2006 TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION LEVELS OF VALUE																	
No	County	Residential			Commercial			Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land Not Subject To Special Valuation			Special Value of Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land Subject to Special Valuation			Recapture Value of Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land Subject to Special Valuation			
		Med ¹	COD ²	PRD ³	Med	COD	PRD	Med	COD	PRD	Med	COD	PRD	Med	COD	PRD	
1	Adams	94.27	19.79	107.12	95.36	41.71	109.51	76.74	26.38	110.35							
2	Antelope	97.68	33.47	113.39	95.37	34.77	106.01	76.37	17.29	100.64							
3	Arthur	Insuff	icient	Sales	Insuff	icient	Sales	75.63	18.59	106.41							
4	Banner	Insuff	icient	Sales	Insuff	icient	Sales	76.28	17.97	102.86							
5	Blaine	Insuff	icient	Sales	insuff	icient	Sales	75.22	11.91	100.20							
6	Boone	96.08	25.43	112.18	94.30	44.95	109.11	74.45	14.97	105.01							
7	Box Butte	98.79	15.15	105.15	98.52	17.68	109.75	75.84	15.08	104.86							
8	Boyd	97.49	8.67	105.00	Insuff	icient	Sales	74.50	17.67	97.72							
9	Brown	98.38	7.29	103.66	97.22	2.11	100.17	77.08	15.75	100.82							
10	Buffalo	97.44	7.10	102.38	97.32	7.96	104.20	76.79	12.20	101.80	76.79	12.20	101.80	77.66	4.94	101.19	
11	Burt	96.18	22.35	106.34	96.75	29.25	117.72	75.69	19.24	104.80							
12	Butler	95.95	8.22	100.64	97.62	11.88	106.41	74.93	15.35	104.51							
13	Cass	96.76	15.45	103.30	98.35	17.78	105.09				76.67 ⁴			79.56	19.04	99.96	
14	Cedar	94.12	26.75	113.19	96.00	44.26	142.80	78.94	16.47	102.62							
15	Chase	95.37	15.51	105.47	94.96	20.85	99.99	75.38	16.67	103.23							
16	Cherry	98.93	6.50	99.75	92.20	20.95	98.40	77.36	10.68	103.96							
17	Cheyenne	98.54	6.54	101.69	99.78	11.42	102.11	77.08	12.42	101.17							
18	Clay	97.02	16.10	105.08	97.95	23.24	139.65	78.92	11.98	101.46							
19	Colfax	96.60	14.07	103.14	95.58	24.25	101.85	74.91	21.35	100.10							
20	Cuming	95.30	15.91	105.56	99.40	33.35	109.90	75.36	25.06	111.57	Insuff	icient	Sales	Insuff	icient	Sales	
21	Custer	98.82	33.73	119.50	98.98	24.40	111.71	76.83	23.04	102.81							
22	Dakota	96.30	14.26	102.13	97.76	14.12	116.76	76.68	21.77	108.78	Insuff	icient	Sales	Insuff	icient	Sales	
23	Dawes	99.75	17.15	105.36	96.44	29.07	125.06	74.28	31.70	94.26	73.61	27.98	113.97	75.61	35.98	98.82	
24	Dawson	97.50	13.80	103.76	99.36	13.71	101.47	75.15	17.50	102.77	75.15	17.50	102.77	Insuff	icient	Sales	
25	Deuel	95.12	10.01	102.20	Insuff	icient	Sales	75.21	13.32	102.44							
26	Dixon	94.69	24.85	107.03	94.39	22.02	91.99	74.93	18.24	105.66							
27	Dodge	96.57	8.65	101.27	99.67	15.56	111.33	75.31	22.11	106.37	75.31	22.11	106.37	73.85	58.54	107.51	
28	Douglas	95.28	13.06	104.93	95.26	19.73	105.71				79.93 ⁴			74.25	29.64	105.92	
29	Dundy	99.67	18.40	106.98	99.05	21.77	104.90	74.52	15.06	105.82							
30	Fillmore	99.32	16.69	104.87	98.29	12.82	101.63	75.83	13.05	104.61							
31	Franklin	99.23	30.03	115.78	97.89	19.11	96.89	77.50	20.05	104.82							
32	Frontier	96.36	6.89	100.97	94.16	10.94	110.04	76.29	8.98	101.86							
33	Furnas	97.57	21.89	107.69	93.75	22.17	105.40	74.15	15.59	102.68	74.15	14.87	101.63	Insuff	icient	Sales	
34	Gage	98.00	19.78	108.82	96.90	19.01	100.86				79.57 ⁴			75.24	21.10	108.33	
35	Garden	94.50	18.74	109.10	94.63	17.40	104.05	75.62	12.06	99.38	75.62 ⁴			Insuff	icient	Sales	
36	Garfield	94.11	30.36	120.20	Insuff	icient	Sales	76.34	11.67	99.99							
37	Gosper	92.91	12.65	105.00	Insuff	icient	Sales	74.86	14.76	101.07							
38	Grant	Insuff	icient	Sales	Insuff	icient	Sales	Insuff	icient	Sales							

2006 TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION LEVELS OF VALUE																	
No	County	Residential			Commercial			Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land Not Subject To Special Valuation			Special Value of Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land Subject to Special Valuation			Recapture Value of Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land Subject to Special Valuation			
		Med ¹	COD ²	PRD ³	Med	COD	PRD	Med	COD	PRD	Med	COD	PRD	Med	COD	PRD	
39	Greeley	96.78	27.47	110.85	Insuff	icient	Sales	76.95	12.33	105.00							
40	Hall	98.49	9.95	102.71	98.82	10.62	101.90	75.00	15.63	100.88							
41	Hamilton	96.76	11.70	103.44	98.00	12.76	102.20	77.35	14.49	101.66							
42	Harlan	96.60	12.13	103.72	99.71	17.04	103.70	78.32	15.49	99.85							
43	Hayes	87.50⁵	194.89	262.18	Insuff	icient	Sales	77.03	22.91	109.74							
44	Hitchcock	95.75	15.56	103.29	97.34	24.86	111.79	77.53	15.96	98.59	77.53	15.96	98.59	Insuff	icient	Sales	
45	Holt	96.65	19.06	105.78	95.54	25.52	108.33	77.38	23.09	100.38							
46	Hooker	98.85	30.25	110.88	Insuff	icient	Sales	78.31	16.70	113.76							
47	Howard	98.13	11.46	100.81	99.35	14.26	98.53	76.73	16.80	105.65							
48	Jefferson	98.55	19.11	110.61	96.98	29.13	108.95	76.51	15.79	104.28							
49	Johnson	97.59	27.36	110.99	99.36	15.10	107.91	75.62	17.27	103.48							
50	Kearney	98.74	11.34	104.40	97.84	57.35	130.25	75.35	18.07	102.89							
51	Keith	96.56	17.10	107.10	94.06	14.75	131.94	76.33	13.57	104.78							
52	Keya Paha	Insuff	icient	Sales	Insuff	icient	Sales	74.45	20.21	99.68							
53	Kimball	99.66	12.71	101.58	95.86	26.18	104.74	76.95	13.78	103.68							
54	Knox	96.53	13.14	106.97	94.06	24.06	97.71	75.80	20.00	104.15							
55	Lancaster	98.00	5.26	100.56	99.52	13.10	103.37				80.36 ⁴			80.39	23.44	113.44	
56	Lincoln	97.99	7.35	100.76	97.76	11.70	99.42	75.60	18.37	103.63	75.60 ⁴			75.60	18.37	103.63	
57	Logan	94.08	36.75	123.81	Insuff	icient	Sales	75.34	20.34	96.54							
58	Loup	95.24	19.25	110.42	Insuff	icient	Sales	76.06	18.90	101.30							
59	Madison	94.63	16.50	105.20	93.06	28.03	101.31	76.94	24.97	108.08							
60	McPherson	92.05	24.43	116.21	Insuff	icient	Sales	76.27	14.27	107.95							
61	Merrick	98.76	16.40	104.07	92.71	12.23	93.68	76.68	27.03	108.70							
62	Morrill	96.00	12.36	107.01	95.94	16.99	101.37	76.95	17.81	108.85							
63	Nance	99.27	4.58	100.55	Insuff	icient	Sales	75.26	14.06	102.59							
64	Nemaha	95.58	14.42	104.81	95.00	14.17	99.89	76.04	17.37	106.15							
65	Nuckolls	98.79	26.51	121.14	98.29	41.18	136.77	78.31	23.32	108.63							
66	Otoe	96.81	21.37	105.89	96.21	19.25	120.38				73.93 ⁴			75.77	17.71	108.89	
67	Pawnee	96.88	32.58	118.78	94.65	41.81	129.36	76.42	21.17	105.36							
68	Perkins	98.24	17.76	103.14	96.00	24.60	113.61	74.52	10.01	100.59							
69	Phelps	94.50	19.29	107.25	97.72	26.35	123.17	77.27	16.69	97.20							
70	Pierce	97.00	14.27	104.48	91.62	23.65	110.19	75.35	32.18	109.83							
71	Platte	97.43	9.28	101.20	96.50	16.51	99.34	74.06	19.49	107.56							
72	Polk	97.71	17.20	109.05	96.30	10.36	101.79	75.03	21.56	107.04							
73	Red Willow	95.98	17.25	106.94	96.09	20.11	95.57	75.82	18.79	103.26							
74	Richardson	98.38	32.08	119.08	96.81	44.03	144.71	75.09	23.13	108.17							
75	Rock	98.46	7.42	100.81	97.37	5.24	100.99	78.51	17.90	103.37							
76	Saline	94.89	18.23	105.59	99.02	21.50	87.68	75.08	16.21	103.56							

2006 TAX EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW COMMISSION LEVELS OF VALUE																
No	County	Residential			Commercial			Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land Not Subject To Special Valuation			Special Value of Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land Subject to Special Valuation			Recapture Value of Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land Subject to Special Valuation		
		Med ¹	COD^2	PRD^3	Med	COD	PRD	Med	COD	PRD	Med	COD	PRD	Med	COD	PRD
77	Sarpy	97.17	11.25	98.34	97.68	13.05	103.10				77.20 ⁴			79.75	23.11	102.63
78	Saunders	97.25	14.02	105.76	96.39	48.09	118.01				76.89 ⁴			76.13	25.92	109.41
79	Scotts Bluff	97.08	21.22	108.23	95.88	33.74	119.21				78.30⁴			81.42 ⁶	49.04	119.78
80	Seward	98.21	6.62	100.60	98.00	17.69	102.52	76.60	12.75	104.14	78.51⁴			75.57	22.31	98.68
81	Sheridan	99.16	28.66	125.99	96.80	41.03	120.65	75.96	20.30	100.67						
82	Sherman	94.40	17.08	110.23	Insuff	icient	Sales	75.12	8.87	101.13						
83	Sioux	96.39	10.21	110.00	Insuff	icient	Sales	78.37	30.14	98.60						
84	Stanton	94.35	14.46	102.48	Insuff	icient	Sales	74.72	17.54	103.37						
85	Thayer	97.87	19.86	110.82	97.35	18.98	107.10	76.75	25.53	109.21						
86	Thomas	98.61	5.76	104.71	Insuff	icient	Sales	74.88	14.75	100.43						
87	Thurston	93.29	34.99	127.93	94.43	34.96	132.43	75.03	17.55	103.94						
88	Valley	95.96	20.57	111.21	95.10	17.00	112.58	76.87	14.34	103.36						
89	Washington	94.36	11.66	102.37	97.69	19.29	104.58				77.92 ⁴			74.76	29.59	111.27
90	Wayne	93.51	15.17	104.88	97.07	16.31	98.08	74.90	18.71	107.35						
91	Webster	99.25	15.67	103.08	96.13	13.93	95.73	74.78	26.95	101.51	74.78	26.95	101.51	Insuff	icient	Sales
92	Wheeler	95.35	41.25	117.76	Insuff	icient	Sales	76.10	22.73	100.42						
93	York	99.38	6.03	101.84	97.92	7.68	104.90	77.43	7.93	101.92	77.43	7.93	101.92	Insuff	icient	Sales

Endnotes:

^{1.} Med. indicates the Median. The median is a measure of central tendency. The value of the middle item in an uneven number of items arranged according to size; the arithmetic average of the two central items in an even number of items. The acceptable ratio range for the median indicated level of value (also known as the "Assessment-Sales Ratio") for the Residential and Commercial Classes of real property is between 92% and 100% of actual or fair market value. The acceptable ratio range for the agricultural class of real property which receives "special valuation" pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1344 is between 92% and 100% of "special valuation," and between 92% and 100% of "recapture valuation." The acceptable ratio range for the special value subclass of the agricultural class of real property is therefore 74% to 80% of the acceptable ratio range for the Agricultural class of real property is therefore 74% to 80% of the acceptable ratio range for the Agricultural Class of real property is between 74% to 80% of the acceptable ratio range for the Agricultural Class of real property is between 74% to 80% of the acceptable ratio range for the Agricultural Class of real property is between 74% to 80% of the acceptable ratio range for the Agricultural Class of real property is between 74% to 80% of the acceptable ratio range for the Agricultural Class of real property is between 74% to 80%.

^{2.} The Coefficient of Dispersion ("COD") is a tool used under professionally accepted mass appraisal methods to measure the uniformity of assessments. The COD is the average absolute deviation from the median stated as a percentage. The COD is calculated by dividing the average absolute deviation by the median assessment/sales price ratio and multiplying by 100 to convert the ratio to a percentage. The acceptable range for the COD shall be: for residential real property 15.0% or less, for agricultural land 20.0% or less, for commercial and industrial property 20.0% or less, and for vacant land and other property classes 20.0% or less.

^{3.} The Price Related Differential ("PRD") is a tool used under professionally accepted mass appraisal methods to determine whether properties of differing values are treated uniformly. The Price Related Differential may indicate assessment bias and inequity between lower valued properties and higher valued properties. A PRD that is under 1.00 indicates higher valued properties are valued at a higher assessment level than lower valued properties. When the PRD is over 1.00 it indicates lower valued properties are valued at a higher level than higher valued properties. The acceptable range for the Price Related Differential shall be .98 to 1.03.

^{4.} The level of assessment for the special value of the agricultural and horticultural land class of real property subject to special valuation and its subclasses was determined through an income based methodology developed by the Property Tax Administrator pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (4) (Supp. 2005).

^{5.} The Department of Property Assessment and Taxation liaison for Hayes County testified that the level of value for residential property in the County indicated by the median in the revised statistical report for residential real property as submitted by the Property Tax Administrator was not representative of the level of value of the residential class of real property in Hayes County, that the level of value of residential property could not be reliably determined, and that the level of value after any proposed ajustment could not be reliably determined.

^{6.} The assessor appeared with her appraiser before the Commission and presented evidence which demonstrated that an adjustment to the Agricultural Land and Horticultural Land class of real property subject to Special Value, or any of its subclasses, including but not limited to Market Area 3 and Market Area 4, as proposed would not improve the equalization of assessments in Scotts Bluff County.