

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 Red Willow County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	293	Median	95.50
Total Sales Price	\$21,933,684	Mean	96.13
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$22,012,334	Wgt. Mean	92.39
Total Assessed Value	\$20,337,142	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$56,399
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$75,127	Avg. Assessed Value	\$69,410

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.28 to 96.58
95% Mean C.I	90.81 to 93.97
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.24 to 98.02
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	40.03
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.03
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.42

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	333	97	97
2009	369	98	98
2008	375	95	95
2007	379	94	94

2011 Commission Summary for Red Willow County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	37	Median	98.52
Total Sales Price	\$5,234,000	Mean	93.53
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,226,000	Wgt. Mean	95.01
Total Assessed Value	\$4,965,452	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$137,357
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$141,243	Avg. Assessed Value	\$134,201

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.91 to 99.45
95% Mean C.I	86.21 to 100.85
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	86.41 to 103.61
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	14.52
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.11
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.99

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	40	98	98
2009	29	99	99
2008	31	96	96
2007	25	97	97

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Red Willow 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	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	99	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	69	The qualitative measures calculated in the random include 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
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Red Willow County

The Red Willow County Assessor made changes to neighborhoods within the County in conjunction with Three Year Plan of Assessment. Rural mobile homes and properties in neighborhood 8500 were updated for 2011. These are located outside of the City of McCook. Market data was reviewed from the new appraisals that were revalued in 2010 for valuation grouping 01, within the City of McCook and including the majority of the residential base in the county. They received updated Marshall and Swift Costing of June/2008 and updated depreciation tables which will be reviewed to keep the values within recent market factors.

New appraisals were completed for residential properties within the Villages of Bartley, Danbury, Lebanon, Marion and neighborhood 8500 outside the City of McCook. These received new Marshall and Swift Costing of June/2008 and new depreciation tables. Physical inspections were completed as part of the revaluation process.

All pickup work was timely completed for 2011 and new values assessed as reported. Physical inspections began for properties within neighborhood 8000 for complete appraisals for 2012. The six year inspection and review process is on schedule with these neighborhoods being reviewed and updated to meet statutory requirements.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The assessor and staff	
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	The City of McCook is the largest commercial based community with a population of approximately 8,000. The City has encouraged property owners in the older, original part of town to clear off structures that are in poor condition. There are a limited number of vacant lots in the older neighborhoods. The newer subdivisions have restricted covenants that limit the demand. New construction is minimal in the City.
	02	Indianola is a smaller village located east of McCook on Hwy 6&34. It serves as farming economic area and bedroom community to McCook with approx. 620 residents.
	03	Bartley is located on east of Indianola and only 355 residents. It has a very minimal commercial base for residents.
	04	Lebanon is a small village located southeast of McCook with a population of less than 70. The majority of the residential properties are vacant.
	05	Danbury is on Hwy 89 near Lebanon; population near 100; limited demand for residential property.
	06	This grouping contains the suburban areas around McCook including the neighborhood 8500 which extends out to the west and north of the suburban boundary.
	07	Rural residential parcels are outside the City and Village boundaries with their own water wells and utility services.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Cost Approach and Sales comparison; The assessor develops spreadsheets and manuals of all sales for each grouping. The depreciation tables are developed from the information gathered from the studies.	
4	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2008; and annually the lot values are studied	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	Vacant lot sales are analyzed to determine the value per square foot in each valuation grouping	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	Every valuation grouping except 07 (rural) is on June/2008 costing tables. The rural valuation grouping is on June/2002.	
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?
	The County develops depreciation tables from local market information
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?
	The depreciation tables are updated at a review or when a mass appraisal is completed in each valuation grouping.
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.
	If the improvement adds more than a minimal value the county would classify it as substantially improved. Example: additions, garage, dwelling.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.
	See attached

73 Red Willow

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 : 293
 Total Sales Price : 21,933,684
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,012,334
 Total Assessed Value : 20,337,142
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 75,127
 Avg. Assessed Value : 69,410

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 96
 COD : 11.73
 PRD : 104.05

COV : 17.15
 STD : 16.49
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.20
 MAX Sales Ratio : 170.78
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.39

95% Median C.I. : 94.28 to 96.58
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.81 to 93.97
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.24 to 98.02

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:15PM

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	47	96.95	96.51	92.90	11.25	103.89	60.78	138.95	92.78 to 100.36	92,241	85,689
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	39	97.38	97.79	94.45	09.15	103.54	73.52	136.13	93.62 to 101.60	67,949	64,177
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	23	98.75	102.43	98.09	11.36	104.42	76.93	170.78	94.31 to 104.14	58,049	56,939
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	39	93.48	93.53	92.28	09.16	101.35	69.84	138.51	91.27 to 97.14	76,806	70,880
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	31	94.75	95.33	93.17	10.23	102.32	70.41	132.56	88.46 to 98.59	73,215	68,212
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	35	96.54	98.46	93.54	16.74	105.26	42.39	167.28	90.62 to 101.30	65,439	61,213
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	35	92.55	93.42	89.89	12.44	103.93	64.52	144.76	87.37 to 95.55	65,768	59,118
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	44	92.86	94.14	88.84	12.08	105.97	57.34	125.56	89.68 to 97.60	87,149	77,426
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	148	96.94	96.98	93.71	10.33	103.49	60.78	170.78	95.15 to 98.71	76,459	71,650
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	145	94.49	95.26	90.99	12.97	104.69	42.39	167.28	92.08 to 96.13	73,769	67,124
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	128	96.19	96.91	93.71	12.10	103.41	42.39	170.78	93.48 to 98.02	69,457	65,086
<u>ALL</u>	293	95.50	96.13	92.39	11.73	104.05	42.39	170.78	94.28 to 96.58	75,127	69,410

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	235	96.26	97.60	93.64	11.06	104.23	42.39	170.78	94.49 to 97.48	72,370	67,768
02	11	95.83	94.22	90.79	15.32	103.78	60.78	127.49	66.57 to 119.28	58,955	53,526
03	10	97.07	97.86	90.14	21.84	108.56	46.32	145.00	73.52 to 132.56	41,850	37,724
04	5	71.59	79.32	75.03	11.87	105.72	70.00	96.13	N/A	15,900	11,930
05	1	98.59	98.59	98.59	00.00	100.00	98.59	98.59	N/A	8,662	8,540
06	23	92.68	89.72	90.14	08.79	99.53	73.52	107.29	80.59 to 95.93	134,203	120,970
07	8	88.10	82.02	77.96	15.03	105.21	57.34	98.71	57.34 to 98.71	95,438	74,406
<u>ALL</u>	293	95.50	96.13	92.39	11.73	104.05	42.39	170.78	94.28 to 96.58	75,127	69,410

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	274	95.34	95.40	92.35	10.96	103.30	46.32	167.28	93.99 to 96.54	78,856	72,825
06											
07	19	99.85	106.71	94.43	21.69	113.00	42.39	170.78	89.02 to 122.48	21,353	20,164
<u>ALL</u>	293	95.50	96.13	92.39	11.73	104.05	42.39	170.78	94.28 to 96.58	75,127	69,410

73 Red Willow

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 : 293
 Total Sales Price : 21,933,684
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,012,334
 Total Assessed Value : 20,337,142
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 75,127
 Avg. Assessed Value : 69,410

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 96
 COD : 11.73
 PRD : 104.05

COV : 17.15
 STD : 16.49
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.20
 MAX Sales Ratio : 170.78
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.39

95% Median C.I. : 94.28 to 96.58
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.81 to 93.97
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.24 to 98.02

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:15PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	5	119.03	118.26	129.22	25.59	91.52	70.00	167.28	N/A	3,640	4,704	
5000 TO 9999	11	98.59	109.10	109.84	20.58	99.33	78.66	160.23	84.57 to 144.76	7,801	8,569	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	16	106.66	111.96	113.23	23.20	98.88	70.00	167.28	87.63 to 144.76	6,501	7,361	
10000 TO 29999	54	99.10	103.29	101.72	15.18	101.54	46.32	170.78	95.10 to 105.18	19,791	20,132	
30000 TO 59999	58	97.62	97.40	97.46	12.78	99.94	42.39	136.13	94.99 to 102.35	44,860	43,719	
60000 TO 99999	87	95.31	94.06	94.10	07.38	99.96	60.78	118.32	92.37 to 97.90	79,093	74,425	
100000 TO 149999	50	91.47	88.70	88.49	09.35	100.24	57.34	104.26	87.09 to 94.49	122,516	108,414	
150000 TO 249999	25	92.08	90.72	90.35	07.59	100.41	69.83	101.77	88.81 to 96.53	175,970	158,995	
250000 TO 499999	3	80.59	87.43	87.30	13.60	100.15	74.41	107.29	N/A	277,193	241,992	
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	293	95.50	96.13	92.39	11.73	104.05	42.39	170.78	94.28 to 96.58	75,127	69,410	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

A. Residential Real Property

Within Red Willow County the major location for approximately 90% of the residential valuation base is in the City of McCook. McCook has nearly 8000 residents and the only Community College, Hospital, Wal-Mart and major suppliers in the area where a lot of the County and area people come to shop for basic needs and employment. New growth for residential property includes 3.7 million.

The number of residential sales has declined each year since 2008 with each assessor location. The total number of qualified residential sales has decreased by 22% in the past four years. This is the declining housing market reflecting the decrease. The assessor uses 64% of the total sales file for measurement purposes and conducts a sales review process that supports good assessment practices. Red Willow County uses every sale possible with a physical inspection when necessary. The assessor and staff completed new appraisals as part of the cyclical review pattern for properties within the Villages of Bartley, Danbury, Lebanon, Marion and neighborhood 8500 outside the City of McCook. These received June/2008 costing tables and new depreciation tables for the 2011 values.

The total qualified sample of 293 will be considered as adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Red Willow County. The median and mean are identical at 96 and show support of the level of value. The weighted mean is also within the acceptable threshold at 92. The COD represents the assessor has met uniform and proportionate assessments within the residential class of property. The PRD is slightly over the threshold of acceptable measures, although the unorganized array of small villages may be skewing this qualitative statistic. There is no information available that indicates the county has not met uniform and proportionate assessments.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 96% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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 Red Willow County

The Red Willow County Assessor reviewed the commercial properties for any areas that need addressed since the new appraisal completed in 2009. In conjunction with the Three Year Plan of Assessment the commercial grain elevators were revalued with new costing and depreciation tables derived from local markets. New actions included the pickup work for 2011 which was timely assessed. The Red Willow County Assessor contracts with Jerry Knoche, a licensed appraiser to value commercial properties using the cost, sales comparison and income approach when the data is available.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The assessor and staff	
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	The City of McCook is the largest commercial based community in Red Willow County. It has two large factories as well as a Super Wal-Mart. There is very limited retail businesses located downtown.
	02	Indianola is a small village located 10 miles east of McCook on Hwy 6 & 34 where several people are retired. Limited jobs in this village make residents commute to McCook for employment.
	03	Bartley sits east of Indianola with minimal commercial base.
	04	Lebanon is located in the southeast portion of the county with vacant commercial properties. The only operating business is the grain elevator.
	05	Danbury is located on Hwy 89 near Lebanon with majority of small business vacate. No grain elevator facility in this location.
	06	This grouping contains the suburban areas around McCook including neighborhood (8500) which extends to the west and north of the suburban boundaries.
	07	Rural commercial parcels outside of the city and village own their own water well and utility services.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	All three approaches to value are used where applicable. Income data is not always available. Information for each occupancy code is limited to determine market value.	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2008	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	A study of all vacant lot sales is completed to determine market value.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June/2007	
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?	
	The County develops depreciation studies based on the local market.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	The County contracts with an outside appraisal company to determine commercial depreciation tables.	

9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?
	At the time a mass appraisal or a review of a specific occupancy code is studied
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.
	If the improvement adds more than a minimal value we would classify it as substantially improved.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.
	See office policies and procedures manual

73 Red Willow

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 : 37
 Total Sales Price : 5,234,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,226,000
 Total Assessed Value : 4,965,452
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 141,243
 Avg. Assessed Value : 134,201

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 94
 COD : 13.47
 PRD : 98.44

COV : 24.30
 STD : 22.73
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.27
 MAX Sales Ratio : 149.33
 MIN Sales Ratio : 17.78

95% Median C.I. : 93.91 to 99.45
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.41 to 103.61
 95% Mean C.I. : 86.21 to 100.85

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:18PM

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>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	4	96.84	100.77	95.72	08.17	105.28	91.22	118.18	N/A	81,000	77,536
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	98.28	97.96	98.05	01.73	99.91	93.60	100.00	N/A	66,200	64,911
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	2	99.29	99.29	99.15	00.16	100.14	99.13	99.45	N/A	293,250	290,771
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	100.20	116.04	139.22	16.89	83.35	98.58	149.33	N/A	78,000	108,589
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	102.25	102.25	104.23	02.10	98.10	100.10	104.39	N/A	687,500	716,579
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	98.52	85.91	83.08	13.24	103.41	62.83	99.60	N/A	74,400	61,814
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	55.56	55.56	56.07	01.82	99.09	54.55	56.56	N/A	91,000	51,025
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	84.81	74.86	74.36	27.60	100.67	17.78	113.10	17.78 to 113.10	147,000	109,315
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	106.73	106.73	106.73	00.00	100.00	106.73	106.73	N/A	120,000	128,071
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	99.18	110.25	100.82	14.70	109.35	93.91	137.66	N/A	136,167	137,280
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	99.67	99.67	96.50	03.45	103.28	96.23	103.10	N/A	13,000	12,545
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	94.93	94.93	93.06	02.85	102.01	92.22	97.64	N/A	192,500	179,142
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	14	99.15	102.82	104.51	06.71	98.38	91.22	149.33	94.50 to 100.20	105,393	110,143
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	15	89.71	79.62	88.94	22.88	89.52	17.78	113.10	56.65 to 99.60	187,400	166,678
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	8	98.41	103.33	98.27	08.46	105.15	92.22	137.66	92.22 to 137.66	117,438	115,410
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	99.29	98.39	103.20	10.52	95.34	62.83	149.33	98.52 to 100.20	213,958	220,794
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	90.86	83.14	81.50	26.36	102.01	17.78	137.66	56.56 to 106.73	132,708	108,154
<u>ALL</u>	37	98.52	93.53	95.01	13.47	98.44	17.78	149.33	93.91 to 99.45	141,243	134,201

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	28	98.83	95.77	96.02	12.46	99.74	17.78	149.33	93.60 to 100.00	177,354	170,300
02	5	97.90	85.06	75.82	21.45	112.19	54.55	113.10	N/A	16,600	12,586
03	1	62.83	62.83	62.83	00.00	100.00	62.83	62.83	N/A	111,500	70,052
04	2	96.54	96.54	98.14	02.11	98.37	94.50	98.58	N/A	2,800	2,748
06	1	97.64	97.64	97.64	00.00	100.00	97.64	97.64	N/A	60,000	58,583
<u>ALL</u>	37	98.52	93.53	95.01	13.47	98.44	17.78	149.33	93.91 to 99.45	141,243	134,201

**73 Red Willow
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 : 37
 Total Sales Price : 5,234,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,226,000
 Total Assessed Value : 4,965,452
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 141,243
 Avg. Assessed Value : 134,201

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 94
 COD : 13.47
 PRD : 98.44

COV : 24.30
 STD : 22.73
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.27
 MAX Sales Ratio : 149.33
 MIN Sales Ratio : 17.78

95% Median C.I. : 93.91 to 99.45
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.41 to 103.61
 95% Mean C.I. : 86.21 to 100.85

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:18PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	1	93.60	93.60	93.60	00.00	100.00	93.60	93.60	N/A	25,000	23,400
03	36	98.52	93.52	95.02	13.70	98.42	17.78	149.33	93.91 to 99.60	144,472	137,279
04											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>37</u>	98.52	93.53	95.01	13.47	98.44	17.78	149.33	93.91 to 99.45	141,243	134,201

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$</u>											
1 TO 4999	3	94.50	84.75	75.86	16.38	111.72	56.65	103.10	N/A	1,200	910
5000 TO 9999	3	98.58	96.86	97.06	02.71	99.79	92.00	100.00	N/A	5,333	5,176
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	6	96.54	90.81	93.16	10.11	97.48	56.65	103.10	56.65 to 103.10	3,267	3,043
10000 TO 29999	7	99.60	102.66	102.09	06.24	100.56	93.60	118.18	93.60 to 118.18	21,643	22,095
30000 TO 59999	5	100.10	98.39	97.95	16.75	100.45	54.55	137.66	N/A	45,900	44,959
60000 TO 99999	5	98.52	92.78	94.05	06.09	98.65	70.07	99.17	N/A	79,300	74,581
100000 TO 149999	4	71.37	76.51	75.97	23.55	100.71	56.56	106.73	N/A	121,125	92,016
150000 TO 249999	5	93.91	90.28	91.19	29.71	99.00	17.78	149.33	N/A	186,880	170,417
250000 TO 499999	2	95.25	95.25	94.85	03.18	100.42	92.22	98.28	N/A	287,500	272,700
500000 +	3	99.13	97.74	99.77	04.93	97.97	89.71	104.39	N/A	811,667	809,760
<u>ALL</u>	<u>37</u>	98.52	93.53	95.01	13.47	98.44	17.78	149.33	93.91 to 99.45	141,243	134,201

73 Red Willow

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 : 37
 Total Sales Price : 5,234,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,226,000
 Total Assessed Value : 4,965,452
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 141,243
 Avg. Assessed Value : 134,201

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 94
 COD : 13.47
 PRD : 98.44

COV : 24.30
 STD : 22.73
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.27
 MAX Sales Ratio : 149.33
 MIN Sales Ratio : 17.78

95% Median C.I. : 93.91 to 99.45
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.41 to 103.61
 95% Mean C.I. : 86.21 to 100.85

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:18PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	6	95.41	81.09	62.89	27.11	128.94	17.78	118.18	17.78 to 118.18	70,900	44,591
302	1	97.64	97.64	97.64	00.00	100.00	97.64	97.64	N/A	60,000	58,583
326	1	97.90	97.90	97.90	00.00	100.00	97.90	97.90	N/A	26,000	25,454
343	2	101.76	101.76	102.87	02.58	98.92	99.13	104.39	N/A	930,000	956,716
344	3	79.90	78.25	82.63	17.41	94.70	56.56	98.28	N/A	167,667	138,547
349	1	70.07	70.07	70.07	00.00	100.00	70.07	70.07	N/A	62,500	43,792
350	2	95.40	95.40	92.31	03.33	103.35	92.22	98.58	N/A	165,000	152,315
352	1	93.60	93.60	93.60	00.00	100.00	93.60	93.60	N/A	25,000	23,400
353	7	99.17	93.57	90.73	08.39	103.13	62.83	106.73	62.83 to 106.73	144,929	131,488
384	1	99.45	99.45	99.45	00.00	100.00	99.45	99.45	N/A	51,500	51,216
386	2	74.23	74.23	85.91	26.51	86.40	54.55	93.91	N/A	108,250	93,000
406	6	100.00	106.21	118.84	10.71	89.37	92.00	137.66	92.00 to 137.66	14,433	17,153
528	3	98.52	98.74	98.86	00.22	99.88	98.52	99.18	N/A	126,333	124,893
851	1	149.33	149.33	149.33	00.00	100.00	149.33	149.33	N/A	186,000	277,750
<u>ALL</u>	<u>37</u>	98.52	93.53	95.01	13.47	98.44	17.78	149.33	93.91 to 99.45	141,243	134,201

2011 Correlation Section for Red Willow County

A. Commerical Real Property

The commercial property in Red Willow County is primarily located within the City of McCook. 95% of the commercial valuation is located here with 76% of the sold properties located in this valuation grouping. The City is comprised of some downtown retail, fast food businesses, Wal-Mart, one grocery store, commercial grain elevators and a couple manufacturing plants. McCook serves as the main source of business for the area counties and farming communities.

The assessor utilizes outside commercial appraisal work through Jerry Knoche. Each year the assessor keeps her cyclical review and inspection process complete by the appraisal work of the occupancy codes that are similar in use and market characteristics. In 2011 commercial grain elevators were revalued using new costing and depreciation tables derived from local market data. The sales comparison and income approach are used to reconcile the market value with the cost approach using all available data for determination.

Red Willow County closely follows the market factors and focuses on the goals for each assessment year as outlined in the Three Year Plan of Assessment. This current study period includes 37 commercial sales. Of those 37 sold properties, 28 are in the valuation grouping 01, or McCook assessor location. This valuation grouping is the only subclass that is representative and has an adequate number of sales for reliability. The median for valuation grouping 01 is 98.83 which supports the county overall median as a reliable measure of the level of value. The COD is 13.47 and the PRD is 98.44 which indicate the County has attained assessment equality.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 99% of market value for the commercial class of property, and the valuation grouping 01 is determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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 Red Willow County

The Red Willow County Assessor analyzed the agricultural sales within Red Willow County and the areas surrounding the county. Recent market factors have shown increases that support higher land values for 2011 in all three land uses. The County Assessor closely monitors the affects the occupational tax and water allocation to operators along the Republican River basin. Although the restrictions are part of the economic factors to the buyers in Red Willow County, the irrigated land market supported the assessment actions to raise each irrigated LCG \$90 for 2011.

The dry land values were increased by \$45 per every LCG compared to 2010. These increases are apparent in the local market and surrounding counties of Furnas, Hitchcock and Frontier. The strong cattle market and corn prices contribute to the higher prices of farm land in this area. Grass also increased by \$30 bringing all the subclasses of grass to \$280 for 2011.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The assessor and staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	There are no apparent characteristic differences throughout the county. Red Willow County consists of a mixture of dry, irrigated and grass. There are limited parcels or sales of a majority of a certain land class. Several parcels include unfenced grass and no stock wells. The water issues with Kansas have created uncertainty with the income potential with irrigated land. The assessor continually gathers information to determine the effect on the value due to the occupation tax and rapid response region that has been designated in the County.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Sales are plotted on a mapping system and spreadsheets to determine any characteristics that are unique within a specific area. There is no evidence to support different market areas at the current time.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	The study of the most recent sales determined the classification for a residential site. The information gathered was the price per acre, the typical number of desirable acres per site, and the location of the sites to determine the market areas. Based on the information gathered; 20 acres or less are valued as a site unless GIS mapping, a physical inspection or evidence is provided to show that the land is actively devoted to agricultural. Sales are monitored for any future recreational use.	
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?	
	Farm home sites carry the same value	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	The agricultural potential versus rural site with no utilities or rural site with well, septic tank and electrical. The County recognizes the distance from the job market, medical facilities , shopping and school systems.	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	The County requested permission from new land owners to receive a new FSA map along with the questionnaires that are mailed out. Updated GIS overlays with the current records and contacts with the owners regarding the land use.	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Spreadsheets and maps are developed for all sales which includes agricultural and possible recreational land.	

9.	Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.
	No
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.
	If the improvement adds more than a minimal value the classification would be substantially changed.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.
	See policy and procedure manual

73 Red Willow

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

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

Number of Sales : 46
 Total Sales Price : 9,646,152
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,148,964
 Total Assessed Value : 6,538,377
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 220,630
 Avg. Assessed Value : 142,139

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 64
 MEAN : 70
 COD : 18.51
 PRD : 108.60

COV : 24.70
 STD : 17.28
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.86
 MAX Sales Ratio : 135.10
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.81

95% Median C.I. : 62.37 to 75.95
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 59.30 to 69.55
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.97 to 74.95

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:21PM

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	1	74.93	74.93	74.93	00.00	100.00	74.93	74.93	N/A	208,000	155,860
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	3	71.17	68.77	61.07	20.06	112.61	46.15	88.98	N/A	162,250	99,088
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	83.55	98.95	86.66	22.70	114.18	78.19	135.10	N/A	157,340	136,354
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	78.25	76.93	76.28	06.45	100.85	64.62	83.44	N/A	217,000	165,525
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	59.29	59.29	62.04	31.17	95.57	40.81	77.76	N/A	174,000	107,958
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	69.54	65.04	59.45	11.63	109.40	50.65	74.93	N/A	351,500	208,961
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	77.36	72.99	63.14	19.58	115.60	52.06	96.66	N/A	179,546	113,368
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	58.91	60.66	58.90	10.73	102.99	51.58	75.12	51.58 to 75.12	283,596	167,050
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	65.02	58.38	52.79	14.18	110.59	41.45	70.15	N/A	284,400	150,124
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	59.08	64.79	68.35	15.20	94.79	54.17	81.12	N/A	149,400	102,111
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	8	68.56	75.64	71.71	14.92	105.48	62.09	102.26	62.09 to 102.26	182,250	130,697
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	12	78.22	80.23	75.04	14.98	106.92	46.15	135.10	71.17 to 83.55	187,648	140,818
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	18	60.81	64.66	60.10	19.73	107.59	40.81	96.66	52.65 to 75.12	253,833	152,558
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	16	66.45	68.21	63.17	15.67	107.98	41.45	102.26	59.08 to 81.12	208,013	131,408
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	13	77.76	76.55	70.26	16.27	108.95	40.81	135.10	64.62 to 83.44	227,655	159,960
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	60.81	63.45	57.84	17.94	109.70	41.45	96.66	52.65 to 71.21	254,916	147,437
<u>ALL</u>	46	69.49	69.96	64.42	18.51	108.60	40.81	135.10	62.37 to 75.95	220,630	142,139

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	46	69.49	69.96	64.42	18.51	108.60	40.81	135.10	62.37 to 75.95	220,630	142,139
<u>ALL</u>	46	69.49	69.96	64.42	18.51	108.60	40.81	135.10	62.37 to 75.95	220,630	142,139

73 Red Willow
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 : 46
 Total Sales Price : 9,646,152
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,148,964
 Total Assessed Value : 6,538,377
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 220,630
 Avg. Assessed Value : 142,139

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 64
 MEAN : 70
 COD : 18.51
 PRD : 108.60

COV : 24.70
 STD : 17.28
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.86
 MAX Sales Ratio : 135.10
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.81

95% Median C.I. : 62.37 to 75.95
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 59.30 to 69.55
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.97 to 74.95

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:21PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	84.78	84.78	84.78	00.00	100.00	84.78	84.78	N/A	32,000	27,128
1	1	84.78	84.78	84.78	00.00	100.00	84.78	84.78	N/A	32,000	27,128
Dry											
County	3	75.12	78.42	76.76	07.91	102.16	71.17	88.98	N/A	141,417	108,546
1	3	75.12	78.42	76.76	07.91	102.16	71.17	88.98	N/A	141,417	108,546
Grass											
County	2	74.17	74.17	71.72	05.42	103.42	70.15	78.19	N/A	87,010	62,407
1	2	74.17	74.17	71.72	05.42	103.42	70.15	78.19	N/A	87,010	62,407
ALL	46	69.49	69.96	64.42	18.51	108.60	40.81	135.10	62.37 to 75.95	220,630	142,139

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	3	52.06	61.93	52.68	22.95	117.56	48.94	84.78	N/A	228,017	120,109
1	3	52.06	61.93	52.68	22.95	117.56	48.94	84.78	N/A	228,017	120,109
Dry											
County	13	71.21	72.17	66.39	14.82	108.71	46.15	102.26	62.37 to 83.44	168,404	111,800
1	13	71.21	72.17	66.39	14.82	108.71	46.15	102.26	62.37 to 83.44	168,404	111,800
Grass											
County	2	74.17	74.17	71.72	05.42	103.42	70.15	78.19	N/A	87,010	62,407
1	2	74.17	74.17	71.72	05.42	103.42	70.15	78.19	N/A	87,010	62,407
ALL	46	69.49	69.96	64.42	18.51	108.60	40.81	135.10	62.37 to 75.95	220,630	142,139

73 Red Willow

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 : 47
 Total Sales Price : 10,833,652
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 11,336,464
 Total Assessed Value : 7,327,502
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 241,201
 Avg. Assessed Value : 155,904

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 65
 MEAN : 70
 COD : 18.22
 PRD : 108.11

COV : 24.47
 STD : 17.10
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.65
 MAX Sales Ratio : 135.10
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.81

95% Median C.I. : 64.62 to 75.12
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.02 to 69.25
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.99 to 74.77

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:24PM

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	1	74.93	74.93	74.93	00.00	100.00	74.93	74.93	N/A	208,000	155,860
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	3	71.17	68.77	61.07	20.06	112.61	46.15	88.98	N/A	162,250	99,088
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	4	80.87	90.82	72.20	22.88	125.79	66.45	135.10	N/A	414,880	299,547
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	78.25	76.93	76.28	06.45	100.85	64.62	83.44	N/A	217,000	165,525
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	59.29	59.29	62.04	31.17	95.57	40.81	77.76	N/A	174,000	107,958
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	69.54	65.04	59.45	11.63	109.40	50.65	74.93	N/A	351,500	208,961
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	77.36	72.99	63.14	19.58	115.60	52.06	96.66	N/A	179,546	113,368
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	58.91	60.66	58.90	10.73	102.99	51.58	75.12	51.58 to 75.12	283,596	167,050
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	65.02	58.38	52.79	14.18	110.59	41.45	70.15	N/A	284,400	150,124
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	59.08	64.79	68.35	15.20	94.79	54.17	81.12	N/A	149,400	102,111
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	8	68.56	75.64	71.71	14.92	105.48	62.09	102.26	62.09 to 102.26	182,250	130,697
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	13	78.19	79.17	72.08	15.00	109.84	46.15	135.10	66.45 to 83.55	264,559	190,687
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	18	60.81	64.66	60.10	19.73	107.59	40.81	96.66	52.65 to 75.12	253,833	152,558
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	16	66.45	68.21	63.17	15.67	107.98	41.45	102.26	59.08 to 81.12	208,013	131,408
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	14	76.86	75.83	69.17	16.33	109.63	40.81	135.10	64.62 to 83.44	296,216	204,901
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	60.81	63.45	57.84	17.94	109.70	41.45	96.66	52.65 to 71.21	254,916	147,437
<u>ALL</u>	47	69.44	69.88	64.64	18.22	108.11	40.81	135.10	64.62 to 75.12	241,201	155,904

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	47	69.44	69.88	64.64	18.22	108.11	40.81	135.10	64.62 to 75.12	241,201	155,904
<u>ALL</u>	47	69.44	69.88	64.64	18.22	108.11	40.81	135.10	64.62 to 75.12	241,201	155,904

73 Red Willow

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 : 47
 Total Sales Price : 10,833,652
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 11,336,464
 Total Assessed Value : 7,327,502
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 241,201
 Avg. Assessed Value : 155,904

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 65
 MEAN : 70
 COD : 18.22
 PRD : 108.11

COV : 24.47
 STD : 17.10
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.65
 MAX Sales Ratio : 135.10
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.81

95% Median C.I. : 64.62 to 75.12
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.02 to 69.25
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.99 to 74.77

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:24PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	84.78	84.78	84.78	00.00	100.00	84.78	84.78	N/A	32,000	27,128
1	1	84.78	84.78	84.78	00.00	100.00	84.78	84.78	N/A	32,000	27,128
Dry											
County	3	75.12	78.42	76.76	07.91	102.16	71.17	88.98	N/A	141,417	108,546
1	3	75.12	78.42	76.76	07.91	102.16	71.17	88.98	N/A	141,417	108,546
Grass											
County	2	74.17	74.17	71.72	05.42	103.42	70.15	78.19	N/A	87,010	62,407
1	2	74.17	74.17	71.72	05.42	103.42	70.15	78.19	N/A	87,010	62,407
ALL	47	69.44	69.88	64.64	18.22	108.11	40.81	135.10	64.62 to 75.12	241,201	155,904

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	3	52.06	61.93	52.68	22.95	117.56	48.94	84.78	N/A	228,017	120,109
1	3	52.06	61.93	52.68	22.95	117.56	48.94	84.78	N/A	228,017	120,109
Dry											
County	13	71.21	72.17	66.39	14.82	108.71	46.15	102.26	62.37 to 83.44	168,404	111,800
1	13	71.21	72.17	66.39	14.82	108.71	46.15	102.26	62.37 to 83.44	168,404	111,800
Grass											
County	3	70.15	71.60	67.13	05.57	106.66	66.45	78.19	N/A	453,840	304,646
1	3	70.15	71.60	67.13	05.57	106.66	66.45	78.19	N/A	453,840	304,646
ALL	47	69.44	69.88	64.64	18.22	108.11	40.81	135.10	64.62 to 75.12	241,201	155,904

73 Red Willow

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 : 80
 Total Sales Price : 17,644,861
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,147,673
 Total Assessed Value : 12,025,650
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 226,846
 Avg. Assessed Value : 150,321

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 70
 COD : 19.23
 PRD : 106.16

COV : 24.61
 STD : 17.31
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.43
 MAX Sales Ratio : 135.10
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.81

95% Median C.I. : 65.36 to 74.93
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.33 to 70.20
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.56 to 74.14

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:27PM

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	5	86.29	78.60	80.00	12.54	98.25	51.38	93.11	N/A	104,900	83,921
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	79.44	76.74	68.40	17.52	112.19	46.15	97.95	N/A	136,810	93,576
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	12	77.18	81.04	72.19	20.41	112.26	49.57	135.10	66.45 to 92.42	304,672	219,936
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	78.25	76.93	76.28	06.45	100.85	64.62	83.44	N/A	217,000	165,525
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	5	66.83	63.67	66.15	17.75	96.25	40.81	77.76	N/A	106,414	70,388
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	64.63	63.71	59.50	13.20	107.08	50.65	74.93	N/A	319,450	190,060
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	7	53.84	64.76	57.91	31.46	111.83	43.15	96.66	43.15 to 96.66	177,655	102,872
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	12	63.31	64.11	65.39	12.04	98.04	51.58	81.66	54.56 to 72.34	297,077	194,249
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	84.83	84.83	73.49	21.63	115.43	66.48	103.17	N/A	222,500	163,520
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	66.36	63.14	56.84	16.18	111.08	41.45	82.11	47.23 to 73.55	239,407	136,082
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	56.98	62.31	65.16	13.67	95.63	54.17	81.12	N/A	146,756	95,629
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	10	67.11	71.16	65.76	16.50	108.21	42.89	102.26	62.09 to 86.99	239,300	157,376
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	27	78.25	79.03	73.19	16.43	107.98	46.15	135.10	73.27 to 86.29	220,356	161,272
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	28	63.31	64.14	62.90	17.85	101.97	40.81	96.66	54.56 to 72.34	236,370	148,688
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	25	66.48	67.95	62.87	17.46	108.08	41.45	103.17	62.09 to 73.45	223,188	140,322
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	26	75.44	74.24	69.90	17.05	106.21	40.81	135.10	66.45 to 78.25	251,959	176,117
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	30	65.40	65.35	62.13	18.36	105.18	41.45	103.17	54.56 to 72.34	246,939	153,429
<u>ALL</u>	80	69.85	70.35	66.27	19.23	106.16	40.81	135.10	65.36 to 74.93	226,846	150,321

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	80	69.85	70.35	66.27	19.23	106.16	40.81	135.10	65.36 to 74.93	226,846	150,321
<u>ALL</u>	80	69.85	70.35	66.27	19.23	106.16	40.81	135.10	65.36 to 74.93	226,846	150,321

73 Red Willow

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 : 80
 Total Sales Price : 17,644,861
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,147,673
 Total Assessed Value : 12,025,650
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 226,846
 Avg. Assessed Value : 150,321

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 70
 COD : 19.23
 PRD : 106.16

COV : 24.61
 STD : 17.31
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.43
 MAX Sales Ratio : 135.10
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.81

95% Median C.I. : 65.36 to 74.93
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.33 to 70.20
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.56 to 74.14

Printed:3/21/2011 5:14:27PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	3	64.25	66.80	64.78	17.32	103.12	51.38	84.78	N/A	65,000	42,105
1	3	64.25	66.80	64.78	17.32	103.12	51.38	84.78	N/A	65,000	42,105
_____Dry_____											
County	5	73.55	76.45	75.37	05.30	101.43	71.17	88.98	N/A	147,850	111,432
1	5	73.55	76.45	75.37	05.30	101.43	71.17	88.98	N/A	147,850	111,432
_____Grass_____											
County	4	68.49	67.62	69.99	09.56	96.61	55.31	78.19	N/A	56,222	39,352
1	4	68.49	67.62	69.99	09.56	96.61	55.31	78.19	N/A	56,222	39,352
_____ALL_____	80	69.85	70.35	66.27	19.23	106.16	40.81	135.10	65.36 to 74.93	226,846	150,321

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	5	52.06	60.28	54.25	18.71	111.12	48.94	84.78	N/A	169,410	91,903
1	5	52.06	60.28	54.25	18.71	111.12	48.94	84.78	N/A	169,410	91,903
_____Dry_____											
County	21	71.21	69.42	64.43	15.10	107.74	45.24	102.26	62.37 to 77.36	167,577	107,968
1	21	71.21	69.42	64.43	15.10	107.74	45.24	102.26	62.37 to 77.36	167,577	107,968
_____Grass_____											
County	6	68.49	68.21	68.18	07.81	100.04	55.31	78.19	55.31 to 78.19	301,109	205,293
1	6	68.49	68.21	68.18	07.81	100.04	55.31	78.19	55.31 to 78.19	301,109	205,293
_____ALL_____	80	69.85	70.35	66.27	19.23	106.16	40.81	135.10	65.36 to 74.93	226,846	150,321

2011 Correlation Section for Red Willow County

A. Agricultural Land

Red Willow County consists of one market area and the makeup of the land is very similar to Hitchcock where dry and grass is approximately half and half and irrigated only 14%. The agricultural market continues to stay strong and increases are between 8 to 15% from last year. The Middle Republican Natural Resource District regulates the water allocations and restrictions to irrigated operators where the occupational tax has been assessed. The assessor closely monitors the market influences from this occupational tax and the Republican River issues for assessment purposes.

In the base sample, which is comprised of 46 sales within Red Willow County, the distribution of the sales among the three year study period was reviewed for adequacy, proportionality and representativeness. The oldest study year is insufficient by one sale to meet the acceptable threshold. When reviewing the majority land use for representativeness, it is apparent that the sample includes an excessive amount of dry land use in the sales file. Further testing is required for reliability of the data before determination can be completed.

The second analysis of random inclusion of comparable sales, one sale was included in the sample borrowed from Hitchcock County. This balanced the time skew and proportionality and dry is now within 5% of the population base in the county. The measures of central tendency remained very constant with only the weighted mean changing by one. The median is 69 in the base and the random inclusion method. The COD and PRD both improved in this analysis by small margins.

The third analysis added 34 comparable sales from the first six miles of Red Willow County. This sample brought in 19 sales from Frontier County, 9 from Hitchcock and 6 from Furnas. Red Willow County borders Kansas on the south. Although this expanded the sample is 80 total sales, the overall statistics did not show only minor change. The median and weighted mean rounded to one point higher than in the second analysis, but the COD increased by over one point. All three samples are analyzed and the random inclusion analysis has shown to be proportionate and representative for determination of the level of value.

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.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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 : 8,179	Value : 684,772,411	Growth 4,043,014	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	457	1,821,564	108	781,466	73	228,944	638	2,831,974	
02. Res Improve Land	3,490	19,610,611	260	2,518,059	294	2,673,758	4,044	24,802,428	
03. Res Improvements	3,619	197,101,694	280	27,075,372	323	22,285,891	4,222	246,462,957	
04. Res Total	4,076	218,533,869	388	30,374,897	396	25,188,593	4,860	274,097,359	1,972,622
% of Res Total	83.87	79.73	7.98	11.08	8.15	9.19	59.42	40.03	48.79
05. Com UnImp Land	127	1,426,462	7	278,607	0	0	134	1,705,069	
06. Com Improve Land	503	10,747,785	27	317,356	11	481,382	541	11,546,523	
07. Com Improvements	527	78,098,478	31	4,311,396	32	3,784,921	590	86,194,795	
08. Com Total	654	90,272,725	38	4,907,359	32	4,266,303	724	99,446,387	298,771
% of Com Total	90.33	90.78	5.25	4.93	4.42	4.29	8.85	14.52	7.39
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	4,076	218,533,869	388	30,374,897	396	25,188,593	4,860	274,097,359	1,972,622
% of Res & Rec Total	83.87	79.73	7.98	11.08	8.15	9.19	59.42	40.03	48.79
Com & Ind Total	654	90,272,725	38	4,907,359	32	4,266,303	724	99,446,387	298,771
% of Com & Ind Total	90.33	90.78	5.25	4.93	4.42	4.29	8.85	14.52	7.39
17. Taxable Total	4,730	308,806,594	426	35,282,256	428	29,454,896	5,584	373,543,746	2,271,393
% of Taxable Total	84.71	82.67	7.63	9.45	7.66	7.89	68.27	54.55	56.18

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	3	180,510	9,787,043	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	3	180,510	9,787,043
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				3	180,510	9,787,043

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	46	35,709,850	46	35,709,850	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	46	35,709,850	46	35,709,850	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	469	126	196	791

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	25	246,724	327	22,501,391	1,566	152,791,074	1,918	175,539,189
28. Ag-Improved Land	3	70,630	157	14,327,608	437	53,159,920	597	67,558,158
29. Ag Improvements	3	49,179	159	8,169,310	469	24,202,979	631	32,421,468
30. Ag Total							2,549	275,518,815

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	7,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1	1.00	7,000	88	88.00	538,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2	1.00	48,525	91	85.00	5,964,928	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	9	102.61	30,999	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	2	2.63	2,630	134	639.82	497,463	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	654	136	0.00	2,204,382	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	4.56	0	0	989.13	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	9	9.00	49,000	10	10.00	56,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	297	297.00	1,523,000	386	386.00	2,068,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	297	289.00	16,669,185	390	375.00	22,682,638	1,771,621
34. HomeSite Total				400	396.00	24,806,638	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	27	438.95	156,162	36	541.56	187,161	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	378	1,402.99	1,391,428	514	2,045.44	1,891,521	
37. FarmSite Improvements	437	0.00	7,533,794	574	0.00	9,738,830	0
38. FarmSite Total				610	2,587.00	11,817,512	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,875.84	0	0	6,869.53	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,010	9,852.53	36,624,150	1,771,621

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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	4,098.63	6.57%	4,979,549	7.62%	1,214.93
46. 1A	43,868.91	70.28%	48,474,322	74.16%	1,104.98
47. 2A1	5,299.72	8.49%	5,263,360	8.05%	993.14
48. 2A	2,381.95	3.82%	2,142,173	3.28%	899.34
49. 3A1	2,191.16	3.51%	1,784,851	2.73%	814.57
50. 3A	218.71	0.35%	156,634	0.24%	716.17
51. 4A1	2,216.08	3.55%	1,403,759	2.15%	633.44
52. 4A	2,147.18	3.44%	1,160,869	1.78%	540.65
53. Total	62,422.34	100.00%	65,365,517	100.00%	1,047.15
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,139.81	0.64%	832,066	0.70%	730.00
55. 1D	130,167.49	72.88%	95,022,445	79.96%	730.00
56. 2D1	4,543.37	2.54%	2,839,635	2.39%	625.01
57. 2D	1,234.36	0.69%	709,793	0.60%	575.03
58. 3D1	23,730.76	13.29%	12,577,360	10.58%	530.00
59. 3D	131.14	0.07%	60,981	0.05%	465.01
60. 4D1	11,828.50	6.62%	4,849,754	4.08%	410.01
61. 4D	5,822.76	3.26%	1,950,637	1.64%	335.00
62. Total	178,598.19	100.00%	118,842,671	100.00%	665.42
Grass					
63. 1G1	997.32	0.51%	279,248	0.51%	280.00
64. 1G	20,668.87	10.59%	5,787,289	10.59%	280.00
65. 2G1	6,113.85	3.13%	1,711,880	3.13%	280.00
66. 2G	3,742.94	1.92%	1,048,019	1.92%	280.00
67. 3G1	6,059.31	3.10%	1,696,625	3.10%	280.00
68. 3G	298.56	0.15%	83,594	0.15%	279.99
69. 4G1	30,066.57	15.40%	8,418,663	15.40%	280.00
70. 4G	127,282.73	65.20%	35,639,151	65.20%	280.00
71. Total	195,230.15	100.00%	54,664,469	100.00%	280.00
Irrigated Total					
	62,422.34	14.28%	65,365,517	27.36%	1,047.15
Dry Total					
	178,598.19	40.86%	118,842,671	49.75%	665.42
Grass Total					
	195,230.15	44.66%	54,664,469	22.88%	280.00
72. Waste	878.36	0.20%	22,008	0.01%	25.06
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	2.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	437,129.04	100.00%	238,894,665	100.00%	546.51

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	164.74	185,752	18,098.32	18,990,099	44,159.28	46,189,666	62,422.34	65,365,517
77. Dry Land	137.10	91,309	16,903.07	11,017,289	161,558.02	107,734,073	178,598.19	118,842,671
78. Grass	109.41	30,636	20,512.82	5,743,578	174,607.92	48,890,255	195,230.15	54,664,469
79. Waste	1.08	27	182.41	4,571	694.87	17,410	878.36	22,008
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	2.00	0	2.00	0
82. Total	412.33	307,724	55,696.62	35,755,537	381,020.09	202,831,404	437,129.04	238,894,665

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	62,422.34	14.28%	65,365,517	27.36%	1,047.15
Dry Land	178,598.19	40.86%	118,842,671	49.75%	665.42
Grass	195,230.15	44.66%	54,664,469	22.88%	280.00
Waste	878.36	0.20%	22,008	0.01%	25.06
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	2.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	437,129.04	100.00%	238,894,665	100.00%	546.51

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

73 Red Willow

	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	269,896,207	274,097,359	4,201,152	1.56%	1,972,622	0.83%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	24,400,521	24,806,638	406,117	1.66%	1,771,621	-5.60%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	294,296,728	298,903,997	4,607,269	1.57%	3,744,243	0.29%
05. Commercial	98,259,459	99,446,387	1,186,928	1.21%	298,771	0.90%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	10,428,582	11,817,512	1,388,930	13.32%	0	13.32%
08. Minerals	22,289,540	35,709,850	13,420,310	60.21	0	60.21
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	130,977,581	146,973,749	15,996,168	12.21%	298,771	11.98%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	425,274,309	445,877,746	20,603,437	4.84%	4,043,014	3.89%
11. Irrigated	59,957,984	65,365,517	5,407,533	9.02%		
12. Dryland	110,738,178	118,842,671	8,104,493	7.32%		
13. Grassland	48,813,312	54,664,469	5,851,157	11.99%		
14. Wasteland	22,146	22,008	-138	-0.62%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	219,531,620	238,894,665	19,363,045	8.82%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	644,805,929	684,772,411	39,966,482	6.20%	4,043,014	5.57%

2010 AMENDED PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR RED WILLOW COUNTY
ASSESSMENT YEARS 2011, 2012 AND 2013
DATE: JUNE 15, 2010

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

General Description of Real Property in Red Willow County:

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Value Base</u>
Residential	4,861	59.48%	41.84%
Commercial	715	08.75%	15.29%
Agricultural	2,547	31.16%	39.38%
Mineral Interest	50	00.61%	03.49%

Agricultural Land – taxable acres:

Irrigated	63,127.91	14.44%
Dry	178,003.62	40.71%
Grass	195,220.40	44.65%
Waste	883.95	00.20%

For more information see 2010 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training

The Red Willow County Assessor provides general supervision over the staff and directs the assessment of all property in Red Willow County. The assessor is a registered appraiser and supervises all reappraisals in the county. Reviews of all properties that have sold are completed and a questionnaire is mailed to both buyer and seller. Other duties include managing the staff, preparing the budget, making decisions on the purchases and filing claims for payment of the expenses for the county assessor's office. The assessor also meets with the liaison on surveys and reports and completes all reports as required by the statutes in a timely manner. When a protest is filed the assessor views each property with the county board. All Tax Equalization and Review Commission hearings are prepared for and attended by the assessor and county attorney. Hiring new employees is handled by the assessor including interviews, setting the salary and preparing the job description for that employee. The state assessed values are verified and certified to the entities by the assessor.

The deputy assessor assists the assessor with personnel matters, including interviewing applicants for employment and helps with reviews for the sold properties. The deputy handles the valuation of all oil and gas properties in the county, processing the appraisals done by Pritchard & Abbott, preparing the personal property schedules for oil, and entering values in the computer. Spreadsheets are prepared in the computer for property sold listing all information about the sale for use in the sales studies. The homestead exemptions are prepared for mailing by the deputy, checking for sold property, deceased individuals and verifying that the information on the application is correct. The qualified sales roster is reviewed by the deputy checking all data entry and any changes in value because of appraisals or corrections. The deputy works with the assessor to prepare materials for TERC hearings and hearings are attended with the assessor. The deputy assists the assessor with all reports and assumes the duties in the absence of the assessor.

The assistant assessor handles the real estate transfers including changing the record cards, rolodex files, computer records, and electronically files the sales information. Sales books are developed for assessor's office use and for the public's use which includes pictures, lot size, sales price and general data on the property. Split-outs are completed by the assistant which would include splitting the parcel on GIS and keeping all maps current. She is also responsible for mailing the questionnaires on the sold property. Her job is to prepare spreadsheets for the agland properties and work with the county assessor on the ag what-if program in determining the agland values. The assistant prepares leased land letters for the signatures of the land owner and improvement owner.

The assessor's clerk updates record cards and copies information to the current records. Her duties include updating the inventory report. The clerk collects information for the certification of trusts owning agland to the Secretary of State. The annual tax exempt applications are prepared by the clerk.

The data collector/clerk collects data for the appraisal work, gets measurements of new construction, takes pictures and gathers information on new construction as well as for reappraisals. The photos in our record cards are updated as we physically inspect the property.

The entire staff is trained to handle personal property schedules including reviewing the taxpayer's depreciation worksheets. They assist real estate agents, appraisers and customers requesting information from our office. The staff helps the public with completing their homestead exemption applications and income forms. They also do data entry on the Marshall-Swift costing. We work together to print and mail notice of valuation changes. Various staff members serve on personnel and safety committees that were set up by the county board.

The county assessor, deputy assessor and assistant assessor all hold an assessor's certificate with the State of Nebraska. The assessor and deputy attend the Assessor's workshops, IAAO courses, as well as district meetings to keep informed about new legislation and the latest information. Our budget includes funds so the assistant assessor

will be able to get the required hours to retain her assessor's certificate. Red Willow County has a procedure manual in place to guide the staff in the process of the pick-up work, reappraisals, real estate transfers, homestead exemptions and all major functions of the assessor's office. The manual describes and explains these operations in detail.

The 2010 budget for the Red Willow County Assessor's office is \$ 208,105.

B. Cadastral Maps

The Red Willow County Assessor's office has identified all parcels and land classifications on GIS. The new soil conversion was completed for 2009. The staff maintains and keeps the data current by updating the information from current surveys and transfers. Our city and village maps were made in 1967. We had maps drawn of the new subdivisions. The county surveyor assists us with any questions concerning surveys.

C. Property Record Cards

Property record cards in the assessor's office include owner's name and mailing address, the address of the property, legal description, classification codes, tax district codes and lot size. Property information including square foot and all physical components of the improvements, quality, condition, sketches and photos are included in the record card. All record cards are updated from information recorded with the county clerk, clerk of the district court and county court. The record cards are kept current due to the number of requests for information by the public. We now have a guest computer that is used by the public to access all information.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

We are currently using Terra Scan software for our CAMA as well as our administrative package. We have a contract with GIS Workshop Inc. for our GIS software & website.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

Real property in Red Willow County is divided into three groups: residential, commercial and agricultural. In Red Willow County, reappraisals are usually done annually on a rotating basis. We continually study our statistics so we can also focus on the areas that are falling below the required level of value.

All improved properties are inspected at the time of a reappraisal. Current data is checked for accuracy, notes are made as to the condition and a photograph is taken of each improvement. Interior updates are verified with the owner if possible. Otherwise we leave a door hanger at each property asking them to contact our office. If additional information is needed to complete the pricing we follow up with a phone call. The interior of our commercial property was inspected in 2007 by the county assessor and data collector.

On new construction we make an inspection of the improvement, we measure and determine the quality of the improvement and collect all the data at the site. If the property is not entirely done upon inspection, a follow-up review takes place at the end of the year. The owner is then contacted by phone or letter to confirm the percent of completion. The Marshall-Swift table of completion is used to determine the percent finished.

The pickup work in Red Willow County is continuous. Building permits are provided by the McCook city office as well as the village of Indianola. The other villages have no offices so permits are not available. Information about new improvements is seldom reported. We complete the pickup work as time permits throughout the year and follow-up with a check of the partially completed improvements right before the end of the year.

Depreciation tables are developed by analyzing the sales in a neighborhood. We gather facts and create a spreadsheet with all the sales information. We have built the sales information in our Terra Scan system so we can study the statistics annually.

Red Willow County uses the income analysis on commercial property only. An outside appraisal company is hired to assist us with our commercial appraisals. Knoche Appraisal is hired on an hourly basis at the determination of the County Assessor. A market analysis is completed on a yearly basis.

Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2010

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	97.00	12.44	103.79
Commercial	98.00	13.77	109.01
Agricultural	72.00	19.56	110.79

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2010 Reports & Opinions.

All reports are completed and filed in a timely manner usually being completed by the assessor with the assistance of the deputy assessor. These reports include the abstract, the personal property abstract, the certification of values, the school district taxable value report, the tax roll and the certificate of taxes levied. There are also tax list corrections filed throughout the year. The Red Willow County Assessor's office prepares the real estate and personal property tax statements for the county treasurer.

The Red Willow County Assessor's office accepts homestead exemption applications from February 1st thru June 30th of each year. We refer to statute 77-3510 thru 77-3528 as a guideline when questions arise. We prepare the applications prior to mailing them out in February, checking for sold property, deceased individuals and making sure information on the application is complete and correct. We assist the applicants with the homestead application and income forms that are provided by the department. We file the applications with the Nebraska Department of Revenue by August 1st of each year.

Personal property schedules are to be filed with our office between January 1st and May

1st of each year. Personal property regulation 20 is used for assistance when questions arise. Schedules are mailed to each individual or company that filed the previous year. If they have not filed two weeks before the May 1st deadline we send a second reminder notice. We also notify all new business and property owners. Penalties on personal property are applied to late filings as the law permits. The personal property abstract is filed by June 15th.

Our real estate transfers are completed and sent to the department once a month. The assistant assessor works the 521's, changes all the necessary records, electronically files the sales information and develops the sales books. A questionnaire is sent to both the buyer and seller for all classes of property. The sales are reviewed with a drive by inspection. At that time we are checking the quality, condition, neighborhood and other factors that may have affected the sale.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011

Residential (and/or subclasses):

We are in the process of completing physical inspections of the village residential. This will include Danbury, Lebanon, Indianola and Bartley. The sales information will be gathered and studied to develop new depreciation tables for each neighborhood. We plan to complete the physical inspections in 2011. Statistics for all residential neighborhoods will be generated and sales information will be studied. If time permits we will begin the inspection of rural residential and rural farm buildings.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

We plan to review the sales and the statistics for each occupation code to determine the problem areas that need reviewed for 2011. We were unable to complete the review of the grain elevators in 2010, so we plan to complete them for 2011.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

We will continue to update GIS using recorded surveys to assure the accuracy of our mapping system. We completed the new soil conversion on GIS and updated information in TerraScan. New GIS maps have been made to replace our 1985 cadastral maps for the rural properties. A study of all land sales will be completed and values will be determined annually. In 2010 new aerial maps were downloaded on GIS. We plan to begin a review of all updated aerial maps to identify changes in the land class. This will require an on-site inspection and contacting the property owner to request a certified map from FSA.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012

For 2012 we plan to continue with the inspection of rural residential and rural farm buildings.

Assessment Actions planned for Assessment Year 2013

All remaining properties that require a physical inspection per statute shall be inspected. Our office will continue to review each class of property to determine problem areas.

Detailed Breakdown of functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:

1. Record maintenance, mapping updates and ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters and annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & funds
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 909 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property; annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions; administer 455 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed-review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing-management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates-management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.

10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property and centrally assessed. Prepare tax statements for the county treasurer.
11. Tax List Corrections-prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization-attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests-assemble and provide information.
13. TERC Appeals-prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization-attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education-attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. Deputy Assessor and Assistant Assessor are required to obtain 15 hours per year of continued education to maintain the assessor's certification.

Conclusion:

The current budget includes salary for staff to complete in-house appraisals for all residential and ag appraisals.

The standard expenses budgeted including telephone, postage, equipment and supplies increase as the cost of these items inflates.

Our current budget includes a line item for reappraisal. This covers expenses for oil and gas appraisal, Knoche Appraisal for commercial updates and guidance on depreciation tables for other classes of property. This line also includes expenses for fuel costs for sales reviews and on-site inspections for all appraisals.

Our budget also contains a line item for the geographical information system. The annual costs for maintenance of GIS is included in our budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra K. Kotschwar
Red Willow County Assessor

Date

PRIOR YEAR'S STATISTICAL CORRELATION

ASSESSMENT YEAR	R & O MEDIAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD
RESIDENTIAL				
2001	95	93	18.78	101.72
2002	94	92	17.01	103.62
2003	95	93	18	104.00
2004	97.22	95.74	19.70	107.19
2005	97.42	95.18	15.14	106.19
2006	95.98	93.17	17.25	106.94
2007	93.71	91.46	16.86	105.81
2008	95.37	92.36	18.21	107.54
2009	98.00	95.00	20.07	107.23
COMMERCIAL				
2001	100	105	21.43	107.09
2002	98	97	17.54	102.80
2003	96	95	17.00	94.00
2004	96	97.08	24.31	99.09
2005	96.09	97.01	25.75	99.38
2006	96.09	95.96	20.11	95.57
2007	97.38	92.13	20.97	106.64
2008	96.00	91.76	23.41	103.07
2009	99.00	97.00	7.84	101.32
AG-LAND				
2001	75	73	14.83	101.29
2002	75	74	15.78	100.43
2003	76	75	15.00	102.00
2004	74	74.95	19.24	103.65
2005	76.33	76.38	15.56	102.21
2006	75.82	73.70	18.79	103.26
2007	71.69	66.35	26.81	108.15
2008	71.59	68.25	24.70	109.43
2009	71.00	66.00	24.12	108.27

2011 Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	4
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$208,105
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$18,000
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	N/A
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$9,500 is dedicated to the GIS system. The Treasurer and Assessor share a computer budget out of the County General Fund for the TerraScan contract and equipment.
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,800
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	0
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	Yes; \$15,183.81

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	TerraScan
2.	CAMA software:
	TerraScan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes, cadastral maps are utilized for the City of McCook and Villages; GIS is maintained for the agricultural parcels.
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?

	The office staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	The Assessor and staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes; excluding villages
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	City of McCook
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	October 2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	An appraiser is contracted on an as needed basis for real property.
2.	Other services:
	Pritchard & Abbott is contracted for the mineral appraisals

2011 Certification for Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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

