

Table of Contents

2011 Commission Summary

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

Residential Correlation

- Residential Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
 - III. Measure of Central Tendency
 - IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

Commercial Correlation

- Commercial Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
 - III. Measure of Central Tendency
 - IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Base Analysis Statistics
- Agricultural Random Inclusion Analysis Statistics
- Agricultural Random Exclusion Analysis Statistics

Special Valuation Statistics

- Special Valuation Methodology
- Special Valuation Base Analysis Statistics
- Special Valuation Random Inclusion Analysis Statistics
- Special Valuation Random Exclusion Analysis Statistics

Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

- Agricultural or Special Valuation Land
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
 - III. Measure of Central Tendency

IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

County Reports

- 2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2011 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2009 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
- Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification

Maps

- Market Areas
- Registered Wells > 500 GPM
- Geo Codes
- Soil Classes

Valuation History Charts

2011 Commission Summary for Keya Paha County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	8	Median	110.23
Total Sales Price	\$156,000	Mean	113.07
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$156,000	Wgt. Mean	108.28
Total Assessed Value	\$168,920	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$21,641
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$19,500	Avg. Assessed Value	\$21,115

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	57.67 to 175.00
95% Mean C.I	88.32 to 128.25
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	82.00 to 144.14
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.65
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.92
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.88

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	9	100	89
2009	17	99	99
2008	16	97	97
2007	16	93	93

2011 Commission Summary for Keya Paha County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	2	Median	125.79
Total Sales Price	\$18,000	Mean	125.79
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$18,000	Wgt. Mean	113.56
Total Assessed Value	\$20,440	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$25,867
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$9,000	Avg. Assessed Value	\$10,220

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	-340.69 to 592.27
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	0.77
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.74
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.08

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	4	100	97
2009	6	100	95
2008	4	100	99
2007	6	97	97

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Keya Paha 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 (R. S. Supp., 2005). 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 this 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	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	69	The qualitative measures calculated in the random exclude sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of Agricultural Land	69	The qualitative measures calculated in the random exclude sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment 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 11th day of April, 2011.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Keya Paha County

All rural residential properties were physically reviewed and revalued by the contract appraiser with new depreciation tables being developed. The results were put on the assessment roll for 2011.

All residential properties will be physically reviewed and revalued by the contract appraiser for assessment year 2012.

All pickup work was completed and placed on the 2011 assessment roll.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Contract Appraiser	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Burton, Jamison, Mills & Norden: all improved and unimproved properties located within these villages. These villages contain very few livable houses.
	02	Meadville: all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Meadville. Approximately 20-25 lots with 10-15 having improvements. The village is located on the Niobrara River and contains a Bar/Grill/Store. Also located next to the river is a village park for camping that is privately owned.
	03	Rural: all improved and unimproved properties located outside the village limits in the rural areas.
	04	Springview: all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Springview. Population of approximately 290. K-12 Public School, convenience store, bank, post office, newspaper, bar/grill, grocery store, hair salon, green house nursery, public library, and welding shop/mechanic shops.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	Springview- 2007 Meadville- 2009 Burton, Jamison, Mills & Norden-2009	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	The lot values were established by completing a sales study using a price per square foot analysis.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June 2005 Marshall-Swift is used for each valuation grouping.	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Depreciation studies are based on local market information.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Individual tables for each grouping	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	Every 4 years	

10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

52 Keya Paha

RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 8
 Total Sales Price : 156,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 156,000
 Total Assessed Value : 168,920
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 19,500
 Avg. Assessed Value : 21,115

MEDIAN : 110
 WGT. MEAN : 108
 MEAN : 113
 COD : 26.79
 PRD : 104.42

COV : 32.86
 STD : 37.16
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 29.53
 MAX Sales Ratio : 175.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 57.67

95% Median C.I. : 57.67 to 175.00
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.32 to 128.25
 95% Mean C.I. : 82.00 to 144.14

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:11PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	93.11	93.11	119.30	38.06	78.05	57.67	128.55	N/A	11,500	13,720
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	133.93	133.93	141.18	30.67	94.86	92.86	175.00	N/A	4,250	6,000
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	145.29	145.29	145.29	00.00	100.00	145.29	145.29	N/A	17,000	24,700
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	98.89	98.89	98.89	00.00	100.00	98.89	98.89	N/A	85,000	84,060
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	103.14	103.14	92.09	17.86	112.00	84.72	121.56	N/A	11,250	10,360
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	2	93.11	93.11	119.30	38.06	78.05	57.67	128.55	N/A	11,500	13,720
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	6	110.23	119.72	106.38	25.00	112.54	84.72	175.00	84.72 to 175.00	22,167	23,580
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	128.55	119.87	132.25	26.41	90.64	57.67	175.00	N/A	9,700	12,828
<u>ALL</u>	8	110.23	113.07	108.28	26.79	104.42	57.67	175.00	57.67 to 175.00	19,500	21,115

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
04	8	110.23	113.07	108.28	26.79	104.42	57.67	175.00	57.67 to 175.00	19,500	21,115
<u>ALL</u>	8	110.23	113.07	108.28	26.79	104.42	57.67	175.00	57.67 to 175.00	19,500	21,115

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	8	110.23	113.07	108.28	26.79	104.42	57.67	175.00	57.67 to 175.00	19,500	21,115
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	8	110.23	113.07	108.28	26.79	104.42	57.67	175.00	57.67 to 175.00	19,500	21,115

**52 Keya Paha
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 8
 Total Sales Price : 156,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 156,000
 Total Assessed Value : 168,920
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 19,500
 Avg. Assessed Value : 21,115

MEDIAN : 110
 WGT. MEAN : 108
 MEAN : 113
 COD : 26.79
 PRD : 104.42

COV : 32.86
 STD : 37.16
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 29.53
 MAX Sales Ratio : 175.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 57.67

95% Median C.I. : 57.67 to 175.00
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.32 to 128.25
 95% Mean C.I. : 82.00 to 144.14

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:11PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	3	92.86	90.70	95.00	22.94	95.47	57.67	121.56	N/A	3,667	3,483	
5000 TO 9999	1	175.00	175.00	175.00	00.00	100.00	175.00	175.00	N/A	5,000	8,750	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	4	107.21	111.77	120.00	34.05	93.14	57.67	175.00	N/A	4,000	4,800	
10000 TO 29999	3	128.55	119.52	119.38	15.71	100.12	84.72	145.29	N/A	18,333	21,887	
30000 TO 59999												
60000 TO 99999	1	98.89	98.89	98.89	00.00	100.00	98.89	98.89	N/A	85,000	84,060	
100000 TO 149999												
150000 TO 249999												
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	8	110.23	113.07	108.28	26.79	104.42	57.67	175.00	57.67 to 175.00	19,500	21,115	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

A. Residential Real Property

With only eight qualified residential sales it is believed the sample is not representative of the population as a whole. The calculated median from the sample will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Keya Paha County, nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

The Keya Paha County Assessor reviews all residential sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. The assessor also serves as the county clerk and register of deeds. Many times when deeds are filed questions are asked at this time regarding the sale of properties eliminating the need to mail a questionnaire. If there is still a question with the sale a phone call will be made to gather more information.

The assessor uses a contract appraiser in valuing the residential properties. This class of property will be reviewed and revalued within the 6 year systematic inspection cycle in assessment year 2012, which is indicated in the three year plan.

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) 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 (2007), 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 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.

2011 Correlation Section for Keya Paha County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in 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 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.

2011 Correlation Section for Keya Paha County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

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

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

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers,

**2011 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

July, 2007, 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. 247.

2011 Commercial Assessment Actions for Keya Paha County

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

Due to the insufficient number of qualified commercial sales no other changes were done to the class of property.

All commercial properties will be physically reviewed and revalued by the contract appraiser for assessment year 2012.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Contract Appraiser	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Burton, Jamison, Mills, Norden, Meadville, Rural and Springview: all improved and unimproved properties located within these villages. The old school house in Burton is now a taxidermy business. Norden has the county fairgrounds along with a Dance Hall. Meadville has a bar/grill/general store. Rural area consists of a Coop, canoe outfitters and hair salons. Springview has a population of approximately 290. K-12 Public School, convenience store, bank, post office, newspaper, bar/grill, grocery store, hair salon, green house nursery, public library, and welding shop/mechanic shops.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	Springview- 2007 Meadville- 2009 Burton, Jamison, Mills & Norden-2009	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	The lot values were established by completing a sales study using a price per square foot analysis.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June 2005 Marshall-Swift	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Depreciation studies are based on local market information.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	One is used for all commercial	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	Every 4 years	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?	
	Yes	

11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

**52 Keya Paha
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 2
 Total Sales Price : 18,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,000
 Total Assessed Value : 20,440
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 9,000
 Avg. Assessed Value : 10,220

MEDIAN : 126
 WGT. MEAN : 114
 MEAN : 126
 COD : 29.18
 PRD : 110.77

COV : 41.28
 STD : 51.92
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 36.71
 MAX Sales Ratio : 162.50
 MIN Sales Ratio : 89.08

95% Median C.I. : N/A
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
 95% Mean C.I. : -340.69 to 592.27

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:14PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	162.50	162.50	162.50	00.00	100.00	162.50	162.50	N/A	6,000	9,750
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	89.08	89.08	89.08	00.00	100.00	89.08	89.08	N/A	12,000	10,690
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	2	125.79	125.79	113.56	29.18	110.77	89.08	162.50	N/A	9,000	10,220
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10											
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	125.79	125.79	113.56	29.18	110.77	89.08	162.50	N/A	9,000	10,220
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09											
<u>ALL</u>	2	125.79	125.79	113.56	29.18	110.77	89.08	162.50	N/A	9,000	10,220

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	2	125.79	125.79	113.56	29.18	110.77	89.08	162.50	N/A	9,000	10,220
<u>ALL</u>	2	125.79	125.79	113.56	29.18	110.77	89.08	162.50	N/A	9,000	10,220

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	2	125.79	125.79	113.56	29.18	110.77	89.08	162.50	N/A	9,000	10,220
04											
<u>ALL</u>	2	125.79	125.79	113.56	29.18	110.77	89.08	162.50	N/A	9,000	10,220

**52 Keya Paha
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 2
 Total Sales Price : 18,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,000
 Total Assessed Value : 20,440
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 9,000
 Avg. Assessed Value : 10,220

MEDIAN : 126
 WGT. MEAN : 114
 MEAN : 126
 COD : 29.18
 PRD : 110.77

COV : 41.28
 STD : 51.92
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 36.71
 MAX Sales Ratio : 162.50
 MIN Sales Ratio : 89.08

95% Median C.I. : N/A
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
 95% Mean C.I. : -340.69 to 592.27

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:14PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999												
5000 TO 9999	1	162.50	162.50	162.50	00.00	100.00	162.50	162.50	N/A	6,000	9,750	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	1	162.50	162.50	162.50	00.00	100.00	162.50	162.50	N/A	6,000	9,750	
10000 TO 29999	1	89.08	89.08	89.08	00.00	100.00	89.08	89.08	N/A	12,000	10,690	
30000 TO 59999												
60000 TO 99999												
100000 TO 149999												
150000 TO 249999												
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	2	125.79	125.79	113.56	29.18	110.77	89.08	162.50	N/A	9,000	10,220	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	89.08	89.08	89.08	00.00	100.00	89.08	89.08	N/A	12,000	10,690	
326	1	162.50	162.50	162.50	00.00	100.00	162.50	162.50	N/A	6,000	9,750	
<u>ALL</u>	2	125.79	125.79	113.56	29.18	110.77	89.08	162.50	N/A	9,000	10,220	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

A. Commerical Real Property

With only two qualified commercial sales it is believed that with the diversity of the sales, the representativeness of the sample to the population is unreliable. The calculated median from the sample will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Keya Paha County, nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

The Keya Paha County Assessor reviews all commercial sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. The assessor also serves as the county clerk and register of deeds. Many times when deeds are filed questions are asked at this time regarding the sale of properties eliminating the need to mail a questionnaire. If there is still a question with the sale a phone call will be made to gather more information.

The assessor uses a contract appraiser in valuing the commercial properties. This class of property will be reviewed and revalued within the 6 year systematic inspection cycle in assessment year 2012, which is indicated in the three year plan.

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) 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 (2007), 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 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.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in 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 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.

2011 Correlation Section for Keya Paha County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

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

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

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers,

**2011 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

July, 2007, 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. 247.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Keya Paha County

The assessor performed a market analysis on all qualified agricultural sales. Based on the analysis it was determined that changes in land valuation would be made to land capability groups in irrigated, dry and grass.

GIS is currently being implemented and is hoped to be rolled over for 2012.

All pick up work and sales verification was completed for assessment year 2011.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Contract Appraiser	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Soils, land use and geographic characteristics.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Each year agricultural sales and characteristics are studied to see if the market is showing any trend that may say a market area or areas are needed.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	Residential is land directly associated with a residence, and is defined in Regulation 10.001.05A. Recreational land is defined according to Regulation 10.001.05E.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	Yes, both carry the same value.	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	Irrigated, Dry, Grass	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	Sales verification, FSA maps and personal knowledge. With the implementation of GIS all parcels will be updated.	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales are monitored and studied on a yearly basis to see if there are any non-agricultural characteristics.	
9.	Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	Yes, at this time there is nothing to indicate implementing special value. The parcels approved for special value have the same value as all other agricultural land.	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?	
	Yes	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.	
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.	
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.	

52 Keya Paha

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 14
 Total Sales Price : 7,592,303
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,592,303
 Total Assessed Value : 5,202,440
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 542,307
 Avg. Assessed Value : 371,603

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 69
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 25.84
 PRD : 107.37

COV : 36.16
 STD : 26.60
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.13
 MAX Sales Ratio : 140.54
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.35

95% Median C.I. : 52.88 to 91.64
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.17 to 73.88
 95% Mean C.I. : 58.21 to 88.93

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:17PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	69.30	69.30	58.62	23.69	118.22	52.88	85.72	N/A	71,500	41,915
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	78.89	78.89	66.65	16.16	118.36	66.14	91.64	N/A	1,595,891	1,063,620
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08											
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	71.23	71.08	70.39	06.61	100.98	63.94	78.06	N/A	872,667	614,233
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	70.27	70.27	75.79	08.87	92.72	64.04	76.49	N/A	529,390	401,245
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	84.95	84.95	41.70	65.45	203.72	29.35	140.54	N/A	126,000	52,545
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	69.07	69.07	69.07	00.00	100.00	69.07	69.07	N/A	96,042	66,340
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	70.41	70.41	75.10	39.45	93.75	42.63	98.18	N/A	116,350	87,375
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	7	71.23	72.80	68.10	14.53	106.90	52.88	91.64	52.88 to 91.64	850,397	579,110
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	70.27	77.61	69.24	43.99	112.09	29.35	140.54	N/A	327,695	226,895
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	3	69.07	69.96	73.34	26.81	95.39	42.63	98.18	N/A	109,581	80,363
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	71.23	70.75	71.94	07.45	98.35	63.94	78.06	N/A	735,356	529,038
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	84.95	84.95	41.70	65.45	203.72	29.35	140.54	N/A	126,000	52,545
<u>ALL</u>	14	70.15	73.57	68.52	25.84	107.37	29.35	140.54	52.88 to 91.64	542,307	371,603

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	14	70.15	73.57	68.52	25.84	107.37	29.35	140.54	52.88 to 91.64	542,307	371,603
<u>ALL</u>	14	70.15	73.57	68.52	25.84	107.37	29.35	140.54	52.88 to 91.64	542,307	371,603

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
<u>Dry</u>											
County	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
<u>Grass</u>											
County	9	76.49	76.01	73.50	28.67	103.41	29.35	140.54	42.63 to 98.18	314,947	231,492
1	9	76.49	76.01	73.50	28.67	103.41	29.35	140.54	42.63 to 98.18	314,947	231,492
<u>ALL</u>	14	70.15	73.57	68.52	25.84	107.37	29.35	140.54	52.88 to 91.64	542,307	371,603

52 Keya Paha

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 14
 Total Sales Price : 7,592,303
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,592,303
 Total Assessed Value : 5,202,440
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 542,307
 Avg. Assessed Value : 371,603

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 69
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 25.84
 PRD : 107.37

COV : 36.16
 STD : 26.60
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.13
 MAX Sales Ratio : 140.54
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.35

95% Median C.I. : 52.88 to 91.64
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.17 to 73.88
 95% Mean C.I. : 58.21 to 88.93

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:17PM

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	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
_____Grass_____											
County	12	72.78	75.48	68.75	26.96	109.79	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 91.64	618,859	425,488
1	12	72.78	75.48	68.75	26.96	109.79	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 91.64	618,859	425,488
_____ALL_____											
	14	70.15	73.57	68.52	25.84	107.37	29.35	140.54	52.88 to 91.64	542,307	371,603

52 Keya Paha

AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 19
 Total Sales Price : 8,578,778
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,578,778
 Total Assessed Value : 6,075,379
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 451,515
 Avg. Assessed Value : 319,757

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 25.64
 PRD : 105.59

COV : 33.19
 STD : 24.82
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.71
 MAX Sales Ratio : 140.54
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.35

95% Median C.I. : 61.63 to 91.64
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.18 to 80.46
 95% Mean C.I. : 62.82 to 86.74

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:19PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	69.30	69.30	58.62	23.69	118.22	52.88	85.72	N/A	71,500	41,915
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	78.89	78.89	66.65	16.16	118.36	66.14	91.64	N/A	1,595,891	1,063,620
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08											
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	71.23	71.08	70.39	06.61	100.98	63.94	78.06	N/A	872,667	614,233
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	61.63	61.63	61.63	00.00	100.00	61.63	61.63	N/A	112,000	69,030
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	70.27	70.27	75.79	08.87	92.72	64.04	76.49	N/A	529,390	401,245
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	103.65	91.18	65.76	35.75	138.66	29.35	140.54	N/A	137,333	90,308
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	69.07	78.61	91.42	14.72	85.99	68.12	98.64	N/A	232,672	212,720
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	58.89	66.57	69.82	31.45	95.35	42.63	98.18	N/A	115,067	80,334
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	7	71.23	72.80	68.10	14.53	106.90	52.88	91.64	52.88 to 91.64	850,397	579,110
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	6	70.27	79.28	72.18	39.29	109.84	29.35	140.54	29.35 to 140.54	263,797	190,408
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	6	68.60	72.59	84.27	23.38	86.14	42.63	98.64	42.63 to 98.64	173,870	146,527
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	6	67.64	69.23	71.64	08.91	96.64	61.63	78.06	61.63 to 78.06	631,463	452,370
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	103.65	91.18	65.76	35.75	138.66	29.35	140.54	N/A	137,333	90,308
<u>ALL</u>	19	69.07	74.78	70.82	25.64	105.59	29.35	140.54	61.63 to 91.64	451,515	319,757

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	19	69.07	74.78	70.82	25.64	105.59	29.35	140.54	61.63 to 91.64	451,515	319,757
<u>ALL</u>	19	69.07	74.78	70.82	25.64	105.59	29.35	140.54	61.63 to 91.64	451,515	319,757

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
<u>Dry</u>											
County	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
<u>Grass</u>											
County	12	72.78	76.23	74.38	28.69	102.49	29.35	140.54	58.89 to 98.18	264,918	197,047
1	12	72.78	76.23	74.38	28.69	102.49	29.35	140.54	58.89 to 98.18	264,918	197,047
<u>ALL</u>	19	69.07	74.78	70.82	25.64	105.59	29.35	140.54	61.63 to 91.64	451,515	319,757

52 Keya Paha

AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 19
 Total Sales Price : 8,578,778
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,578,778
 Total Assessed Value : 6,075,379
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 451,515
 Avg. Assessed Value : 319,757

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 25.64
 PRD : 105.59

COV : 33.19
 STD : 24.82
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.71
 MAX Sales Ratio : 140.54
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.35

95% Median C.I. : 61.63 to 91.64
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.18 to 80.46
 95% Mean C.I. : 62.82 to 86.74

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:19PM

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	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
_____Grass_____											
County	16	72.78	77.19	71.20	26.68	108.41	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 98.18	518,799	369,360
1	16	72.78	77.19	71.20	26.68	108.41	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 98.18	518,799	369,360
_____ALL_____											
	19	69.07	74.78	70.82	25.64	105.59	29.35	140.54	61.63 to 91.64	451,515	319,757

52 Keya Paha

AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 21
 Total Sales Price : 9,268,778
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,268,778
 Total Assessed Value : 6,720,304
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 441,370
 Avg. Assessed Value : 320,014

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 73
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 26.05
 PRD : 104.17

COV : 32.51
 STD : 24.55
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.99
 MAX Sales Ratio : 140.54
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.35

95% Median C.I. : 61.93 to 91.64
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.50 to 81.51
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.34 to 86.70

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:22PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	69.30	69.30	58.62	23.69	118.22	52.88	85.72	N/A	71,500	41,915
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	78.89	78.89	66.65	16.16	118.36	66.14	91.64	N/A	1,595,891	1,063,620
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08											
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	71.23	71.08	70.39	06.61	100.98	63.94	78.06	N/A	872,667	614,233
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	61.63	61.63	61.63	00.00	100.00	61.63	61.63	N/A	112,000	69,030
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	64.04	67.49	73.95	07.57	91.26	61.93	76.49	N/A	406,926	300,937
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	103.65	91.18	65.76	35.75	138.66	29.35	140.54	N/A	137,333	90,308
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	69.07	78.61	91.42	14.72	85.99	68.12	98.64	N/A	232,672	212,720
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	78.54	75.71	89.97	31.77	84.15	42.63	103.14	N/A	218,300	196,402
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	7	71.23	72.80	68.10	14.53	106.90	52.88	91.64	52.88 to 91.64	850,397	579,110
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	7	64.04	76.80	71.23	37.43	107.82	29.35	140.54	29.35 to 140.54	249,254	177,538
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	69.07	76.95	90.62	26.96	84.92	42.63	103.14	42.63 to 103.14	224,460	203,396
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	64.04	68.19	71.24	08.54	95.72	61.63	78.06	61.63 to 78.06	564,397	402,077
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	103.65	91.18	65.76	35.75	138.66	29.35	140.54	N/A	137,333	90,308
<u>ALL</u>	21	69.07	75.52	72.50	26.05	104.17	29.35	140.54	61.93 to 91.64	441,370	320,014

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	21	69.07	75.52	72.50	26.05	104.17	29.35	140.54	61.93 to 91.64	441,370	320,014
<u>ALL</u>	21	69.07	75.52	72.50	26.05	104.17	29.35	140.54	61.93 to 91.64	441,370	320,014

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
<u>Dry</u>											
County	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
<u>Grass</u>											
County	14	72.78	77.13	77.78	28.63	99.16	29.35	140.54	58.89 to 103.14	276,359	214,964
1	14	72.78	77.13	77.78	28.63	99.16	29.35	140.54	58.89 to 103.14	276,359	214,964
<u>ALL</u>	21	69.07	75.52	72.50	26.05	104.17	29.35	140.54	61.93 to 91.64	441,370	320,014

52 Keya Paha

AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 21
 Total Sales Price : 9,268,778
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,268,778
 Total Assessed Value : 6,720,304
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 441,370
 Avg. Assessed Value : 320,014

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 73
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 26.05
 PRD : 104.17

COV : 32.51
 STD : 24.55
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.99
 MAX Sales Ratio : 140.54
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.35

95% Median C.I. : 61.93 to 91.64
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.50 to 81.51
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.34 to 86.70

Printed:3/24/2011 3:43:22PM

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	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23	00.00	100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
_____Grass_____											
County	18	72.78	77.79	72.90	26.86	106.71	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 98.18	499,488	364,149
1	18	72.78	77.79	72.90	26.86	106.71	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 98.18	499,488	364,149
_____ALL_____	21	69.07	75.52	72.50	26.05	104.17	29.35	140.54	61.93 to 91.64	441,370	320,014

2011 Methodology Report for Special Valuation

Keya Paha, County

There is nothing at this time to indicate implementing special value. The parcels approved for special value are no different than the rest of the agricultural land.

Suzy Wentworth

Keya Paha County Assessor

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2010 Posted Before : 02/17/2011

Number of Sales :	14	Median :	70	COV :	36.16	95% Median C.I. :	52.88 to 91.64
Total Sales Price :	7,592,303	Wgt. Mean :	69	STD :	26.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	63.17 to 73.88
Total Adj. Sales Price :	7,592,303	Mean :	74	Avg.Abs.Dev :	18.13	95% Mean C.I. :	58.21 to 88.93
Total Assessed Value :	5,202,440						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	542,307	COD :	25.84	MAX Sales Ratio :	140.54		
Avg. Assessed Value :	371,603	PRD :	107.37	MIN Sales Ratio :	29.35		

Printed : 03/30/2011

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007	2	69.30	69.30	58.62	23.69	118.22	52.88	85.72	N/A	71,500	41,915
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	2	78.89	78.89	66.65	16.16	118.36	66.14	91.64	N/A	1,595,891	1,063,620
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008											
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	3	71.23	71.08	70.39	06.61	100.98	63.94	78.06	N/A	872,667	614,233
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008											
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	2	70.27	70.27	75.79	08.87	92.72	64.04	76.49	N/A	529,390	401,245
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009	2	84.95	84.95	41.70	65.45	203.72	29.35	140.54	N/A	126,000	52,545
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009											
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009											
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009											
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	1	69.07	69.07	69.07		100.00	69.07	69.07	N/A	96,042	66,340
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	2	70.41	70.41	75.10	39.45	93.75	42.63	98.18	N/A	116,350	87,375
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	7	71.23	72.80	68.10	14.53	106.90	52.88	91.64	52.88 to 91.64	850,397	579,110
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	4	70.27	77.61	69.24	43.99	112.09	29.35	140.54	N/A	327,695	226,895
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	3	69.07	69.96	73.34	26.81	95.39	42.63	98.18	N/A	109,581	80,363
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	14	70.15	73.57	68.52	25.84	107.37	29.35	140.54	52.88 to 91.64	542,307	371,603

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2010 Posted Before : 02/17/2011

Number of Sales :	14	Median :	70	COV :	36.16	95% Median C.I. :	52.88 to 91.64
Total Sales Price :	7,592,303	Wgt. Mean :	69	STD :	26.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	63.17 to 73.88
Total Adj. Sales Price :	7,592,303	Mean :	74	Avg.Abs.Dev :	18.13	95% Mean C.I. :	58.21 to 88.93
Total Assessed Value :	5,202,440						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	542,307	COD :	25.84	MAX Sales Ratio :	140.54		
Avg. Assessed Value :	371,603	PRD :	107.37	MIN Sales Ratio :	29.35		

Printed : 03/30/2011

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
1	14	70.15	73.57	68.52	25.84	107.37	29.35	140.54	52.88 to 91.64	542,307	371,603
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	14	70.15	73.57	68.52	25.84	107.37	29.35	140.54	52.88 to 91.64	542,307	371,603

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Dry</u>											
County	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
<u>Grass</u>											
County	9	76.49	76.01	73.50	28.67	103.41	29.35	140.54	42.63 to 98.18	314,947	231,492
1	9	76.49	76.01	73.50	28.67	103.41	29.35	140.54	42.63 to 98.18	314,947	231,492
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	14	70.15	73.57	68.52	25.84	107.37	29.35	140.54	52.88 to 91.64	542,307	371,603

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Dry</u>											
County	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
<u>Grass</u>											
County	12	72.78	75.48	68.75	26.96	109.79	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 91.64	618,859	425,488
1	12	72.78	75.48	68.75	26.96	109.79	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 91.64	618,859	425,488
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	14	70.15	73.57	68.52	25.84	107.37	29.35	140.54	52.88 to 91.64	542,307	371,603

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM INCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	19	Median :	69	COV :	33.19	95% Median C.I. :	61.63 to 91.64
Total Sales Price :	8,578,778	Wgt. Mean :	71	STD :	24.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	61.18 to 80.46
Total Adj. Sales Price :	8,578,778	Mean :	75	Avg. Abs. Dev :	17.71	95% Mean C.I. :	62.82 to 86.74
Total Assessed Value :	6,075,379						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	451,515	COD :	25.64	MAX Sales Ratio :	140.54		
Avg. Assessed Value :	319,757	PRD :	105.59	MIN Sales Ratio :	29.35		

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007	2	69.30	69.30	58.62	23.69	118.22	52.88	85.72	N/A	71,500	41,915
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	2	78.89	78.89	66.65	16.16	118.36	66.14	91.64	N/A	1,595,891	1,063,620
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008											
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	3	71.23	71.08	70.39	06.61	100.98	63.94	78.06	N/A	872,667	614,233
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	1	61.63	61.63	61.63		100.00	61.63	61.63	N/A	112,000	69,030
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	2	70.27	70.27	75.79	08.87	92.72	64.04	76.49	N/A	529,390	401,245
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009	3	103.65	91.18	65.76	35.75	138.66	29.35	140.54	N/A	137,333	90,308
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009											
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009											
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009											
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	3	69.07	78.61	91.42	14.72	85.99	68.12	98.64	N/A	232,672	212,720
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	3	58.89	66.57	69.82	31.45	95.35	42.63	98.18	N/A	115,067	80,334
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	7	71.23	72.80	68.10	14.53	106.90	52.88	91.64	52.88 to 91.64	850,397	579,110
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	6	70.27	79.28	72.18	39.29	109.84	29.35	140.54	29.35 to 140.54	263,797	190,408
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	6	68.60	72.59	84.27	23.38	86.14	42.63	98.64	42.63 to 98.64	173,870	146,527
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	6	67.64	69.23	71.64	08.91	96.64	61.63	78.06	61.63 to 78.06	631,463	452,370
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	3	103.65	91.18	65.76	35.75	138.66	29.35	140.54	N/A	137,333	90,308

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
1	19	69.07	74.78	70.82	25.64	105.59	29.35	140.54	61.63 to 91.64	451,515	319,757

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM INCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	19	Median :	69	COV :	33.19	95% Median C.I. :	61.63 to 91.64
Total Sales Price :	8,578,778	Wgt. Mean :	71	STD :	24.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	61.18 to 80.46
Total Adj. Sales Price :	8,578,778	Mean :	75	Avg. Abs. Dev :	17.71	95% Mean C.I. :	62.82 to 86.74
Total Assessed Value :	6,075,379						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	451,515	COD :	25.64	MAX Sales Ratio :	140.54		
Avg. Assessed Value :	319,757	PRD :	105.59	MIN Sales Ratio :	29.35		

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 Value
<u> Dry </u>											
County	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
<u> Grass </u>											
County	12	72.78	76.23	74.38	28.69	102.49	29.35	140.54	58.89 to 98.18	264,918	197,047
1	12	72.78	76.23	74.38	28.69	102.49	29.35	140.54	58.89 to 98.18	264,918	197,047
<u> ALL </u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	19	69.07	74.78	70.82	25.64	105.59	29.35	140.54	61.63 to 91.64	451,515	319,757

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 Value
<u> Dry </u>											
County	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
<u> Grass </u>											
County	16	72.78	77.19	71.20	26.68	108.41	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 98.18	518,799	369,360
1	16	72.78	77.19	71.20	26.68	108.41	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 98.18	518,799	369,360
<u> ALL </u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	19	69.07	74.78	70.82	25.64	105.59	29.35	140.54	61.63 to 91.64	451,515	319,757

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM EXCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	21	Median :	69	COV :	32.51	95% Median C.I. :	61.93 to 91.64
Total Sales Price :	9,268,778	Wgt. Mean :	73	STD :	24.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	63.50 to 81.51
Total Adj. Sales Price :	9,268,778	Mean :	76	Avg. Abs. Dev :	17.99	95% Mean C.I. :	64.34 to 86.70
Total Assessed Value :	6,720,304						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	441,370	COD :	26.05	MAX Sales Ratio :	140.54		
Avg. Assessed Value :	320,014	PRD :	104.17	MIN Sales Ratio :	29.35		

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007	2	69.30	69.30	58.62	23.69	118.22	52.88	85.72	N/A	71,500	41,915
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	2	78.89	78.89	66.65	16.16	118.36	66.14	91.64	N/A	1,595,891	1,063,620
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008											
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	3	71.23	71.08	70.39	06.61	100.98	63.94	78.06	N/A	872,667	614,233
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	1	61.63	61.63	61.63		100.00	61.63	61.63	N/A	112,000	69,030
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	3	64.04	67.49	73.95	07.57	91.26	61.93	76.49	N/A	406,926	300,937
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009	3	103.65	91.18	65.76	35.75	138.66	29.35	140.54	N/A	137,333	90,308
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009											
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009											
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009											
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	3	69.07	78.61	91.42	14.72	85.99	68.12	98.64	N/A	232,672	212,720
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	4	78.54	75.71	89.97	31.77	84.15	42.63	103.14	N/A	218,300	196,402
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	7	71.23	72.80	68.10	14.53	106.90	52.88	91.64	52.88 to 91.64	850,397	579,110
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	7	64.04	76.80	71.23	37.43	107.82	29.35	140.54	29.35 to 140.54	249,254	177,538
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	7	69.07	76.95	90.62	26.96	84.92	42.63	103.14	42.63 to 103.14	224,460	203,396
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	7	64.04	68.19	71.24	08.54	95.72	61.63	78.06	61.63 to 78.06	564,397	402,077
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	3	103.65	91.18	65.76	35.75	138.66	29.35	140.54	N/A	137,333	90,308

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
1	21	69.07	75.52	72.50	26.05	104.17	29.35	140.54	61.93 to 91.64	441,370	320,014

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM EXCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	21	Median :	69	COV :	32.51	95% Median C.I. :	61.93 to 91.64
Total Sales Price :	9,268,778	Wgt. Mean :	73	STD :	24.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	63.50 to 81.51
Total Adj. Sales Price :	9,268,778	Mean :	76	Avg. Abs. Dev :	17.99	95% Mean C.I. :	64.34 to 86.70
Total Assessed Value :	6,720,304						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	441,370	COD :	26.05	MAX Sales Ratio :	140.54		
Avg. Assessed Value :	320,014	PRD :	104.17	MIN Sales Ratio :	29.35		

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 Value
<u> Dry </u>											
County	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
<u> Grass </u>											
County	14	72.78	77.13	77.78	28.63	99.16	29.35	140.54	58.89 to 103.14	276,359	214,964
1	14	72.78	77.13	77.78	28.63	99.16	29.35	140.54	58.89 to 103.14	276,359	214,964
<u> ALL </u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	21	69.07	75.52	72.50	26.05	104.17	29.35	140.54	61.93 to 91.64	441,370	320,014

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 Value
<u> Dry </u>											
County	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
1	1	71.23	71.23	71.23		100.00	71.23	71.23	N/A	48,000	34,190
<u> Grass </u>											
County	18	72.78	77.79	72.90	26.86	106.71	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 98.18	499,488	364,149
1	18	72.78	77.79	72.90	26.86	106.71	29.35	140.54	63.94 to 98.18	499,488	364,149
<u> ALL </u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	21	69.07	75.52	72.50	26.05	104.17	29.35	140.54	61.93 to 91.64	441,370	320,014

**2011 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

A. Agricultural Land

Keya Paha County has one market area with the majority of the county consisting of grassland parcels. In reviewing the comparability of the surrounding counties, it was determined that land within six miles of the county boarder was comparable in terms of soil type and topography.

In the base statistic, which is comprised of 14 sales within Keya Paha County, the distribution of the sales among the three year study period was reviewed for adequacy, proportionality and representativeness. The base sample contains a disproportionate distribution of sales, with more sales in the oldest study year. The sample is representative of the make-up of land uses in the county.

Sales from comparable areas outside the county were used in the expanded samples to create a proportionate distribution of sales. In both the random inclusion and the random exclusion statistics, the statistical measures of the overall class and the subclasses correlate closely. Both overall medians of the expanded samples are about one percent lower than the median of the base sample. Due to the base sample being more heavily weighted with older sales, these results are expected.

In analyzing the three sets of statistics it appears all subclasses support that the land uses have been assessed at similar portions of market value. The values are also reasonably similar to adjoining counties with similar influences. The qualitative statistics are above the standard range; however the assessor's process of analyzing the local market, surrounding markets and applying valuation changes is done consistently within the agricultural class. The statistics are considered appropriate for agricultural lands rather than an indicator of lack of assessment uniformity or assessment regressivity.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 69% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

A1. Correlation for Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

A review of Keya Paha County indicates applications for special valuation have been filed, however the influences have been determined to be only those typical in the agricultural market. As a result, the assessed values for agricultural land and special value land are the same. Therefore, it is the opinion of Property Tax Administrator that the level of value for special value parcels is 69% of market value, as indicated by the level of value for agricultural land.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) 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 (2007), 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 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.

2011 Correlation Section for Keya Paha County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in 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 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.

2011 Correlation Section for Keya Paha County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

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

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

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers,

**2011 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

July, 2007, 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. 247.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 2,419	Value : 246,669,690	Growth 5,345,046	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	106	131,710	0	0	36	227,200	142	358,910	
02. Res Improve Land	166	395,990	0	0	33	281,470	199	677,460	
03. Res Improvements	171	4,258,090	0	0	103	3,708,090	274	7,966,180	
04. Res Total	277	4,785,790	0	0	139	4,216,760	416	9,002,550	681,935
% of Res Total	66.59	53.16	0.00	0.00	33.41	46.84	17.20	3.65	12.76
05. Com UnImp Land	4	7,470	0	0	1	1,070	5	8,540	
06. Com Improve Land	45	143,320	4	18,020	5	19,170	54	180,510	
07. Com Improvements	47	1,089,820	4	197,340	17	412,100	68	1,699,260	
08. Com Total	51	1,240,610	4	215,360	18	432,340	73	1,888,310	320,900
% of Com Total	69.86	65.70	5.48	11.40	24.66	22.90	3.02	0.77	6.00
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	277	4,785,790	0	0	139	4,216,760	416	9,002,550	681,935
% of Res & Rec Total	66.59	53.16	0.00	0.00	33.41	46.84	17.20	3.65	12.76
Com & Ind Total	51	1,240,610	4	215,360	18	432,340	73	1,888,310	320,900
% of Com & Ind Total	69.86	65.70	5.48	11.40	24.66	22.90	3.02	0.77	6.00
17. Taxable Total	328	6,026,400	4	215,360	157	4,649,100	489	10,890,860	1,002,835
% of Taxable Total	67.08	55.33	0.82	1.98	32.11	42.69	20.21	4.42	18.76

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				0	0	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	45	4	100	149

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	2	74,730	1,526	163,405,220	1,528	163,479,950
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	1,050	3	163,420	384	54,805,570	388	54,970,040
29. Ag Improvements	1	5,700	3	168,280	398	17,154,860	402	17,328,840
30. Ag Total							1,930	235,778,830

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	1.00	1,050	3	3.20	3,190	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	5,700	3	0.00	168,280	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.88	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	25	26.00	27,300	25	26.00	27,300	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	304	351.00	368,550	304	351.00	368,550	
33. HomeSite Improvements	293	302.00	11,706,160	293	302.00	11,706,160	4,342,211
34. HomeSite Total				318	377.00	12,102,010	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	24	62.41	51,970	24	62.41	51,970	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	69	190.31	130,010	73	194.51	134,250	
37. FarmSite Improvements	363	0.00	5,448,700	367	0.00	5,622,680	0
38. FarmSite Total				391	256.92	5,808,900	
39. Road & Ditches	0	3,189.94	0	0	3,190.82	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				709	3,824.74	17,910,910	4,342,211

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	7	1,325.01	554,070	7	1,325.01	554,070

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	169	43,712.35	18,811,630	169	43,712.35	18,811,630
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	219.88	0.92%	228,670	0.93%	1,039.98
46. 1A	786.43	3.27%	817,870	3.31%	1,039.98
47. 2A1	2,534.74	10.55%	2,635,690	10.67%	1,039.83
48. 2A	3,639.10	15.15%	3,782,750	15.31%	1,039.47
49. 3A1	1,761.89	7.33%	1,814,590	7.34%	1,029.91
50. 3A	6,596.29	27.46%	6,793,560	27.49%	1,029.91
51. 4A1	5,424.88	22.58%	5,533,350	22.39%	1,019.99
52. 4A	3,060.11	12.74%	3,103,850	12.56%	1,014.29
53. Total	24,023.32	100.00%	24,710,330	100.00%	1,028.60
Dry					
54. 1D1	448.12	1.38%	218,870	1.51%	488.42
55. 1D	4,674.09	14.40%	2,282,450	15.75%	488.32
56. 2D1	5,915.87	18.22%	2,657,700	18.34%	449.25
57. 2D	8,731.54	26.90%	3,920,720	27.06%	449.03
58. 3D1	2,259.87	6.96%	971,150	6.70%	429.74
59. 3D	5,537.11	17.06%	2,380,280	16.43%	429.88
60. 4D1	2,608.54	8.04%	1,095,560	7.56%	419.99
61. 4D	2,288.09	7.05%	961,000	6.63%	420.00
62. Total	32,463.23	100.00%	14,487,730	100.00%	446.28
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,026.71	0.24%	482,570	0.27%	470.02
64. 1G	4,553.56	1.07%	2,138,140	1.20%	469.55
65. 2G1	8,350.30	1.96%	3,758,640	2.10%	450.12
66. 2G	21,313.43	5.00%	9,594,230	5.37%	450.15
67. 3G1	18,192.48	4.27%	7,640,760	4.28%	420.00
68. 3G	77,674.37	18.23%	32,622,980	18.26%	420.00
69. 4G1	85,818.98	20.14%	35,615,900	19.94%	415.01
70. 4G	209,090.82	49.08%	86,774,300	48.58%	415.01
71. Total	426,020.65	100.00%	178,627,520	100.00%	419.29
Irrigated Total					
	24,023.32	4.96%	24,710,330	11.34%	1,028.60
Dry Total					
	32,463.23	6.70%	14,487,730	6.65%	446.28
Grass Total					
	426,020.65	87.91%	178,627,520	81.99%	419.29
72. Waste	2,117.35	0.44%	42,340	0.02%	20.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	366.12	0.08%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	484,624.55	100.00%	217,867,920	100.00%	449.56

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	203.60	207,670	23,819.72	24,502,660	24,023.32	24,710,330
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	25.63	10,860	32,437.60	14,476,870	32,463.23	14,487,730
78. Grass	0.00	0	39.57	16,430	425,981.08	178,611,090	426,020.65	178,627,520
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,117.35	42,340	2,117.35	42,340
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	12.10	0	0.00	0	354.02	0	366.12	0
82. Total	0.00	0	268.80	234,960	484,355.75	217,632,960	484,624.55	217,867,920

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	24,023.32	4.96%	24,710,330	11.34%	1,028.60
Dry Land	32,463.23	6.70%	14,487,730	6.65%	446.28
Grass	426,020.65	87.91%	178,627,520	81.99%	419.29
Waste	2,117.35	0.44%	42,340	0.02%	20.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	366.12	0.08%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	484,624.55	100.00%	217,867,920	100.00%	449.56

2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2010 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

52 Keya Paha

	2010 CTL County Total	2011 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2011 form 45 - 2010 CTL)	Percent Change	2011 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	9,040,280	9,002,550	-37,730	-0.42%	681,935	-7.96%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	11,469,780	12,102,010	632,230	5.51%	4,342,211	-32.35%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	20,510,060	21,104,560	594,500	2.90%	5,024,146	-21.60%
05. Commercial	1,887,380	1,888,310	930	0.05%	320,900	-16.95%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	5,623,350	5,808,900	185,550	3.30%	0	3.30%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	7,510,730	7,697,210	186,480	2.48%	320,900	-1.79%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	28,020,790	28,801,770	780,980	2.79%	5,345,046	-16.29%
11. Irrigated	23,424,330	24,710,330	1,286,000	5.49%		
12. Dryland	13,464,670	14,487,730	1,023,060	7.60%		
13. Grassland	168,278,870	178,627,520	10,348,650	6.15%		
14. Wasteland	42,340	42,340	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	205,210,210	217,867,920	12,657,710	6.17%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	233,231,000	246,669,690	13,438,690	5.76%	5,345,046	3.47%

**Keya Paha County Plan of Assessment
Assessment Years 2011, 2012 & 2013
October 2010**

INTRODUCTION

The Plan of Assessment is a required documentation of the assessor to the Property Tax Administrator and the County Board of Equalization to help them understand the plans and workings of the Keya Paha County Assessor's Office. This plan is to be submitted by July 31st to the CBOE and October 31st to PA&T.

LEVEL OF VALUE

The level of value for Keya Paha for the 2010 year is as follows:

Residential Class Not Applicable - lack of enough sales
Commercial Class Not Applicable - lack of enough sales
Agricultural Class is 74% COD of 26.72 and a PRD of 112.92

PARCEL COUNT

The 2010 County Abstract record shows 2,401 parcels.

STAFF AND EQUIPMENT

The Keya Paha County Assessor is also the County Clerk and has one full time deputy to perform all the duties of the ex-officio office. The Assessor and Deputy attend schooling and workshops offered by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. Working around board meetings and workload is a juggling act to work in the required continuing education hours, especially during an election year. A weeklong class is a burden for the office, having one person gone makes it difficult to clerk commissioners meetings, answering phone and etc. The Deputy has passed her Assessors test.

The Assessor budget submitted for the 2010-2011 year is \$41,750 which would include a percentage of the office personnel salaries on a shared basis with all of the positions. There is \$15,000 budgeted for appraisal and another \$15,000 for one third of the cost of implementing GIS in Keya Paha County. GIS will enable Keya Paha County to implement the new soil types and will eliminate the need for new cadastral maps.

The property record cards are very well kept and always current. They contain all pertinent information required plus some extra information. They include: name, address, legal, acres, and current land use and value. The record also includes historic information dating back at least 15 years. The records are kept in pull out file cabinets that are very well marked with townships and ranges so that anyone can easily access a file. The folders have a metal clasp so that all records are secure and kept in the same order for each record so that similar information can easily be compared to other parcels.

The Marshall & Swift pricing for all improvements is done with the use of Terra Scan. Keya Paha County will have all assessment information available on GIS and a website in the near future; the process began in 2010 and is nearly complete.

PROCEEDURES MANUAL

The Property Tax Division's "Assessor Reference Manual" is the main book of reference for filing deadlines and reposts. A policy and procedure manual was developed in 2002. It describes the steps taken in the office when changes are made and values are set. It outlines real and personal property procedures in the office.

REPORT GENERATION

The reports required by the State are all filed in a timely manner from the Terra Scan program. The Assessor completes and files all of the reports. The reports are generated as well as supporting documents to compare that all information is correct. The reports are kept in chronological order and easily accessible. The tax corrections are in a bound book and numbered. The Treasurer is also on Terra Scan so all tax rolls are easily delivered to her and both have the same information available at all times.

REAL PROPERTY

Discovery is done by building permits from the Zoning Administrator, Village Clerk and personal knowledge of county officials and employees.

When new improvements are discovered through sales process, building permits, and information received there is a list compiled for the appraiser. The appraiser does the data collection and measurements, along with the yearly review of property according to the 5 year plan of reappraisal.

The Real Estate Transfer Statements are received with the Deeds at the time of recording. This office is also the Register of Deeds and Clerk so there is no waiting to receive them. The property record cards are changed and updated along with the recording process. The Assessor does the 521's monthly and the 521's are sent to the Department of Revenue along with the revenue.

Each 521 is reviewed along with the Property Record Card. After a deed is recorded the property record card is left with the 521 until the sale is reviewed. The sale properties are not physically reviewed at the time of the sale, as this is a small county the Assessor and Deputy are familiar with most properties in the county. The Assessor and Deputy visit about the sale as the review is conducted. All pertinent sales information is put into a binder containing all the sales for that year. We also have a sales map on display in the office that has a different color for each year and a flag stating the book and page of recording as well as the price per acre. The map is placed where the public can easily see it and it is a great point of interest to most visitors in the office.

After the sales are added to the sales file and the preliminary statistics are released by PA&T the valuation studies are done on all classes of property. Use is determined and ag studies are done. The market approach is applied to all sales properties as well as unsold properties. A review of improvements is done on the 5 year cycle depending on the study that is to be done that year.

Valuation change notices are mailed timely after the abstract is submitted and the report and opinion is rendered and no show cause hearing changes any value. The appeal process for valuation protest is as prescribed by law. Taxpayer fills the appropriate forms for protest and submits them to the County Clerk and a schedule of hearing dates is set up for the County Board of Equalization hearings. Hearings are held on protests and a final review and determination is made by the CBOE. The Clerk notifies the taxpayer of the CBOE decision as prescribed by law within the time allowed.

Taxpayers may then appeal to the TERC if not satisfied by the CBOE's decision. The Assessor attends any hearings and show cause hearings to defend values and preparation of any defense of that value.

PERSONAL PROPERTY

A postcard is sent to all who have personal property on record to remind them that they must bring in their depreciation sheet and file by May 1. Non residents as well as new taxpayers are also sent a postcard at the same time to let them know about Nebraska personal property law. The personal property files are included in the Terra Scan program and easily and quickly accessed by the staff. A personal property roster is printed as soon after the 1st of January as possible. This roster includes the schedule number, name and all property that was listed the prior year. The roster also includes the type, year, adjusted basis, recovery, depreciation percent and tax value. The roster is compared to the depreciation sheets as the taxpayer is in the office so that they do not have to make follow-up trips to the office. Every effort is made to get everything done for them to file in a timely manner with only one trip to the courthouse. Follow up reminders are sent after the filing deadline in June and August to get all the schedules filed and all the personal property in the county listed. The schedules are filed in alphabetical order as received and kept in a secure place as personal property lists are not available to the public. The roster printed for the office use is shredded after the taxpayer files.

PLAN BREAKDOWN BY YEAR

2011-All pick-up work will be done and rural properties will again be looked at based on our five year plan of assessment, then values would be effective for 2012.

2012-Residential and Commercial Properties will again be looked at on our five year plan with the values taking effect in 2013.

2013-All pick-up work will be completed

CONCLUSION

We continue to struggle to get all things accomplished in our ex-officio office. The coming year is an election year and will be exceptionally challenging to keep up with the work of the Clerk, Assessor, Register of Deeds, Clerk of the District Court and the Election Commissioner.

A market study was done on rural parcels that have sold to help set the value and depreciation adjustment needed to have the improvements valued at market value. The pick-up work is kept up on a yearly basis.

The three year plan, that of reviewing the property classes on a 5 year cycle, would also include continued growth in knowledge and implementation of the changes that need to be made to keep the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment equal to statutory and administrative guidelines.

Suzy Wentworth, Assessor

Date

2011 Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	None
3.	Other full-time employees:
	None
4.	Other part-time employees:
	None
5.	Number of shared employees:
	One
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$55,750
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same as above
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$44,000
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	None
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$5,000 for Terra Scan
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,300
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$4,450 postage, newspaper ads and dues.
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	\$11,778.96

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 Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS company with input from the assessor
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	None
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1995

D. Contracted Services

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

2011 Certification for Keya Paha County

This is to certify that the 2011 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 Keya Paha County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

