,494.60	100.00%	7,904,120	100.00%	832.49
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	35.00	15.98%	14,000	16.47%	400.00
59. 3D	59.00	26.94%	23,600	27.76%	400.00
60. 4D1	117.00	53.42%	44,460	52.29%	380.00
61. 4D	8.00	3.65%	2,960	3.48%	370.00
62. Total	219.00	100.00%	85,020	100.00%	388.22
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	14,210.93	4.49%	5,678,490	6.00%	399.59
65. 2G1	29.22	0.01%	11,690	0.01%	400.07
66. 2G	11,382.54	3.59%	4,529,465	4.79%	397.93
67. 3G1	50,527.64	15.96%	20,108,755	21.26%	397.98
68. 3G	1,791.60	0.57%	627,750	0.66%	350.39
69. 4G1	88,041.56	27.80%	24,224,505	25.61%	275.15
70. 4G	150,695.36	47.59%	39,399,185	41.66%	261.45
71. Total	316,678.85	100.00%	94,579,840	100.00%	298.66
Irrigated Total	9,494.60	2.82%	7,904,120	7.56%	832.49
Dry Total	219.00	0.07%	85,020	0.08%	388.22
Grass Total	316,678.85	94.00%	94,579,840	90.43%	298.66
72. Waste	8,574.83	2.55%	857,485	0.82%	100.00
73. Other	1,933.29	0.57%	1,159,975	1.11%	600.00
74. Exempt	3,580.07	1.06%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	336,900.57	100.00%	104,586,440	100.00%	310.44

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	448.00	1.24%	806,400	1.37%	1,800.00
47. 2A1	53.00	0.15%	90,100	0.15%	1,700.00
48. 2A	1,098.85	3.04%	1,868,045	3.18%	1,700.00
49. 3A1	4,847.68	13.43%	8,119,875	13.83%	1,675.00
50. 3A	13,873.34	38.44%	22,840,775	38.90%	1,646.38
51. 4A1	14,795.21	41.00%	23,667,300	40.31%	1,599.66
52. 4A	971.00	2.69%	1,320,715	2.25%	1,360.16
53. Total	36,087.08	100.00%	58,713,210	100.00%	1,626.99
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	443.91	12.42%	221,955	13.08%	500.00
56. 2D1	99.00	2.77%	49,500	2.92%	500.00
57. 2D	64.00	1.79%	32,000	1.89%	500.00
58. 3D1	519.98	14.55%	249,590	14.70%	480.00
59. 3D	1,433.77	40.11%	688,210	40.54%	480.00
60. 4D1	766.86	21.45%	345,085	20.33%	450.00
61. 4D	247.07	6.91%	111,180	6.55%	449.99
62. Total	3,574.59	100.00%	1,697,520	100.00%	474.89
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	2,190.78	1.75%	1,022,825	2.35%	466.88
65. 2G1	117.00	0.09%	53,310	0.12%	455.64
66. 2G	2,091.85	1.67%	975,965	2.24%	466.56
67. 3G1	16,702.85	13.34%	6,661,220	15.28%	398.81
68. 3G	20,423.80	16.32%	7,757,925	17.80%	379.85
69. 4G1	46,669.65	37.28%	14,971,880	34.34%	320.81
70. 4G	36,984.07	29.54%	12,150,855	27.87%	328.54
71. Total	125,180.00	100.00%	43,593,980	100.00%	348.25
Irrigated Total					
	36,087.08	21.65%	58,713,210	55.99%	1,626.99
Dry Total					
	3,574.59	2.14%	1,697,520	1.62%	474.89
Grass Total					
	125,180.00	75.09%	43,593,980	41.57%	348.25
72. Waste	505.50	0.30%	49,950	0.05%	98.81
73. Other	1,362.55	0.82%	817,530	0.78%	600.00
74. Exempt	1,076.26	0.65%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	166,709.72	100.00%	104,872,190	100.00%	629.07

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
70. 4G	411.39	100.00%	230,380	100.00%	560.00
71. Total	411.39	100.00%	230,380	100.00%	560.00
Irrigated Total					
	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry Total					
	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total					
	411.39	97.86%	230,380	97.71%	560.00
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	9.00	2.14%	5,400	2.29%	600.00
74. Exempt	1.50	0.36%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	420.39	100.00%	235,780	100.00%	560.86

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	363.70	472,170	49,377.09	70,773,920	49,740.79	71,246,090
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,978.59	1,886,280	3,978.59	1,886,280
78. Grass	0.00	0	4,012.53	2,084,960	555,410.88	198,917,910	559,423.41	201,002,870
79. Waste	0.00	0	33.50	3,350	11,395.93	1,138,995	11,429.43	1,142,345
80. Other	0.00	0	89.00	53,400	4,347.44	2,608,465	4,436.44	2,661,865
81. Exempt	0.00	0	26.80	0	5,165.66	0	5,192.46	0
82. Total	0.00	0	4,498.73	2,613,880	624,509.93	275,325,570	629,008.66	277,939,450

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	49,740.79	7.91%	71,246,090	25.63%	1,432.35
Dry Land	3,978.59	0.63%	1,886,280	0.68%	474.11
Grass	559,423.41	88.94%	201,002,870	72.32%	359.30
Waste	11,429.43	1.82%	1,142,345	0.41%	99.95
Other	4,436.44	0.71%	2,661,865	0.96%	600.00
Exempt	5,192.46	0.83%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	629,008.66	100.00%	277,939,450	100.00%	441.87

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

75 Rock

	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	22,831,230	23,755,445	924,215	4.05%	318,650	2.65%
02. Recreational	710,535	740,880	30,345	4.27%	0	4.27%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	10,113,955	12,351,455	2,237,500	22.12%	329,195	18.87%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	33,655,720	36,847,780	3,192,060	9.48%	647,845	7.56%
05. Commercial	7,005,460	7,143,265	137,805	1.97%	135,505	0.03%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	8,702,415	10,136,040	1,433,625	16.47%	0	16.47%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	15,707,875	17,279,305	1,571,430	10.00%	135,505	9.14%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	49,363,595	54,127,085	4,763,490	9.65%	783,350	8.06%
11. Irrigated	56,588,635	71,246,090	14,657,455	25.90%		
12. Dryland	1,829,820	1,886,280	56,460	3.09%		
13. Grassland	198,955,840	201,002,870	2,047,030	1.03%		
14. Wasteland	1,142,345	1,142,345	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	2,667,265	2,661,865	-5,400	-0.20%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	261,183,905	277,939,450	16,755,545	6.42%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	310,547,500	332,066,535	21,519,035	6.93%	783,350	6.68%

PURSUANT TO LB 263, THE ASSESSOR SHALL PREPARE A PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR THE COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION EACH YEAR ON OR BEFORE JUNE 15 DESCRIBING THE NEXT YEARS ASSESSMENT PLANS AND EACH OF THE NEXT TWO YEARS THEREAFTER. ON OR BEFORE JULY 31 EACH YEAR, THE ASSESSOR SHALL PRESENT THE PLAN TO THE COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION AND ON OR BEFORE OCTOBER 31 EACH YEAR THE ASSESSOR SHALL MAIL A COPY OF THE PLAN WITH ANY ADJUSTMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE. THE ASSESSOR SHALL UPDATE THE PLAN EACH YEAR. THE PLAN AND ANY UPDATES SHALL EXAMINE THE LEVEL, QUALITY, AND UNIFORMITY OF ASSESSMENT IN THE COUNTY AND MAY BE DERIVED FROM A PROGRESS REPORT DEVELOPED BY THE DEPARTMENT AND PRESENTED TO THE ASSESSOR ON OR BEFORE JULY 31.

Rock County has a total valuation for Real Property in 2011 of \$310,628,220.
The Parcel count for Real Property in 2011 is 3033.
Personal Property filings for 2011 were 323.
Homestead Exemptions filed and approved by our office for 2011 totaled 139.
Permissive Exemptions filed and approved by our office and the Rock County Commissioners for 2011 were 16.

The levels of value of real property in Rock County for tax year 2011 satisfy the requirements of Neb. Const. .art. V111 §1, and Neb. Stat. §77-5023(Cum. Supp 2008).

2011 Sales Statistics Ratio as determined by the Tax Equalization Commission.

No changes in Residential value -	Assessment Ratio - 97%
No changes in Commercial value -	Assessment Ratio - 97.37
No changes in Agricultural land value -	Assessment Ratio - 73%

New residential photos we taken in 2010 for 2011 year in Bassett and Newport. We updated improvement cost tables to June 2010. Our aerial photos are from 2010 and we will soon add the Rural Improvements fly-over photos completed by GIS Workshop this summer. We will continue to do our pickup work on a timely basis and this fall start checking for any changes reveled from the fly-over photos that may have been missed from prior years.

Our office will try to contact owners by phone prior to our visit as we prefer they can accompany us. Great effort will be made to try to schedule in advance our on-site inspection when they or a representative can be present. Our focus will be to look for changes and any additions that we might have missed from prior years. We will verify measurements are correct. We will not do an interior inspection unless we are invited in

and or the owner has given us prior permission if we notice there have been some renovation.

2012 - Review 2011 fly-over photo's for Rock County. We will review and update all Rural Improvements using the 2010 cost tables. Time will be the factor that will dictate if we update more than Area 2 in 2012. We started at the Southeast corner of the county and will continue with Area 1 and then finish with Area 3. This will continue until all the Rural Improvements are revalued.

2012 - We need to do a study of our Commercial Property. We have not had enough sales to actually have to do a revalue, but we will update the cost tables and revalue this class of property in 2013.

2013 - Review and Physical Inspection calendar-
Every parcel in the county needs to be looked at on a rotation or schedule over a six year period. I did look at most of the rural in the southeast of our county in the fall of 2010.

2010 - looked at southeast corner of Rock, done.

2011 - plan to look at the southwest,

2012 - the east center portion,

2013 - the west center portion,

2014 - the northeast portion and

2015 - the northwest in 2016.

GIS Workshop flew the county and provided us with updated aerial photos of the county in 2011 which helped our office establish a visual reference point for rural property for all improvements. Going forward the office would like to have GIS Workshop update our aerial photos every six years. I do not know the schedule for the Farm Service Agency aerial photo's. We will receive them from GIS Workshop as part of our contract each year they are taken.

2014 - The plan has been made to update cost tables for Improvements every 4 (four) years. This time frame will lessen the impact for taxpayers but will insure the office has been kept current. New tables and photo's will be used for Residential Property for 2014 to be in effect for 2015, Commercial Property for 2016, Area 2 in 2016, Area 1 and 3 in 2017.

We continue to have talks with Brown, Keya Paha, Boyd and Holt Counties about an appraiser for our counties to assist us when needed. We always continue to work on our quality and uniformity of assessment.

Our budget for this year did not include much in the appraisal budget because it will be mainly work that we can do ourselves. Hopefully, the mileage numbers will be sufficient

to check the CRP acres along with the acres of dry land. These need to be physically checked for 2012.

Monica J Turpin
Rock County Assessor

JUNE 15,2011

2012 Assessment Survey for Rock County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	None
3.	Other full-time employees:
	None
4.	Other part-time employees:
	None
5.	Number of shared employees:
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$72,826
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same as above
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$600
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$4,500
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$800
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	None
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$2,589

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Terra Scan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	GIS Workshop
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 – rock.assessor.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop
8.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

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?
	Bassett
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1998

D. Contracted Services

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

2012 Certification for Rock 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 Rock 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

