Table of Contents

Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification

Maps

Market Areas
Registered Wells > 500 GPM

Valuation History Charts

2013 Commission Summary

for Cuming County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	161	Median	96.62
Total Sales Price	$14,785,245	Mean	103.02
Total Adj. Sales Price	$14,760,345	Wgt. Mean	94.11
Total Assessed Value	$13,891,570	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$70,175
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$91,679	Avg. Assessed Value	$86,283

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.32 to 98.91
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.21 to 97.02
95% Mean C.I	96.99 to 109.05
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	13.31
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.21
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.41

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	143	96	96.05
2011	149	95	95
2010	149	97	97
2009	168	97	97

2013 Commission Summary

for Cuming County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	21	Median	94.92
Total Sales Price	$2,259,945	Mean	92.43
Total Adj. Sales Price	$2,238,945	Wgt. Mean	90.49
Total Assessed Value	$2,025,980	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$117,580
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$106,616	Avg. Assessed Value	$96,475

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	85.83 to 99.70
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	77.82 to 103.16
95% Mean C.I	83.35 to 101.51
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.76
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.18
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.61

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	12		97.21
2011	21	96	96
2010	21	95	95
2009	27	95	95

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Cuming 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	**95**	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	**74**	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 5th day of April, 2013.

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Cuming County

Beemer –pickup work

Beemer reappraisal – reviewed lot values and depreciation with sales.

RURAL RESIDENTIAL

Reviewed House and Site acres for the Rural Properties

We raised the Farm/Rurban House values from $10,000 to $12,000, Suburban from $11,000 to $13,000

Raised Farm/Ruban site acres from $4500 to $5000,

Suburban site from $5500 to $6000

2nd House site from $5500 to $8500

Reappraised rural outbuildings using new oblique pictures.

Raised rural homes 2%.

Bancroft pickup work

Wisner-Pickup work

Wisner – we have moved Wisner's reappraisal to 2014, there is not enough time and man power as we decided it was more important to get the outbuildings with new pricing.

West Point – Pickup work

Recreation – raised improved and unimproved lots

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Cuming County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Appraiser, Assessor and Office Clerk
2.	**List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
01	West Point – 3 school systems, hospital, county seat, jobs available, and retail available
05	Bancroft
10	Beemer – lost high school, no grocery store available
20	Rural
25	Wisner – minimal retail, mostly ag related community
	Hidden Meadows, Cottonwood Chimes, Stalp Subdivision, Lake Subdivision, Par Acres

3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.**
	Cost approach and comparable sales. Income approach as a check on rental properties.
4	**What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?**
	2009 Marshall and Swift – CAMA 2000; for West Point, Wisner, Beemer, Bancroft and Rural and Lake Subdivisions
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?**
	Physical depreciation tables from CAMA. Any functional is determined from the market, economic depreciations determined from market. Grouped into ranges and effective age used for each group.
6.	**Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?**
	Economic depreciation tables are developed for each valuation grouping and effective age grouped according to sales in each market area.
7.	**When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?**
	Economic depreciation tables are developed for each valuation grouping and effective age grouped according to sales in each market area. West Point 2012, Wisner 2009, Beemer 2013, Bancroft 2010, Rural 2009
8.	**When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?**
	We review the lot sales every year, when needed we implement a reappraisal of the lots. Last reappraisal of lots; West Point 2010, Wisner 2009, Beemer 2013, Bancroft 2010 and the Rural 2013
9.	**Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?**
	Square foot with base lot and excess beyond base lot at $/acre for the city. Rural-per acre.

20 Cuming

RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales :	161	MEDIAN :	97	COV :	37.91
Total Sales Price :	14,785,245	WGT. MEAN :	94	STD :	39.06
Total Adj. Sales Price :	14,760,345	MEAN :	103	Avg. Abs. Dev :	18.33
Total Assessed Value :	13,891,570				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	91,679	COD :	18.97	MAX Sales Ratio :	484.70
Avg. Assessed Value :	86,283	PRD :	109.47	MIN Sales Ratio :	58.13

95% Median C.I. : 93.32 to 98.91

95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.21 to 97.02

95% Mean C.I. : 96.99 to 109.05

Printed:3/27/2013 9:49:11AM

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-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	14	98.23	109.06	100.25	23.59	108.79	58.13	208.76	87.16 to 147.50	83,486	83,695
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	11	99.00	95.10	88.05	09.81	108.01	63.43	116.10	79.93 to 108.66	81,177	71,475
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	15	96.07	92.90	93.98	07.16	98.85	63.23	105.64	87.94 to 99.10	127,827	120,136
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	28	96.96	102.73	95.19	17.46	107.92	61.02	201.47	89.99 to 103.33	95,150	90,571
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	27	98.29	104.47	99.59	17.78	104.90	59.76	158.26	90.23 to 112.27	87,324	86,967
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	13	96.62	97.05	89.61	11.88	108.30	67.10	120.30	89.70 to 110.74	127,327	114,100
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	27	91.50	114.35	89.98	36.17	127.08	61.72	484.70	83.43 to 103.67	76,226	68,588
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	26	93.76	98.95	93.47	16.33	105.86	69.76	142.52	84.37 to 108.61	78,688	73,550
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	68	97.09	100.63	94.77	15.36	106.18	58.13	208.76	94.41 to 99.00	97,696	92,588
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	93	94.57	104.76	93.58	21.96	111.95	59.76	484.70	90.70 to 102.89	87,280	81,673
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	81	97.26	100.46	95.40	14.75	105.30	59.76	201.47	93.32 to 99.31	96,695	92,252
_____ALL_____	161	96.62	103.02	94.11	18.97	109.47	58.13	484.70	93.32 to 98.91	91,679	86,283

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	94	97.43	100.91	95.54	14.10	105.62	59.76	217.22	93.98 to 99.29	100,944	96,442
05	9	97.92	101.27	90.92	25.91	111.38	58.13	147.50	63.23 to 145.57	50,433	45,854
10	11	91.50	90.22	89.63	07.28	100.66	71.30	99.68	83.81 to 99.31	56,682	50,806
20	16	92.10	100.37	97.14	18.68	103.33	63.43	166.49	85.64 to 114.09	110,962	107,785
25	31	99.00	115.82	88.05	34.44	131.54	61.02	484.70	85.28 to 119.36	78,027	68,706
_____ALL_____	161	96.62	103.02	94.11	18.97	109.47	58.13	484.70	93.32 to 98.91	91,679	86,283

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	161	96.62	103.02	94.11	18.97	109.47	58.13	484.70	93.32 to 98.91	91,679	86,283
06											
07											
_____ALL_____	161	96.62	103.02	94.11	18.97	109.47	58.13	484.70	93.32 to 98.91	91,679	86,283

20 Cuming

RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales :	161	MEDIAN :	97	COV :	37.91
Total Sales Price :	14,785,245	WGT. MEAN :	94	STD :	39.06
Total Adj. Sales Price :	14,760,345	MEAN :	103	Avg. Abs. Dev :	18.33
Total Assessed Value :	13,891,570				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	91,679	COD :	18.97	MAX Sales Ratio :	484.70
Avg. Assessed Value :	86,283	PRD :	109.47	MIN Sales Ratio :	58.13

95% Median C.I. :	93.32 to 98.91		
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	91.21 to 97.02		
95% Mean C.I. :	96.99 to 109.05		
		Printed:3/27/2013	*9:49:11AM*

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	1	125.00	125.00	125.00	00.00	100.00	125.00	125.00	N/A	4,500	5,625
Less Than 15,000	14	124.36	152.77	139.60	41.55	109.43	78.96	484.70	88.25 to 162.37	9,193	12,834
Less Than 30,000	27	122.75	140.05	128.24	34.02	109.21	63.23	484.70	99.31 to 147.50	15,504	19,882
__Ranges Excl. Low $__											
Greater Than 4,999	160	96.35	102.88	94.10	18.96	109.33	58.13	484.70	93.32 to 98.83	92,224	86,787
Greater Than 14,999	147	95.13	98.28	93.71	14.86	104.88	58.13	208.76	92.85 to 98.23	99,535	93,278
Greater Than 29,999	134	94.43	95.55	93.12	12.53	102.61	58.13	166.49	91.51 to 97.59	107,028	99,662
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999	1	125.00	125.00	125.00	00.00	100.00	125.00	125.00	N/A	4,500	5,625
5,000 TO 14,999	13	123.71	154.91	140.13	44.90	110.55	78.96	484.70	88.25 to 162.37	9,554	13,388
15,000 TO 29,999	13	120.30	126.35	123.19	25.56	102.57	63.23	208.76	95.70 to 158.26	22,300	27,472
30,000 TO 59,999	33	99.29	100.26	99.23	11.24	101.04	58.13	137.53	94.44 to 105.23	45,733	45,383
60,000 TO 99,999	45	96.07	97.69	97.61	12.50	100.08	59.76	166.49	92.47 to 101.33	76,297	74,475
100,000 TO 149,999	26	87.04	91.53	91.47	12.02	100.07	63.43	132.72	83.40 to 96.92	118,787	108,649
150,000 TO 249,999	22	90.11	91.68	91.42	13.38	100.28	61.02	145.18	81.39 to 100.30	183,169	167,460
250,000 TO 499,999	8	89.32	87.90	87.54	07.90	100.41	67.10	99.80	67.10 to 99.80	285,125	249,600
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
_____ALL_____	161	96.62	103.02	94.11	18.97	109.47	58.13	484.70	93.32 to 98.91	91,679	86,283

A. Residential Real Property

Cuming County is located in the northeastern portion of the state. There are four towns within the boundary of the county. The city of West Point (Valuation Group 1) is located on Highway 275 and has a population of over 3400. The city of Beemer (Valuation Group 10) is west of West Point on Highway 275 and has a population of over 600. Wisner (Valuation Group 25) is also on Highway 275 and is on the west side of Cuming County with a population over 1100. The small village of Bancroft (Valuation Group 5) has a population near 500.

The residential sales file has a sufficient number of sales (161) to consider the sample adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. The city of West Point represents 58% of the total qualified statistical analysis.

Cuming County completed a reappraisal of the village of Beemer for the 2013 assessment year. As part of the systematic review the county has utilized the oblique pictures and continued into the rural population reappraising rural outbuildings.

Based on the consideration of all the available information, the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the residential class of real property in Cuming County. All of the subclasses with sufficient sales and information are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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.

2013 Commercial Assessment Actions for Cuming County

Beemer Reappraisal – sales are very limited, there are not enough sales for a good measurement for the state for Beemer alone. We do use sales information from Bancroft & Wisner. This would have included the lots as well as the improvements.

Bancroft – Pickup work – only 3 sales in Bancroft and one seems to be between families, have not heard from them as to whether that was influencing the sale or not.

Wisner – Pickup work Wisner has only 2 sales. Wisner reappraisal will be in 2014.

West Point – Pickup work

Rural – Pickup work – raised excess lot

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Cuming County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Appraiser, Assessor and Office Clerk
2.	**List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
01	West Point
05	Bancroft
10	Beemer
20	Rural
25	Wisner

3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.**
	Cost, income and comparable sales.
3a.	**Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.**
	Sales review, check with other counties, appraisers, and liaison for comparable sales of similar type/use.
4.	**What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?**
	January 2008 for West Point, Wisner, Bancroft, Rural. 2012 for Beemer
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?**
	Economic depreciation determined from market, depreciation determined from market information, 60 year and 55 year life. We do not use CAMA vendor for commercial, we use only Marshall and Swift pricing manual.
6.	**Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?**
	No, effective age and comparable sales and reconciliation for each property.
7.	**When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?**
	2009-2010 West Point and Wisner, 2010-2011 Bancroft, 2013 Beemer
8.	**When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?**
	2009-2010 West Point and Wisner, 2010-2011 Bancroft, 2013 Beemer
9.	**Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.**
	Sales, using square foot, and or acres, dependent on location and size of lot.

20 Cuming

COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales :	21	MEDIAN :	95	COV : 21.57	95% Median C.I. : 85.83 to 99.70
Total Sales Price :	2,259,945	WGT. MEAN :	90	STD : 19.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 77.82 to 103.16
Total Adj. Sales Price :	2,238,945	MEAN :	92	Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.08	95% Mean C.I. : 83.35 to 101.51
Total Assessed Value :	2,025,980				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	106,616	COD :	13.78	MAX Sales Ratio : 130.06	
Avg. Assessed Value :	96,475	PRD :	102.14	MIN Sales Ratio : 37.42	*Printed:3/27/2013 9:49:12AM*

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-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	88.98	88.98	88.98	00.00	100.00	88.98	88.98	N/A	40,000	35,590
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	94.20	94.20	93.81	00.77	100.42	93.47	94.92	N/A	49,228	46,183
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	77.98	77.98	77.98	00.00	100.00	77.98	77.98	N/A	51,000	39,770
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	84.26	84.26	85.08	01.88	99.04	82.68	85.83	N/A	49,250	41,900
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	101.70	101.70	101.70	00.00	100.00	101.70	101.70	N/A	300,000	305,105
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	130.06	130.06	130.06	00.00	100.00	130.06	130.06	N/A	32,000	41,620
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	3	98.18	85.77	53.48	28.62	160.38	37.42	121.71	N/A	89,253	47,730
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	93.83	93.83	90.77	08.15	103.37	86.18	101.47	N/A	71,500	64,903
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	83.05	83.05	83.05	00.00	100.00	83.05	83.05	N/A	120,000	99,660
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	99.08	98.27	98.46	00.82	99.81	96.64	99.08	N/A	98,333	96,817
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	4	97.26	90.64	96.39	16.04	94.03	55.27	112.79	N/A	198,307	191,156
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	4	91.23	88.84	88.53	05.88	100.35	77.98	94.92	N/A	47,364	41,931
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	7	98.18	93.94	82.16	21.47	114.34	37.42	130.06	37.42 to 130.06	99,751	81,959
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	10	97.86	92.81	95.06	09.83	97.63	55.27	112.79	83.05 to 101.47	135,123	128,454
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	85.83	86.98	87.09	06.47	99.87	77.98	94.92	N/A	49,591	43,187
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	7	101.47	96.67	83.43	18.54	115.87	37.42	130.06	37.42 to 130.06	106,109	88,531
_____ALL_____	21	94.92	92.43	90.49	13.78	102.14	37.42	130.06	85.83 to 99.70	106,616	96,475

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	13	98.18	92.25	91.29	12.62	101.05	37.42	130.06	83.05 to 101.47	145,500	132,823
05	3	112.79	109.81	105.05	07.92	104.53	94.92	121.71	N/A	15,072	15,833
10	2	95.06	95.06	95.05	01.67	100.01	93.47	96.64	N/A	75,000	71,290
20	1	88.98	88.98	88.98	00.00	100.00	88.98	88.98	N/A	40,000	35,590
25	2	66.63	66.63	65.59	17.05	101.59	55.27	77.98	N/A	56,115	36,805
_____ALL_____	21	94.92	92.43	90.49	13.78	102.14	37.42	130.06	85.83 to 99.70	106,616	96,475

20 Cuming

COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales :	21	MEDIAN :	95	COV :	21.57
Total Sales Price :	2,259,945	WGT. MEAN :	90	STD :	19.94
Total Adj. Sales Price :	2,238,945	MEAN :	92	Avg. Abs. Dev :	13.08
Total Assessed Value :	2,025,980				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	106,616	COD :	13.78	MAX Sales Ratio :	130.06
Avg. Assessed Value :	96,475	PRD :	102.14	MIN Sales Ratio :	37.42

95% Median C.I. : 85.83 to 99.70

95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 77.82 to 103.16

95% Mean C.I. : 83.35 to 101.51

Printed:3/27/2013 9:49:12AM

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	21	94.92	92.43	90.49	13.78	102.14	37.42	130.06	85.83 to 99.70	106,616	96,475
04											
_____ALL_____	21	94.92	92.43	90.49	13.78	102.14	37.42	130.06	85.83 to 99.70	106,616	96,475

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											
Less Than 15,000	2	117.25	117.25	115.97	03.80	101.10	112.79	121.71	N/A	10,880	12,618
Less Than 30,000	5	94.92	101.38	96.86	12.01	104.67	82.68	121.71	N/A	17,343	16,799
__Ranges Excl. Low $__											
Greater Than 4,999	21	94.92	92.43	90.49	13.78	102.14	37.42	130.06	85.83 to 99.70	106,616	96,475
Greater Than 14,999	19	94.81	89.82	90.24	12.76	99.53	37.42	130.06	83.05 to 99.08	116,694	105,302
Greater Than 29,999	16	95.06	89.63	90.23	14.32	99.34	37.42	130.06	83.05 to 99.70	134,514	121,374
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	2	117.25	117.25	115.97	03.80	101.10	112.79	121.71	N/A	10,880	12,618
15,000 TO 29,999	3	94.81	90.80	90.46	04.30	100.38	82.68	94.92	N/A	21,652	19,587
30,000 TO 59,999	3	88.98	99.01	95.11	19.51	104.10	77.98	130.06	N/A	41,000	38,993
60,000 TO 99,999	6	95.06	88.48	88.21	10.82	100.31	55.27	101.47	55.27 to 101.47	64,872	57,222
100,000 TO 149,999	4	92.63	91.85	91.77	07.81	100.09	83.05	99.08	N/A	110,000	100,951
150,000 TO 249,999	1	37.42	37.42	37.42	00.00	100.00	37.42	37.42	N/A	200,000	74,835
250,000 TO 499,999	1	101.70	101.70	101.70	00.00	100.00	101.70	101.70	N/A	300,000	305,105
500,000 TO 999,999	1	99.70	99.70	99.70	00.00	100.00	99.70	99.70	N/A	700,000	697,930
1,000,000 +											
_____ALL_____	21	94.92	92.43	90.49	13.78	102.14	37.42	130.06	85.83 to 99.70	106,616	96,475

20 Cuming

COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales :	21	MEDIAN :	95	COV :	21.57
Total Sales Price :	2,259,945	WGT. MEAN :	90	STD :	19.94
Total Adj. Sales Price :	2,238,945	MEAN :	92	Avg. Abs. Dev :	13.08
Total Assessed Value :	2,025,980				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	106,616	COD :	13.78	MAX Sales Ratio :	130.06
Avg. Assessed Value :	96,475	PRD :	102.14	MIN Sales Ratio :	37.42

95% Median C.I. :	85.83 to 99.70
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	77.82 to 103.16
95% Mean C.I. :	83.35 to 101.51

Printed:3/27/2013 9:49:12AM

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	93.47	93.47	93.47	00.00	100.00	93.47	93.47	N/A	75,000	70,100
344	3	94.92	102.68	93.21	16.51	110.16	83.05	130.06	N/A	58,485	54,515
350	2	84.43	84.43	85.51	02.07	98.74	82.68	86.18	N/A	61,750	52,803
352	1	94.81	94.81	94.81	00.00	100.00	94.81	94.81	N/A	18,000	17,065
353	2	78.37	78.37	74.33	29.48	105.44	55.27	101.47	N/A	52,115	38,735
406	2	67.80	67.80	51.44	44.81	131.80	37.42	98.18	N/A	130,000	66,873
434	1	112.79	112.79	112.79	00.00	100.00	112.79	112.79	N/A	14,000	15,790
471	3	96.64	102.44	95.73	11.29	107.01	88.98	121.71	N/A	40,920	39,172
528	4	99.08	96.42	98.73	04.01	97.66	85.83	101.70	N/A	148,750	146,861
529	1	77.98	77.98	77.98	00.00	100.00	77.98	77.98	N/A	51,000	39,770
546	1	99.70	99.70	99.70	00.00	100.00	99.70	99.70	N/A	700,000	697,930
_____ALL_____	21	94.92	92.43	90.49	13.78	102.14	37.42	130.06	85.83 to 99.70	106,616	96,475

A. Commercial Real Property

Cuming County is located in northeast Nebraska and is considered the largest livestock producing county in Nebraska. The city of West Point (Valuation Group 1) is the largest in population with nearly 3,400. A community the size of West Point offers a full spectrum of commercial services. Each of the towns in Cuming County has large grain handling facilities to accommodate the agricultural sector. Wisner (Valuation Group 25), Beemer (Valuation Group 10) and Bancroft (Valuation Group 5) all have commercial parcels typical of communities of their size.

Cuming County has been timely completing the systematic review and inspection of the commercial properties. The continued plan included a reappraisal of the village of Beemer for the 2013 assessment year.

When reviewing the statistical profile for the commercial class of property the sample has increased to 21 sales over the three year period indicating a slight increase in the market activity. There are 13 of those sales in the city of West Point distributed amongst a variety of occupancy codes. The sales in West Point represent several occupancy codes and the median is 98%.

Based on an analysis of the commercial profile and the known assessment practices of the county the commercial level of value is 95%.

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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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

2013 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Cuming County

Approximately 20 to 30% rise in dry land values.

Raised difference of pivot irrigation to dry land - $150 per acre (2013 $350 difference).

No change in dry or irrigated grassland, an increase in wet grassland and all tree cover.

Feed lot and lagoon, nursery/vineyards values raised $700 per acre, to $4,200 per acre.

Farm home sites raised $2,000, up to $12,000; farm sites raised $500, to $5,000 per acre.

No change to Waste land stayed at $100 per acre.

GIS land use review to Range 4 and all feedlots, and pickup work.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Cuming County

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

Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
1	Mostly northeast part of county, Pender, Bancroft and Lyons and includes Beemer, which is in the middle of the county
2	Area west of West Point and south of Beemer (Howells, Dodge, West Point)
3	Majority is Wisner school district, northwest of county, more sandy soils.
4	Southeast portion of the county, West Point and Hooper, Scribner and Oakland, Craig east and north, some sandy areas

3.	**Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.**
	Market area values are determined from the market. Market areas determined by school district, rainfall, market, location, location, location.
4.	**Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.**
	Each sale is analyzed and determined unique characteristics and utilized to determine the value for each category and is double checked in the ratio to be within range.
5.	**Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?**
	The farm sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites. All rural market areas are the same. The Suburban area around West Point is valued higher due to market and proximity to town.
6.	**Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.**
	Physical inspections (pick up work), FSA maps, GIS layer, NRD irrigation variances, each range will be put on a 4 to 6 year cycle.
7.	**Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.**
	We do have special valuation applications on record for the West Point Greenbelt, the farm ground in the Greenbelt area is assessed just the same as all other farm ground.
8.	**If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.**
	Same process as agricultural land but the range is 92 to 100% of most current sales.

20 Cuming

AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales :	119	MEDIAN :	74	COV : 30.91	95% Median C.I. : 66.57 to 80.53
Total Sales Price :	54,432,969	WGT. MEAN :	67	STD : 23.27	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
Total Adj. Sales Price :	54,432,969	MEAN :	75	Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.48	95% Mean C.I. : 71.11 to 79.47
Total Assessed Value :	36,695,629				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	457,420	COD :	25.12	MAX Sales Ratio : 184.58	
Avg. Assessed Value :	308,367	PRD :	111.69	MIN Sales Ratio : 38.38	*Printed:3/27/2013 9:49:13AM*

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-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	21	95.06	97.25	96.52	10.23	100.76	69.76	117.69	89.85 to 106.47	337,725	325,986
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	85.64	89.49	89.14	07.99	100.39	81.38	99.73	81.38 to 99.73	317,488	283,008
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	89.98	90.93	92.08	13.23	98.75	71.70	120.60	N/A	191,467	176,311
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	6	82.28	81.29	82.17	05.92	98.93	68.63	91.39	68.63 to 91.39	389,966	320,449
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	17	80.53	87.84	77.50	21.16	113.34	56.64	184.58	69.52 to 97.53	388,059	300,760
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	67.72	78.56	69.72	20.92	112.68	61.02	135.73	61.02 to 135.73	377,963	263,522
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	6	66.92	66.00	61.44	14.24	107.42	51.11	79.54	51.11 to 79.54	484,886	297,925
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	10	63.52	68.18	57.86	23.99	117.84	46.32	102.82	47.35 to 85.58	541,396	313,268
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	15	55.24	58.84	58.60	18.03	100.41	43.96	100.12	48.21 to 66.76	602,630	353,168
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	17	53.59	55.69	54.12	09.83	102.90	48.94	71.96	49.95 to 59.76	641,719	347,273
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	6	51.35	54.99	50.47	17.00	108.96	38.38	79.99	38.38 to 79.99	445,560	224,867
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	53.81	48.99	44.75	09.91	109.47	38.58	54.58	N/A	670,367	299,983
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	39	91.39	92.59	92.22	11.22	100.40	68.63	120.60	84.34 to 98.30	323,379	298,231
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	39	74.38	78.01	67.57	22.65	115.45	46.32	184.58	64.10 to 80.53	440,719	297,802
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	41	53.59	56.25	54.60	14.22	103.02	38.38	100.12	50.59 to 56.62	600,808	328,057
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	35	82.66	87.49	81.69	15.35	107.10	56.64	184.58	80.53 to 90.26	346,187	282,807
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	37	63.18	65.72	60.10	20.72	109.35	43.96	135.73	55.24 to 67.03	530,554	318,889
_____ALL_____	119	73.58	75.29	67.41	25.12	111.69	38.38	184.58	66.57 to 80.53	457,420	308,367

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	35	74.38	75.54	67.53	25.03	111.86	38.38	120.77	60.67 to 87.33	442,109	298,576
02	35	71.96	76.58	73.84	24.85	103.71	49.31	120.60	62.10 to 82.73	414,124	305,800
03	24	75.54	72.25	65.42	23.42	110.44	43.96	106.47	50.65 to 89.85	489,320	320,113
04	25	70.65	76.05	61.79	27.52	123.08	38.58	184.58	56.64 to 81.70	508,845	314,390
_____ALL_____	119	73.58	75.29	67.41	25.12	111.69	38.38	184.58	66.57 to 80.53	457,420	308,367

20 Cuming

AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 119	MEDIAN : 74	COV : 30.91	95% Median C.I. : 66.57 to 80.53
Total Sales Price : 54,432,969	WGT. MEAN : 67	STD : 23.27	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
Total Adj. Sales Price : 54,432,969	MEAN : 75	Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.48	95% Mean C.I. : 71.11 to 79.47
Total Assessed Value : 36,695,629			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 457,420	COD : 25.12	MAX Sales Ratio : 184.58	
Avg. Assessed Value : 308,367	PRD : 111.69	MIN Sales Ratio : 38.38	*Printed:3/27/2013 9:49:13AM*

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	83.15	83.15	84.52	19.94	98.38	66.57	99.73	N/A	196,199	165,820
01	1	99.73	99.73	99.73	00.00	100.00	99.73	99.73	N/A	212,397	211,820
04	1	66.57	66.57	66.57	00.00	100.00	66.57	66.57	N/A	180,000	119,820
_____Dry_____											
County	70	71.67	74.09	66.74	26.96	111.01	38.38	184.58	60.67 to 80.88	432,148	288,415
01	24	60.72	69.96	63.50	29.84	110.17	38.38	109.68	51.11 to 87.33	449,029	285,125
02	17	79.54	80.51	77.69	24.75	103.63	53.30	120.60	59.25 to 99.88	403,288	313,308
03	14	72.22	69.33	62.28	25.08	111.32	43.96	106.47	48.21 to 91.48	476,501	296,742
04	15	79.99	77.84	65.00	24.30	119.75	47.94	184.58	55.24 to 82.97	396,453	257,695
_____ALL_____	119	73.58	75.29	67.41	25.12	111.69	38.38	184.58	66.57 to 80.53	457,420	308,367

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	91.39	85.95	75.26	14.18	114.20	49.99	100.56	66.57 to 100.12	600,636	452,034
01	1	99.73	99.73	99.73	00.00	100.00	99.73	99.73	N/A	212,397	211,820
02	1	98.99	98.99	98.99	00.00	100.00	98.99	98.99	N/A	664,000	657,295
03	4	94.99	91.73	93.44	09.06	98.17	76.38	100.56	N/A	388,303	362,849
04	3	66.57	69.32	58.73	20.73	118.03	49.99	91.39	N/A	992,040	582,600
_____Dry_____											
County	93	70.65	72.90	65.15	25.97	111.90	38.38	184.58	61.02 to 79.99	459,939	299,658
01	31	73.58	73.29	66.07	24.63	110.93	38.38	109.68	56.60 to 87.33	452,626	299,064
02	26	64.62	74.11	70.27	27.72	105.46	49.31	120.60	56.62 to 81.82	423,329	297,471
03	17	69.52	68.34	61.24	24.83	111.59	43.96	106.47	48.21 to 83.50	538,725	329,936
04	19	70.65	74.70	61.25	27.60	121.96	38.58	184.58	53.59 to 82.97	451,474	276,531
_____ALL_____	119	73.58	75.29	67.41	25.12	111.69	38.38	184.58	66.57 to 80.53	457,420	308,367

Cuming County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Cuming	1	4,273	4,282	3,981	3,982	3,630	3,648	3,111	2,977	3,977
Burt	1	4,530	4,320	4,060	3,810	3,099	3,265	2,600	2,145	3,579
Thurston	1	3,750	3,735	3,450	3,380	3,305	3,300	3,020	2,730	3,514
Thurston	2	3,750	3,735	3,305	3,380	3,305	3,300	3,020	2,730	3,378
Cuming	2	4,617	4,637	4,347	4,219	3,955	3,956	3,379	3,154	4,263
Colfax	1	4,410	4,120	4,020	3,880	3,530	3,300	2,800	2,500	3,797
Dodge	2	5,265	4,895	4,550	4,230	3,874	3,655	3,400	3,170	4,527
Stanton	1	3,570	3,570	3,505	3,505	3,505	3,305	2,775	2,200	3,379
Cuming	3	4,043	4,043	3,799	3,794	3,393	3,403	2,857	2,876	3,646
Stanton	1	3,570	3,570	3,505	3,505	3,505	3,305	2,775	2,200	3,379
Wayne	10	4,660	4,660	4,620	4,620	3,530	2,825	2,680	2,530	3,691
Cuming	4	4,354	4,367	4,087	4,026	3,698	3,687	3,105	3,112	4,007
Burt	2	4,580	4,450	N/A	3,890	3,595	3,710	2,880	2,230	4,148
Dodge	2	5,265	4,895	4,550	4,230	3,874	3,655	3,400	3,170	4,527

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Cuming	1	3,962	3,965	3,710	3,685	3,317	3,317	2,774	2,733	3,580
Burt	1	4,455	4,175	3,950	3,780	3,135	3,180	2,545	2,105	3,380
Thurston	1	3,625	3,565	3,220	3,220	3,220	3,125	2,875	2,500	3,226
Thurston	2	3,440	3,365	3,165	2,815	2,740	2,740	2,700	2,500	2,872
Cuming	2	4,325	4,325	4,035	3,998	3,645	3,641	3,054	3,027	3,897
Colfax	1	3,888	3,733	3,598	3,398	3,295	2,996	2,226	1,805	3,193
Dodge	2	4,867	4,529	4,207	3,920	3,617	3,170	2,875	2,365	3,930
Stanton	1	3,105	3,105	3,050	3,050	2,785	2,596	2,406	2,000	2,718
Cuming	3	3,735	3,735	3,383	3,462	3,058	3,009	2,473	2,355	3,293
Stanton	1	3,105	3,105	3,050	3,050	2,785	2,596	2,406	2,000	2,718
Wayne	10	4,165	3,955	3,670	3,385	3,090	2,800	2,510	2,225	3,262
Cuming	4	4,050	4,050	3,760	3,715	3,362	3,252	2,626	2,684	3,663
Burt	2	4,500	4,340	4,010	3,835	3,663	3,660	2,775	2,125	3,891
Cuming	4	4,050	4,050	3,760	3,715	3,362	3,252	2,626	2,684	3,663
Dodge	2	4,867	4,529	4,207	3,920	3,617	3,170	2,875	2,365	3,930

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Cuming	1	2,053	1,819	1,750	1,625	1,469	1,456	1,547	839	1,576
Burt	1	1,909	1,838	1,825	1,511	1,553	1,579	1,518	1,253	1,524
Thurston	1	892	869	812	820	711	706	694	638	775
Thurston	2	822	777	672	742	626	633	615	499	612
Cuming	2	1,922	1,865	1,654	1,674	1,622	1,409	1,381	772	1,567
Colfax	1	1,250	1,250	1,150	1,150	1,085	1,085	975	975	1,082

Dodge	2	1,725	1,515	1,580	1,508	1,368	1,393	1,371	1,339	1,456
Stanton	1	1,400	1,400	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,030	960	906	1,081
Cuming	3	1,926	1,897	1,601	1,595	1,458	1,371	1,239	784	1,429
Stanton	1	1,400	1,400	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,030	960	906	1,081
Wayne	10	2,457	2,433	2,145	2,044	2,086	1,766	1,591	1,270	2,016
Cuming	4	2,069	1,923	1,805	1,641	1,532	1,478	1,230	923	1,526
Dodge	2	1,902	1,834	2,085	1,373	1,626	1,512	1,519	1,301	1,556
Cuming	4	2,069	1,923	1,805	1,641	1,532	1,478	1,230	923	1,526
Dodge	2	1,725	1,515	1,580	1,508	1,368	1,393	1,371	1,339	1,456

Source: 2013 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

CUMING COUNTY ASSESSOR'S OFFICE
Cherie Kreikemeier, Assessor
200 S. Lincoln Street, Room 101
West Point, Ne 68788
(402) 372-6000 Fax (402) 372-6013

February 22, 2013

Nebraska Department of Revenue
Property Assessment Division
301 Centennial Mall South
P.O. Box 98919
Lincoln, NE 68508

Our method of determining Greenbelt values for Cuming County, Nebraska is as follows:

The Greenbelt area in Cuming County is located adjacent to West Point City to the eastern city limits and is monitored by the City of West Point.

The uninfluenced values are derived from the sales file and equalized with the surrounding lands, using 69-75% of the indicated market values. This is done on a yearly basis, just as is the valuing of agricultural land.

The values are derived from the sales file and equalized to the surrounding market values of land. This is also done on a yearly basis at the time the agricultural land is valued.

Cherie J. Kreikemeier
Cuming County Assessor

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

A. Agricultural Land

Cuming County is divided into four market areas. The county has defined Market Area 1 as being mostly in the northeastern portion of the county including GEO Code 1541. Market Area 2 as defined by the county is the area west of West Point and south of Beemer. Market Area 3 is defined as the portion in the northwest corner of the county and primarily the Wisner school district and the soil characteristic tends to have more sandy soils. The area defined as Market Area 4 lies in the southeast portion of the county and also includes some sandy soil characteristics.

The county monitors the market information each year to determine that the four areas are needed. Each of the market areas majority land use is defined as dry with 13 to 21 percent irrigated depending on the market area. There is very little grass and waste in each of the four market areas. Review of the surrounding counties found that all adjacent counties are comparable to Cuming County in terms of soil type, topography and irrigation potential.

The analysis of the county was expanded with 34 sales to adequately represent the county defined market areas. All measures were taken to utilize comparable sales and meet the thresholds of determining an adequate sample.

The county increased values in all four market areas for the 2013 assessment year increasing all the land use categories. The values in Cuming County are reasonably comparable to all adjoining counties indicating that all market areas are at uniform portions of market value. The calculated medians for each market area are within the acceptable level of value. The overall calculated median is 74%.

A review of the majority land use substrata shows that the dry land median in area two is above the acceptable range in the 95% substratum, but within the acceptable range in the 80% substratum. The dispersion in the statistics is not extreme, and shows the county's effort to keep land values at the upper end of the acceptable range. The county's assessment actions and comparison of adjoining county values supports that assessments are acceptable.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the overall level of value is determined to be 74% of market value for the agricultural class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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 :** 8,485 **Value :** 1,628,878,345 **Growth** 8,560,580 (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	302	2,390,050	20	328,710	44	1,041,155	366	3,759,915	
02. Res Improve Land	2,294	21,276,415	68	1,510,390	267	6,613,380	2,629	29,400,185	
03. Res Improvements	2,328	149,321,540	73	8,410,625	284	24,871,725	2,685	182,603,890	
04. Res Total	2,630	172,988,005	93	10,249,725	328	32,526,260	3,051	215,763,990	2,880,095
% of Res Total	86.20	80.17	3.05	4.75	10.75	15.07	35.96	13.25	33.64
05. Com UnImp Land	94	1,407,580	6	89,525	11	107,540	111	1,604,645	
06. Com Improve Land	473	7,291,135	22	678,970	30	907,445	525	8,877,550	
07. Com Improvements	481	43,075,850	23	7,198,510	35	2,950,430	539	53,224,790	
08. Com Total	575	51,774,565	29	7,967,005	46	3,965,415	650	63,706,985	748,610
% of Com Total	88.46	81.27	4.46	12.51	7.08	6.22	7.66	3.91	8.74
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	8	308,285	1	184,350	0	0	9	492,635	
11. Ind Improvements	9	6,531,355	1	6,871,960	0	0	10	13,403,315	
12. Ind Total	9	6,839,640	1	7,056,310	0	0	10	13,895,950	0
% of Ind Total	90.00	49.22	10.00	50.78	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.85	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	1	5,000	8	167,760	9	172,760	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	1	5,000	11	405,080	12	410,080	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	1	105	28	423,845	29	423,950	
16. Rec Total	0	0	2	10,105	36	996,685	38	1,006,790	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	5.26	1.00	94.74	99.00	0.45	0.06	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,630	172,988,005	95	10,259,830	364	33,522,945	3,089	216,770,780	2,880,095
% of Res & Rec Total	85.14	79.80	3.08	4.73	11.78	15.46	36.41	13.31	33.64
Com & Ind Total	584	58,614,205	30	15,023,315	46	3,965,415	660	77,602,935	748,610
% of Com & Ind Total	88.48	75.53	4.55	19.36	6.97	5.11	7.78	4.76	8.74
17. Taxable Total	3,214	231,602,210	125	25,283,145	410	37,488,360	3,749	294,373,715	3,628,705
% of Taxable Total	85.73	78.68	3.33	8.59	10.94	12.73	44.18	18.07	42.39

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	12	846,365	5,131,550	0	0	0
20. Industrial	2	5,575	1,188,265	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	12	846,365	5,131,550
20. Industrial	0	0	0	2	5,575	1,188,265
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				**14**	**851,940**	**6,319,815**

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	254	0	20	274

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	6	299,785	3,213	790,054,500	3,219	790,354,285
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	28,805	38	3,055,525	1,607	427,072,130	1,646	430,156,460
29. Ag Improvements	1	310	2	50,925	1,514	113,942,650	1,517	113,993,885
30. Ag Total							**4,736**	**1,334,504,630**

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	0.90	4,500	2	6.78	33,900	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	310	2	0.00	50,925	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	25.10	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	1	1.00	12,000	1	1.00	12,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,074	1,071.21	12,798,520	1,074	1,071.21	12,798,520	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,069	0.00	56,911,885	1,069	0.00	56,911,885	1,167,265
34. HomeSite Total				**1,070**	**1,072.21**	**69,722,405**	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	178	187.21	552,425	178	187.21	552,425	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,411	5,969.74	22,283,795	1,414	5,977.42	22,322,195	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,455	0.00	57,030,765	1,458	0.00	57,082,000	3,764,610
38. FarmSite Total				**1,636**	**6,164.63**	**79,956,620**	
39. Road & Ditches	0	7,340.51	0	0	7,365.61	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	937.01	562,210	0	937.01	562,210	
41. Total Section VI				**2,706**	**15,539.46**	**150,241,235**	**4,931,875**

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	1	121.69	154,130	1	121.69	154,130

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	41	1,702.00	4,360,015	41	1,702.00	4,360,015
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 1**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,682.59	19.03%	11,461,710	20.44%	4,272.63
46. 1A	2,932.59	20.80%	12,558,210	22.40%	4,282.29
47. 2A1	169.83	1.20%	676,170	1.21%	3,981.45
48. 2A	4,355.42	30.90%	17,345,270	30.94%	3,982.46
49. 3A1	1,265.16	8.98%	4,592,725	8.19%	3,630.15
50. 3A	1,973.78	14.00%	7,199,445	12.84%	3,647.54
51. 4A1	699.93	4.97%	2,177,520	3.88%	3,111.05
52. 4A	16.97	0.12%	50,525	0.09%	2,977.31
53. Total	14,096.27	100.00%	56,061,575	100.00%	3,977.05
Dry					
54. 1D1	7,155.47	11.44%	28,353,190	12.66%	3,962.45
55. 1D	18,249.25	29.18%	72,351,060	32.31%	3,964.60
56. 2D1	983.88	1.57%	3,650,200	1.63%	3,710.01
57. 2D	6,886.59	11.01%	25,378,495	11.34%	3,685.20
58. 3D1	7,651.68	12.24%	25,377,135	11.33%	3,316.54
59. 3D	16,273.18	26.02%	53,978,555	24.11%	3,317.03
60. 4D1	5,223.61	8.35%	14,491,945	6.47%	2,774.32
61. 4D	114.67	0.18%	313,425	0.14%	2,733.28
62. Total	62,538.33	100.00%	223,894,005	100.00%	3,580.11
Grass					
63. 1G1	432.47	6.07%	887,645	7.91%	2,052.50
64. 1G	1,220.57	17.13%	2,220,325	19.77%	1,819.09
65. 2G1	236.38	3.32%	413,560	3.68%	1,749.56
66. 2G	2,626.81	36.86%	4,268,615	38.01%	1,625.02
67. 3G1	423.93	5.95%	622,725	5.55%	1,468.93
68. 3G	1,058.64	14.86%	1,541,345	13.73%	1,455.97
69. 4G1	464.81	6.52%	718,855	6.40%	1,546.56
70. 4G	662.06	9.29%	555,725	4.95%	839.39
71. Total	7,125.67	100.00%	11,228,795	100.00%	1,575.82
Irrigated Total	14,096.27	16.42%	56,061,575	18.94%	3,977.05
Dry Total	62,538.33	72.87%	223,894,005	75.64%	3,580.11
Grass Total	7,125.67	8.30%	11,228,795	3.79%	1,575.82
72. Waste	941.22	1.10%	94,110	0.03%	99.99
73. Other	1,122.53	1.31%	4,714,635	1.59%	4,200.01
74. Exempt	0.46	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	85,824.02	100.00%	295,993,120	100.00%	3,448.84

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 2**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,983.23	14.94%	9,156,215	16.18%	4,616.82
46. 1A	4,796.46	36.14%	22,242,235	39.31%	4,637.22
47. 2A1	287.45	2.17%	1,249,685	2.21%	4,347.49
48. 2A	717.31	5.40%	3,026,270	5.35%	4,218.92
49. 3A1	1,184.64	8.93%	4,685,485	8.28%	3,955.20
50. 3A	2,906.55	21.90%	11,499,515	20.32%	3,956.41
51. 4A1	1,392.78	10.49%	4,706,380	8.32%	3,379.13
52. 4A	3.95	0.03%	12,460	0.02%	3,154.43
53. Total	13,272.37	100.00%	56,578,245	100.00%	4,262.86
Dry					
54. 1D1	8,115.45	10.45%	35,099,385	11.60%	4,325.01
55. 1D	26,153.39	33.68%	113,107,795	37.38%	4,324.79
56. 2D1	1,953.69	2.52%	7,883,165	2.61%	4,035.01
57. 2D	3,593.81	4.63%	14,367,380	4.75%	3,997.81
58. 3D1	8,982.44	11.57%	32,741,065	10.82%	3,645.01
59. 3D	19,259.37	24.80%	70,126,225	23.17%	3,641.15
60. 4D1	9,503.22	12.24%	29,027,420	9.59%	3,054.48
61. 4D	85.78	0.11%	259,640	0.09%	3,026.81
62. Total	77,647.15	100.00%	302,612,075	100.00%	3,897.27
Grass					
63. 1G1	475.59	4.18%	913,925	5.12%	1,921.67
64. 1G	2,458.53	21.59%	4,584,015	25.69%	1,864.53
65. 2G1	861.65	7.57%	1,425,200	7.99%	1,654.04
66. 2G	3,344.11	29.37%	5,596,655	31.37%	1,673.59
67. 3G1	697.37	6.12%	1,131,220	6.34%	1,622.12
68. 3G	1,248.09	10.96%	1,758,645	9.86%	1,409.07
69. 4G1	1,076.95	9.46%	1,486,870	8.33%	1,380.63
70. 4G	1,224.30	10.75%	945,590	5.30%	772.35
71. Total	11,386.59	100.00%	17,842,120	100.00%	1,566.94

Irrigated Total	13,272.37	12.53%	56,578,245	14.68%	4,262.86
Dry Total	77,647.15	73.28%	302,612,075	78.51%	3,897.27
Grass Total	11,386.59	10.75%	17,842,120	4.63%	1,566.94
72. Waste	1,965.11	1.85%	2,066,080	0.54%	1,051.38
73. Other	1,688.27	1.59%	6,352,190	1.65%	3,762.54
74. Exempt	8.37	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	105,959.49	100.00%	385,450,710	100.00%	3,637.72

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 3**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	862.19	6.78%	3,485,545	7.52%	4,042.66
46. 1A	2,221.03	17.47%	8,978,825	19.36%	4,042.64
47. 2A1	145.44	1.14%	552,490	1.19%	3,798.75
48. 2A	3,616.76	28.44%	13,722,815	29.59%	3,794.23
49. 3A1	1,244.30	9.78%	4,222,445	9.11%	3,393.43
50. 3A	4,009.43	31.53%	13,643,745	29.42%	3,402.91
51. 4A1	603.00	4.74%	1,722,715	3.72%	2,856.91
52. 4A	14.80	0.12%	42,560	0.09%	2,875.68
53. Total	12,716.95	100.00%	46,371,140	100.00%	3,646.40
Dry					
54. 1D1	3,020.62	7.12%	11,282,040	8.07%	3,735.01
55. 1D	10,604.45	24.99%	39,604,160	28.34%	3,734.67
56. 2D1	821.29	1.94%	2,778,080	1.99%	3,382.58
57. 2D	6,308.05	14.87%	21,837,775	15.63%	3,461.89
58. 3D1	4,612.52	10.87%	14,102,975	10.09%	3,057.54
59. 3D	14,835.02	34.96%	44,641,655	31.94%	3,009.21
60. 4D1	2,122.72	5.00%	5,249,525	3.76%	2,473.02
61. 4D	109.06	0.26%	256,860	0.18%	2,355.22
62. Total	42,433.73	100.00%	139,753,070	100.00%	3,293.44
Grass					
63. 1G1	36.83	0.55%	70,930	0.74%	1,925.88
64. 1G	752.25	11.22%	1,427,210	14.89%	1,897.25
65. 2G1	537.48	8.01%	860,625	8.98%	1,601.22
66. 2G	1,619.38	24.14%	2,582,800	26.94%	1,594.93
67. 3G1	460.46	6.87%	671,455	7.00%	1,458.23
68. 3G	1,817.08	27.09%	2,492,055	25.99%	1,371.46
69. 4G1	701.74	10.46%	869,205	9.07%	1,238.64
70. 4G	781.95	11.66%	613,170	6.40%	784.15
71. Total	6,707.17	100.00%	9,587,450	100.00%	1,429.43
Irrigated Total	12,716.95	19.73%	46,371,140	22.80%	3,646.40
Dry Total	42,433.73	65.84%	139,753,070	68.72%	3,293.44
Grass Total	6,707.17	10.41%	9,587,450	4.71%	1,429.43
72. Waste	787.15	1.22%	78,725	0.04%	100.01
73. Other	1,805.84	2.80%	7,584,545	3.73%	4,200.01
74. Exempt	0.65	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	64,450.84	100.00%	203,374,930	100.00%	3,155.50

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 4**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,720.56	11.10%	7,491,715	12.07%	4,354.23
46. 1A	4,272.94	27.58%	18,660,895	30.06%	4,367.23
47. 2A1	198.01	1.28%	809,320	1.30%	4,087.27
48. 2A	3,091.66	19.95%	12,446,395	20.05%	4,025.80
49. 3A1	1,410.61	9.10%	5,216,795	8.40%	3,698.25
50. 3A	4,387.90	28.32%	16,176,080	26.05%	3,686.52
51. 4A1	400.08	2.58%	1,242,350	2.00%	3,105.25
52. 4A	13.64	0.09%	42,445	0.07%	3,111.80
53. Total	15,495.40	100.00%	62,085,995	100.00%	4,006.74
Dry					
54. 1D1	6,933.34	11.83%	28,080,220	13.08%	4,050.03
55. 1D	18,972.84	32.36%	76,840,570	35.78%	4,050.03
56. 2D1	372.54	0.64%	1,400,750	0.65%	3,760.00
57. 2D	7,391.15	12.61%	27,461,400	12.79%	3,715.44
58. 3D1	6,798.77	11.60%	22,857,155	10.64%	3,361.95
59. 3D	16,630.91	28.37%	54,077,075	25.18%	3,251.60
60. 4D1	1,463.02	2.50%	3,842,270	1.79%	2,626.26
61. 4D	67.52	0.12%	181,190	0.08%	2,683.50
62. Total	58,630.09	100.00%	214,740,630	100.00%	3,662.64
Grass					
63. 1G1	225.17	1.88%	465,880	2.55%	2,069.01
64. 1G	1,493.05	12.47%	2,871,270	15.71%	1,923.09
65. 2G1	100.59	0.84%	181,610	0.99%	1,805.45
66. 2G	4,531.39	37.83%	7,438,195	40.70%	1,641.48
67. 3G1	610.36	5.10%	934,870	5.12%	1,531.67
68. 3G	2,318.20	19.36%	3,426,395	18.75%	1,478.04
69. 4G1	1,514.66	12.65%	1,862,810	10.19%	1,229.85
70. 4G	1,183.50	9.88%	1,092,550	5.98%	923.15
71. Total	11,976.92	100.00%	18,273,580	100.00%	1,525.73
Irrigated Total	15,495.40	17.63%	62,085,995	20.73%	4,006.74
Dry Total	58,630.09	66.70%	214,740,630	71.71%	3,662.64
Grass Total	11,976.92	13.63%	18,273,580	6.10%	1,525.73
72. Waste	792.87	0.90%	114,195	0.04%	144.03
73. Other	1,007.20	1.15%	4,230,235	1.41%	4,200.00
74. Exempt	89.70	0.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	87,902.48	100.00%	299,444,635	100.00%	3,406.56

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	19.59	80,515	55,561.40	221,016,440	55,580.99	221,096,955
77. Dry Land	4.83	20,750	591.92	1,898,090	240,652.55	879,080,940	241,249.30	880,999,780
78. Grass	3.94	3,525	800.43	1,157,965	36,391.98	55,770,455	37,196.35	56,931,945
79. Waste	0.32	30	51.18	23,350	4,434.85	2,329,730	4,486.35	2,353,110
80. Other	0.00	0	38.45	161,490	5,585.39	22,720,115	5,623.84	22,881,605
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	99.18	0	99.18	0
82. Total	**9.09**	**24,305**	**1,501.57**	**3,321,410**	**342,626.17**	**1,180,917,680**	**344,136.83**	**1,184,263,395**

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	55,580.99	16.15%	221,096,955	18.67%	3,977.92
Dry Land	241,249.30	70.10%	880,999,780	74.39%	3,651.82
Grass	37,196.35	10.81%	56,931,945	4.81%	1,530.58
Waste	4,486.35	1.30%	2,353,110	0.20%	524.50
Other	5,623.84	1.63%	22,881,605	1.93%	4,068.68
Exempt	99.18	0.03%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	**344,136.83**	100.00%	**1,184,263,395**	100.00%	3,441.26

2013 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2012 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

20 Cuming

	2012 CTL County Total	2013 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2013 form 45 - 2012 CTL)	Percent Change	2013 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	210,004,060	215,763,990	5,759,930	2.74%	2,880,095	1.37%
02. Recreational	864,120	1,006,790	142,670	16.51%	0	16.51%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	65,965,550	69,722,405	3,756,855	5.70%	1,167,265	3.93%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	**276,833,730**	**286,493,185**	**9,659,455**	**3.49%**	**4,047,360**	**2.03%**
05. Commercial	62,823,210	63,706,985	883,775	1.41%	748,610	0.22%
06. Industrial	13,892,125	13,895,950	3,825	0.03%	0	0.03%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	75,521,655	79,956,620	4,434,965	5.87%	3,764,610	0.89%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	**152,236,990**	**157,559,555**	**5,322,565**	**3.50%**	**4,513,220**	**0.53%**
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	**429,070,720**	**444,614,950**	**15,544,230**	**3.62%**	**8,560,580**	**1.63%**
11. Irrigated	179,836,855	221,096,955	41,260,100	22.94%		
12. Dryland	739,617,575	880,999,780	141,382,205	19.12%		
13. Grassland	50,189,135	56,931,945	6,742,810	13.43%		
14. Wasteland	1,795,480	2,353,110	557,630	31.06%		
15. Other Agland	19,395,945	22,881,605	3,485,660	17.97%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	**990,834,990**	**1,184,263,395**	**193,428,405**	**19.52%**		
17. Total Value of all Real Property	**1,419,905,710**	**1,628,878,345**	**208,972,635**	**14.72%**	**8,560,580**	**14.11%**
(Locally Assessed)						

CUMING COUNTY ASSESSOR'S OFFICE

Cherie Kreikemeier, Assessor
200 S. Lincoln Street, Room 101
West Point, NE 68788
(402) 372-6000 Fax (402) 372-6013
www.co.cuming.ne.us

Introduction

This Plan of Assessment is required by Law – Section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB 170, Section 5, as amended by Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9. Purpose: Submit plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 each year and the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31 each year. This is to be a 3-year plan.

General Description of Cuming County

Cuming County has a total population of 9,139 (2010 Census Bureau). We are listing 3,772 parcels of Residential property, 29 parcels of Recreational property, 648 parcels as Commercial property, 10 parcels as Industrial property, and 4,749 parcels as Agricultural property. Cuming County also has 269 exempt parcels, 14 TIF parcels, and 1 Nebraska Games & Parks parcel.

Cuming County has approximately 1300 Personal Property Schedules filed each year. We also have approximately 430 Homestead Exemption applications filed each year.

The Assessor's Office has 4 employees, in addition to the Assessor: 1 full-time appraiser, who is 95% in charge of the appraisal process; and 3 full time clerks, who are the all-around helpers. (Lynette Harris works for the Treasures on Fridays and 1 week in April & 1 week in August to help with tax payers) Verdene retired September 2012, at this time we do not plan on filling her vacant position. We will share her duties and may need a little help from the clerks in the Treasurer and Clerk Offices. If need be we may hire a part time clerk. We all share in the responsibilities of collecting information for the real estate, personal property, homestead exemptions, etc.

Education

The Assessor and Appraiser will continue to attend mandated continuing education classes each year. The office employees attend classes and/or seminars as needed. These classes might include: GIS training, appraisal training, assessor's workshops, etc. Our office has also started taking NIRMA classes offered on the internet.

Procedures Manual

Cuming County has a Policies and Procedures Manual which is updated on a continual basis. A copy for review is available in the Assessor's Office at all times.

Responsibilities

Record Maintenance

The Assessor's Office maintains a Cadastral Map in our office. It is kept up-to-date by the Assessor. The background flight is a 1975 aerial photo, which is used, primarily, for ownership records. The actual acre determination is done using the current aerial imagery layer on the GIS maps. Currently we are assessing the number of acres by previous records and/or survey records. There is a

difference between deeded acres and GIS acres. We are currently using the deeded acres for assessment purposes. The Assessor's Office also updates and maintains the Irregular Tract Book for parcel splits. In September 2005, our office started with the GIS Workshop on updating our Cadastral Maps with the GIS system. We have all the parcels labeled, and land use is completed. We are using the GIS for split, transfer, etc. and have been updating the GIS Records as the legal descriptions change.

Property Record Cards

The Rural Property Record Cards were replaced in 1998 and the City Property Record Cards were replaced in 1990 and are in average condition listing 5 or more years of valuation information. In 2010 we developed a new property record card to replace the 1990 cards as we are running out of space for the current years' value. In 2011 we replaced the current residential, commercial and exempt property record cards for the Villages of Bancroft and Beemer, Wisner. The City of West Point residential cards will be replaced for the 2012 tax year. The Wisner commercial cards will also be replaced for the 2012 tax year. In order to make enough room for the transition of new city property record cards, we invested in storage boxes and placed the 1980 –through 1997 rural property cards and the city cards up to 1989 in the downstairs vault. We are also in the process of scanning our assessor sheets of the rural parcels to make more room for the more current years sheets. In the summer of 2010 scanned assessor sheets from 2000 to 2004, in 2013 we are scanning the 2005 and 2006 rural sheets, in 2013 we will scan the 2007 rural sheets, and in 2014 we plan on scanning the 1987-2007 rural house and outbuilding sheets. We may also replace the rural property record cards at this time.

Report Generation

The Assessor timely files all reports due to the proper Government Entities:
Abstract – Due March 19 –Personal Property Abstract – No longer required
Certification of Values – Due to subdivision August 20
School District Taxable Value report – Due August 25
3-Year Plan of Assessments –Due July 31 to County Board, October 31 to PAD
Certificate of Taxes Levied – Due December 1
Generate Tax Roll – Deliver to Treasurer by November 22
Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report – November 22
Tax List Corrections – On an as needed basis

Filing Homestead Exemption Applications
Accept Homestead Applications – after Feb 1 and on\before June 30
Send approved Homestead Exemption Applications to Tax Commissioner-Due August 1

Filling Personal Property
Accept Personal Property Schedules on or before May 1
Apply 10% penalty if filed after May 1 and by July 31
Apply 25% penalty if filed on or after August 1

Centrally Assessed Value
Review valuations certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list in an excel program.

Tax Increment Financing
Management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.

Tax Districts and Tax Rates
Management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process, we work with the Clerk's office.

Real Property

The assessor's office utilizes the CAMA 2000 computer program. CAMA 2000 implements the Marshall& Swift pricing system. We are currently using the 2009 pricing version. We use this program to develop the cost approach and sales comparison approach for all residential properties. Digital photos are taken during inspections, reviews, and pickup. These photos are then labeled by parcel and stored in CAMA. The linking of these digital photos allows us to print digital photos on our sales files and with the property record card. MIPS are presently working on a new CAMA program, which eventually we may have to implement, but at this time the new program cannot print out our new property record cards and they do not have the ability to run comparable sales.

All commercial buildings, agricultural buildings, and anything not priced in CAMA 2000 are manually priced using the 2009 Marshall& Swift pricing manual. Data is entered into Excel spreadsheets to create information/pricing sheets for the properties. We develop the cost, sales comparison, and income approach for commercial properties. Depreciation tables are developed based upon sales for the agricultural properties.

Our review process consists of physical inspections, aerial flights and interior inspections (if possible). Any improvements, changes, or discrepancies are corrected by measuring/remeasuring, collecting data; taking digital photos, comparing the data and entering that data into our computer database/updating our property record card files with updated information. If the property owner is not present, we leave a questionnaire for the property owner to fill out and return to our office or they may call our office with the information. If there continues to be questions, we will set up an appointment to review the property again. We also get information from newspaper listings, sales reviews, broker information, personal knowledge, etc., before placing a value on a parcel.

Our pick-up work is started in late fall and continues until the March deadline for the abstract filing. We use building permits, property owner information sheets, and in-field sightings for adding properties to the property valuation rolls. Our inspections are similar to the reviews, except we provide the property owner (who has reported their improvements) with a written notice that we will be inspecting properties in their township, village, or town. We ask those property owners to call us to set up an appointment. This allows us to schedule our inspections in an orderly fashion and allows the property owner to schedule the appointments around their schedules. The properties, where the owner doesn't schedule an appointment, are inspected as we are in the neighborhood or the area. We also obtain limited information from our Zoning Administrator and Personal Property Schedules.

Sales Review

The Assessor's Office does an in-house sales review. This process includes comparing our property record card file, with any information we obtain during our sales review, and the Property Tax Sales File for any discrepancies. These discrepancies might affect the sale and ultimately the value placed on that property and similar properties.

We use a verification questionnaire which is done by phone, mail or if possible, in person. We visit with either the seller, the buyer or even the broker or lawyer for information pertaining to that particular sale.

County Board of Equalization

The Assessor and Appraiser attend County Board of Equalization meetings for valuation protests.

We review the properties in question a second time and spend lots of valuable time on these extra issues.

TERC

The Assessor and Appraiser spend lots of valuable time in preparing information for TERC Hearings, plus there is lots of extra expense in defending our values. TERC hearings take lots of valuable time away from the office. The Assessor prepares for the TERC Statewide Equalization hearings if applicable to the county to defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC

CUMING COUNTY'S 3-YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN 2012-2014

Rural Residential

In 2010 we completed the process of implementing the 2009 Marshall& Swift pricing and reappraising all rural residences and rural buildings using the aerial imagery photos. During the revaluation process we sent out verification sheets to the property owners in 16 townships. The verification sheets for the rural residential include, but are not limited to: review of home, review of buildings information, and a GIS photo and corresponding land use sheet. These review sheets allow the land owner to verify that we have the correct information about their property. The resulting data collected is inputted and corrected for the homes, outbuildings, and land. The sketches will be checked, and the photos will be printed and attached in the CAMA 2000 system. We were able to implement the current GIS land use in 4 townships for the 2011 tax year and finished the rest of the townships (Wisner, Beemer, Elkhorn, Sherman, & St. Charles) for the 2012 tax year. We completed the revaluation of the rural buildings using an Excel spreadsheet that we have developed with the Marshall& Swift 2009 pricing for 2010 tax year. The Excel program allows us to enter data pertaining to each outbuilding, including the cost, RCN, and depreciation. The values are entered and a Cost approach and Comparable sales approach are developed for every rural residential property.

We took aerial imagery photos (oblique photos) in the year 2006 and 2012. We have received the 2012 aerial imagery. We were disappointed in the quality GIS Workshop made some adjustments to the photos to help with the quality. There were a number of photos missing and/or not user friendly for our appraisal needs. We have sent a list of the parcels that we would like retaken. In 2013 we will start our rural reappraisal by reviewing photos & match buildings in the photos to our property record card information. At this time we will also implement 2012 pricing for the rural outbuilding. We will develop a more definite timeline for reviewing the aerial imagery. This timeline will depend on time restraints due to other projects, the amount of changes necessary and statistical results as to where we will begin the process of the reappraisals. In 2012 – 2014 we plan to continue to monitor market values and add any new improvements or remodeling.

Residential

We updated the Marshall & Swift pricing on all residential properties for 2010 assessment year (using the 2009 Marshall & Swift pricing). For the 2012 assessment we would like to research the $70,000 -$300,000 sales in West Point. We feel we are low on these homes. We will determine if any adjustments are necessary at that time. The Wisner properties were reappraised in 2011 (including converting residential lot pricing to square foot instead of front foot) for the 2009 assessment year.

Beemer's inspection, and pictures were taken summer of 2012 (last inspected 2006), and implemented in the 2013 assessment year. Wisner will be done in 2012 (2013 assessment) (last inspected 2006), West Point in 2013 (2014 assessment) (last inspected 2007), and Bancroft in 2014 (2015 assessment) (last inspected 2007 & 2011). Bancroft is planned for 2014 to get into a routine of reviewing 1 town per year, and developing a 6 year rotation. We may change directions as different situations arise.

In 2012 West Point's and Wisner's excess lots and their values were reviewed. The residential properties values and ratios are monitored on a yearly basis and may need to be revalued to stay within required ratios.

Commercial Property

In 2010 we completed the West Point commercial property appraisal. In 2011 we completed the reappraisal of Bancroft and Beemer. We have completed the Apex sketches for Beemer. In 2012 Beemer & Wisner Commercial digital pictures will be updated when we update the residential digital pictures. We will reappraise West Point in 2014 and Bancroft in 2015. In 2011, we rearranged our Excel commercial sheets to improve their readability. The commercial properties are reappraised using cost, comparable sales (if available), and income approach (if applicable and if we receive adequate income and expense information).

Agricultural Property

GIS Workshop flew Cuming County to update our aerial flights of rural properties in the fall – spring of 2011 and 2012. Retakes will be taken this winter/spring. (Depends upon weather conditions.) It will be 6 years since the last aerial imagery was taken. The proposed cost is $23,000. This cost is to be divided into two equal payments. We feel this is an important tool for equalization of properties (adding buildings that may not be reported, removing buildings that have been removed or are falling over) and providing evidence in eliminating disagreements with property owners.

The office is in the process of updating the cadastral maps to a Geographic Information System (GIS). For the 2010 assessment year we implemented the GIS land use in 6 townships and for the 2011 assessment year we implemented the GIS land use in Logan, Grant, Cleveland and Blaine Townships and finished the remaining townships for the 2012 tax year. After reviewing the properties with the GIS, a copy of the results are mailed to the property owner for review (at the same time we mail out property/building review sheets). GIS was used to determine intensive use areas (feedlots/lagoon areas) during their revaluation. We have found the GIS to be especially helpful in parcel splits (especially metes & bounds), new subdivisions, replats, etc. for correctly valuing properties. Our dependence on the program has grown to the point where the public is a custom to coming in and being able to see their property lines with the area flight. The GIS has cleared up quite a few difficult situations for a number of people. We continue to notice that improvements have been assessed on the incorrect parcels. Recreational land/river properties (trees, river, bluffs, waste, swamp, etc.) will be the most difficult area to revalue (most landowners feel it should not be valued since it doesn't generate revenue). We were able to review the land along the flooded Elkhorn River with the use of the GIS and information from the property owners for the 2011 tax year. We will need to continue to monitor this area and those values. We developed a soil code for the damaged crop ground; it is similar to our sandy soil values. As it comes back into production (removing river sand, trees, etc.) we will need to revalue it. In 2012 removed the flood discount on tree areas. Plan to review the Elkhorn River crop land with new FSA 2012 flight for the 2013 tax year. Review of Land Use: Range 4- 2013, Range 5- 2014, Range 5-2015, Range 6-2016 and Range 7-2017. This may change depending on time available.

We completed the land use data entry for the 2012 assessment year. The GIS has several steps to complete before we will be able to use it to it's full potential, but we believe it will be very beneficial for not only our office, but other county offices as well (i.e. zoning, roads dept, E911, civil defense, and the sheriff's dept). We are very appreciative for the funding of this project. In the future we would like to have the GIS information available on a 2nd computer for public use, courthouse use, or other employees in the office. The 2nd computer would be used for viewing and printing pictures only. It can't be used to edit the information. We would like to look into having our GIS and parcel information on the WEB by 2014. GIS may be applying for Grants that may help pay for the initial cost of the WEB. This would help other departments as they will be able to have a TAB on the WEB.

Our agricultural land values are monitored on a yearly basis, using our sales file. We also monitor the land use (i.e. irrigated, dryland, pasture, etc) using FSA aerial photography layer, inspections, and property owner provided information. We have developed sales files on agricultural land, feedlots, confinement hog buildings, and recreation land. This data & research often provides significant insight into these properties. The knowledge received in reviewing the properties is quite useful in our continued monitoring of the valuations. One example of this insight is depreciation tables being developed for the rural buildings. Another example of this monitoring is the need to review older hog confinement buildings (especially the < 500 head finishing units, and <2500 sow confinement units).We have completed a reappraisal of all farm buildings. May implement 2012 Marshal & Swift pricing on outbuildings for the 2013 assessment year.

In 2010 we implemented the new Soil Conversion and symbols. With the high land values and the new soil codes, we believe it is more important than ever to be very detail oriented with our sales file. (We are currently implementing ways to analyze our agricultural sales.) The unique property characteristics that we are monitoring include: sand spots, alkali spots, wetlands, areas prone to flooding, river/recreational properties, Wetlands Reserve Program, and properties with inaccessible areas. These characteristics are being monitored to determine if any market adjustment is necessary. This will slow up the valuation process of agricultural land, but we want to be as fair and equitable as possible.

Each year we have a significant amount of pickup work (nearly 600 parcels / year). As we inspect a property for new improvements or removal of any improvements, we make a complete inspection of the entire property for any changes. We would rather revalue the property at the same time, rather than returning to the property and irritating the property owner again. (We have enough problems with that, as it is). This does slow up the pickup process significantly, but we feel this is necessary to maintain accurate records.

Cuming County is a very progressive and prosperous agricultural county. The cost of the improvements in the county has increased quite a bit with inflation. Along with those improvements, we have seen the sale of properties, within the county, continue to be very strong and agricultural values have increased significantly over the past few years. This indicates a continual need to monitor the assessed values on an annual basis, as they will also be increasing dramatically. There is also, a significant increase in the number of irrigated acres added each year. In addition, our office has identified numerous cattle yard improvements, such as yards, bunks, lagoons, etc. (most of this is due to DEQ requirements).

Overview

All of the plans listed above for our 3-year assessment process are goals that have been established by the Assessor and her appraisal staff. They are all still contingent on time, state mandates, help and monies budgeted for these years. We would like to also stress that **this is a plan and may need to be changed at any time to address priority issues**.

Our County Board has continued to be very cooperative in allowing the Assessor's Office the equipment and monies needed to keep current in our assessment process. We are quite appreciative of their support and hope to live up to their expectations and ours. Our office realizes how important our job is to correctly value properties for both the property owners and the taxing entities. We work very hard to implement any process that might improve our ability to value all properties fairly and equitably.

Valuing properties is a very important, difficult, and time consuming task, for these reasons it is important to retain good quality employees. Employees of the Assessor's office often need to be knowledgeable about many topics that may impact the assessment process. Since there is **not** a lot of time to spare it is important to avoid employee turnover and retain knowledgeable employees. Because of the importance of the employees to the assessment process, employee salaries account for a majority of the Assessor's budget.

We are currently cross training employees to be able to complete co-workers duties in case of emergencies. The staff is doing a very good job and we feel we are moving forward in every aspect of the office. We hope someday to be caught up, but with the requirements of the office, the technology changes, and the real estate market continually changing, we know that this is nearly impossible.

Respectfully submitted,

Cherie Kreikemeier
Cuming County Assessor's Office

Date: June 27th, 2012
Updated: October 17th, 2012

2013 Assessment Survey for Cuming County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	**Deputy(ies) on staff:**
	0
2.	**Appraiser(s) on staff:**
	1
3.	**Other full-time employees:**
	2
4.	**Other part-time employees:**
5.	**Number of shared employees:**
	1 (Lynette works in our office 4 days a week)
6.	**Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:**
	$229,480.00
7.	**Adopted budget, or granted budget *if different from above*:**
	Same
8.	**Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:**
	Approximately $51,460.00
9.	**If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:**
	NA
10.	**Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:**
	$13,750.00 (GIS), MIPS fees are in the general fund, new computer equipment and repairs come out of my budget
11.	**Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:**
	$2,125.00
12.	**Other miscellaneous funds:**
	$11,025
13.	**Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:**
	$2,464.81 (GIS gave some credit due to selling of our GIS data)

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

	Yes
6.	**Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?**
	Not at this time
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?**
	Yes
3.	**What municipalities in the county are zoned?**
	West Point, Wisner, Beemer, Bancroft
4.	**When was zoning implemented?**
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	**Appraisal Services:**
	N/A
2.	**GIS Services:**
	GIS Workshop
3.	**Other services:**
	MIPS

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	**Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?**
	Not at this time, we may consult different appraisers for general information if needed
2.	**If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?**
	NA
3.	**What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?**
	N/A
4.	**Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?**
	N/A
5.	**Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?**
	N/A

2013 Certification for Cuming County

This is to certify that the 2013 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 Cuming County Assessor.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

STATE OF NEBRASKA
PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR
DEPT. OF REVENUE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT DIVISION