# Table of Contents

Assessment Survey – General Information

**Certification**

**Maps**

Market Areas
Registered Wells > 500 GPM

**Valuation History Charts**

# 2013 Commission Summary

## for Richardson County

**Residential Real Property - Current**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Sales | 156 | Median | 98.20 |
| Total Sales Price | $7,238,641 | Mean | 101.84 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $7,238,641 | Wgt. Mean | 97.32 |
| Total Assessed Value | $7,044,528 | Average Assessed Value of the Base | $36,559 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $46,402 | Avg. Assessed Value | $45,157 |

**Confidence Interval - Current**

| | |
|---|---|
| 95% Median C.I | 95.54 to 100.34 |
| 95% Wgt. Mean C.I | 93.93 to 100.70 |
| 95% Mean C.I | 97.14 to 106.54 |
| % of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the | 15.78 |
| % of Records Sold in the Study Period | 3.66 |
| % of Value Sold in the Study Period | 4.53 |

**Residential Real Property - History**

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2012** | 199 | 95 | 95.41 |
| **2011** | 277 | 96 | 96 |
| **2010** | 265 | 97 | 97 |
| **2009** | 301 | 98 | 98 |

# 2013 Commission Summary

## for Richardson County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Sales | 18 | Median | 94.18 |
| Total Sales Price | $2,749,118 | Mean | 107.41 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $2,749,118 | Wgt. Mean | 67.40 |
| Total Assessed Value | $1,852,902 | Average Assessed Value of the Base | $52,564 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $152,729 | Avg. Assessed Value | $102,939 |

### Confidence Interval - Current

| | |
|---|---|
| 95% Median C.I | 72.27 to 106.00 |
| 95% Wgt. Mean C.I | 58.50 to 76.30 |
| 95% Mean C.I | 73.48 to 141.34 |
| % of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 3.26 |
| % of Records Sold in the Study Period | 2.94 |
| % of Value Sold in the Study Period | 5.76 |

### Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2012** | 25 | | 97.70 |
| **2011** | 38 | 94 | 94 |
| **2010** | 46 | 96 | 96 |
| **2009** | 43 | 97 | 97 |

# 2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Richardson 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** | **98** | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices. | No recommendation. |
| | | | |
| **Commercial Real Property** | ***NEI** | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices. | No recommendation. |
| | | | |
| **Agricultural Land** | **69** | 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 Richardson County

***RESIDENTIAL - CITIES***

The appraiser completed a review and reappraisal for the following areas or property types:

- City of Falls City

**Reappraisal procedures enacted:**

Field review and photo inventory of all subject properties was completed.

Cost approach

- Market value review of vacant land and update if necessary
- Update physical & functional depreciation on all improvements from observations.
- Review current economic depreciation for area and update if necessary

The county verified sales and completed a statistical analysis of the class. The County completed all pick up and permit work for 2013.

# 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Richardson County

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | **Valuation data collection done by:** |
| | Contracted Individuals |
| 2. | **List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:** |

| Valuation Grouping | Description of unique characteristics |
|---|---|
| | The County feels that each town has its own unique market and each offer distinct amenities that affect the market values of the residential properties. They also have an appraisal cycle set up to review each location. In their analysis a market study is set up to follow these valuation groups. |
| 01 | Falls City |
| 02 | Dawson |
| 03 | Humboldt |
| 04 | Stella |
| 05 | Salem |
| 06 | Rulo |
| 07 | Verdon |
| 08 | Shubert |
| 11 | Acreages |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. | **List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.** |
| | Cost Approach and Market Analysis. The county uses the Cost approach and arrives at market value by making adjustments for items of depreciation. |
| 4 | **What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?** |
| | Falls City uses 2012, Shubert, Stella and Dawson use 2011, Humboldt 2010, while the rest of the valuation groups are using 2008 costing. |
| 5. | **If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?** |
| | The County utilizes local market information in developing the depreciation tables. |
| 6. | **Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?** |
| | Yes, They are reviewed during the reappraisal cycle. |
| 7. | **When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?** |
| | The County reviews the statistical analysis and if areas of concern arise they will adjust the depreciation tables. |
| 8. | **When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?** |
| | Following the assessment cycle the county reviews the lot value and conducts a study in conjunction with the review of the improvements. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 9. | **Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?** |
| | The County completes a market analysis on the vacant land sales and uses an allocation procedure on improved sales to verify the results of the vacant land analysis. |

**74 Richardson**

**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 : | 156 | MEDIAN : | 98 | COV : 29.39 | 95% Median C.I. : 95.54 to 100.34 |
| Total Sales Price : | 7,238,641 | WGT. MEAN : | 97 | STD : 29.93 | 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.93 to 100.70 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : | 7,238,641 | MEAN : | 102 | Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.54 | 95% Mean C.I. : 97.14 to 106.54 |
| Total Assessed Value : | 7,044,528 | | | | |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : | 46,402 | COD : | 18.88 | MAX Sales Ratio : 273.64 | |
| Avg. Assessed Value : | 45,157 | PRD : | 104.64 | MIN Sales Ratio : 52.58 | *Printed:3/26/2013 9:54:02AM* |

**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 | 18 | 90.86 | 93.44 | 94.67 | 15.21 | 98.70 | 56.01 | 131.47 | 82.71 to 108.13 | 54,692 | 51,776 |
| 01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11 | 16 | 98.48 | 100.71 | 100.57 | 20.39 | 100.14 | 52.86 | 167.25 | 78.88 to 114.59 | 47,206 | 47,476 |
| 01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11 | 7 | 96.74 | 100.71 | 93.72 | 14.76 | 107.46 | 68.26 | 138.17 | 68.26 to 138.17 | 43,757 | 41,009 |
| 01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11 | 29 | 99.00 | 107.29 | 97.36 | 19.82 | 110.20 | 52.58 | 257.92 | 95.54 to 107.65 | 47,974 | 46,709 |
| 01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11 | 14 | 103.48 | 101.37 | 101.49 | 15.06 | 99.88 | 69.71 | 153.44 | 83.68 to 115.11 | 44,107 | 44,762 |
| 01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12 | 21 | 102.30 | 110.70 | 98.97 | 29.63 | 111.85 | 55.99 | 273.64 | 84.19 to 120.49 | 33,538 | 33,194 |
| 01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12 | 26 | 98.17 | 97.82 | 95.07 | 10.61 | 102.89 | 64.69 | 135.31 | 89.93 to 103.69 | 48,809 | 46,403 |
| 01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12 | 25 | 94.87 | 99.62 | 97.57 | 19.02 | 102.10 | 67.61 | 213.10 | 86.01 to 105.35 | 48,421 | 47,244 |
| _____Study Yrs_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11 | 70 | 97.86 | 101.57 | 96.97 | 18.80 | 104.74 | 52.58 | 257.92 | 92.73 to 100.06 | 49,104 | 47,617 |
| 01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12 | 86 | 98.33 | 102.06 | 97.63 | 18.98 | 104.54 | 55.99 | 273.64 | 94.87 to 103.26 | 44,202 | 43,155 |
| _____Calendar Yrs_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11 | 66 | 98.95 | 103.74 | 98.62 | 18.66 | 105.19 | 52.58 | 257.92 | 96.11 to 106.30 | 46,520 | 45,877 |
| _____ALL_____ | 156 | 98.20 | 101.84 | 97.32 | 18.88 | 104.64 | 52.58 | 273.64 | 95.54 to 100.34 | 46,402 | 45,157 |

**VALUATION GROUPING**

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | 86 | 98.20 | 100.81 | 99.17 | 12.78 | 101.65 | 60.80 | 159.32 | 95.54 to 102.30 | 52,276 | 51,842 |
| 02 | 4 | 82.49 | 83.69 | 80.11 | 12.27 | 104.47 | 71.19 | 98.58 | N/A | 23,000 | 18,426 |
| 03 | 26 | 99.61 | 106.04 | 91.15 | 26.67 | 116.34 | 60.59 | 257.92 | 85.58 to 116.89 | 32,564 | 29,681 |
| 04 | 5 | 105.66 | 122.57 | 98.88 | 31.12 | 123.96 | 67.31 | 213.10 | N/A | 22,300 | 22,051 |
| 05 | 3 | 60.60 | 63.25 | 62.10 | 09.42 | 101.85 | 56.01 | 73.15 | N/A | 16,333 | 10,143 |
| 06 | 4 | 108.04 | 98.39 | 109.28 | 19.39 | 90.03 | 55.99 | 121.49 | N/A | 39,875 | 43,574 |
| 07 | 5 | 127.29 | 109.87 | 90.84 | 28.09 | 120.95 | 52.86 | 167.25 | N/A | 29,400 | 26,706 |
| 08 | 7 | 98.04 | 98.61 | 99.45 | 02.69 | 99.16 | 94.90 | 102.71 | 94.90 to 102.71 | 18,243 | 18,143 |
| 11 | 16 | 93.89 | 105.63 | 96.33 | 30.46 | 109.65 | 52.58 | 273.64 | 72.88 to 114.85 | 75,594 | 72,823 |
| _____ALL_____ | 156 | 98.20 | 101.84 | 97.32 | 18.88 | 104.64 | 52.58 | 273.64 | 95.54 to 100.34 | 46,402 | 45,157 |

**PROPERTY TYPE ***

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | 155 | 98.10 | 101.77 | 97.27 | 18.93 | 104.63 | 52.58 | 273.64 | 95.54 to 100.34 | 46,553 | 45,282 |
| 06 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 07 | 1 | 112.47 | 112.47 | 112.47 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 112.47 | 112.47 | N/A | 23,000 | 25,869 |
| _____ALL_____ | 156 | 98.20 | 101.84 | 97.32 | 18.88 | 104.64 | 52.58 | 273.64 | 95.54 to 100.34 | 46,402 | 45,157 |

**74 Richardson**

**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 : | 156 | MEDIAN : | 98 | COV : | 29.39 |
| Total Sales Price : | 7,238,641 | WGT. MEAN : | 97 | STD : | 29.93 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : | 7,238,641 | MEAN : | 102 | Avg. Abs. Dev : | 18.54 |
| Total Assessed Value : | 7,044,528 | | | | |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : | 46,402 | COD : | 18.88 | MAX Sales Ratio : | 273.64 |
| Avg. Assessed Value : | 45,157 | PRD : | 104.64 | MIN Sales Ratio : | 52.58 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 95% Median C.I. : | 95.54 to 100.34 | |
| 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : | 93.93 to 100.70 | |
| 95% Mean C.I. : | 97.14 to 106.54 | |
| | | *Printed:3/26/2013 9:54:02AM* |

**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 | 2 | 201.41 | 201.41 | 197.38 | 28.06 | 102.04 | 144.90 | 257.92 | N/A | 2,800 | 5,527 |
| Less Than 15,000 | 30 | 110.17 | 122.23 | 115.60 | 28.83 | 105.74 | 55.99 | 273.64 | 98.30 to 132.00 | 8,992 | 10,395 |
| Less Than 30,000 | 73 | 102.07 | 111.23 | 106.89 | 23.81 | 104.06 | 52.86 | 273.64 | 98.04 to 109.56 | 16,125 | 17,236 |
| __Ranges Excl. Low $__ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greater Than 4,999 | 154 | 98.07 | 100.55 | 97.24 | 17.78 | 103.40 | 52.58 | 273.64 | 95.54 to 100.06 | 46,968 | 45,672 |
| Greater Than 14,999 | 126 | 96.39 | 96.99 | 96.61 | 15.47 | 100.39 | 52.58 | 167.25 | 92.73 to 98.89 | 55,309 | 53,434 |
| Greater Than 29,999 | 83 | 95.25 | 93.58 | 95.46 | 13.52 | 98.03 | 52.58 | 133.05 | 90.06 to 98.64 | 73,030 | 69,714 |
| __Incremental Ranges__ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 TO 4,999 | 2 | 201.41 | 201.41 | 197.38 | 28.06 | 102.04 | 144.90 | 257.92 | N/A | 2,800 | 5,527 |
| 5,000 TO 14,999 | 28 | 107.16 | 116.58 | 113.87 | 25.63 | 102.38 | 55.99 | 273.64 | 96.24 to 126.75 | 9,434 | 10,742 |
| 15,000 TO 29,999 | 43 | 98.75 | 103.56 | 104.30 | 18.50 | 99.29 | 52.86 | 167.25 | 94.90 to 107.80 | 21,102 | 22,009 |
| 30,000 TO 59,999 | 39 | 89.93 | 90.12 | 89.94 | 13.74 | 100.20 | 60.59 | 123.63 | 82.96 to 97.62 | 44,442 | 39,969 |
| 60,000 TO 99,999 | 28 | 96.14 | 94.01 | 93.44 | 14.72 | 100.61 | 52.58 | 121.49 | 88.56 to 106.66 | 76,299 | 71,298 |
| 100,000 TO 149,999 | 13 | 98.36 | 100.60 | 101.43 | 08.78 | 99.18 | 82.57 | 133.05 | 90.23 to 109.26 | 121,185 | 122,915 |
| 150,000 TO 249,999 | 2 | 110.15 | 110.15 | 110.71 | 03.79 | 99.49 | 105.97 | 114.32 | N/A | 176,250 | 195,125 |
| 250,000 TO 499,999 | 1 | 92.06 | 92.06 | 92.06 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 92.06 | 92.06 | N/A | 264,000 | 243,038 |
| 500,000 TO 999,999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1,000,000 + | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _____ALL_____ | 156 | 98.20 | 101.84 | 97.32 | 18.88 | 104.64 | 52.58 | 273.64 | 95.54 to 100.34 | 46,402 | 45,157 |

## A. Residential Real Property

Richardson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Falls City which is located towards the southeast corner of the County. Richardson is bordered to the south by the state of Kansas and to the east by Missouri. Nemaha County is directly north and Pawnee County is to the west. Richardson County has seen a decline of over a thousand people over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat.

The sales file consists of 156 qualified residential sales and is considered to be an adequate sample for the residential class of property. Of the measures of central tendency only the mean is outside the acceptable range and only by 2 points. These measures of central tendency show a total range of 5 points and demonstrate moderate support for the overall median. The quality statistics are both slightly above the recommended range. In the sales file there are 32 sales with a sale price of 15,000 dollars or less that affect all of the statistical measures. Both of the qualitative statistics are within the recommended range after the removal of these lower dollar sales.

Richardson County employs outside individuals to help with the appraisal functions in the county. They are used for listing properties and also reviewing sales and conducting sales analysis. The counties valuation groups represent the assessor locations in the county and they represent the appraisal cycle of the county more than unique markets. The county has also hired another staff person in the office, the former deputy assessor.

Richardson County has a consistent procedure for sales verification. In reviewing the non-qualified sales the county has noted in the file the reason for all sale disqualifications. The County utilizes an acceptable portion of available sales and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file. The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one–third of the counties each year to systematically review assessment practices. This review was completed in 2011 for Richardson County. Since that time the county has improved the documentation for inspections in the file along with the reasons for sale disqualification. The assessment practices are reliable and are being applied consistently.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 98% of market value for the residential 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.

# 2013 Commercial Assessment Actions for Richardson County

The county verified sales and conducted an analysis of the class.

**Pickup work.**

New construction in the commercial class was completed for the ***entire*** county by reviewing all building permits as well as observed construction without a permit and then adding or subtracting appropriate market & equalized value for the change within the appraisal system.

# 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Richardson County

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | **Valuation data collection done by:** |
| | Contract Appraiser |
| 2. | **List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:** |

| Valuation Grouping | Description of unique characteristics |
|---|---|
| | Each of the following valuation groups , demonstrate their own unique market factors. The groups also reflect the appraisal cycle that the County follows as evidenced by the three year plan and the six year inspection cycle. |
| 01 | Falls City |
| 02 | Humboldt |
| 03 | Remainder of the county. |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. | **List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.** |
| | The cost approach is a basis for value with adjustments in depreciation to arrive at market value. |
| 3a. | **Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.** |
| | Along with the cost approach the county relies on sales of similar property outside the county. The county then applies multipliers to adjust to the local market of commercial properties. |
| 4. | **What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?** |
| | 2008 |
| 5. | **If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?** |
| | The County develops depreciation tables based on the local market. |
| 6. | **Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?** |
| | The County develops depreciations tables for each valuation group as they are reviewed and re-appraised. |
| 7. | **When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?** |
| | They were updated at the time of the last review in 2008. |
| 8. | **When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?** |
| | 2008 |
| 9. | **Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.** |
| | The county uses a sq. ft method derived from vacant lot sales. |

**74 Richardson**

**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 : | 18 | MEDIAN : | 94 | COV : 63.51 | 95% Median C.I. : 72.27 to 106.00 |
| Total Sales Price : | 2,749,118 | WGT. MEAN : | 67 | STD : 68.22 | 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.50 to 76.30 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : | 2,749,118 | MEAN : | 107 | Avg. Abs. Dev : 34.68 | 95% Mean C.I. : 73.48 to 141.34 |
| Total Assessed Value : | 1,852,902 | | | | |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : | 152,729 | COD : | 36.82 | MAX Sales Ratio : 352.03 | |
| Avg. Assessed Value : | 102,939 | PRD : | 159.36 | MIN Sales Ratio : 34.22 | *Printed:3/26/2013 9:54:03AM* |

**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 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10 | 1 | 87.99 | 87.99 | 87.99 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 87.99 | 87.99 | N/A | 15,000 | 13,198 |
| 01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10 | 4 | 99.03 | 98.36 | 101.26 | 04.69 | 97.14 | 89.37 | 106.00 | N/A | 13,792 | 13,966 |
| 01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11 | 2 | 116.16 | 116.16 | 145.99 | 37.78 | 79.57 | 72.27 | 160.04 | N/A | 9,375 | 13,687 |
| 01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11 | 3 | 96.26 | 116.07 | 119.68 | 23.30 | 96.98 | 92.34 | 159.62 | N/A | 25,900 | 30,998 |
| 01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11 | 2 | 70.27 | 70.27 | 63.41 | 10.23 | 110.82 | 63.08 | 77.45 | N/A | 1,182,500 | 749,862 |
| 01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11 | 3 | 65.99 | 70.33 | 56.78 | 38.67 | 123.86 | 34.22 | 110.78 | N/A | 43,333 | 24,603 |
| 01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12 | 2 | 211.96 | 211.96 | 105.50 | 66.09 | 200.91 | 71.88 | 352.03 | N/A | 31,250 | 32,968 |
| 01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12 | 1 | 96.02 | 96.02 | 96.02 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 96.02 | 96.02 | N/A | 25,000 | 24,005 |
| _____Study Yrs_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10 | 1 | 87.99 | 87.99 | 87.99 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 87.99 | 87.99 | N/A | 15,000 | 13,198 |
| 01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11 | 11 | 96.26 | 101.32 | 66.60 | 21.65 | 152.13 | 63.08 | 160.04 | 72.27 to 159.62 | 228,783 | 152,359 |
| 01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12 | 6 | 83.95 | 121.82 | 75.29 | 76.78 | 161.80 | 34.22 | 352.03 | 34.22 to 352.03 | 36,250 | 27,292 |
| _____Calendar Yrs_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10 | 5 | 98.06 | 96.28 | 98.42 | 05.84 | 97.83 | 87.99 | 106.00 | N/A | 14,034 | 13,812 |
| 01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11 | 10 | 84.90 | 93.21 | 65.36 | 36.04 | 142.61 | 34.22 | 160.04 | 63.08 to 159.62 | 259,145 | 169,390 |
| _____ALL_____ | 18 | 94.18 | 107.41 | 67.40 | 36.82 | 159.36 | 34.22 | 352.03 | 72.27 to 106.00 | 152,729 | 102,939 |

**VALUATION GROUPING**

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | 10 | 94.18 | 122.32 | 67.14 | 45.20 | 182.19 | 63.08 | 352.03 | 65.99 to 159.62 | 250,670 | 168,308 |
| 02 | 4 | 97.16 | 107.95 | 96.41 | 21.72 | 111.97 | 77.45 | 160.04 | N/A | 25,563 | 24,644 |
| 03 | 4 | 72.08 | 69.59 | 50.83 | 22.95 | 136.91 | 34.22 | 100.00 | N/A | 35,042 | 17,812 |
| _____ALL_____ | 18 | 94.18 | 107.41 | 67.40 | 36.82 | 159.36 | 34.22 | 352.03 | 72.27 to 106.00 | 152,729 | 102,939 |

**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 | 18 | 94.18 | 107.41 | 67.40 | 36.82 | 159.36 | 34.22 | 352.03 | 72.27 to 106.00 | 152,729 | 102,939 |
| 04 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _____ALL_____ | 18 | 94.18 | 107.41 | 67.40 | 36.82 | 159.36 | 34.22 | 352.03 | 72.27 to 106.00 | 152,729 | 102,939 |

**74 Richardson**

**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 : 18 | MEDIAN : 94 | COV : 63.51 | 95% Median C.I. : 72.27 to 106.00 |
| Total Sales Price : 2,749,118 | WGT. MEAN : 67 | STD : 68.22 | 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.50 to 76.30 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,749,118 | MEAN : 107 | Avg. Abs. Dev : 34.68 | 95% Mean C.I. : 73.48 to 141.34 |
| Total Assessed Value : 1,852,902 | | | |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 152,729 | COD : 36.82 | MAX Sales Ratio : 352.03 | |
| Avg. Assessed Value : 102,939 | PRD : 159.36 | MIN Sales Ratio : 34.22 | *Printed:3/26/2013 9:54:03AM* |

**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 | 3 | 89.37 | 87.21 | 85.91 | 10.34 | 101.51 | 72.27 | 100.00 | N/A | 2,723 | 2,339 |
| Less Than 15,000 | 5 | 96.26 | 141.99 | 178.98 | 60.34 | 79.33 | 72.27 | 352.03 | N/A | 4,434 | 7,935 |
| Less Than 30,000 | 11 | 96.26 | 120.37 | 112.43 | 38.20 | 107.06 | 65.99 | 352.03 | 72.27 to 160.04 | 13,447 | 15,118 |
| __Ranges Excl. Low $__ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greater Than 4,999 | 15 | 96.02 | 111.45 | 67.34 | 40.95 | 165.50 | 34.22 | 352.03 | 71.88 to 110.78 | 182,730 | 123,059 |
| Greater Than 14,999 | 13 | 92.34 | 94.11 | 66.49 | 27.49 | 141.54 | 34.22 | 160.04 | 65.99 to 110.78 | 209,765 | 139,479 |
| Greater Than 29,999 | 7 | 77.45 | 87.05 | 64.84 | 35.70 | 134.25 | 34.22 | 159.62 | 34.22 to 159.62 | 371,600 | 240,943 |
| __Incremental Ranges__ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 TO 4,999 | 3 | 89.37 | 87.21 | 85.91 | 10.34 | 101.51 | 72.27 | 100.00 | N/A | 2,723 | 2,339 |
| 5,000 TO 14,999 | 2 | 224.15 | 224.15 | 233.28 | 57.06 | 96.09 | 96.26 | 352.03 | N/A | 7,000 | 16,330 |
| 15,000 TO 29,999 | 6 | 97.04 | 102.35 | 100.69 | 19.60 | 101.65 | 65.99 | 160.04 | 65.99 to 160.04 | 20,958 | 21,104 |
| 30,000 TO 59,999 | 5 | 92.34 | 102.41 | 95.69 | 26.22 | 107.02 | 71.88 | 159.62 | N/A | 42,240 | 40,420 |
| 60,000 TO 99,999 | 1 | 34.22 | 34.22 | 34.22 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 34.22 | 34.22 | N/A | 80,000 | 27,379 |
| 100,000 TO 149,999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 150,000 TO 249,999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 250,000 TO 499,999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 500,000 TO 999,999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1,000,000 + | 1 | 63.08 | 63.08 | 63.08 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 63.08 | 63.08 | N/A | 2,310,000 | 1,457,125 |
| _____ALL_____ | 18 | 94.18 | 107.41 | 67.40 | 36.82 | 159.36 | 34.22 | 352.03 | 72.27 to 106.00 | 152,729 | 102,939 |

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Blank | 2 | 76.99 | 76.99 | 75.42 | 14.29 | 102.08 | 65.99 | 87.99 | N/A | 17,500 | 13,198 |
| 313 | 1 | 63.08 | 63.08 | 63.08 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 63.08 | 63.08 | N/A | 2,310,000 | 1,457,125 |
| 325 | 1 | 71.88 | 71.88 | 71.88 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 71.88 | 71.88 | N/A | 55,000 | 39,533 |
| 344 | 3 | 106.00 | 114.36 | 106.92 | 25.84 | 106.96 | 77.45 | 159.62 | N/A | 37,067 | 39,633 |
| 350 | 2 | 65.24 | 65.24 | 38.89 | 47.55 | 167.76 | 34.22 | 96.26 | N/A | 43,250 | 16,818 |
| 353 | 6 | 94.18 | 93.46 | 98.08 | 09.34 | 95.29 | 72.27 | 110.78 | 72.27 to 110.78 | 17,195 | 16,865 |
| 404 | 1 | 352.03 | 352.03 | 352.03 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 352.03 | 352.03 | N/A | 7,500 | 26,402 |
| 470 | 1 | 160.04 | 160.04 | 160.04 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 160.04 | 160.04 | N/A | 15,750 | 25,206 |
| 528 | 1 | 98.06 | 98.06 | 98.06 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 98.06 | 98.06 | N/A | 25,000 | 24,515 |
| _____ALL_____ | 18 | 94.18 | 107.41 | 67.40 | 36.82 | 159.36 | 34.22 | 352.03 | 72.27 to 106.00 | 152,729 | 102,939 |

## A. Commercial Real Property

Richardson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Falls City which is located towards the southeast corner of the County. Richardson is bordered to the south by the state of Kansas and to the east by Missouri. Nemaha County is directly north and Pawnee County is to the west. Richardson County has seen a decline of over a thousand people over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat.

The 2013 Richardson County commercial statistical profile reveals a total of 18 qualified commercial sales to be used as a sample for the three-year study period. The calculated median is 94. The profile indicates that two of the three measures of central tendency are outside the acceptable range. Regarding the qualitative statistical measures, the COD and the PRD are both above the recommended range. The valuation group of 01(Falls City) has the largest number of sales (10) but the COD is well outside the recommended range. It is determined that there is not enough information available to call a level of value.

The sample is not representative of the population as a whole even though the contract appraiser has tried to utilize as many sales as available. There are only eight occupancies in the qualified sales, making one question the representativeness. The contract appraiser conducted a statistical analysis of the commercial sales and determined that no adjustment was warranted for 2013. The appraiser conducts a physical inspection in conjunction with the sales verification for the commercial parcels.

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

## B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of real property.

The Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

## C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization. The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

## D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.
Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.
Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

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 Richardson County

Irrigated, dry, grass, and timber land values increased approximately 12% overall to achieve a median of 70%. The quality statistics generated from this change are typical for the volatile agricultural land sales market in these economic times.

Pickup work for new construction was completed for the ***entire*** county by reviewing all building permits as well as observed construction without a permit and then adding or subtracting appropriate market & equalized value for the change within the appraisal system.

# 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Richardson County

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | **Valuation data collection done by:** |
| | Staff |
| 2. | **List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.** |

| Market Area | Description of unique characteristics |
|---|---|
| 50 | Richardson County considers the entire County as one market area. |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3. | **Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.** |
| | The reviews all areas in the county to determine if there is enough information available to determine if there are characteristics that affect the market differently from one location to the next. Typically they will review the sales /assessment ratio on sales in the various townships in the county to see if the market value is different or tends to trend in one direction or the other. During the review the county remains cognizant of the time frame of the sales as well as the impact of different land uses. |
| 4. | **Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.** |
| | The county puts the most weight on the present use of the parcel. The county uses a sales verification system to inquire of any anticipated changes to the parcel, and the motivation of the buyers. |
| 5. | **Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?** |
| | No, farm home site 10,000, rural res 10,600 |
| 6. | **Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.** |
| | The sales verification process is used to monitor any influences. |
| 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.** |
| | **No** |
| 8. | **If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.** |
| | The county uses WRP sales from within the county to arrive at values for the parcels. |

**74 Richardson**

**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 : 76 | MEDIAN : 69 | COV : 32.09 | 95% Median C.I. : 62.05 to 74.91 |
| Total Sales Price : 33,308,298 | WGT. MEAN : 64 | STD : 22.57 | 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : 33,614,965 | MEAN : 70 | Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.94 | 95% Mean C.I. : 65.26 to 75.40 |
| Total Assessed Value : 21,665,914 | | | |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 442,302 | COD : 24.53 | MAX Sales Ratio : 140.89 | |
| Avg. Assessed Value : 285,078 | PRD : 109.12 | MIN Sales Ratio : 14.82 | *Printed:3/26/2013 9:54:03AM* |

**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 | 5 | 91.80 | 89.60 | 81.47 | 17.65 | 109.98 | 65.15 | 117.34 | N/A | 165,116 | 134,528 |
| 01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10 | 12 | 69.57 | 75.80 | 77.33 | 15.45 | 98.02 | 54.28 | 104.88 | 66.64 to 87.69 | 479,020 | 370,439 |
| 01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10 | 3 | 71.72 | 80.02 | 72.47 | 18.68 | 110.42 | 64.06 | 104.27 | N/A | 341,667 | 247,604 |
| 01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10 | 6 | 78.89 | 86.28 | 83.42 | 13.45 | 103.43 | 71.83 | 126.97 | 71.83 to 126.97 | 318,214 | 265,469 |
| 01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10 | 12 | 78.94 | 80.19 | 73.42 | 21.61 | 109.22 | 39.92 | 140.89 | 59.47 to 96.84 | 352,177 | 258,569 |
| 01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11 | 9 | 71.95 | 68.03 | 58.92 | 19.12 | 115.46 | 37.80 | 103.66 | 50.22 to 80.69 | 757,700 | 446,440 |
| 01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11 | 2 | 49.74 | 49.74 | 61.97 | 30.30 | 80.26 | 34.67 | 64.80 | N/A | 469,000 | 290,650 |
| 01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11 | 1 | 60.47 | 60.47 | 60.47 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 60.47 | 60.47 | N/A | 732,000 | 442,675 |
| 01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11 | 8 | 59.15 | 60.14 | 56.75 | 13.47 | 105.97 | 46.50 | 81.74 | 46.50 to 81.74 | 581,686 | 330,134 |
| 01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12 | 6 | 59.21 | 65.83 | 60.96 | 24.32 | 107.99 | 40.84 | 97.25 | 40.84 to 97.25 | 302,500 | 184,407 |
| 01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12 | 7 | 57.25 | 62.38 | 58.68 | 22.32 | 106.31 | 46.50 | 104.30 | 46.50 to 104.30 | 211,714 | 124,237 |
| 01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12 | 5 | 30.53 | 36.52 | 42.15 | 45.66 | 86.64 | 14.82 | 64.63 | N/A | 688,190 | 290,087 |
| _____Study Yrs_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10 | 26 | 76.98 | 81.36 | 78.39 | 17.52 | 103.79 | 54.28 | 126.97 | 69.26 to 87.69 | 365,696 | 286,675 |
| 01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11 | 24 | 72.39 | 72.27 | 64.05 | 23.48 | 112.83 | 34.67 | 140.89 | 59.47 to 80.22 | 529,809 | 339,365 |
| 01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12 | 26 | 57.29 | 57.52 | 53.26 | 24.30 | 108.00 | 14.82 | 104.30 | 47.41 to 61.28 | 438,132 | 233,369 |
| _____Calendar Yrs_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10 | 33 | 77.06 | 79.68 | 76.57 | 18.22 | 104.06 | 39.92 | 140.89 | 69.87 to 81.05 | 391,171 | 299,507 |
| 01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11 | 20 | 60.19 | 62.67 | 58.46 | 19.60 | 107.20 | 34.67 | 103.66 | 55.69 to 71.95 | 657,139 | 384,150 |
| _____ALL_____ | 76 | 69.06 | 70.33 | 64.45 | 24.53 | 109.12 | 14.82 | 140.89 | 62.05 to 74.91 | 442,302 | 285,078 |

**AREA (MARKET)**

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50 | 76 | 69.06 | 70.33 | 64.45 | 24.53 | 109.12 | 14.82 | 140.89 | 62.05 to 74.91 | 442,302 | 285,078 |
| _____ALL_____ | 76 | 69.06 | 70.33 | 64.45 | 24.53 | 109.12 | 14.82 | 140.89 | 62.05 to 74.91 | 442,302 | 285,078 |

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| _____Dry_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 7 | 77.06 | 72.95 | 70.99 | 12.87 | 102.76 | 57.25 | 87.69 | 57.25 to 87.69 | 453,958 | 322,261 |
| 50 | 7 | 77.06 | 72.95 | 70.99 | 12.87 | 102.76 | 57.25 | 87.69 | 57.25 to 87.69 | 453,958 | 322,261 |
| _____Grass_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 1 | 56.14 | 56.14 | 56.14 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 56.14 | 56.14 | N/A | 455,000 | 255,458 |
| 50 | 1 | 56.14 | 56.14 | 56.14 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 56.14 | 56.14 | N/A | 455,000 | 255,458 |
| _____ALL_____ | 76 | 69.06 | 70.33 | 64.45 | 24.53 | 109.12 | 14.82 | 140.89 | 62.05 to 74.91 | 442,302 | 285,078 |

**74 Richardson**

**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 : | 76 | MEDIAN : | 69 | COV : | 32.09 |
| Total Sales Price : | 33,308,298 | WGT. MEAN : | 64 | STD : | 22.57 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : | 33,614,965 | MEAN : | 70 | Avg. Abs. Dev : | 16.94 |
| Total Assessed Value : | 21,665,914 | | | | |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : | 442,302 | COD : | 24.53 | MAX Sales Ratio : | 140.89 |
| Avg. Assessed Value : | 285,078 | PRD : | 109.12 | MIN Sales Ratio : | 14.82 |

| 95% Median C.I. : | 62.05 to 74.91 |
|---|---|
| 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : | |
| 95% Mean C.I. : | 65.26 to 75.40 |

*Printed:3/26/2013 9:54:03AM*

**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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| _____Dry_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 39 | 71.72 | 73.67 | 68.11 | 19.48 | 108.16 | 46.50 | 140.89 | 64.63 to 78.91 | 468,372 | 319,025 |
| 50 | 39 | 71.72 | 73.67 | 68.11 | 19.48 | 108.16 | 46.50 | 140.89 | 64.63 to 78.91 | 468,372 | 319,025 |
| _____Grass_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 2 | 64.48 | 64.48 | 62.06 | 12.93 | 103.90 | 56.14 | 72.82 | N/A | 352,500 | 218,749 |
| 50 | 2 | 64.48 | 64.48 | 62.06 | 12.93 | 103.90 | 56.14 | 72.82 | N/A | 352,500 | 218,749 |
| _____ALL_____ | 76 | 69.06 | 70.33 | 64.45 | 24.53 | 109.12 | 14.82 | 140.89 | 62.05 to 74.91 | 442,302 | 285,078 |

# Richardson County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

| County | Mkt Area | 1A1 | 1A | 2A1 | 2A | 3A1 | 3A | 4A1 | 4A | AVG IRR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Richardson | 50 | 3,735 | 3,670 | 3,146 | 3,310 | 2,877 | 2,455 | 1,920 | 1,870 | 3,113 |
| Pawnee | 1 | 3,010 | 3,360 | N/A | 2,880 | 2,630 | N/A | 1,975 | 1,975 | 2,875 |
| Nemaha | 8300 | 4,750 | 4,750 | 3,750 | 3,000 | 2,625 | 3,735 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 3,406 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| County | Mkt Area | 1D1 | 1D | 2D1 | 2D | 3D1 | 3D | 4D1 | 4D | AVG DRY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Richardson | 50 | 3,277 | 3,064 | 2,805 | 2,847 | 2,806 | 2,777 | 2,433 | 1,920 | 2,826 |
| Pawnee | 1 | 2,510 | 2,800 | 2,567 | 2,400 | 2,190 | 1,900 | 1,645 | 1,645 | 2,219 |
| Nemaha | 8300 | 3,789 | 3,800 | 2,994 | 2,400 | 2,100 | 2,909 | 1,600 | 1,600 | 2,610 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| County | Mkt Area | 1G1 | 1G | 2G1 | 2G | 3G1 | 3G | 4G1 | 4G | AVG GRASS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Richardson | 50 | 1,089 | 1,216 | 913 | 1,064 | 1,030 | 976 | 932 | 774 | 950 |
| Pawnee | 1 | 1,430 | 1,587 | 1,077 | 1,383 | 1,272 | 1,134 | 1,196 | 1,031 | 1,254 |
| Nemaha | 8300 | 1,719 | 2,021 | 1,906 | 1,160 | 1,200 | 1,157 | 982 | 830 | 1,161 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

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

**Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation**

## A. Agricultural Land

Richardson County is located in the southeast corner of Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Falls City which is located towards the southeast corner of the County. Richardson is bordered to the south by the state of Kansas and to the east by Missouri. Nemaha County is directly north and Pawnee County is to the west. The agricultural market in the County along with the area and state is seeing a rapid increase and has for the past several years.

Richardson County is predominately dry crop land, (71%) with the balance of pasture. There is very little irrigation in the County. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted for accuracy of the market area determination. In reviewing the qualification of the sales there is no evidence of excessive trimming. While not all non-qualified sales have assessor comments there is a numeric code that is used in cases of family sales or exempt transfers that correlates with the usability of the sales.

For 2013 there are 76 agricultural sales in the statistical profile. Two measures of central tendency are in the range with only the weighted mean being below the range. The quality statistics are both above the range. The rapidly increasing market, along with the duration of the study period, contributes to the impact on the quality statistics. The statistical sample consists of sales that meet the required balance as to date of sale and are proportionate by majority land use. This was met by including comparable sales from the same general market all within six miles of the subject county.

The 80% majority land use statistics demonstrate that the level of value is within the range for Richardson County for dry land. In analyzing the grass it is noted the very limited number of sales available for analysis. In comparing the average LCG values with neighboring counties it is noted that the Richardson values for grass are below both the Pawnee and Nemaha counties averages by LCG while the dry land average is higher. The grass values may be skewed by the inclusion of a higher percentage of CRP acres in Pawnee County. There will be no recommendation for adjustment to any class or sub-class of agricultural land in Richardson County.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 69% of market value for the residential 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 :** 8,950 **Value :** 986,364,965 **Growth** 4,031,280 (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** | 765 | 2,299,010 | 10 | 38,583 | 21 | 191,937 | 796 | 2,529,530 | |
| **02. Res Improve Land** | 3,007 | 9,016,287 | 66 | 1,699,880 | 304 | 5,674,332 | 3,377 | 16,390,499 | |
| **03. Res Improvements** | 3,035 | 107,607,482 | 67 | 4,751,061 | 316 | 23,384,258 | 3,418 | 135,742,801 | |
| **04. Res Total** | 3,800 | 118,922,779 | 77 | 6,489,524 | 337 | 29,250,527 | 4,214 | 154,662,830 | 1,710,328 |
| **% of Res Total** | 90.18 | 76.89 | 1.83 | 4.20 | 8.00 | 18.91 | 47.08 | 15.68 | 42.43 |
| **05. Com UnImp Land** | 112 | 1,023,127 | 22 | 292,551 | 11 | 112,316 | 145 | 1,427,994 | |
| **06. Com Improve Land** | 383 | 3,132,450 | 23 | 764,298 | 20 | 181,028 | 426 | 4,077,776 | |
| **07. Com Improvements** | 396 | 17,865,847 | 24 | 2,601,488 | 24 | 1,269,607 | 444 | 21,736,942 | |
| **08. Com Total** | 508 | 22,021,424 | 46 | 3,658,337 | 35 | 1,562,951 | 589 | 27,242,712 | 296,596 |
| **% of Com Total** | 86.25 | 80.83 | 7.81 | 13.43 | 5.94 | 5.74 | 6.58 | 2.76 | 7.36 |
| **09. Ind UnImp Land** | 1 | 30,400 | 11 | 1,417,821 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1,448,221 | |
| **10. Ind Improve Land** | 5 | 114,141 | 4 | 410,500 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 524,641 | |
| **11. Ind Improvements** | 7 | 1,416,361 | 4 | 1,537,385 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2,953,746 | |
| **12. Ind Total** | 8 | 1,560,902 | 15 | 3,365,706 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 4,926,608 | 0 |
| **% of Ind Total** | 34.78 | 31.68 | 65.22 | 68.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.50 | 0.00 |
| **13. Rec UnImp Land** | 15 | 57,556 | 4 | 71,327 | 10 | 190,000 | 29 | 318,883 | |
| **14. Rec Improve Land** | 7 | 28,347 | 1 | 17,278 | 5 | 180,030 | 13 | 225,655 | |
| **15. Rec Improvements** | 7 | 46,253 | 1 | 92,062 | 6 | 284,804 | 14 | 423,119 | |
| **16. Rec Total** | 22 | 132,156 | 5 | 180,667 | 16 | 654,834 | 43 | 967,657 | 0 |
| **% of Rec Total** | 51.16 | 13.66 | 11.63 | 18.67 | 37.21 | 67.67 | 0.48 | 0.10 | 0.00 |
| **Res & Rec Total** | 3,822 | 119,054,935 | 82 | 6,670,191 | 353 | 29,905,361 | 4,257 | 155,630,487 | 1,710,328 |
| **% of Res & Rec Total** | 89.78 | 76.50 | 1.93 | 4.29 | 8.29 | 19.22 | 47.56 | 15.78 | 42.43 |
| **Com & Ind Total** | 516 | 23,582,326 | 61 | 7,024,043 | 35 | 1,562,951 | 612 | 32,169,320 | 296,596 |
| **% of Com & Ind Total** | 84.31 | 73.31 | 9.97 | 21.83 | 5.72 | 4.86 | 6.84 | 3.26 | 7.36 |
| **17. Taxable Total** | 4,338 | 142,637,261 | 143 | 13,694,234 | 388 | 31,468,312 | 4,869 | 187,799,807 | 2,006,924 |
| **% of Taxable Total** | 89.09 | 75.95 | 2.94 | 7.29 | 7.97 | 16.76 | 54.40 | 19.04 | 49.78 |

**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** | 6 | 189,957 | 1,166,568 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **20. Industrial** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 403,721 | 1,216,879 |
| **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 | 6 | 189,957 | 1,166,568 |
| **20. Industrial** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 403,721 | 1,216,879 |
| **21. Other** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **22. Total Sch II** | | | | **9** | **593,678** | **2,383,447** |

**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 | 34 | 4,856,276 | 34 | 4,856,276 | 0 |
| **24. Non-Producing** | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 87 | 3,940,070 | 92 | 3,940,070 | 0 |
| **25. Total** | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 121 | 8,796,346 | 126 | 8,796,346 | 0 |

**Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural**

| | Urban | SubUrban | Rural | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Records | Records | Records | Records |
| **26. Exempt** | 378 | 74 | 316 | 768 |

**Schedule V : Agricultural Records**

| | Urban | | SubUrban | | Rural | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| **27. Ag-Vacant Land** | 0 | 0 | 335 | 43,124,680 | 2,350 | 415,785,497 | 2,685 | 458,910,177 |
| **28. Ag-Improved Land** | 0 | 0 | 140 | 25,716,148 | 1,113 | 266,800,808 | 1,253 | 292,516,956 |
| **29. Ag Improvements** | 3 | 23,863 | 140 | 3,955,261 | 1,127 | 34,362,555 | 1,270 | 38,341,679 |
| **30. Ag Total** | | | | | | | **3,955** | **789,768,812** |

**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 | 74 | 75.00 | 750,600 | |
| **33. HomeSite Improvements** | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 75 | 72.00 | 2,528,834 | |
| **34. HomeSite Total** | | | | | | | |
| **35. FarmSite UnImp Land** | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 11 | 22.73 | 53,287 | |
| **36. FarmSite Improv Land** | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 116 | 276.87 | 829,785 | |
| **37. FarmSite Improvements** | 3 | 0.00 | 23,863 | 134 | 0.00 | 1,426,427 | |
| **38. FarmSite Total** | | | | | | | |
| **39. Road & Ditches** | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 502.32 | 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** | 24 | 25.78 | 242,578 | 24 | 25.78 | 242,578 | |
| **32. HomeSite Improv Land** | 680 | 687.66 | 6,890,100 | 754 | 762.66 | 7,640,700 | |
| **33. HomeSite Improvements** | 670 | 637.36 | 20,918,919 | 745 | 709.36 | 23,447,753 | 2,024,356 |
| **34. HomeSite Total** | | | | **769** | **788.44** | **31,331,031** | |
| **35. FarmSite UnImp Land** | 109 | 180.07 | 507,511 | 120 | 202.80 | 560,798 | |
| **36. FarmSite Improv Land** | 912 | 2,097.85 | 6,320,307 | 1,028 | 2,374.72 | 7,150,092 | |
| **37. FarmSite Improvements** | 1,049 | 0.00 | 13,443,636 | 1,186 | 0.00 | 14,893,926 | 0 |
| **38. FarmSite Total** | | | | **1,306** | **2,577.52** | **22,604,816** | |
| **39. Road & Ditches** | 0 | 5,332.91 | 0 | 0 | 5,835.23 | 0 | |
| **40. Other- Non Ag Use** | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | |
| **41. Total Section VI** | | | | **2,075** | **9,201.19** | **53,935,847** | **2,024,356** |

**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** | 14 | 691.48 | 278,337 | 14 | 691.48 | 278,337 |

**Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value**

| | Urban | | | SubUrban | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| **43. Special Value** | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| **44. Recapture Value N/A** | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| | **Rural** | | | **Total** | | |
| | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| **43. Special Value** | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| **44. Market Value** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

**Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail** **Market Area 50**

| Irrigated | Acres | % of Acres* | Value | % of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 45. 1A1 | 272.25 | 11.32% | 1,016,856 | 13.58% | 3,735.01 |
| 46. 1A | 145.50 | 6.05% | 533,985 | 7.13% | 3,670.00 |
| 47. 2A1 | 591.69 | 24.61% | 1,861,180 | 24.86% | 3,145.53 |
| 48. 2A | 379.61 | 15.79% | 1,256,509 | 16.79% | 3,310.00 |
| 49. 3A1 | 881.06 | 36.64% | 2,534,846 | 33.86% | 2,877.04 |
| 50. 3A | 45.31 | 1.88% | 111,237 | 1.49% | 2,455.02 |
| 51. 4A1 | 75.00 | 3.12% | 144,000 | 1.92% | 1,920.00 |
| 52. 4A | 14.25 | 0.59% | 26,648 | 0.36% | 1,870.04 |
| 53. Total | 2,404.67 | 100.00% | 7,485,261 | 100.00% | 3,112.80 |
| Dry | | | | | |
| 54. 1D1 | 17,271.95 | 7.46% | 56,592,721 | 8.65% | 3,276.57 |
| 55. 1D | 37,035.17 | 16.00% | 113,483,959 | 17.35% | 3,064.22 |
| 56. 2D1 | 17,985.88 | 7.77% | 50,453,840 | 7.72% | 2,805.19 |
| 57. 2D | 15,049.00 | 6.50% | 42,841,434 | 6.55% | 2,846.80 |
| 58. 3D1 | 69,500.73 | 30.03% | 194,985,084 | 29.82% | 2,805.51 |
| 59. 3D | 46,040.29 | 19.90% | 127,832,194 | 19.55% | 2,776.53 |
| 60. 4D1 | 25,239.47 | 10.91% | 61,411,523 | 9.39% | 2,433.15 |
| 61. 4D | 3,292.35 | 1.42% | 6,319,791 | 0.97% | 1,919.54 |
| 62. Total | 231,414.84 | 100.00% | 653,920,546 | 100.00% | 2,825.75 |
| Grass | | | | | |
| 63. 1G1 | 4,145.09 | 5.41% | 4,514,473 | 6.20% | 1,089.11 |
| 64. 1G | 6,627.56 | 8.65% | 8,061,219 | 11.08% | 1,216.32 |
| 65. 2G1 | 3,318.62 | 4.33% | 3,029,791 | 4.16% | 912.97 |
| 66. 2G | 3,240.95 | 4.23% | 3,446,931 | 4.74% | 1,063.56 |
| 67. 3G1 | 17,438.40 | 22.77% | 17,954,245 | 24.67% | 1,029.58 |
| 68. 3G | 6,144.00 | 8.02% | 5,998,128 | 8.24% | 976.26 |
| 69. 4G1 | 13,551.30 | 17.69% | 12,634,167 | 17.36% | 932.32 |
| 70. 4G | 22,123.57 | 28.89% | 17,125,322 | 23.54% | 774.08 |
| 71. Total | 76,589.49 | 100.00% | 72,764,276 | 100.00% | 950.06 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Irrigated Total | 2,404.67 | 0.74% | 7,485,261 | 1.02% | 3,112.80 |
| Dry Total | 231,414.84 | 70.82% | 653,920,546 | 88.87% | 2,825.75 |
| Grass Total | 76,589.49 | 23.44% | 72,764,276 | 9.89% | 950.06 |
| 72. Waste | 16,183.02 | 4.95% | 1,617,677 | 0.22% | 99.96 |
| 73. Other | 189.53 | 0.06% | 45,205 | 0.01% | 238.51 |
| 74. Exempt | 2,844.78 | 0.87% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 75. Market Area Total | 326,781.55 | 100.00% | 735,832,965 | 100.00% | 2,251.76 |

**Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total**

| | Urban | | SubUrban | | Rural | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| **76. Irrigated** | 0.00 | 0 | 110.00 | 350,856 | 2,294.67 | 7,134,405 | 2,404.67 | 7,485,261 |
| **77. Dry Land** | 0.00 | 0 | 20,899.19 | 59,820,295 | 210,515.65 | 594,100,251 | 231,414.84 | 653,920,546 |
| **78. Grass** | 0.00 | 0 | 7,056.38 | 6,902,991 | 69,533.11 | 65,861,285 | 76,589.49 | 72,764,276 |
| **79. Waste** | 0.00 | 0 | 1,329.90 | 132,990 | 14,853.12 | 1,484,687 | 16,183.02 | 1,617,677 |
| **80. Other** | 0.00 | 0 | 0.24 | 24 | 189.29 | 45,181 | 189.53 | 45,205 |
| **81. Exempt** | 26.79 | 0 | 27.96 | 0 | 2,790.03 | 0 | 2,844.78 | 0 |
| **82. Total** | **0.00** | **0** | **29,395.71** | **67,207,156** | **297,385.84** | **668,625,809** | **326,781.55** | **735,832,965** |

| | Acres | % of Acres* | Value | % of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Irrigated** | 2,404.67 | 0.74% | 7,485,261 | 1.02% | 3,112.80 |
| **Dry Land** | 231,414.84 | 70.82% | 653,920,546 | 88.87% | 2,825.75 |
| **Grass** | 76,589.49 | 23.44% | 72,764,276 | 9.89% | 950.06 |
| **Waste** | 16,183.02 | 4.95% | 1,617,677 | 0.22% | 99.96 |
| **Other** | 189.53 | 0.06% | 45,205 | 0.01% | 238.51 |
| **Exempt** | 2,844.78 | 0.87% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| **Total** | **326,781.55** | 100.00% | **735,832,965** | 100.00% | 2,251.76 |

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

**74 Richardson**

| | 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 | 148,207,479 | 154,662,830 | 6,455,351 | 4.36% | 1,710,328 | 3.20% |
| 02. Recreational | 901,612 | 967,657 | 66,045 | 7.33% | 0 | 7.33% |
| 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling | 29,063,117 | 31,331,031 | 2,267,914 | 7.80% | 2,024,356 | 0.84% |
| **04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)** | **178,172,208** | **186,961,518** | **8,789,310** | **4.93%** | **3,734,684** | **2.84%** |
| 05. Commercial | 25,177,972 | 27,242,712 | 2,064,740 | 8.20% | 296,596 | 7.02% |
| 06. Industrial | 3,240,548 | 4,926,608 | 1,686,060 | 52.03% | 0 | 52.03% |
| 07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 21,462,816 | 22,604,816 | 1,142,000 | 5.32% | 0 | 5.32% |
| 08. Minerals | 10,757,996 | 8,796,346 | -1,961,650 | -18.23 | 0 | -18.23 |
| **09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)** | **60,639,332** | **63,570,482** | **2,931,150** | **4.83%** | **296,596** | **4.34%** |
| **10. Total Non-Agland Real Property** | **238,811,540** | **250,532,000** | **11,720,460** | **4.91%** | **4,031,280** | **3.22%** |
| 11. Irrigated | 5,777,673 | 7,485,261 | 1,707,588 | 29.55% | | |
| 12. Dryland | 587,625,007 | 653,920,546 | 66,295,539 | 11.28% | | |
| 13. Grassland | 66,390,910 | 72,764,276 | 6,373,366 | 9.60% | | |
| 14. Wasteland | 1,621,955 | 1,617,677 | -4,278 | -0.26% | | |
| 15. Other Agland | -112,478 | 45,205 | 157,683 | | | |
| **16. Total Agricultural Land** | **661,303,067** | **735,832,965** | **74,529,898** | **11.27%** | | |
| **17. Total Value of all Real Property** | **900,114,607** | **986,364,965** | **86,250,358** | **9.58%** | **4,031,280** | **9.13%** |
| (Locally Assessed) | | | | | | |

**Office of Richardson County Assessor**
**Pamela G. Vice**
**1700 Stone St.**
**Falls City, NE 68355**
**Phone (402) 245-4012**
**richcoassessor@sentco.net**

***2013 Three Year Plan of Assessment***

**2013**

- Reappraise Falls City residential (approximately 2,200 properties)
- Reappraise portion of Falls City commercial& industrial as time allows
- Do all-county new construction (pickup work) valuation
- Review all classes for level of assessment
- Do sales review – all classes

**2014**

- Reappraise residential properties in villages of Salem, Rulo, Preston, & Barada - totaling approximately 546 properties
- Reappraise rural (4000 class) & rural-res class (4500) in Barada, Ohio, Arago, Salem, Falls City, Jefferson, & Rulo townships – totaling approximately 864 properties
- Reappraise remaining portion of Falls City commercial& industrial as time allows
- Review all classes for level of assessment
- Do all-county new construction (pickup work) valuation
- Do sales review – all classes

**2015**

- Reappraise residential properties in villages of Humboldt & Verdon - totaling approximately 661 properties
- Reappraise rural (4000 class) & rural-res class (4500) in Franklin, Porter, East & West Muddy, Humboldt, Grant, Liberty, Speiser, and Nemaha townships – totaling approximately 824 properties
- Reappraise all non-Falls City commercial & industrial as time allows.
- Review all classes for level of assessment
- Do all-county new construction (pickup work) valuation
- Do sales review – all classes

**Note:**

A land use study needs to be done as soon as possible in order to better reflect what is present in the agricultural market in Richardson County. This office is waiting on ratifying a contract with GIS Workshop to implement the needed tools in our computer system. This will allow us to complete this study in a timely manner.

The addition of a land use study in a specific appraisal year may or may not cause us to alter our reappraisal projects in future years.

**Pamela G. Vice** **Date**

**Richardson County Assessor**

# 2013 Assessment Survey for Richardson County

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | **Deputy(ies) on staff:** |
| | 1 |
| 2. | **Appraiser(s) on staff:** |
| | 0 |
| 3. | **Other full-time employees:** |
| | 1 |
| 4. | **Other part-time employees:** |
| | 0 |
| 5. | **Number of shared employees:** |
| | 0 |
| 6. | **Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:** |
| | 220,000 |
| 7. | **Adopted budget, or granted budget *if different from above*:** |
| | 217,373.92 |
| 8. | **Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:** |
| | 89,950 |
| 9. | **If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:** |
| | 0 |
| 10. | **Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:** |
| | 29,094 |
| 11. | **Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:** |
| | Funded out of County General |
| 12. | **Other miscellaneous funds:** |
| | 0 |
| 13. | **Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:** |
| | 0 |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. | **Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?** |
| | Yes http://www.richardson.assessor.gisworkshop.com/ |
| 7. | **Who maintains the GIS software and maps?** |
| | GIS Workshop |
| 8. | **Personal Property software:** |
| | Terra Scan |

## C. Zoning Information

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | **Does the county have zoning?** |
| | No |
| 2. | **If so, is the zoning countywide?** |
| | No |
| 3. | **What municipalities in the county are zoned?** |
| | Falls City and Humboldt |
| 4. | **When was zoning implemented?** |
| | Unsure of the date |

## D. Contracted Services

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | **Appraisal Services:** |
| | Prichard & Abbott- mineral interest |
| 2. | **GIS Services:** |
| | GIS Workshop |
| 3. | **Other services:** |
| | ASI for Terra Scan |

## E. Appraisal /Listing Services

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | **Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?** |
| | Yes |
| 2. | **If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?** |
| | No |
| 3. | **What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?** |
| | No requirement |
| 4. | **Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?** |
| | No |
| 5. | **Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?** |
| | No |

# 2013 Certification for Richardson 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 Richardson 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