

Table of Contents

2012 Commission Summary

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

Residential Correlation

- 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
- Commercial Statistics

Commercial Correlation

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Special Valuation Methodology, if applicable
- Special Valuation Statistics, if applicable

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

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

County Reports

- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2012 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2011 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

Valuation History Charts

2012 Commission Summary for Kimball County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	71	Median	95.11
Total Sales Price	\$4,869,042	Mean	101.63
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,854,042	Wgt. Mean	95.68
Total Assessed Value	\$4,644,505	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$54,340
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$68,367	Avg. Assessed Value	\$65,416

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.26 to 100.07
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.29 to 100.08
95% Mean C.I	95.28 to 107.98
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	22.22
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.85
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.64

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	69	96	96
2010	75	94	94
2009	91	97	97
2008	109	100	100

2012 Commission Summary for Kimball County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	17	Median	95.00
Total Sales Price	\$2,241,578	Mean	102.89
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,237,578	Wgt. Mean	95.09
Total Assessed Value	\$2,127,650	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$121,307
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$131,622	Avg. Assessed Value	\$125,156

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	85.66 to 119.94
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.40 to 97.77
95% Mean C.I	90.26 to 115.52
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	14.19
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.23
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.33

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	27	100	100
2010	26	100	100
2009	36	98	98
2008	34	100	100

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Kimball County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	95	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	95	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	70	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 9th day of April, 2012.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Kimball County

In addition to the completion of pick-up work, the County completed the physical review of all rural residential property (with the exception of Range 55). Two valuation groupings were also specifically addressed: in Valuation Grouping 10 (Kimball), there was a 6% decrease to residential land and improvements; in Valuation Grouping 80 (Rural) land and improvements were raised by 11.5%. The County will begin the physical review of the villages of Bushnell and Dix to be completed in 2013.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Kimball County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The Assessor and her staff.	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	10	Kimball—includes all residential parcels within the town of Kimball and all residential parcels that would be considered suburban to Kimball,, since there is no separate suburban market.
	20	Bushnell—all residential parcels within the village of Bushnell.
	30	Dix—all residential parcels within the village of Dix.
	80	Rural—all residential parcels not within the aforementioned valuation groupings.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Replacement cost new, minus depreciation.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Both by CAMA and in the past by market-derived depreciation tables.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	When the appraisal of the valuation grouping is completed.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	In 2007.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	The market approach is used, and lots are valued by square foot for each valuation grouping.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	Substantially changed would be determined by extensive remodeling to the improvements, or the significant additions to the parcel.	

**53 Kimball
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 71
 Total Sales Price : 4,869,042
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,854,042
 Total Assessed Value : 4,644,505
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 68,367
 Avg. Assessed Value : 65,416

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 96
 MEAN : 102
 COD : 19.26
 PRD : 106.22

COV : 26.88
 STD : 27.32
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.32
 MAX Sales Ratio : 217.08
 MIN Sales Ratio : 53.16

95% Median C.I. : 91.26 to 100.07
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.29 to 100.08
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.28 to 107.98

Printed:3/29/2012 3:20:52PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	11	93.88	99.77	95.94	08.64	103.99	88.71	126.06	90.04 to 122.89	86,470	82,959
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	98.94	111.80	100.89	17.64	110.81	88.31	138.56	N/A	50,500	50,950
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	90.05	95.76	90.45	13.40	105.87	76.51	137.80	76.51 to 137.80	79,929	72,292
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	91.84	95.00	95.60	10.70	99.37	77.88	115.90	77.88 to 115.90	92,129	88,079
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	11	103.21	100.10	99.65	21.72	100.45	53.16	162.60	66.84 to 133.24	66,673	66,440
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	6	97.50	97.48	91.86	13.92	106.12	78.26	116.65	78.26 to 116.65	56,987	52,349
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	102.65	109.38	94.62	30.48	115.60	57.80	186.80	57.80 to 186.80	31,250	29,568
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	18	96.76	104.56	95.70	24.45	109.26	55.89	217.08	81.19 to 114.47	65,731	62,904
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	30	94.13	99.73	95.09	12.37	104.88	76.51	138.56	90.05 to 98.94	80,269	76,330
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	41	98.26	103.03	96.26	23.50	107.03	53.16	217.08	88.68 to 110.18	59,658	57,430
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	31	92.64	97.46	95.08	17.25	102.50	53.16	162.60	87.22 to 105.16	73,539	69,920
<u>ALL</u>	71	95.11	101.63	95.68	19.26	106.22	53.16	217.08	91.26 to 100.07	68,367	65,416

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
10	50	95.83	99.26	93.81	17.72	105.81	53.16	162.60	89.98 to 105.16	57,469	53,912
20	4	93.24	96.54	94.67	08.19	101.98	85.20	114.47	N/A	37,892	35,873
30	6	99.08	109.17	105.26	27.67	103.71	55.89	186.80	55.89 to 186.80	39,000	41,053
80	11	93.10	110.18	97.75	24.02	112.72	73.01	217.08	88.31 to 133.24	145,000	141,735
<u>ALL</u>	71	95.11	101.63	95.68	19.26	106.22	53.16	217.08	91.26 to 100.07	68,367	65,416

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	71	95.11	101.63	95.68	19.26	106.22	53.16	217.08	91.26 to 100.07	68,367	65,416
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	71	95.11	101.63	95.68	19.26	106.22	53.16	217.08	91.26 to 100.07	68,367	65,416

**53 Kimball
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 71
 Total Sales Price : 4,869,042
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,854,042
 Total Assessed Value : 4,644,505
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 68,367
 Avg. Assessed Value : 65,416

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 96
 MEAN : 102
 COD : 19.26
 PRD : 106.22

COV : 26.88
 STD : 27.32
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.32
 MAX Sales Ratio : 217.08
 MIN Sales Ratio : 53.16

95% Median C.I. : 91.26 to 100.07
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.29 to 100.08
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.28 to 107.98

Printed:3/29/2012 3:20:52PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___Low \$ Ranges___												
Less Than 5,000	2	109.25	109.25	94.00	48.84	116.22	55.89	162.60	N/A	3,500	3,290	
Less Than 15,000	5	137.80	132.85	130.64	25.01	101.69	55.89	186.80	N/A	7,300	9,537	
Less Than 30,000	15	114.47	120.59	116.86	29.54	103.19	53.16	217.08	85.20 to 138.56	15,643	18,281	
___Ranges Excl. Low \$___												
Greater Than 4,999	69	95.11	101.41	95.69	18.19	105.98	53.16	217.08	91.26 to 100.07	70,247	67,216	
Greater Than 14,999	66	94.23	99.27	95.42	16.60	104.03	53.16	217.08	91.26 to 99.23	72,993	69,649	
Greater Than 29,999	56	93.49	96.56	94.61	12.87	102.06	57.80	146.53	90.56 to 98.09	82,489	78,041	
___Incremental Ranges___												
0 TO 4,999	2	109.25	109.25	94.00	48.84	116.22	55.89	162.60	N/A	3,500	3,290	
5,000 TO 14,999	3	137.80	148.59	139.34	15.88	106.64	121.17	186.80	N/A	9,833	13,702	
15,000 TO 29,999	10	111.20	114.46	114.33	26.35	100.11	53.16	217.08	66.84 to 138.56	19,815	22,654	
30,000 TO 59,999	22	99.09	100.54	99.44	14.27	101.11	57.80	146.53	90.04 to 107.93	43,453	43,209	
60,000 TO 99,999	20	92.57	94.38	94.16	12.04	100.23	72.43	131.86	84.34 to 98.26	70,750	66,617	
100,000 TO 149,999	5	88.68	95.97	97.58	13.87	98.35	76.51	133.24	N/A	122,085	119,136	
150,000 TO 249,999	9	92.64	91.98	91.07	05.63	101.00	73.01	105.01	88.71 to 98.05	182,000	165,742	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ALL___	71	95.11	101.63	95.68	19.26	106.22	53.16	217.08	91.26 to 100.07	68,367	65,416	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

A. Residential Real Property

The preceding pages of the 2012 Reports and Opinions residential improved statistical profile reveal seventy-one sales deemed qualified by the Kimball County Assessor during the two years of the sales study period. Two of the three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range the median and the weighted mean at 95% and 96%, respectively. The mean is two points above range at 102%. The Coefficient of Dispersion is about four points above range at 19.26, and the Price-Related Differential is above its prescribed parameters at 106.22. The hypothetical removal of the two most extreme outliers (book 73, page 273 and book 73, page 1) would bring the mean to within range at 99%, and the COD would drop to less than two points above its prescribed range (at 16.68) and the PRD qualitative measure would be 103.83. Under the heading "Valuation Grouping" it can be seen that all ranges have median measures within range.

The sales qualification and review process within the County consists of a questionnaire mailed to all buyers of residential, commercial and agricultural real property. A rough estimate for the rate of return of the questionnaires is around 60 to 70 percent. In the case of non-responses, the Assessor's office then attempts to contact either the buyer or seller (and in some cases the realtor) involved in the transaction. Since Kimball County is small in size and population, the personal knowledge of the Assessor and her staff is also utilized to further enhance the qualification process.

For assessment year 2012, in addition to the completion of pick-up work, the County completed the physical review of all rural residential property (with the exception of Range 55). Two valuation groupings were also specifically addressed: in Valuation Grouping 10 (Kimball), there was a 6% decrease to residential land and improvements; in Valuation Grouping 80 (Rural) land and improvements were raised by 11.5%. The County will begin the physical review of the villages of Bushnell and Dix to be completed in 2013.

Considering all of the above information, the residential level of value of Kimball County is determined to be 95% of actual market value. And the qualitative statistics without the extreme outliers would meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball 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 of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

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

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

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

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

2012 Correlation Section for Kimball 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 IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

2012 Commercial Assessment Actions for Kimball County

For assessment year 2012, the County completed the commercial pick-up work, and decreased Kimball commercial land and improvements by 5%. The County will begin to physically review the commercial property in Bushnell and Dix.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Kimball County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The Assessor and her staff.	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	10	Kimball—includes all commercial parcels within the town of Kimball and all parcels that would be considered suburban to Kimball, since there is not a separate suburban market.
	20	Bushnell—all commercial parcels within the village of Bushnell.
	30	Dix—any commercial parcels within the village of Dix.
	80	Rural—all commercial parcels not found within the aforementioned valuation groupings.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The cost approach that consists of replacement cost new, minus depreciation.	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	For unique commercial properties, an outside appraiser would be contracted to assist with these properties.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Presently the tables provided by the CAMA vendor are used.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes, and in Kimball by location.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2008	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2008	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	By the market approach using vacant commercial lot sales. These are then priced per square foot for each valuation grouping.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	Extensive remodeling (such as when the occupancy code changes), and significant additions would be viewed as substantially changed.	

**53 Kimball
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 17
Total Sales Price : 2,241,578
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,237,578
Total Assessed Value : 2,127,650
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 131,622
Avg. Assessed Value : 125,156

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 95
MEAN : 103
COD : 17.13
PRD : 108.20

COV : 23.87
STD : 24.56
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.27
MAX Sales Ratio : 160.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 72.09

95% Median C.I. : 85.66 to 119.94
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.40 to 97.77
95% Mean C.I. : 90.26 to 115.52

Printed:3/29/2012 3:20:53PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	95.00	94.47	94.75	03.04	99.70	89.87	98.53	N/A	503,359	476,912
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	85.31	85.31	85.31	00.00	100.00	85.31	85.31	N/A	40,000	34,125
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	110.85	110.85	108.78	16.79	101.90	92.24	129.45	N/A	22,500	24,475
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	91.84	91.84	90.07	04.29	101.97	87.90	95.77	N/A	81,500	73,410
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	85.42	85.42	85.42	00.00	100.00	85.42	85.42	N/A	25,000	21,355
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	103.74	103.74	97.08	06.81	106.86	96.68	110.80	N/A	87,500	84,945
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	160.00	160.00	160.00	00.00	100.00	160.00	160.00	N/A	15,000	24,000
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	119.94	119.94	119.94	00.00	100.00	119.94	119.94	N/A	40,000	47,975
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	119.93	119.93	125.39	28.58	95.65	85.66	154.20	N/A	17,250	21,630
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	81.16	81.16	84.49	11.18	96.06	72.09	90.22	N/A	95,000	80,270
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	6	93.62	98.40	94.91	09.89	103.68	85.31	129.45	85.31 to 129.45	265,846	252,302
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	5	95.77	95.31	93.13	07.13	102.34	85.42	110.80	N/A	72,600	67,613
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	6	105.08	113.69	98.67	29.53	115.22	72.09	160.00	72.09 to 160.00	46,583	45,963
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	94.01	101.34	94.12	11.99	107.67	87.90	129.45	N/A	52,000	48,943
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	110.80	114.57	103.22	17.66	111.00	85.42	160.00	N/A	51,000	52,644
<u>ALL</u>	17	95.00	102.89	95.09	17.13	108.20	72.09	160.00	85.66 to 119.94	131,622	125,156

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
10	16	95.39	103.96	95.15	17.52	109.26	72.09	160.00	87.90 to 119.94	138,942	132,202
20	1	85.66	85.66	85.66	00.00	100.00	85.66	85.66	N/A	14,500	12,420
<u>ALL</u>	17	95.00	102.89	95.09	17.13	108.20	72.09	160.00	85.66 to 119.94	131,622	125,156

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
02											
03	17	95.00	102.89	95.09	17.13	108.20	72.09	160.00	85.66 to 119.94	131,622	125,156
04											
<u>ALL</u>	17	95.00	102.89	95.09	17.13	108.20	72.09	160.00	85.66 to 119.94	131,622	125,156

**53 Kimball
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 17
 Total Sales Price : 2,241,578
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,237,578
 Total Assessed Value : 2,127,650
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 131,622
 Avg. Assessed Value : 125,156

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 103
 COD : 17.13
 PRD : 108.20

COV : 23.87
 STD : 24.56
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.27
 MAX Sales Ratio : 160.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 72.09

95% Median C.I. : 85.66 to 119.94
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.40 to 97.77
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.26 to 115.52

Printed:3/29/2012 3:20:53PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Low \$ Ranges												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	2	98.23	98.23	92.10	12.80	106.66	85.66	110.80	N/A	9,750	8,980	
Less Than 30,000	7	110.80	116.82	114.94	23.25	101.64	85.42	160.00	85.42 to 160.00	17,786	20,444	
Ranges Excl. Low \$												
Greater Than 4,999	17	95.00	102.89	95.09	17.13	108.20	72.09	160.00	85.66 to 119.94	131,622	125,156	
Greater Than 14,999	15	95.00	103.51	95.11	17.65	108.83	72.09	160.00	87.90 to 119.94	147,872	140,646	
Greater Than 29,999	10	92.61	93.13	93.92	08.69	99.16	72.09	119.94	85.31 to 98.53	211,308	198,455	
Incremental Ranges												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	2	98.23	98.23	92.10	12.80	106.66	85.66	110.80	N/A	9,750	8,980	
15,000 TO 29,999	5	129.45	124.26	119.19	21.10	104.25	85.42	160.00	N/A	21,000	25,029	
30,000 TO 59,999	4	97.15	99.89	99.64	09.62	100.25	85.31	119.94	N/A	45,795	45,630	
60,000 TO 99,999	1	72.09	72.09	72.09	00.00	100.00	72.09	72.09	N/A	60,000	43,255	
100,000 TO 149,999	3	89.87	89.33	89.36	00.86	99.97	87.90	90.22	N/A	121,000	108,122	
150,000 TO 249,999	1	96.68	96.68	96.68	00.00	100.00	96.68	96.68	N/A	170,000	164,350	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +	1	95.00	95.00	95.00	00.00	100.00	95.00	95.00	N/A	1,336,898	1,270,055	
ALL	17	95.00	102.89	95.09	17.13	108.20	72.09	160.00	85.66 to 119.94	131,622	125,156	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	110.80	110.80	110.80	00.00	100.00	110.80	110.80	N/A	5,000	5,540	
304	1	119.94	119.94	119.94	00.00	100.00	119.94	119.94	N/A	40,000	47,975	
326	1	85.42	85.42	85.42	00.00	100.00	85.42	85.42	N/A	25,000	21,355	
340	1	95.00	95.00	95.00	00.00	100.00	95.00	95.00	N/A	1,336,898	1,270,055	
344	1	154.20	154.20	154.20	00.00	100.00	154.20	154.20	N/A	20,000	30,840	
352	3	89.87	86.21	90.13	09.12	95.65	72.09	96.68	N/A	115,000	103,653	
353	5	95.77	113.54	99.29	22.35	114.35	90.22	160.00	N/A	47,000	46,666	
391	1	87.90	87.90	87.90	00.00	100.00	87.90	87.90	N/A	118,000	103,725	
494	1	85.31	85.31	85.31	00.00	100.00	85.31	85.31	N/A	40,000	34,125	
528	1	98.53	98.53	98.53	00.00	100.00	98.53	98.53	N/A	58,180	57,325	
555	1	85.66	85.66	85.66	00.00	100.00	85.66	85.66	N/A	14,500	12,420	
ALL	17	95.00	102.89	95.09	17.13	108.20	72.09	160.00	85.66 to 119.94	131,622	125,156	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

A. Commercial Real Property

During the three year timeframe of the commercial sales study (7.01.08 to 6.30.11), seventeen improved sales were determined to be qualified by the Kimball County Assessor. Of these, sixteen sales occurred within the Kimball valuation grouping (10) and one sale occurred within the Bushnell commercial valuation grouping (20). Under the heading "Occupancy Code," the sales appear numerically scattered, with the two largest groups consisting of three sales in code 352--multiple residence, and five sales in occupancy code 353--retail store. The overall commercial statistical profile indicates that two of the three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range and are at the same level: the median and the weighted mean are both at 95%. The mean is above the upper limit of acceptable range at 103%. Regarding the overall qualitative statistics, the COD is at 17.13, and the PRD is above range at 108.20. However, the hypothetical removal of the most extreme outlier (book 72, page 375) would move the mean within range at 99%, the COD would become 14.13 and the PRD would move to 104.93.

The sales qualification and review process within Kimball County consists of a questionnaire mailed to all buyers of residential, commercial and agricultural real property. A rough estimate for the rate of return of the questionnaires is around 60 to 70 percent. In the case of non-responses, the Assessor's office then attempts to contact either the buyer or seller (and in some cases the realtor) involved in the transaction. Since Kimball County is small in size and population, the personal knowledge of the Assessor and her staff is also utilized to further enhance the qualification process.

For assessment year 2012, the County completed the commercial pick-up work, and decreased Kimball commercial land and improvements by 5%. The County will begin to physically review the commercial property in Bushnell and Dix.

Therefore, based on all available information the level of value for commercial property in Kimball County is 95%, and it is believed that the qualitative measures of assessment meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices (with the removal of the most extreme outlier, as mentioned above, and taking into consideration the County's assessment practices).

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball 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 of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

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

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

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

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

2012 Correlation Section for Kimball 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 IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Kimball County

Assessment actions taken by the Kimball County Assessor to address agricultural land included the following: In Market Areas One and Two, the lowering of all grass LCG's; Market Area Three included raising irrigated subclasses 2A1, 4A1 and 4A, as well as dry subclasses 2D1, 2D and 3D1, while lowering all grass subclasses, except for 3G; In Market Area Four, all dry and grass subclasses were lowered.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Kimball County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The Assessor's staff.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	This agricultural area borders Wyoming to the west and Colorado to the south. It consists of approximately two-thirds grass and about one-third dry land.
	2	The eastern border of this agricultural market area borders Cheyenne County and is surrounded by the three other market areas. Its land composition is almost evenly divided between dry and grass land.
	3	The western portion of this market area borders Wyoming, and the northern portion borders Banner County. It contains slightly more dry land than grass land.
	4	Located in the northeast area of the County, this agricultural market area shares borders with both Banner and Cheyenne counties. The land composition is more than 50% dry, and has almost twice the percentage of irrigated land than the other three market areas.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Includes a review of market activity within each specific area to determine any changes or possible trends.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	The process consists of determining the primary use of the land. Rural residential is valued by market comparison with other like properties. Recreational use has not been discovered within the County at this time.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	Yes	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	FSA maps, GIS maps, and physical inspection.	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Primarily using the sales verification questionnaires that are returned in order to identify and monitor any possible non-agricultural influence.	
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	If a new home or significant additions were added to a vacant parcel of land, this	

	would constitute a “substantially changed” parcel.
--	--

53 Kimball
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 88
Total Sales Price : 13,000,035
Total Adj. Sales Price : 12,990,035
Total Assessed Value : 8,632,461
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 147,614
Avg. Assessed Value : 98,096

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 66
MEAN : 72
COD : 21.06
PRD : 108.17

COV : 28.92
STD : 20.79
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.81
MAX Sales Ratio : 158.61
MIN Sales Ratio : 32.68

95% Median C.I. : 65.06 to 75.42
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.62 to 71.29
95% Mean C.I. : 67.54 to 76.22

Printed:3/29/2012 3:20:54PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	77.08	86.76	78.27	28.97	110.85	61.36	131.53	N/A	74,625	58,411	
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	77.51	74.12	69.41	14.95	106.79	51.67	100.55	53.67 to 86.58	112,045	77,772	
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	11	73.31	84.14	78.61	21.42	107.03	62.20	121.38	67.89 to 111.05	148,545	116,772	
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	75.86	80.46	79.49	20.60	101.22	59.32	106.21	N/A	207,500	164,945	
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	77.64	84.18	78.91	20.44	106.68	60.74	121.10	N/A	109,060	86,064	
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	76.37	73.51	74.83	07.18	98.24	54.36	82.59	68.61 to 79.50	118,900	88,972	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	6	62.65	80.60	67.58	37.89	119.27	53.10	158.61	53.10 to 158.61	107,624	72,729	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	8	78.72	73.42	68.06	12.80	107.88	47.61	89.47	47.61 to 89.47	110,188	74,999	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	69.88	68.12	69.03	11.45	98.68	52.48	78.46	N/A	65,519	45,229	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	14	64.22	61.78	64.02	14.87	96.50	39.21	75.65	48.39 to 73.38	212,271	135,904	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	9	54.50	55.90	54.02	23.10	103.48	32.68	94.42	44.58 to 67.67	181,517	98,052	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	44.43	44.82	42.33	08.73	105.88	39.20	50.84	N/A	373,333	158,033	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	28	76.20	80.54	75.93	20.09	106.07	51.67	131.53	68.64 to 86.58	131,266	99,668	
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	29	77.31	76.79	72.25	17.16	106.28	47.61	158.61	65.06 to 79.50	112,467	81,255	
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	31	60.08	59.45	57.58	19.82	103.25	32.68	94.42	50.84 to 69.27	195,259	112,431	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	29	75.86	80.10	77.66	16.28	103.14	54.36	121.38	69.83 to 82.59	137,614	106,875	
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	33	65.06	68.98	65.58	20.01	105.18	39.21	158.61	60.23 to 74.22	146,262	95,914	
<u>ALL</u>	88	70.33	71.88	66.45	21.06	108.17	32.68	158.61	65.06 to 75.42	147,614	98,096	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
1	22	70.65	69.53	69.25	15.68	100.40	44.76	89.47	60.08 to 81.40	157,531	109,086	
2	24	69.92	76.54	68.56	29.10	111.64	39.21	158.61	57.25 to 84.80	108,531	74,413	
3	19	71.92	72.89	63.53	21.52	114.73	39.20	121.38	57.93 to 78.47	189,911	120,646	
4	23	69.07	68.42	65.06	17.16	105.16	32.68	100.55	60.23 to 76.90	143,970	93,668	
<u>ALL</u>	88	70.33	71.88	66.45	21.06	108.17	32.68	158.61	65.06 to 75.42	147,614	98,096	

53 Kimball
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 88
 Total Sales Price : 13,000,035
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 12,990,035
 Total Assessed Value : 8,632,461
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 147,614
 Avg. Assessed Value : 98,096

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 72
 COD : 21.06
 PRD : 108.17

COV : 28.92
 STD : 20.79
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.81
 MAX Sales Ratio : 158.61
 MIN Sales Ratio : 32.68

95% Median C.I. : 65.06 to 75.42
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.62 to 71.29
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.54 to 76.22

Printed:3/29/2012 3:20:54PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Dry_____											
County	26	68.14	65.78	62.67	20.31	104.96	32.68	106.21	53.67 to 75.42	136,173	85,342
1	5	69.83	67.79	66.32	10.80	102.22	54.36	81.40	N/A	68,615	45,504
2	7	53.67	62.31	63.01	29.16	98.89	39.21	106.21	39.21 to 106.21	147,022	92,637
3	4	59.40	64.35	58.42	24.56	110.15	48.39	90.21	N/A	173,388	101,296
4	10	72.25	67.77	63.59	18.71	106.57	32.68	94.42	44.58 to 82.20	147,471	93,772
_____Grass_____											
County	5	73.31	71.63	68.07	19.34	105.23	52.48	100.55	N/A	212,560	144,698
1	1	73.31	73.31	73.31	00.00	100.00	73.31	73.31	N/A	433,500	317,790
2	3	54.50	61.43	61.04	15.19	100.64	52.48	77.31	N/A	191,567	116,933
4	1	100.55	100.55	100.55	00.00	100.00	100.55	100.55	N/A	54,600	54,899
_____ALL_____	88	70.33	71.88	66.45	21.06	108.17	32.68	158.61	65.06 to 75.42	147,614	98,096

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	6	66.59	62.83	58.56	16.92	107.29	39.20	75.86	39.20 to 75.86	391,173	229,070
3	4	66.59	62.06	57.60	16.91	107.74	39.20	75.86	N/A	462,750	266,538
4	2	64.38	64.38	62.15	17.52	103.59	53.10	75.65	N/A	248,020	154,134
_____Dry_____											
County	34	68.84	66.17	63.64	18.17	103.98	32.68	106.21	60.08 to 74.22	125,822	80,076
1	8	65.60	65.66	63.36	14.95	103.63	47.61	81.40	47.61 to 81.40	76,884	48,716
2	8	57.21	62.12	62.93	25.49	98.71	39.21	106.21	39.21 to 106.21	133,269	83,867
3	6	69.80	67.26	61.20	16.52	109.90	48.39	90.21	48.39 to 90.21	142,008	86,907
4	12	72.65	68.68	65.37	16.27	105.06	32.68	94.42	60.23 to 77.51	145,389	95,040
_____Grass_____											
County	7	71.46	69.65	69.21	17.24	100.64	52.48	100.55	52.48 to 100.55	310,543	214,920
1	2	72.39	72.39	72.01	01.28	100.53	71.46	73.31	N/A	724,250	521,565
2	3	54.50	61.43	61.04	15.19	100.64	52.48	77.31	N/A	191,567	116,933
3	1	57.93	57.93	57.93	00.00	100.00	57.93	57.93	N/A	96,000	55,614
4	1	100.55	100.55	100.55	00.00	100.00	100.55	100.55	N/A	54,600	54,899
_____ALL_____	88	70.33	71.88	66.45	21.06	108.17	32.68	158.61	65.06 to 75.42	147,614	98,096

Kimball County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
53.10	Kimball	1	N/A	730	685	540	495	380	315	275	523
53.20	Kimball	2	N/A	770	695	575	495	385	340	275	544
53.30	Kimball	3	N/A	1,210	1,100	950	895	840	700	665	927
53.40	Kimball	4	N/A	1,200	1,100	950	875	850	800	750	923
4.10	Banner	1	N/A	850	850	750	750	700	700	583	727
17.10	Cheyenne	1	N/A	1,005	1,035	1,019	1,025	999	863	798	1,010
17.30	Cheyenne	3	N/A	1,250	1,225	1,190	1,055	1,040	1,000	975	1,213

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Kimball	1	N/A	315	275	270	225	200	190	185	234
	Kimball	2	N/A	300	300	280	250	220	170	155	225
	Kimball	3	N/A	325	310	300	250	200	175	160	251
	Kimball	4	N/A	360	340	285	240	225	180	180	263
	Banner	1	N/A	320	320	320	290	260	245	225	298
	Cheyenne	1	N/A	340	325	295	275	200	195	190	289
	Cheyenne	3	N/A	395	385	385	370	350	340	320	387

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Kimball	1	N/A	332	297	278	236	202	198	189	216
	Kimball	2	N/A	282	265	275	232	203	177	164	189
	Kimball	3	N/A	361	339	297	214	185	157	140	202
	Kimball	4	N/A	389	350	307	255	201	178	175	199
	Banner	1	N/A	304	303	295	258	254	233	221	245
	Cheyenne	1	N/A	256	244	225	226	209	191	119	174
	Cheyenne	3	N/A	337	374	332	341	299	299	179	283

*Land capability grouping averages calculated using data reported on the 2012 Form 45, Abstract of Assessment

2012 Correlation Section for Kimball County

A. Agricultural Land

Kimball County has a total land area of 952 square miles, and the agricultural land consists of approximately of 51% grass, 42% dry land and about 7% irrigated. The County currently has four clearly defined agricultural market areas based on topography, soil type and availability of water. Counties contiguous to Kimball are Banner to the north and Cheyenne to the east. The southern part of the County borders the State of Colorado, and the western portion is contiguous to the State of Wyoming. Neighboring Banner County has no defined agricultural market areas. Kimball County lies within the South Platte NRD (SPNRD), part of the Platte River Basin, and this NRD, like others within the Platte River Basin, "use regulation such as moratoriums on new well drilling in fully appropriated areas or require well metering and limit ground water pumping as part of their long-term ground water management plans for protecting the basin's stream flows" (quotation taken from the Platte River Basin web site).

Historically, the sales qualification and review process within the County consists of a questionnaire mailed to all buyers of residential, commercial and agricultural real property. A rough estimate for the rate of return of the questionnaires is around 60 to 70 percent. In the case of non-responses, the Assessor's office then attempts to contact either the buyer or seller (and in some cases the realtor) involved in the transaction. Since Kimball County is small in size and population, the personal knowledge of the Assessor and her staff is also utilized to further enhance the qualification process.

Preliminary analysis indicated that only Area Three is time proportionate for the three years of the sales study period (with five sales in both years one and two and four sales in year three). Area One has a total of thirty-four sales, with six occurring during the first year, eighteen during the second and ten occurring during the third year of the sales study. Agricultural Market Area Two has a total of twenty-three sales in the sample with nine occurring during the first year, eight in the second year, and only six in the third (this does not meet the 10% Department policy threshold). Area Four is the most time-disproportionate, with nine sales in the sample--there is only one sale in the first year, no sales in the second, and eight in the third. Comparable sales from surrounding counties will need to be obtained in order to balance the time periods. The major problem with this will be with Market Area One--since it is bordered on the west by Wyoming and on the south by Colorado.

A review of the Majority Land Use indicated that for the County overall, the sample is over-represented by the grass land use. Agricultural Market Area One is over-represented by grass (76% sample, 62% base) and under-represented by dry land (23% sample and 33% base). Again, it was not considered possible to obtain comparable sales from surrounding counties, since Area One is bordered on two sides by other states. Because of time nonproportionality in this market area, and the literal lack of any comparable properties in Cheyenne County, twelve sales were randomly removed: 71-507, 71-546, 71-716, 71-726, 72-65, 72-104, 72-111, 72-130, 72-155, 72-176, 72-608 and 72-677.

For Area Two, there was no MLU imbalance (i.e., any class that is out of the 10 point threshold range), but as mentioned previously, there was a time imbalance. Therefore, any sales obtained for the third year from neighboring counties must not disrupt the Majority Land

2012 Correlation Section for Kimball County

Use balance.

As noted previously, Area Three is the only area that has proportionate time balance. However, the sales file sample was not balanced for MLU: the sample was over-represented by irrigated sales (24% sample versus 7% county base) and under-represented by dry sales (30% sample and 51% base). Since the sample for this area is small, a number of comparable sales would need to be borrowed to maintain time proportionality, while correcting MLU imbalance. Area Four has both severe time imbalance, and sample non-representativeness in the grass and dry classes. Therefore, any comparable sales utilized from surrounding counties should be selected to correct both.

Thus, twelve sales were randomly removed from Market Area One (ten from year two and two from year three), one comparable sale was used for Area Two, five comparable sales were incorporated into the Area Three sample, and eight comparable sales were utilized in Market Area Four. The result of these actions taken is a representative sample that is both time and Majority Land Use balanced (for the County as a whole, and also by agricultural market area).

Assessment actions taken by the Kimball County Assessor to address agricultural land included the following: In Market Areas One and Two, the lowering of all grass LCG's; Market Area Three included raising irrigated subclasses 2A1, 4A1 and 4A, as well as dry subclasses 2D1, 2D and 3D1, while lowering all grass subclasses (except for 3G); In Market Area Four, all dry and grass subclasses were lowered.

The resultant statistical profile reveals eighty-eight sales, with an overall median of 70%, a weighted mean of 66% and a mean of 72%. Both the median and the mean are within acceptable range, and either could be used to describe the level of value of agricultural land within the County. However, a COD of 21% (only 1.06 above upper limits) tends to confirm the median measure of central tendency. The overall PRD is at 108.17. Further review of the profile under the heading "Area (Market) indicates that all Area ranges (1-4) have a median within acceptable range. An analysis of "95% MLU By Market Area" shows that the only subclass that has a statistically significant number of sales in the sample is Market Area Four dry land (ten sales), with a median of 72.25%, a COD of 18.71 and a PRD of 106.57.

Based on consideration of all the information available, it is determined that the level of value of agricultural land in Kimball County is 70%. Further, based on knowledge of the Countys assessment practices, it is believed that assessment quality of agricultural land meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball 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 of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

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

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

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

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

2012 Correlation Section for Kimball 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 IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 4,841	Value : 450,391,982	Growth 5,755,372
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

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	147	528,115	16	131,705	32	297,820	195	957,640	
02. Res Improve Land	1,293	7,511,995	55	628,570	197	3,487,420	1,545	11,627,985	
03. Res Improvements	1,358	64,281,992	57	4,133,960	232	19,093,380	1,647	87,509,332	
04. Res Total	1,505	72,322,102	73	4,894,235	264	22,878,620	1,842	100,094,957	547,460
% of Res Total	81.70	72.25	3.96	4.89	14.33	22.86	38.05	22.22	9.51
05. Com UnImp Land	58	347,850	5	35,760	21	179,065	84	562,675	
06. Com Improve Land	340	2,939,378	7	137,225	87	635,295	434	3,711,898	
07. Com Improvements	340	21,375,168	7	752,649	87	3,305,193	434	25,433,010	
08. Com Total	398	24,662,396	12	925,634	108	4,119,553	518	29,707,583	1,386,288
% of Com Total	76.83	83.02	2.32	3.12	20.85	13.87	10.70	6.60	24.09
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	1	110,650	1	110,650	
10. Ind Improve Land	5	122,945	1	15,245	2	99,540	8	237,730	
11. Ind Improvements	5	1,935,421	1	259,184	2	31,678,250	8	33,872,855	
12. Ind Total	5	2,058,366	1	274,429	3	31,888,440	9	34,221,235	9,696
% of Ind Total	55.56	6.01	11.11	0.80	33.33	93.18	0.19	7.60	0.17
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	1,505	72,322,102	73	4,894,235	264	22,878,620	1,842	100,094,957	547,460
% of Res & Rec Total	81.70	72.25	3.96	4.89	14.33	22.86	38.05	22.22	9.51
Com & Ind Total	403	26,720,762	13	1,200,063	111	36,007,993	527	63,928,818	1,395,984
% of Com & Ind Total	76.47	41.80	2.47	1.88	21.06	56.33	10.89	14.19	24.26
17. Taxable Total	1,908	99,042,864	86	6,094,298	375	58,886,613	2,369	164,023,775	1,943,444
% of Taxable Total	80.54	60.38	3.63	3.72	15.83	35.90	48.94	36.42	33.77

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	1	25,080	1,596,571	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	1	25,080	1,596,571
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	25,080	1,596,571

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	237	112,396,890	237	112,396,890	3,629,460
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	276	135,879	276	135,879	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	513	112,532,769	513	112,532,769	3,629,460

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	117	33	330	480

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	4	92,140	1,454	107,063,995	1,458	107,156,135
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	1	34,675	500	43,919,075	501	43,953,750
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	1	54,325	500	22,671,228	501	22,725,553
30. Ag Total							1,959	173,835,438

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	5,465	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	51,025	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.01	220	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.04	230	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	3,300	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	3	5.37	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	53	56.00	296,500	53	56.00	296,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	210	255.54	1,338,145	211	256.54	1,343,610	
33. HomeSite Improvements	219	0.00	14,133,285	220	0.00	14,184,310	52,385
34. HomeSite Total				273	312.54	15,824,420	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	65	216.62	128,875	66	217.63	129,095	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	411	2,054.40	542,460	412	2,055.44	542,690	
37. FarmSite Improvements	493	0.00	8,537,943	494	0.00	8,541,243	130,083
38. FarmSite Total				560	2,273.07	9,213,028	
39. Road & Ditches	1,391	5,294.33	0	1,394	5,299.70	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				833	7,885.31	25,037,448	182,468

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	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	863.16	8.35%	630,105	11.65%	730.00
47. 2A1	3,389.81	32.80%	2,322,025	42.93%	685.00
48. 2A	2,018.81	19.54%	1,090,160	20.16%	540.00
49. 3A1	309.92	3.00%	153,405	2.84%	494.98
50. 3A	681.44	6.59%	258,950	4.79%	380.00
51. 4A1	2,730.01	26.42%	859,940	15.90%	315.00
52. 4A	341.16	3.30%	93,810	1.73%	274.97
53. Total	10,334.31	100.00%	5,408,395	100.00%	523.34
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	6,420.19	8.72%	2,022,390	11.73%	315.00
56. 2D1	6,952.23	9.44%	1,911,855	11.09%	275.00
57. 2D	19,411.60	26.35%	5,241,120	30.39%	270.00
58. 3D1	9,486.76	12.88%	2,134,505	12.38%	225.00
59. 3D	697.70	0.95%	139,545	0.81%	200.01
60. 4D1	23,347.19	31.70%	4,435,965	25.73%	190.00
61. 4D	7,341.89	9.97%	1,358,220	7.88%	185.00
62. Total	73,657.56	100.00%	17,243,600	100.00%	234.10
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	4,226.34	2.90%	1,402,970	4.47%	331.96
65. 2G1	9,865.61	6.78%	2,928,235	9.32%	296.81
66. 2G	14,757.95	10.14%	4,109,120	13.08%	278.43
67. 3G1	7,877.58	5.41%	1,857,275	5.91%	235.77
68. 3G	7,969.10	5.48%	1,613,205	5.13%	202.43
69. 4G1	48,974.28	33.66%	9,697,735	30.87%	198.02
70. 4G	51,822.95	35.62%	9,809,275	31.22%	189.28
71. Total	145,493.81	100.00%	31,417,815	100.00%	215.94
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	10,334.31	4.50%	5,408,395	10.00%	523.34
Dry Total					
Dry Total	73,657.56	32.10%	17,243,600	31.89%	234.10
Grass Total					
Grass Total	145,493.81	63.40%	31,417,815	58.11%	215.94
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	229,485.68	100.00%	54,069,810	100.00%	235.61

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	1,938.05	13.93%	1,492,295	19.73%	770.00
47. 2A1	4,163.10	29.93%	2,893,275	38.25%	694.98
48. 2A	1,785.33	12.84%	1,026,545	13.57%	574.99
49. 3A1	818.24	5.88%	405,015	5.35%	494.98
50. 3A	1,000.03	7.19%	384,990	5.09%	384.98
51. 4A1	3,171.48	22.80%	1,078,280	14.25%	339.99
52. 4A	1,033.41	7.43%	284,185	3.76%	275.00
53. Total	13,909.64	100.00%	7,564,585	100.00%	543.84
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	1,281.90	1.54%	384,545	2.05%	299.98
56. 2D1	8,492.06	10.21%	2,547,630	13.61%	300.00
57. 2D	15,569.99	18.72%	4,359,605	23.29%	280.00
58. 3D1	21,626.92	26.01%	5,406,735	28.89%	250.00
59. 3D	903.96	1.09%	198,860	1.06%	219.99
60. 4D1	23,363.80	28.09%	3,971,800	21.22%	170.00
61. 4D	11,922.38	14.34%	1,847,955	9.87%	155.00
62. Total	83,161.01	100.00%	18,717,130	100.00%	225.07
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	573.39	0.63%	161,420	0.95%	281.52
65. 2G1	4,199.17	4.64%	1,111,635	6.51%	264.73
66. 2G	5,729.22	6.34%	1,576,215	9.23%	275.12
67. 3G1	5,963.64	6.60%	1,382,480	8.09%	231.82
68. 3G	8,275.87	9.15%	1,679,030	9.83%	202.88
69. 4G1	31,057.22	34.35%	5,502,625	32.22%	177.18
70. 4G	34,616.10	38.29%	5,666,090	33.17%	163.68
71. Total	90,414.61	100.00%	17,079,495	100.00%	188.90
Irrigated Total					
	13,909.64	7.42%	7,564,585	17.45%	543.84
Dry Total					
	83,161.01	44.36%	18,717,130	43.17%	225.07
Grass Total					
	90,414.61	48.22%	17,079,495	39.39%	188.90
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	187,485.26	100.00%	43,361,210	100.00%	231.28

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	643.97	9.17%	779,195	11.97%	1,209.99
47. 2A1	1,807.81	25.75%	1,988,600	30.55%	1,100.00
48. 2A	1,761.03	25.08%	1,672,975	25.70%	950.00
49. 3A1	213.74	3.04%	191,300	2.94%	895.01
50. 3A	463.54	6.60%	389,375	5.98%	840.00
51. 4A1	2,019.58	28.77%	1,413,670	21.72%	699.98
52. 4A	110.82	1.58%	73,685	1.13%	664.91
53. Total	7,020.49	100.00%	6,508,800	100.00%	927.11
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	4,885.76	9.99%	1,587,855	12.92%	325.00
56. 2D1	4,267.25	8.73%	1,322,845	10.77%	310.00
57. 2D	18,046.77	36.90%	5,413,985	44.07%	300.00
58. 3D1	2,120.98	4.34%	530,260	4.32%	250.01
59. 3D	904.06	1.85%	180,815	1.47%	200.00
60. 4D1	17,389.70	35.56%	3,043,215	24.77%	175.00
61. 4D	1,292.29	2.64%	206,780	1.68%	160.01
62. Total	48,906.81	100.00%	12,285,755	100.00%	251.21
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1,479.66	3.31%	534,420	5.93%	361.18
65. 2G1	3,173.06	7.11%	1,075,255	11.93%	338.87
66. 2G	7,677.67	17.20%	2,278,470	25.27%	296.77
67. 3G1	2,838.91	6.36%	608,775	6.75%	214.44
68. 3G	2,061.77	4.62%	381,410	4.23%	184.99
69. 4G1	17,423.67	39.03%	2,733,415	30.32%	156.88
70. 4G	9,988.27	22.37%	1,403,140	15.56%	140.48
71. Total	44,643.01	100.00%	9,014,885	100.00%	201.93
Irrigated Total					
	7,020.49	6.98%	6,508,800	23.41%	927.11
Dry Total					
	48,906.81	48.63%	12,285,755	44.18%	251.21
Grass Total					
	44,643.01	44.39%	9,014,885	32.42%	201.93
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	100,570.31	100.00%	27,809,440	100.00%	276.52

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	1,206.87	12.65%	1,448,245	16.44%	1,200.00
47. 2A1	648.11	6.79%	712,915	8.09%	1,099.99
48. 2A	3,259.39	34.15%	3,096,375	35.15%	949.99
49. 3A1	39.79	0.42%	34,820	0.40%	875.09
50. 3A	575.59	6.03%	489,250	5.55%	850.00
51. 4A1	3,336.04	34.96%	2,668,795	30.30%	799.99
52. 4A	477.99	5.01%	358,490	4.07%	749.99
53. Total	9,543.78	100.00%	8,808,890	100.00%	923.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	6,935.41	17.12%	2,496,765	23.44%	360.00
56. 2D1	3,651.82	9.01%	1,241,610	11.66%	340.00
57. 2D	13,190.59	32.56%	3,759,310	35.30%	285.00
58. 3D1	1,615.80	3.99%	387,770	3.64%	239.99
59. 3D	961.51	2.37%	216,340	2.03%	225.00
60. 4D1	13,072.02	32.27%	2,352,965	22.09%	180.00
61. 4D	1,084.29	2.68%	195,155	1.83%	179.98
62. Total	40,511.44	100.00%	10,649,915	100.00%	262.89
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	527.53	2.57%	205,095	5.00%	388.78
65. 2G1	291.28	1.42%	102,080	2.49%	350.45
66. 2G	1,965.37	9.56%	604,240	14.74%	307.44
67. 3G1	322.37	1.57%	82,125	2.00%	254.75
68. 3G	1,043.23	5.08%	209,225	5.10%	200.56
69. 4G1	6,800.23	33.08%	1,210,765	29.54%	178.05
70. 4G	9,605.01	46.73%	1,685,195	41.12%	175.45
71. Total	20,555.02	100.00%	4,098,725	100.00%	199.40
<hr/>					
Irrigated Total	9,543.78	13.52%	8,808,890	37.39%	923.00
Dry Total	40,511.44	57.37%	10,649,915	45.21%	262.89
Grass Total	20,555.02	29.11%	4,098,725	17.40%	199.40
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	70,610.24	100.00%	23,557,530	100.00%	333.63

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	51.02	35,455	40,757.20	28,255,215	40,808.22	28,290,670
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	38.08	9,385	246,198.74	58,887,015	246,236.82	58,896,400
78. Grass	0.00	0	432.03	76,060	300,674.42	61,534,860	301,106.45	61,610,920
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	521.13	120,900	587,630.36	148,677,090	588,151.49	148,797,990

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	40,808.22	6.94%	28,290,670	19.01%	693.26
Dry Land	246,236.82	41.87%	58,896,400	39.58%	239.19
Grass	301,106.45	51.20%	61,610,920	41.41%	204.62
Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	588,151.49	100.00%	148,797,990	100.00%	252.99

2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2011 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

53 Kimball

	2011 CTL County Total	2012 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2012 form 45 - 2011 CTL)	Percent Change	2012 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	101,908,479	100,094,957	-1,813,522	-1.78%	547,460	-2.32%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	15,838,411	15,824,420	-13,991	-0.09%	52,385	-0.42%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	117,746,890	115,919,377	-1,827,513	-1.55%	599,845	-2.06%
05. Commercial	29,805,276	29,707,583	-97,693	-0.33%	1,386,288	-4.98%
06. Industrial	34,277,334	34,221,235	-56,099	-0.16%	9,696	-0.19%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	9,197,497	9,213,028	15,531	0.17%	130,083	-1.25%
08. Minerals	88,386,169	112,532,769	24,146,600	27.32	3,629,460	23.21
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	161,666,276	185,674,615	24,008,339	14.85%	5,155,527	11.66%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	279,413,166	301,593,992	22,180,826	7.94%	5,755,372	5.88%
11. Irrigated	28,176,190	28,290,670	114,480	0.41%		
12. Dryland	58,816,510	58,896,400	79,890	0.14%		
13. Grassland	60,250,590	61,610,920	1,360,330	2.26%		
14. Wasteland	0	0	0			
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	147,243,290	148,797,990	1,554,700	1.06%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	426,656,456	450,391,982	23,735,526	5.56%	5,755,372	4.21%

**2011 Plan of Assessment for Kimball County
Assessment Years 2012, 2013 and 2014
Date: June 15, 2011**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. 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 of each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes or real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344, and 75% of its recapture value as defined in §77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347.

See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2009).

General Description of Real Property in Kimball County:

According to the 2011 County Abstract, Kimball County consists of the following real property types:

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Value</u>
<u>Base</u>			
Residential	1844	38.00%	23.88%
Commercial	520	10.50%	6.82%
Industrial	9	.50%	8.03%
Recreational	0		

Minerals	528	10.50%	20.89%
Agricultural	1959	40.50%	40.38%

Kimball County has 588,418.43 acres of agricultural land; comprised of 6.93% irrigated land, 42.57% dryland, and 50.5% grassland.

New Property: For assessment year 2011, several building permits and/or Information Statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county. Our yearly pickup work incorporated these permits and Information Statements and included newly constructed buildings, improvements, removed or deteriorated improvements, updating land uses, etc. Kimball County had an estimated \$21,084,328 of growth for 2011, of which \$18,507,180 pertained to producing mineral interests.

For more information see 2011 Reports & Opinions, Abstract, and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources:

Staff: Deputy Assessor and three clerks.

Budget: For 2010-2011 the assessor’s office and reappraisal budget request was \$173,424. The adopted budget was \$180,924.

Training: Required continuing education for certification of assessor and deputy plus workshops and other instruction that I feel is necessary for proper assessment practices.

Cadastral Maps accuracy/condition, other land use maps, aerial photos: Cadastral Maps and aerial photos are continually updated when a split or combination of a parcel is made or whenever a transfer occurs.

Property Record Cards: The Kimball County Assessor’s property record cards are very complete, detailed and current. The property record cards contain the following information:

- Owner’s name and address;
- Legal description;
- Parcel identification number;
- Cadastral map number;
- Tax district code;
- School district number;
- Valuation showing primary building, secondary buildings, land, and total value;
- Pricing sheets of houses, garages, and outbuildings that include information and notes about each improvement and replacement cost new with depreciation applied for current condition, location, etc. Attached to the pricing sheet is the CAMA sheet showing replacement cost;
- Sketches of all buildings;
- Numbered photos depicting improvements;
- Notes concerning inspections.

Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS: The Kimball County Assessor’s office has contracted with MIPS/County Solutions for CAMA pricing using Marshall & Swift cost data and an administrative package. We also have a GIS system using GIS Workshop, Inc.

Web based – property record information access website:

<http://kimball.assessor.gisworkshop.com>

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

Discover, List and Inventory all property: Paperwork corresponding to Real Estate Transfers is completed as soon as possible after they are brought to our office by the County Clerk's personnel. Ownership changes, etc. are entered in the computer, on the property record card and folder, in the real estate books, on the cadastral map and card, on index cards and on aerial and GIS maps if the sale includes rural land. We also inform the Treasurer's Office of landfill changes and SPNRD of irrigated land sales. The transfer is reviewed by the assessor and deputy to determine if it is a good sale. Sales questionnaires are sent to the buyer and seller for every transfer.

Data Collection: We perform extensive pick-up work each year. Our office receives information from building permits, information statements, newspaper reports, verbal reports from the public, and our own observations. The information we receive is reviewed by two staff members performing field work under guidance from myself.

Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions: Spreadsheets of residential, commercial, and agricultural sales are prepared each year based on the qualified sales rosters. Miscellaneous "what-ifs" are run to determine the most appropriate percentage increases/decreases to apply to bring values within the required statistical ranges. My state Property Assessment Division liaison is working with me on the ratio studies since, as a new assessor, I have not yet had training on using the "what-ifs" analysis.

Approaches to Value: Because of the variety of sales that occur in Kimball County, the Market approach and the Cost approach are used together when doing a complete repricing. The cost approach is done on the CAMA system using Marshall & Swift pricing. The latest depreciation study was done by the former assessor as of November 2004. At this time, the income approach is not used by Kimball County.

Land market areas were determined years ago by the Commissioners and the former Assessor appointing landowners to a board. They drove the county and looked at each sale and the current soil maps. The areas were determined with the landowners and commissioners. "What-if" spreadsheets are prepared using various potential changes in value to different classes of land to determine the most equitable overall increases/decreases in values to achieve the required statistics for levels of value. At this time there is no special value for agricultural land in Kimball County.

Reconciliation of final value and documentation: Our property record cards show how we arrive at value using the Marshall & Swift replacement cost new of improvements less any physical, locational or functional depreciation appropriate for the final value. New agricultural values are shown on the agricultural record along with the soil types.

Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions: All assessment actions are taken in conjunction with the assessment sales ratio studies to ensure that any actions taken result in valuations that meet the required statistics.

Notices and Public Relations: By June 1st of each year, notice of valuation changes are sent to the owners of record. The media (newspaper and radio) are sent our statistics for the current

year and they are also posted in our office. We mail reminders about timely filing for both personal property returns and homestead applications. In the future, I plan to run notices in the newspaper regarding these filing dates in addition to notices about field work, permissive exemptions, etc. Public relations begin in the office. Each interaction with a taxpayer is an opportunity to help them understand the what's, why's and how's of our efforts to provide fair assessments. The assessor's website needs to be updated so that it is more helpful and informative to the public. I spoke to the High School Civics Class on "Government Day" and to the Kimball Rotary Club about some of the procedures and requirements of our office. I would like to have more public education sessions in the future.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2011:

Kimball County

PROPERTY CLASS	MEDIAN	COEFFICIENT OF DISPERSION	PRICE RELATED DIFFERENTIAL
RESIDENTIAL	96.00	14.41	104.82
COMMERCIAL	100.00	30.40	97.08
AGRICULTURAL	73.00	17.59	104.69

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

Residential Property:

Review of residential property in the Villages of Dix and Bushnell. New pictures will be taken and compared with the old pictures in the file. Appointments will be made with property owners to examine any changes. Necessary adjustments to valuation will be made when the review is completed.

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. Real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

Sale questionnaires are sent out on every transfer to gather information concerning the sale.

Commercial Property:

Pickup work will be continuing for this term. Real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Until the time that all property is reviewed, percentage adjustments will be used to maintain the median level of value. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

Sale questionnaires are sent out on every transfer to gather information concerning the sale.

Agricultural Land:

As real estate transfers are received, we send out a questionnaire confirming the land use.

Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Residential Property:

Review of residential property in the City of Kimball and Suburbs. New pictures will be taken and compared with the old pictures in the file. Appointments will be made with property owners to examine any changes. Necessary adjustments to valuation will be made when the review is completed.

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. Real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

Sale questionnaires are sent out on every transfer to gather information concerning the sale.

Commercial Property:

Pickup work will be continuing for this term. Real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Until the time that all property is reviewed, percentage adjustments will be used to maintain the median level of value. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

Sale questionnaires are sent out on every transfer to gather information concerning the sale.

Agricultural Land:

As real estate transfers are received, we send out a questionnaire confirming the land use.

Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:

Residential Property:

Pickup work will be continuing for this term. Real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

We send out questionnaires on every transfer to gather information concerning the sale.

Commercial Property:

Review of commercial property in the City of Kimball and Suburbs. New pictures will be taken and compared with the old pictures in the file. Appointments will be made with property owners to examine any changes. Necessary adjustments to valuation will be made when the review is completed.

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. Real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

We send out questionnaires on every sale to gather information concerning the sale.

Agricultural Land:

As real estate transfers are received, we send out a questionnaire confirming the land use.

Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

Other functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:

1. Personal Property: Assist taxpayers with preprinted schedules mailed to them and prepare new schedules when there are changes. Prepare notices of failure to file, penalties, unsigned returns, etc. as required.
2. Homestead Exemption Program: Assist applicants with forms. Send reminders or telephone previous year applicants that haven't filed by June 15th. Process applications before mailing to State.
3. Annually prepare and file administrative reports as required by law or regulation with the Property Tax Administrator:
 - Real Estate and Personal Property Abstracts
 - Sales information to PAD rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Real Estate Abstract
 - Annual Plan of Assessment Report
 - Assessor Survey
 - School District Taxable Value Report
 - Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - Average Residential Value for Homestead Exemption purposes
 - Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
 - Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
 - Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
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: annually review government owned property not used for a public purpose and send notice of intent to tax.
6. Record maintenance, mapping updates, and ownership changes.
7. On or before June 1st send Notices of Valuation Change to owners of record.

8. Centrally Assessed: review of valuations of entities as certified by PAD for railroad and public service entities. Establish assessment records for each subdivision taxed to each company and tax billing for tax list given the County Treasurer.
9. 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. Two parcels for each TIF property, one real estate card with the base value and one for the excess value of the property are maintained.
10. 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.
11. Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed property.
12. Tax List Corrections: prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
13. Annual Inventory: update report designating personal property of the assessor's office by August 25th each year.
14. County Board of Equalization: attend all County Board of Equalization meetings. Assemble and provide information for valuation protests.
15. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC.
16. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.
17. Pull real estate cards, make copies, and answer questions in person, over the phone or through email. Among those we assist are appraisers, realtors, lending institutions, property owners, attorneys, surveyors, property owners, and other county offices.
18. Education: Assessor and Deputy Assessor must attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

Conclusion:

We strive to operate a well-organized, non-adversarial, congenial office that serves the public and educates them about the assessment process. Our aim is equalization and uniformity of valuation of all property in the county and completing the duties and responsibilities required of the assessor's office by associated Nebraska Statutes, Regulations and Directives. Kimball County adopted Zoning and Subdivision Regulations on October 5, 2010.

Respectfully submitted:

Debora Huff
Kimball County Assessor
June 15, 2011

2012 Assessment Survey for Kimball County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	None
3.	Other full-time employees:
	Three
4.	Other part-time employees:
	None
5.	Number of shared employees:
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$183,356
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	same
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$32,655
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	None
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$29,800
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$4,600
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	Postage, cell phone, County car usage and a copier are funded from the General Fund.
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$3,800

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	County Solutions
2.	CAMA software:
	County Solutions
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes, in conjunction with the GIS
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	The Deputy Assessor and staff clerk Sherrie maintain the GIS cadastral maps.
5.	Does the county have GIS software?

	Yes
6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	Yes, both property records and maps. http://kimball.assessor.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop and staff clerk Sherrie.
8.	Personal Property software:
	County Solutions

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	The city of Kimball and the villages of Bushnell and Dix.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	It is unknown when zoning was implemented.

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	The physical inspection and valuation for all three property classes have been done "in-house." Pritchard & Abbott is the contracted appraisal service for oil, gas and mineral interests.
2.	Other services:
	County Solutions for administrative, CAMA and personal property software. GIS workshop is contracted for both GIS and the County's internet GIS web site.

2012 Certification for Kimball County

This is to certify that the 2012 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 Kimball County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

