

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 Morrill County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	57	Median	97.65
Total Sales Price	\$4,033,750	Mean	107.51
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,030,750	Wgt. Mean	99.18
Total Assessed Value	\$3,997,516	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$41,456
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$70,715	Avg. Assessed Value	\$70,132

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.90 to 102.45
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	95.98 to 102.37
95% Mean C.I	100.53 to 114.49
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	19.45
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.36
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.99

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	70	97	97
2010	114	97	97
2009	155	93	93
2008	181	96	96

2012 Commission Summary for Morrill County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	Median	97.45
Total Sales Price	\$493,500	Mean	104.64
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$497,500	Wgt. Mean	99.55
Total Assessed Value	\$495,255	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$77,917
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$45,227	Avg. Assessed Value	\$45,023

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.74 to 133.08
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.82 to 107.28
95% Mean C.I	92.39 to 116.89
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.63
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.96
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.71

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	9	0	95
2010	12	94	94
2009	20	100	95
2008	40	96	96

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Morrill County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	98	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	73	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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Morrill County

Within the residential class of real property no major changes occurred. Stanard Appraisal Services has been retained to consult with the county and assist when needed. The appraisal company did review the residential sales to confirm that the models they had built during the reappraisal did not need to be calibrated and that they were still working with the current residential market.

The annual residential pickup work was completed for assessment year 2012.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Morrill County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Stanard Appraisal Service and office	
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>
	1	Bridgeport would be considered the main business district for the county, and would have a higher exposure to the market and highway traffic. There are enough sales to analyze the market on its own merits.
	2	Bayard has the closest proximity to Scottsbluff and enough sales to analyze its own market.
	3	Broadwater lies to the east of Bridgeport and there are no other villages within the county to compare it to, it is a market within itself.
	4	The rural market is a reflection of those wanting to live outside of town and enjoy the amenities of country living.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	All three approaches will be looked at but the market will carry the most weight.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2008	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The appraisal company will review the sales and determine the depreciation from the market. New construction will be pulled to compare to the factoring tables and the correct local cost multipliers will be inputted into the pricing. The sales will also be used as a guide to compare to the new construction for age and condition. Models will then be built, and sales charted, for a cost range per square foot (less depreciation, land and outbuildings) based on style, quality, age, condition and size. Adjustment factors will also be developed that can be applied for, but not limited to; basement, basement finish, garage, central air, and so on.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	

8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?
	2010
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?
	From the market a square foot method has been developed.
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	A property is considered substantially changed when improvements surpass the market at time of sale. Motivation, change of use, and the removal of buildings are also determining factors.

**62 Morrill
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 : 57
Total Sales Price : 4,033,750
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,030,750
Total Assessed Value : 3,997,516
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 70,715
Avg. Assessed Value : 70,132

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 99
MEAN : 108
COD : 16.50
PRD : 108.40

COV : 25.02
STD : 26.90
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.11
MAX Sales Ratio : 219.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 79.58

95% Median C.I. : 95.90 to 102.45
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.98 to 102.37
95% Mean C.I. : 100.53 to 114.49

Printed:3/29/2012 3:25:46PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	12	97.02	97.11	97.42	01.32	99.68	94.73	100.04	95.92 to 98.06	68,292	66,526
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	93.53	94.19	95.33	02.37	98.80	91.13	98.58	N/A	82,375	78,528
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	108.98	113.33	104.41	10.87	108.54	97.73	133.27	N/A	106,167	110,847
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	102.45	115.37	104.07	20.04	110.86	91.27	163.35	91.27 to 163.35	85,343	88,820
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	12	95.83	104.50	97.27	18.55	107.43	79.58	148.15	87.76 to 126.02	66,521	64,706
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	96.38	101.75	97.14	05.90	104.75	95.90	112.97	N/A	70,300	68,292
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	7	104.54	121.30	101.64	29.74	119.34	82.22	219.50	82.22 to 219.50	59,850	60,829
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	9	103.64	114.43	97.38	24.53	117.51	83.56	201.90	83.94 to 137.55	59,750	58,184
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	26	97.51	103.45	100.09	08.96	103.36	91.13	163.35	95.92 to 99.48	79,419	79,489
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	31	98.61	110.91	98.22	22.57	112.92	79.58	219.50	89.98 to 120.66	63,415	62,284
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	25	98.61	108.27	100.55	17.28	107.68	79.58	163.35	93.45 to 118.42	77,002	77,425
<u>ALL</u>	57	97.65	107.51	99.18	16.50	108.40	79.58	219.50	95.90 to 102.45	70,715	70,132

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	23	99.48	105.33	101.81	11.76	103.46	82.22	142.65	95.90 to 112.97	67,167	68,383
02	25	96.38	108.71	98.61	18.86	110.24	83.33	219.50	92.81 to 100.04	62,242	61,378
03	4	137.51	129.49	113.85	15.24	113.74	79.58	163.35	N/A	26,838	30,553
04	5	93.05	93.88	93.38	02.98	100.54	89.98	97.73	N/A	164,500	153,606
<u>ALL</u>	57	97.65	107.51	99.18	16.50	108.40	79.58	219.50	95.90 to 102.45	70,715	70,132

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	57	97.65	107.51	99.18	16.50	108.40	79.58	219.50	95.90 to 102.45	70,715	70,132
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	57	97.65	107.51	99.18	16.50	108.40	79.58	219.50	95.90 to 102.45	70,715	70,132

62 Morrill
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 : 57
Total Sales Price : 4,033,750
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,030,750
Total Assessed Value : 3,997,516
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 70,715
Avg. Assessed Value : 70,132

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 99
MEAN : 108
COD : 16.50
PRD : 108.40

COV : 25.02
STD : 26.90
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.11
MAX Sales Ratio : 219.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 79.58

95% Median C.I. : 95.90 to 102.45
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.98 to 102.37
95% Mean C.I. : 100.53 to 114.49

Printed:3/29/2012 3:25:46PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	1	91.13	91.13	91.13	00.00	100.00	91.13	91.13	N/A	4,500	4,101	
Less Than 15,000	4	125.26	140.29	136.53	30.53	102.75	91.13	219.50	N/A	8,963	12,236	
Less Than 30,000	11	137.47	141.78	141.11	21.08	100.47	91.13	219.50	103.64 to 201.90	16,341	23,059	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	56	97.69	107.80	99.18	16.66	108.69	79.58	219.50	95.92 to 102.45	71,897	71,311	
Greater Than 14,999	53	97.36	105.03	98.84	14.23	106.26	79.58	201.90	95.42 to 100.04	75,375	74,501	
Greater Than 29,999	46	96.18	99.31	97.22	09.32	102.15	79.58	142.65	94.24 to 98.06	83,717	81,388	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	91.13	91.13	91.13	00.00	100.00	91.13	91.13	N/A	4,500	4,101	
5,000 TO 14,999	3	137.55	156.67	143.04	25.82	109.53	112.97	219.50	N/A	10,450	14,948	
15,000 TO 29,999	7	137.47	142.64	142.26	17.23	100.27	103.64	201.90	103.64 to 201.90	20,557	29,244	
30,000 TO 59,999	14	96.32	103.77	101.26	15.44	102.48	79.58	142.65	83.33 to 126.02	39,179	39,672	
60,000 TO 99,999	21	97.36	98.60	98.20	08.01	100.41	83.56	124.14	93.45 to 100.04	83,595	82,094	
100,000 TO 149,999	8	95.91	95.72	95.79	03.29	99.93	88.50	104.54	88.50 to 104.54	116,500	111,596	
150,000 TO 249,999	3	91.27	92.99	92.96	02.83	100.03	89.98	97.73	N/A	205,000	190,572	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	57	97.65	107.51	99.18	16.50	108.40	79.58	219.50	95.90 to 102.45	70,715	70,132	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Morrill County**

A. Residential Real Property

The statistical sampling of 57 residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Morrill County. There is a close relationship between two of the measures of central tendency, the median and the weighted mean, the mean is slightly above the acceptable standard but is being effected by outliers; four sales with high assessed value/sale price ratios (book 73 pages 449, 474, 631 and book 74 page 81). The qualitative measures, coefficient of dispersion (COD) and price related differential (PRD), are slightly above the prescribed parameters as set out in the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) standards, the same four sales are affecting these measures. When the sales are hypothetically removed all measures are within range; median - 96, mean - 100, weighted mean - 96, COD - 11.65 and PRD - 103.33.

A sales verification process has been implemented in Morrill County. A questionnaire, specific to each property class (residential, commercial, and agricultural), is sent to both the buyer and seller with a stamped return envelope. The assessor has developed a tracking process for the questionnaires, each time one is returned it is noted on the spreadsheet. Phone calls will still be utilized when needed and the information will be documented. Other sources of data collection are county board members, neighbors, and personal knowledge in some instances, the realtors, title insurance agents, and attorneys are also helpful in verifying sales data. There appears to be no bias in the qualification process. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

Stanard Appraisal Services reviewed the residential sales to confirm that the models they had built during the reappraisal did not need to be calibrated and that they were still working with the current residential market. The annual residential pickup work was completed for assessment year 2012.

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill County

Within the commercial class of real property no major changes occurred. Stanard Appraisal Services has been retained to consult with the county and assist when needed. The appraisal company did review the commercial sales to confirm that the models they had built during the reappraisal did not need to be calibrated and that they were still working with the current commercial market.

The annual commercial pickup work was completed for assessment year 2012.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Morrill County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Office staff and Stanard Appraisal Service	
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> - <i>Each town is different in size, economy, and job availability.</i>
	1	Bridgeport would be considered the main business district for the county, and would have a higher exposure to the market and highway traffic. There are enough sales to analyze the market on its own merits.
	2	Bayard still has several established businesses and the closest proximity to Scottsbluff. Because of the distance to Scottsbluff, the startup of new businesses has been attempted but more often than not they do not survive.
	3	Broadwater lies to the east of Bridgeport and there are no other villages within the county to compare it to. The closest like village would be Lisco in Garden County to the east of Morrill.
	4	The rural market would be somewhat specialized with sugar beets, corn and an ethanol plant. The sugar beet factory in Morrill county has closed down, the closest processing plant now is in Scottsbluff.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	All three approaches will be looked at, but primarily the market and income approaches will carry the most weight.	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	Stanard Appraisal Service has valued the unique commercial properties, such as the ethanol plant, feedlots, and elevator facilities.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2008	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Models are built from the market.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	

7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?
	2010
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?
	2010
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.
	From the market a square foot method will be developed.
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	A property is considered substantially changed when improvements surpass the market at time of sale. Motivation and change of use are also determining factors.

62 Morrill
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 : 11
Total Sales Price : 493,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 497,500
Total Assessed Value : 495,255
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 45,227
Avg. Assessed Value : 45,023

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 100
MEAN : 105
COD : 11.61
PRD : 105.11

COV : 17.43
STD : 18.24
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.31
MAX Sales Ratio : 145.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 87.50

95% Median C.I. : 91.74 to 133.08
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.82 to 107.28
95% Mean C.I. : 92.39 to 116.89

Printed:3/29/2012 3:25:47PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	94.77	95.47	94.34	01.54	101.20	93.63	98.00	N/A	69,167	65,250
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	96.92	96.92	96.92	00.00	100.00	96.92	96.92	N/A	50,000	48,460
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	97.45	97.45	97.45	00.00	100.00	97.45	97.45	N/A	10,000	9,745
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	111.30	111.30	111.30	00.00	100.00	111.30	111.30	N/A	100,000	111,300
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	110.29	110.29	98.68	20.66	111.77	87.50	133.08	N/A	26,500	26,150
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	145.00	145.00	145.00	00.00	100.00	145.00	145.00	N/A	4,000	5,800
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	96.67	96.67	98.49	05.10	98.15	91.74	101.60	N/A	36,500	35,950
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	3	94.77	95.47	94.34	01.54	101.20	93.63	98.00	N/A	69,167	65,250
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	3	97.45	101.89	105.94	04.92	96.18	96.92	111.30	N/A	53,333	56,502
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	5	101.60	111.78	100.00	19.46	111.78	87.50	145.00	N/A	26,000	26,000
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	96.92	96.15	94.94	01.45	101.27	93.63	98.00	N/A	53,500	50,791
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	111.30	110.63	106.93	13.65	103.46	87.50	133.08	N/A	51,000	54,533
<u>ALL</u>	11	97.45	104.64	99.55	11.61	105.11	87.50	145.00	91.74 to 133.08	45,227	45,023

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	5	94.77	101.18	95.27	10.31	106.20	87.50	133.08	N/A	57,100	54,402
02	6	99.80	107.52	105.30	11.81	102.11	91.74	145.00	91.74 to 145.00	35,333	37,208
<u>ALL</u>	11	97.45	104.64	99.55	11.61	105.11	87.50	145.00	91.74 to 133.08	45,227	45,023

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	11	97.45	104.64	99.55	11.61	105.11	87.50	145.00	91.74 to 133.08	45,227	45,023
04											
<u>ALL</u>	11	97.45	104.64	99.55	11.61	105.11	87.50	145.00	91.74 to 133.08	45,227	45,023

62 Morrill
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 : 11
Total Sales Price : 493,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 497,500
Total Assessed Value : 495,255
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 45,227
Avg. Assessed Value : 45,023

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 100
MEAN : 105
COD : 11.61
PRD : 105.11

COV : 17.43
STD : 18.24
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.31
MAX Sales Ratio : 145.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 87.50

95% Median C.I. : 91.74 to 133.08
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.82 to 107.28
95% Mean C.I. : 92.39 to 116.89

Printed:3/29/2012 3:25:47PM

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	1	145.00	145.00	145.00	00.00	100.00	145.00	145.00	N/A	4,000	5,800	
Less Than 15,000	3	133.08	125.18	121.65	11.91	102.90	97.45	145.00	N/A	9,000	10,948	
Less Than 30,000	5	98.00	113.05	104.59	18.14	108.09	91.74	145.00	N/A	15,000	15,689	
___Ranges Excl. Low \$___												
Greater Than 4,999	10	97.19	100.60	99.18	07.91	101.43	87.50	133.08	91.74 to 111.30	49,350	48,946	
Greater Than 14,999	8	95.85	96.93	98.28	05.24	98.63	87.50	111.30	87.50 to 111.30	58,813	57,801	
Greater Than 29,999	6	95.85	97.62	98.65	05.89	98.96	87.50	111.30	87.50 to 111.30	70,417	69,468	
___Incremental Ranges___												
0 TO 4,999	1	145.00	145.00	145.00	00.00	100.00	145.00	145.00	N/A	4,000	5,800	
5,000 TO 14,999	2	115.27	115.27	117.59	15.46	98.03	97.45	133.08	N/A	11,500	13,523	
15,000 TO 29,999	2	94.87	94.87	95.00	03.30	99.86	91.74	98.00	N/A	24,000	22,800	
30,000 TO 59,999	4	95.85	95.20	95.69	04.24	99.49	87.50	101.60	N/A	43,125	41,265	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999	1	111.30	111.30	111.30	00.00	100.00	111.30	111.30	N/A	100,000	111,300	
150,000 TO 249,999	1	93.63	93.63	93.63	00.00	100.00	93.63	93.63	N/A	150,000	140,450	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ALL___	11	97.45	104.64	99.55	11.61	105.11	87.50	145.00	91.74 to 133.08	45,227	45,023	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
344	2	115.00	115.00	104.38	15.72	110.17	96.92	133.08	N/A	31,500	32,880	
350	1	94.77	94.77	94.77	00.00	100.00	94.77	94.77	N/A	32,500	30,800	
353	3	93.63	93.04	93.00	03.74	100.04	87.50	98.00	N/A	71,667	66,650	
406	3	101.60	112.78	100.91	17.47	111.76	91.74	145.00	N/A	25,667	25,900	
528	1	97.45	97.45	97.45	00.00	100.00	97.45	97.45	N/A	10,000	9,745	
531	1	111.30	111.30	111.30	00.00	100.00	111.30	111.30	N/A	100,000	111,300	
___ALL___	11	97.45	104.64	99.55	11.61	105.11	87.50	145.00	91.74 to 133.08	45,227	45,023	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Morrill County**

A. Commercial Real Property

The statistical sampling for the commercial class of real property is made up of 11 sales and will not be relied upon to determine a level of value for Morrill County. In reviewing the overall data for measurement purposes the overall median is at an acceptable level of value and the coefficient of dispersion is slightly above the recommended IAAO standard. Further stratification of the sample by occupancy codes displays five different codes. The measurement of these small samples is unrealistic, and because there is not a test to determine if each occupancy code listed is representative of the population these measures are insignificant. A level of value for the commercial class of property cannot be made without a reasonable degree of certainty that the commercial sample is adequate and representative of the commercial population as a whole.

A sales verification process has been implemented in Morrill County. A questionnaire, specific to each property class (residential, commercial, and agricultural), is sent to both the buyer and seller with a stamped return envelope. The assessor has developed a tracking process for the questionnaires, each time one is returned it is noted on the spreadsheet. Phone calls will still be utilized when needed and the information will be documented. Other sources of data collection are county board members, neighbors, and personal knowledge in some instances, the realtors, title insurance agents, and attorneys are also helpful in verifying sales data. There appears to be no bias in the qualification process. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

Stanard Appraisal Services reviewed the commercial sales to confirm that the models they had built during the reappraisal did not need to be calibrated and that they were still working with the current commercial market. The annual commercial pickup work was completed for assessment year 2012.

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill County

The agricultural land market was analyzed for 2012, each market area (2, 3 and 4) was analyzed on its own importance and then the county as a whole was reviewed. This year market area 1 was merged into market area 2 as the market does not recognize a difference between them. Research was expanded to the adjoining counties of Box Butte, Sheridan, Garden, Cheyenne, Banner, Scottsbluff and Sioux for comparable sales unique to the market area it adjoined.

Modifications were made to the land values in each market area as identified in the agricultural analysis.

For assessment year 2013 the anticipation is to have all GIS information loaded onto the counties MIPS CAMA/administrative computer system. The county is so saturated with small agricultural parcels that it has been difficult and very time consuming to research these parcels and verify that data is accurate. The county utilizes GIS Workshop and is fortunate in that the newly appointed deputy assessor is also well versed in GIS mapping, this individual will definitely benefit the county in getting this work completed.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Morrill County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Office staff and Stanard Appraisal Services	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
		Market area 1 was merged with 2 since most feel there is not a recognizable market difference.
	2	The northern portion of the county which consists primarily of the sand hill soils.
	3	Begins at the escarpments and falls off into the valley and covers the remainder of Morrill County. GIS Workshop was contacted for help in determining what soil type(s) would be the best indicator in determining the line for this change in topography and they have indicated that soils 4810 through 4807 are the best; the makeup of this area makes it difficult to give one specific soil as the key factor.
	4	Is the area along the river as identified by numerical code 9999 (which is the river itself) and 6312 the islands and has recreational potential.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	The determination is made through the process of a sales review and verification, location and use of the property and a physical inspection if needed.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	The primary use of the land is a good indicator in determining if it is agricultural, after an on-site review and if the verification process reveals the parcel was not purchased with the intent to farm or ranch it is considered residential, normally after verification with the buyer and/or seller, or realtor listed on the Real Estate Transfer Statement, Form 521 it can be determined if the parcel is going to be used for recreational purposes.	
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.)	
	GIS along with physical inspections, NRD and FSA maps, and personal property listings of irrigated equipment.	

7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.
	Values will be developed from a market analysis of the sales of parcels along the river to determine if there is a recreational 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?
	A property is considered substantially changed when improvements surpass the market at time of sale. Motivation, change of use, and the removal of buildings are also determining factors.

62 Morrill
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 : 70
Total Sales Price : 16,558,074
Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,558,074
Total Assessed Value : 11,475,962
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 236,544
Avg. Assessed Value : 163,942

MEDIAN : 73
WGT. MEAN : 69
MEAN : 73
COD : 19.39
PRD : 104.86

COV : 25.34
STD : 18.42
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.14
MAX Sales Ratio : 122.07
MIN Sales Ratio : 41.31

95% Median C.I. : 68.41 to 75.77
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.02 to 74.60
95% Mean C.I. : 68.36 to 77.00

Printed:3/29/2012 3:25:48PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	69.09	67.11	64.58	06.80	103.92	56.09	74.16	N/A	99,500	64,256	
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	75.36	80.05	67.24	25.15	119.05	41.31	115.10	N/A	187,049	125,776	
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	7	76.01	78.12	74.43	18.08	104.96	54.70	109.25	54.70 to 109.25	182,669	135,967	
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	76.58	73.47	72.91	14.91	100.77	48.52	91.20	48.52 to 91.20	201,038	146,567	
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	69.78	70.50	71.47	09.89	98.64	62.68	79.75	N/A	99,200	70,894	
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	72.53	81.26	81.60	15.51	99.58	68.78	111.21	N/A	76,500	62,426	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	62.70	66.14	66.45	22.28	99.53	49.31	88.32	49.31 to 88.32	366,114	243,296	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	75.77	74.32	81.10	26.13	91.64	42.36	101.93	42.36 to 101.93	169,839	137,747	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	75.80	75.80	78.53	37.73	96.52	47.20	104.39	N/A	24,325	19,102	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	68.96	74.94	66.75	22.93	112.27	42.75	122.07	42.75 to 122.07	593,472	396,165	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	8	69.16	67.78	69.91	14.44	96.95	47.01	89.98	47.01 to 89.98	199,584	139,529	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	68.41	66.94	62.10	14.81	107.79	51.18	80.53	N/A	224,832	139,624	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	24	74.89	75.14	71.33	17.59	105.34	41.31	115.10	68.72 to 82.30	175,843	125,425	
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	23	71.24	72.02	71.44	20.40	100.81	42.36	111.21	62.68 to 79.75	209,591	149,734	
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	23	68.60	70.79	66.80	19.93	105.97	42.75	122.07	60.56 to 77.19	326,837	218,342	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	23	75.05	75.72	74.03	15.31	102.28	48.52	111.21	68.78 to 79.75	156,078	115,547	
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	25	68.60	72.02	68.63	25.80	104.94	42.36	122.07	57.48 to 86.63	356,568	244,725	
<u>ALL</u>	70	72.92	72.68	69.31	19.39	104.86	41.31	122.07	68.41 to 75.77	236,544	163,942	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
2	24	69.92	67.54	70.40	14.77	95.94	42.36	89.98	56.09 to 75.77	218,385	153,738	
3	30	74.43	75.13	67.17	21.31	111.85	41.31	115.10	64.51 to 82.30	230,819	155,052	
4	16	73.34	75.81	71.37	22.21	106.22	44.06	122.07	57.48 to 91.20	274,517	195,919	
<u>ALL</u>	70	72.92	72.68	69.31	19.39	104.86	41.31	122.07	68.41 to 75.77	236,544	163,942	

62 Morrill
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 : 70
Total Sales Price : 16,558,074
Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,558,074
Total Assessed Value : 11,475,962
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 236,544
Avg. Assessed Value : 163,942

MEDIAN : 73
WGT. MEAN : 69
MEAN : 73
COD : 19.39
PRD : 104.86

COV : 25.34
STD : 18.42
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.14
MAX Sales Ratio : 122.07
MIN Sales Ratio : 41.31

95% Median C.I. : 68.41 to 75.77
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.02 to 74.60
95% Mean C.I. : 68.36 to 77.00

Printed:3/29/2012 3:25:48PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	13	74.16	70.63	65.93	20.23	107.13	42.36	96.90	52.73 to 89.27	201,849	133,083
2	5	52.73	58.92	55.94	22.19	105.33	42.36	75.77	N/A	113,240	63,342
3	4	79.00	76.69	76.11	19.47	100.76	53.90	94.87	N/A	147,074	111,938
4	4	81.24	79.22	65.71	16.49	120.56	57.48	96.90	N/A	367,386	241,404
_____Dry_____											
County	8	66.57	71.62	57.74	26.24	124.04	41.31	104.39	41.31 to 104.39	133,967	77,353
2	1	56.09	56.09	56.09	00.00	100.00	56.09	56.09	N/A	165,000	92,550
3	7	70.60	73.83	58.04	25.34	127.21	41.31	104.39	41.31 to 104.39	129,534	75,182
_____Grass_____											
County	27	73.32	73.52	72.65	12.41	101.20	47.01	115.10	67.92 to 77.95	199,032	144,594
2	13	73.32	74.19	74.84	09.42	99.13	60.56	89.98	67.71 to 80.53	268,337	200,813
3	10	74.43	71.98	66.46	17.02	108.31	47.01	115.10	48.52 to 79.75	113,678	75,555
4	4	70.65	75.23	71.84	09.38	104.72	68.41	91.20	N/A	187,180	134,479
_____ALL_____	70	72.92	72.68	69.31	19.39	104.86	41.31	122.07	68.41 to 75.77	236,544	163,942

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	19	68.72	69.24	61.31	24.78	112.93	42.36	109.25	52.73 to 88.32	253,181	155,233
2	6	53.72	58.22	55.58	18.76	104.75	42.36	75.77	42.36 to 75.77	131,867	73,297
3	7	68.72	69.86	58.91	23.40	118.59	42.75	94.87	42.75 to 94.87	278,957	164,321
4	6	81.24	79.55	65.78	22.91	120.93	51.18	109.25	51.18 to 109.25	344,424	226,568
_____Dry_____											
County	9	62.54	68.90	57.53	27.55	119.76	41.31	104.39	47.20 to 94.71	121,526	69,912
2	1	56.09	56.09	56.09	00.00	100.00	56.09	56.09	N/A	165,000	92,550
3	7	70.60	73.83	58.04	25.34	127.21	41.31	104.39	41.31 to 104.39	129,534	75,182
4	1	47.20	47.20	47.20	00.00	100.00	47.20	47.20	N/A	22,000	10,383
_____Grass_____											
County	31	73.75	74.58	73.14	12.79	101.97	47.01	115.10	68.41 to 77.19	202,125	147,838
2	15	73.75	74.24	74.87	08.30	99.16	60.56	89.98	67.92 to 78.73	271,359	203,170
3	11	75.05	75.55	69.41	19.73	108.85	47.01	115.10	48.52 to 111.21	110,616	76,774
4	5	68.78	73.49	70.59	08.37	104.11	66.53	91.20	N/A	195,744	138,185
_____ALL_____	70	72.92	72.68	69.31	19.39	104.86	41.31	122.07	68.41 to 75.77	236,544	163,942

Morrill County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
62.20	Morrill	2	#DIV/0!	975	925	825	#DIV/0!	650	650	650	697
62.30	Morrill	3	#DIV/0!	1,210	1,210	1,210	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,147
62.40	Morrill	4	#DIV/0!	1,700	1,625	1,575	1,400	1,325	1,250	1,100	1,380
83.10	Sioux	1	#DIV/0!	640	600	500	500	500	470	470	519
7.10	Box Butte	1	#DIV/0!	1,203	1,036	1,208	1,230	1,223	1,225	1,228	1,219
81.10	Sheridan	1	#DIV/0!	975	900	780	750	750	750	750	837
35.10	Garden	1	#DIV/0!	975	850	750	650	650	650	650	702
17.40	Cheyenne	4	#DIV/0!	1,230	1,220	1,150	1,055	1,005	940	880	1,176
17.30	Cheyenne	3	#DIV/0!	1,250	1,225	1,190	1,055	1,040	1,000	975	1,213
4.10	Banner	1	#DIV/0!	850	850	750	750	700	700	583	727
79.20	ScottsBluff	2	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	1,825	1,350	1,350	1,200	1,200	1,180	1,363
79.30	ScottsBluff	3	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	1,850	1,348	1,350	1,198	1,200	1,200	1,468

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Morrill	2	#DIV/0!	240	240	240	#DIV/0!	240	240	240	240
	Morrill	3	#DIV/0!	380	380	340	340	340	340	340	349
	Morrill	4	#DIV/0!	450	#DIV/0!	400	#DIV/0!	340	340	340	350
	Sioux	1	#DIV/0!	350	260	255	250	250	250	230	260
	Box Butte	1	#DIV/0!	350	#DIV/0!	270	225	225	225	225	275
	Sheridan	1	#DIV/0!	460	460	440	410	400	350	350	416
	Garden	1	#DIV/0!	505	445	400	400	400	400	400	466
	Cheyenne	4	#DIV/0!	475	470	470	460	400	339	335	460
	Cheyenne	3	#DIV/0!	395	385	385	370	350	340	320	387
	Banner	1	#DIV/0!	320	320	320	290	260	245	225	298
	ScottsBluff	2	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	310	#DIV/0!	230	230	210	237
	ScottsBluff	3	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	330	310	260	230	230	210	275

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Morrill	2	#DIV/0!	220	220	220	#DIV/0!	220	220	220	220
	Morrill	3	#DIV/0!	325	300	275	250	200	200	200	209
	Morrill	4	#DIV/0!	375	350	325	300	250	225	225	234
	Sioux	1	#DIV/0!	230	230	230	210	210	185	195	197
	Box Butte	1	#DIV/0!	271	245	253	205	204	201	200	206
	Sheridan	1	#DIV/0!	370	295	285	250	245	230	220	233
	Garden	1	#DIV/0!	297	250	249	243	249	233	230	232
	Cheyenne	4	#DIV/0!	292	242	258	230	237	248	169	221
	Cheyenne	3	#DIV/0!	337	374	332	341	299	299	179	283
	Banner	1	#DIV/0!	304	303	295	258	254	233	221	245
	ScottsBluff	2	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	311	309	337	260	253	229	244
	ScottsBluff	3	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	250	240	235	215	215	200	214

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

2012 Correlation Section for Morrill County

A. Agricultural Land

Morrill County is in the western part of Nebraska more commonly known as the Panhandle, and nearer to the states of Colorado and Wyoming. Morrill County is part of the North Platte Natural Resource District. In western Nebraska ground water is greatly dependent on a series of canals, tributaries, and seasonal irrigation run-off, which recharge the aquifer. In 2001 a moratorium on new water well drilling was put into effect. Good roads for the marketing of crops and livestock are important in the agricultural market. Primary roads running through Morrill County are highway 26 from the southeast to the northwest and highway 385 north to south.

The ability of Morrill County to locate comparable sales is somewhat hindered by its location, even though six counties (Box Butte, Sheridan, Morrill, Cheyenne, Banner and Scotts Bluff) adjoin it. The fact that it is located within three of the Major Land Resource Areas (MLRA) adds to the complexity of the position when looking for comparables. In the northeastern corner is MLRA 65 (Nebraska Sand Hills) which is part of a large sand-dune area with average annual precipitation of 15 to 26 inches. Next is a narrow strip of land running from the northwest corner down to a point in the southeast corner known as MLRA 64 (Mixed Sandy and Silty Tableland and Badlands) which comprises 42% in South Dakota, 41% in Nebraska and 17% in Wyoming. Land use consists of eroded walls and escarpments, grass tablelands and scattered eroded buttes. The last MLRA is 67A (Central High Plains, Northern Part) which comprises 68% in Wyoming, 29% in Nebraska and 3% in Colorado. Land use is predominantly grass, and approximately a third cropland. Higher parts of the tableland are nearly level to moderately sloping, but steeper terrain exists on the sides of ridges and drainage ways. Average annual precipitation in the last two areas is approximately 12-19 inches.

Originally four market areas were established that somewhat mirrored the MLRA it is located in. Market area 1 (previously the northeast corner) was dissolved into market area 2, the area is sand hills similar to Garden County with lush grasses and better feeding conditions for cattle. Market area 2 is the remainder of the sand hills and the composition of soil changes to a very fine to powder like sand and the grasses are thinly populated even though they are the same as in market area one, the makeup of the ground lessens the carrying capacity for cattle. However, this difference is not greatly recognized in the market.

Market Area 3 will take in the escarpments and falls off into the valley and covers the remainder of Morrill County. GIS Workshop was contacted for help in determining what soil type(s) would be the best indicator in determining the line for this change in topography; soils 4810 through 4807 worked best. The makeup of this area makes it difficult to give one specific soil as the key factor. An effort was made to keep the boundary line on sections lines, any other attempt at establishing this line to the contour of the escarpments would have entailed a great deal of cost to hire a contracted surveyor to establish it.

Market area 4 is along the river as identified by numerical code 9999 (which is the river itself) and 6312 (the islands) as established by the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the US Department of Agriculture. This area has the potential to become special value due to the

2012 Correlation Section for Morrill County

hunting and recreation along the Platte River. The section lines were used for this boundary as well since hiring a surveyor would have been cost prohibitive.

A sales verification process has been implemented in Morrill County. A questionnaire, specific to each property class (residential, commercial, and agricultural), is sent to both the buyer and seller with a stamped return envelope. The assessor has developed a tracking process for the questionnaires, each time one is returned it is noted on a spreadsheet. Phone calls will still be utilized when needed and the information will be documented. Other sources of data collection are county board members, neighbors, and personal knowledge in some instances, the realtors, title insurance agents, and attorneys are also helpful in verifying sales data.

A review of the agricultural sales in Morrill County from 7/1/08 to 6/30/11 revealed a total of 30 sales. Stratified by market area there are 4 sales in market area two, 21 sales in market area three and 5 sales in market area four. A review of the breakdown of the sales demonstrates that in market area two, with only 4 sales, the sample is clearly not proportionate or representative. In market area 3 the first year is under-represented in comparison to the second and third years and the sample is heavily weighted with dry land sales. In market area 4 the sample is neither proportionate nor representative; there are a high number of irrigated sales.

Comparable sales were sought from the surrounding counties of Sioux (market area 1), Box Butte (market area 1), Sheridan, Garden, Cheyenne (market areas 3 & 4), Banner, and Scotts Bluff (market areas 2 & 3) with similar soils, land use makeup, and topography appropriate for each market area and study period. The data was sorted according to sale date, usage, soils, topography, proximity, and market. The stratification of the pool became complex with the selection criteria. The resulting endeavor did mitigate the time bias that had previously existed and improved or retained the makeup of the sales file in comparison to the composition of each market area. For market area two; 20 sales were brought into the analysis, the sample was considered adequate and proportionate and there was not a difference of more than 10 percentage points between each year. For market area three; 9 sales were brought into the analysis, the sample was considered adequate but the proportionality was still slightly skewed with the over-abundance of dry land sales. For market area four all comparable sales were brought into the sample. Typically a sample of sixteen sales may be considered inadequate however, along the river where the area is somewhat homogeneous and variation in the market is minimal, the sample may be statistically reliable.

From the assessors analysis of the agricultural land market the values were adjusted by market area if needed to achieve an acceptable level of value and uniform and proportionate assessments. The agricultural land analysis displayed an overall county median of 72.92% with a coefficient of dispersion (COD) of 19.39; each market area attained an acceptable level of value as well.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 73% of market value for the agricultural land class of property.

There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the agricultural class of property in Morrill County.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 : 7,079

Value : 514,791,968

Growth 3,828,975

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	430	1,035,830	112	195,790	47	655,040	589	1,886,660	
02. Res Improve Land	1,247	5,875,145	72	290,175	327	3,488,120	1,646	9,653,440	
03. Res Improvements	1,352	58,252,303	72	2,990,064	383	25,859,292	1,807	87,101,659	
04. Res Total	1,782	65,163,278	184	3,476,029	430	30,002,452	2,396	98,641,759	578,684
% of Res Total	74.37	66.06	7.68	3.52	17.95	30.42	33.85	19.16	15.11
05. Com UnImp Land	43	195,575	8	11,120	17	182,920	68	389,615	
06. Com Improve Land	246	1,819,905	14	53,395	44	2,059,180	304	3,932,480	
07. Com Improvements	246	14,837,022	14	382,410	42	8,097,689	302	23,317,121	
08. Com Total	289	16,852,502	22	446,925	59	10,339,789	370	27,639,216	1,810,390
% of Com Total	78.11	60.97	5.95	1.62	15.95	37.41	5.23	5.37	47.28
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	1	4,435	0	0	1	112,680	2	117,115	
11. Ind Improvements	1	1,980	0	0	1	1,226,670	2	1,228,650	
12. Ind Total	1	6,415	0	0	1	1,339,350	2	1,345,765	0
% of Ind Total	50.00	0.48	0.00	0.00	50.00	99.52	0.03	0.26	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	16	634,145	16	634,145	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	3	210,265	3	210,265	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	3	630,581	3	630,581	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	19	1,474,991	19	1,474,991	101,930
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.27	0.29	2.66
Res & Rec Total	1,782	65,163,278	184	3,476,029	449	31,477,443	2,415	100,116,750	680,614
% of Res & Rec Total	73.79	65.09	7.62	3.47	18.59	31.44	34.11	19.45	17.78
Com & Ind Total	290	16,858,917	22	446,925	60	11,679,139	372	28,984,981	1,810,390
% of Com & Ind Total	77.96	58.16	5.91	1.54	16.13	40.29	5.25	5.63	47.28
17. Taxable Total	2,072	82,022,195	206	3,922,954	509	43,156,582	2,787	129,101,731	2,491,004
% of Taxable Total	74.35	63.53	7.39	3.04	18.26	33.43	39.37	25.08	65.06

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	3	14,085	294,915	0	0	0
20. Industrial	1	6,415	41,573,885	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	3	14,085	294,915
20. Industrial	0	0	0	1	6,415	41,573,885
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				4	20,500	41,868,800

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	54	9,166,030	54	9,166,030	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	42	39,215	42	39,215	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	96	9,205,245	96	9,205,245	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	202	29	253	484

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	3,373	236,099,525	3,373	236,099,525
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	823	84,420,920	823	84,420,920
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	823	55,964,547	823	55,964,547
30. Ag Total							4,196	376,484,992

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	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	76	78.37	632,000	76	78.37	632,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	557	648.41	5,192,000	557	648.41	5,192,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	577	0.00	35,515,639	577	0.00	35,515,639	1,136,785
34. HomeSite Total				653	726.78	41,339,639	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	105	104.37	104,370	105	104.37	104,370	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	722	737.21	737,210	722	737.21	737,210	
37. FarmSite Improvements	775	0.00	20,448,908	775	0.00	20,448,908	201,186
38. FarmSite Total				880	841.58	21,290,488	
39. Road & Ditches	2,123	7,209.13	0	2,123	7,209.13	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,533	8,777.49	62,630,127	1,337,971

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	3	594.00	254,155	3	594.00	254,155

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 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	761.50	5.09%	742,465	7.11%	975.00
47. 2A1	1.00	0.01%	925	0.01%	925.00
48. 2A	2,647.70	17.68%	2,184,385	20.91%	825.01
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	5,033.90	33.62%	3,272,065	31.33%	650.01
51. 4A1	5,395.58	36.03%	3,507,155	33.58%	650.01
52. 4A	1,135.41	7.58%	738,045	7.07%	650.03
53. Total	14,975.09	100.00%	10,445,040	100.00%	697.49
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	5,596.28	14.31%	1,343,110	14.31%	240.00
56. 2D1	4.50	0.01%	1,080	0.01%	240.00
57. 2D	10,227.97	26.15%	2,454,710	26.15%	240.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	10,172.82	26.00%	2,441,480	26.00%	240.00
60. 4D1	9,548.27	24.41%	2,291,565	24.41%	240.00
61. 4D	3,570.28	9.13%	856,870	9.13%	240.00
62. Total	39,120.12	100.00%	9,388,815	100.00%	240.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1,394.70	0.43%	306,835	0.43%	220.00
65. 2G1	14.00	0.00%	3,080	0.00%	220.00
66. 2G	6,069.47	1.86%	1,335,290	1.86%	220.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	14,027.64	4.29%	3,086,080	4.29%	220.00
69. 4G1	64,009.83	19.59%	14,082,170	19.59%	220.00
70. 4G	241,153.53	73.82%	53,053,780	73.82%	220.00
71. Total	326,669.17	100.00%	71,867,235	100.00%	220.00
Irrigated Total	14,975.09	3.90%	10,445,040	11.37%	697.49
Dry Total	39,120.12	10.19%	9,388,815	10.22%	240.00
Grass Total	326,669.17	85.10%	71,867,235	78.22%	220.00
72. Waste	1,606.34	0.42%	48,190	0.05%	30.00
73. Other	1,476.87	0.38%	129,685	0.14%	87.81
74. Exempt	363.20	0.09%	45,040	0.05%	124.01
75. Market Area Total	383,847.59	100.00%	91,878,965	100.00%	239.36

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	1,919.78	2.39%	2,322,940	2.52%	1,210.00
47. 2A1	8,207.50	10.20%	9,931,080	10.76%	1,210.00
48. 2A	32,563.71	40.47%	39,402,150	42.71%	1,210.00
49. 3A1	828.23	1.03%	890,345	0.96%	1,075.00
50. 3A	11,537.24	14.34%	12,402,630	13.44%	1,075.01
51. 4A1	22,487.14	27.95%	24,173,840	26.20%	1,075.01
52. 4A	2,922.76	3.63%	3,142,030	3.41%	1,075.02
53. Total	80,466.36	100.00%	92,265,015	100.00%	1,146.63
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	7,918.99	18.33%	3,009,215	19.95%	380.00
56. 2D1	1,845.55	4.27%	701,310	4.65%	380.00
57. 2D	16,437.34	38.04%	5,588,715	37.06%	340.00
58. 3D1	640.52	1.48%	217,775	1.44%	340.00
59. 3D	4,677.82	10.83%	1,590,450	10.55%	340.00
60. 4D1	10,258.37	23.74%	3,487,840	23.13%	340.00
61. 4D	1,428.40	3.31%	485,655	3.22%	340.00
62. Total	43,206.99	100.00%	15,080,960	100.00%	349.04
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	3,276.54	1.08%	1,064,905	1.69%	325.01
65. 2G1	884.53	0.29%	265,360	0.42%	300.00
66. 2G	29,278.30	9.68%	8,051,680	12.75%	275.01
67. 3G1	78.40	0.03%	19,605	0.03%	250.06
68. 3G	18,503.16	6.12%	3,700,645	5.86%	200.00
69. 4G1	94,909.75	31.39%	18,981,950	30.05%	200.00
70. 4G	155,422.54	51.40%	31,084,505	49.21%	200.00
71. Total	302,353.22	100.00%	63,168,650	100.00%	208.92
Irrigated Total					
	80,466.36	18.80%	92,265,015	53.94%	1,146.63
Dry Total					
	43,206.99	10.09%	15,080,960	8.82%	349.04
Grass Total					
	302,353.22	70.64%	63,168,650	36.93%	208.92
72. Waste	1,182.18	0.28%	35,465	0.02%	30.00
73. Other	805.94	0.19%	512,785	0.30%	636.26
74. Exempt	1,142.75	0.27%	162,265	0.09%	142.00
75. Market Area Total	428,014.69	100.00%	171,062,875	100.00%	399.67

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	1,800.95	7.33%	3,061,610	9.03%	1,700.00
47. 2A1	1,823.63	7.42%	2,963,415	8.74%	1,625.01
48. 2A	5,756.92	23.43%	9,067,230	26.74%	1,575.01
49. 3A1	188.23	0.77%	263,520	0.78%	1,399.99
50. 3A	3,134.18	12.76%	4,152,805	12.25%	1,325.01
51. 4A1	9,006.37	36.66%	11,258,015	33.20%	1,250.01
52. 4A	2,856.21	11.63%	3,141,830	9.27%	1,100.00
53. Total	24,566.49	100.00%	33,908,425	100.00%	1,380.27
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	9.00	0.82%	4,050	1.06%	450.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	158.45	14.44%	63,380	16.53%	400.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	174.00	15.86%	59,160	15.43%	340.00
60. 4D1	449.24	40.95%	152,740	39.83%	340.00
61. 4D	306.44	27.93%	104,190	27.17%	340.00
62. Total	1,097.13	100.00%	383,520	100.00%	349.57
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	217.50	0.49%	81,565	0.78%	375.01
65. 2G1	140.31	0.31%	49,110	0.47%	350.01
66. 2G	2,585.87	5.78%	840,430	8.04%	325.01
67. 3G1	41.85	0.09%	12,555	0.12%	300.00
68. 3G	3,247.40	7.26%	811,885	7.76%	250.01
69. 4G1	19,498.76	43.59%	4,387,290	41.95%	225.00
70. 4G	19,000.10	42.48%	4,275,115	40.88%	225.00
71. Total	44,731.79	100.00%	10,457,950	100.00%	233.79
Irrigated Total					
	24,566.49	29.13%	33,908,425	66.60%	1,380.27
Dry Total					
	1,097.13	1.30%	383,520	0.75%	349.57
Grass Total					
	44,731.79	53.04%	10,457,950	20.54%	233.79
72. Waste	1,636.18	1.94%	49,080	0.10%	30.00
73. Other	12,303.52	14.59%	6,114,050	12.01%	496.94
74. Exempt	804.54	0.95%	24,965	0.05%	31.03
75. Market Area Total	84,335.11	100.00%	50,913,025	100.00%	603.70

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	120,007.94	136,618,480	120,007.94	136,618,480
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	83,424.24	24,853,295	83,424.24	24,853,295
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	673,754.18	145,493,835	673,754.18	145,493,835
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	4,424.70	132,735	4,424.70	132,735
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	14,586.33	6,756,520	14,586.33	6,756,520
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,310.49	232,270	2,310.49	232,270
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	896,197.39	313,854,865	896,197.39	313,854,865

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	120,007.94	13.39%	136,618,480	43.53%	1,138.41
Dry Land	83,424.24	9.31%	24,853,295	7.92%	297.91
Grass	673,754.18	75.18%	145,493,835	46.36%	215.94
Waste	4,424.70	0.49%	132,735	0.04%	30.00
Other	14,586.33	1.63%	6,756,520	2.15%	463.21
Exempt	2,310.49	0.26%	232,270	0.07%	100.53
Total	896,197.39	100.00%	313,854,865	100.00%	350.21

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

62 Morrill

	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	96,430,473	98,641,759	2,211,286	2.29%	578,684	1.69%
02. Recreational	1,372,311	1,474,991	102,680	7.48%	101,930	0.05%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	41,671,264	41,339,639	-331,625	-0.80%	1,136,785	-3.52%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	139,474,048	141,456,389	1,982,341	1.42%	1,817,399	0.12%
05. Commercial	25,904,023	27,639,216	1,735,193	6.70%	1,810,390	-0.29%
06. Industrial	1,345,765	1,345,765	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	21,390,189	21,290,488	-99,701	-0.47%	201,186	-1.41%
08. Minerals	6,549,235	9,205,245	2,656,010	40.55	0	40.55
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	55,189,212	59,480,714	4,291,502	7.78%	2,011,576	4.13%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	194,663,260	200,937,103	6,273,843	3.22%	3,828,975	1.26%
11. Irrigated	136,211,885	136,618,480	406,595	0.30%		
12. Dryland	21,496,540	24,853,295	3,356,755	15.62%		
13. Grassland	137,780,080	145,493,835	7,713,755	5.60%		
14. Wasteland	121,525	132,735	11,210	9.22%		
15. Other Agland	6,792,520	6,756,520	-36,000	-0.53%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	302,402,550	313,854,865	11,452,315	3.79%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	497,065,810	514,791,968	17,726,158	3.57%	3,828,975	2.80%

MORRILL COUNTY

2011 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

PLAN OF ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15th of each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. 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 31st of 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 Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue on or before October 31st 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 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 (Reissue 2003)

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1. One hundred (100) percent of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2. Seventy-five (75) percent of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3. Seventy-five (75) percent of special value as defined in §77-1343 and at its actual value when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347 for agricultural land and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R.S. Supp. 2006)

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY IN MORRILL COUNTY:

Per the 2010 County Abstract, Morrill County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcel/Acre Count	% Parcel	Total Value	% Value	Land Value	Improvement Value
Residential/Rec	2412	35%	95,169,543	20%	11,665,045	83,504,498
Commercial/Ind	367	5%	26,946,326	6%	4,252,905	22,693,421
Agricultur/Recr	4213	60%	364,335,420	74%	306,669,260	57,666,160
TIF	4	0%	20,500	0%	Bs20,500	(Ex41,868,800)
Total	6997	100%	486,471,789	100%	322,607,710	205,732,879

Agricultural land is the predominant property type in Morrill County, with the majority consisting of grassland, primarily used for cow/calf operations.

Additional information is contained in the 2011 Reports & Opinions, issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2011.

CURRENT RESOURCES:

Staff/Budget/Training

In addition to the assessor, there are 2 full-time clerks and 2 part time clerks on staff. The part-time person hired to complete the land use review required by the Department of Revenue has completed his portion prior to the end of 2010. The county contracts with an independent appraiser, as needed, for appraisal maintenance.

The proposed budget for the assessment portion of the Assessor's budget for FY 2011-2012 is \$215,788. The county has again agreed to a maintenance contract of appraisal through Stanard Appraisal, and also the continued work of part-time staff for continued records clean up in the Assessment Office of Morrill County.

The assessor believes continuing education is vital to maintaining proper assessment action. The assessor attends as many monthly district meetings as possible, as well as workshops offered by the Nebraska Association of County Officials, the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue and the International Association of Assessing Officers. The current assessor completed and successfully passed the exams of 3 continuing education courses offered through IAAO in 2010, which were required for her to retain her certificate by the end of 2013. She will be taking at least one IAAO course in 2011 which is being offered in Scottsbluff County.

Record Maintenance

Morrill County's cadastral maps have not been consistently maintained since the mid 1990's. The county board has recognized the need for consistent maintenance of the records and

approved the development of a web based GIS system through GIS Workshop. Development began in June 2007. Currently, the Morrill County Board has agreed to a 100% support contract through GIS Workshop. GIS Workshop is completing all parcel identification on the smaller problematic parcels and also the land use layer to be in place by Dec 31, 2011.

New property record cards are currently and continue to be created for each parcel of real property in 2011. Each property record card is filed by legal description and contains up-to-date listings, photographs and sketches for those properties that have improvements.

Morrill County utilizes software provided by MIPS for assessment and CAMA (computer assisted mass appraisal) administration. Upon completion of development of the GIS system, this office will have the ability to maintain all records electronically and make them available via the Internet.

ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES:

Discover/List/Inventory Property

The assessor also keeps in close contact with the register of deeds and all zoning administrators of Morrill County, which is an aid in the process of property discovery. Data collection is done on a regular basis to ensure listings are current and accurate. Utilization of the local FSA, NRCS, and NRD offices are also useful in tracking land usage.

Morrill County processes more than four-hundred Real Estate Transfer Form 521's annually. These are filed on a timely basis with the Department of Assessment & Taxation. Standards of sales review from the International Association of Assessing Officers, Standard on Ratio Studies, 2010, are adhered to.

Data Collection

Morrill County will implement procedures to complete a physical routine inspection of all properties on a six-year cycle.

Ratio Studies

Ratio studies are a vital tool in considering any assessment actions taken. Ratio studies are conducted internally to determine whether any assessment action is required in a specific area or class of property. Consultation with the field liaison is an important part of this process.

Value Approaches

Market Approach: The market approach is used on all classes of property to obtain market value for each parcel of property. Sales comparison is the most common way to determine market value on similar properties.

Cost Approach: The cost approach is primarily used in the valuation process of residential and commercial properties. Marshall/Swift costing dated 2008 is used to arrive at Replacement Cost New (RCN). A depreciation factor derived from market analysis within the county is used to apply to the RCN to determine market value. A depreciation study completed in 2009 by the county's contracted appraiser for residential, rural residential and commercial revaluation was used for the current year market values.

Income Approach: The income approach is primarily used in the valuation of commercial properties. Collection and analysis of income and expense data was completed in 2009 by the county's contracted appraiser.

Land valuation studies will be performed on an annual basis. A three-year study of arms-length transactions will be used to obtain current market values.

Reconciliation of Value

A reconciliation of the three approaches to value (if applicable) will be completed and documented.

Sales Ratio Review

Upon completion of assessment actions, sales ratio studies are reviewed to determine if the statistics are within the guidelines set forth by the state.

Notices

Change of value notices are sent to the property owner of record no later than June 1st of each year as required by §77-1315. Prior to notices being sent, an article is published in the paper to keep taxpayers informed of the process.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Ratio (Level of Value)</u>	<u>*COD</u>	<u>*PRD</u>
Residential	97.00	8.55	103.57
Commercial	0—Not enough sales--Insufficient to provide reliable statistical data		
Agricultural	72.00	22.17	121.74

(*Co-efficient of dispersion and price-related differential)

For more information regarding statistical measures, see 2011 Reports & Opinions issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2010.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

Residential: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Commercial: A physical inspection to be started on commercial parcels within the county will be completed by the assessor and/or contract appraiser. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments.

Agricultural: A continued physical inspection of all ag-improved parcels within a portion of the county will be completed by the assessor and/or contract appraiser. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Residential: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. A physical review will be started for the Village of Broadwater. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Commercial: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. A physical inspection will continue on portions of commercial properties. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Agricultural: A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:

Residential: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. A physical review will be started for the town of Bayard. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Commercial: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. A physical inspection will continue on portions of commercial properties. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Agricultural: A continued physical inspection of all ag-improved parcels within a portion of the county will be completed by the assessor and/or contract appraiser. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies.

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

Permissive Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use and make recommendation to county board. This office receives approximately 35 applications annually.

Homestead Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications; process approvals and denials; send denial notifications to applicants no later than July 31; prepare and send applications to Department of Revenue no later than August 1 annually. This office receives approximately 270 applications annually.

Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report: Compile tax loss due to Homestead Exemptions and report no later than November 30 annually.

Personal Property Schedules: Review annual filings of agricultural and commercial schedules. This office receives approximately 700 personal property schedules annually.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property and Assessed Value Update: Compile all real property valuation information and report no later than March 19 annually.

Change of Value Notification: Notification sent no later than June 1 annually to all property owners whose value changed from the prior year.

Tax List Corrections: Prepare tax list corrections documents for County Board of Equalization review.

Taxable Value and Growth Certifications: Total assessments for real, personal and centrally assessed properties are reported to all political subdivisions no later than August 20 annually.

School District Taxable Value Report: Final report of taxable value for all school districts located within the county to be filed no later than August 25 annually.

Annual Inventory Statement: Report of all personal property in possession of this office to be filed with the County Board by August 31 annually.

Average Residential Value Report: Certification of the average residential value for Homestead Exemption purposes filed no later than September 1 annually.

Three Year Plan of Assessment: Assessment plan detailing the next three years that must be prepared by June 15 annually, submitted to the County Board of Equalization no later than July 31 annually and filed no later than October 31 annually.

Tax List: Certification of the tax list, for both real and personal property within the county, which must be delivered to the treasurer no later than November 22 annually.

Certificate of Taxes Levied: Final report of the total taxes to be collected by the county to be filed no later than December 1 annually.

Government Owned Properties Report: Report of taxable and exempt state or governmental political subdivision owned properties to be filed for the year 2004 and every 4th year thereafter no later than December 1 annually.

Conclusion:

The Morrill County Assessor makes every effort to comply with state statute and the rules and regulations of the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation to attempt to assure uniform and proportionate assessments of all properties in Morrill County.

Considering the broad range of duties this office is responsible for, it is anticipated that there will always be a need for the services of a contract appraiser. However, it is a goal of this office to ultimately complete the majority of the appraisal work by the assessor and deputy, as budgetary concerns exist.

Lastly, it is a high priority that this office makes every effort to promote good public relations and keep the public apprised of the assessment practices required by law.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose M. Nelson
Morrill County Assessor

2012 Assessment Survey for Morrill County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$ 213,688
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$ 185,890 (assessor requested the attached letter be included with survey)
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	Stanard Appraisal - \$24,840 Pritchard & Abbott - \$3,500
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:
	Data processing equipment comes from a general fund that every office shares - \$29,800
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	Dues, subscriptions, registrations, etc. - \$3,000
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	GIS - \$5,000/yr to pay for a \$20,000 contract to finish land use
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$47,995 - \$18,000 was budgeted for a deputy & \$19,428 was an unused portion of the Stanard Appraisal contract.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and clerk

5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	GIS Workshop
6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	Not at this time.
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop and office
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

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?
	Bridgeport, Bayard, and Broadwater
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Stanard Appraisal Services and Pritchard & Abbott
2.	Other services:
	GIS Workshop

Rose M Nelson
MORRILL COUNTY ASSESSOR
P O BOX 868
BRIDGEPORT, NE 69336
308-262-1534

September 9, 2011

Steve Erdman
Morrill County Board of Commissioners, Chair
8527 L 62A
Bayard, NE 69334

Dear Steve;

It is with great concern over the results of the Morrill County Budget Hearing held August 23, 2011 that I am writing this letter. I would like to point out a few facts about the budgets of the County Assessor, the County Treasurer, and the County Clerk/Election.

Keeping in mind that I have now hired a new employee in the Assessor's Office, and would like to encourage him to become the Deputy Assessor, I was disturbed when I learned the amount allotted a deputy salary had been removed. I was able to retain this amount for the last two years in my budget, and have never used it—that amount was always turned back in. I turned back in a total of \$47,995 this year (of which \$18,800 was half of a Deputy salary, and \$19,428 was Stanard Appraisal Inc's unused contract portion). This shows my ability to not "spend down" the budget just because the monies were available to me. The Treasurer's budget returned \$6,338, and the Clerk returned only \$924, and the Election returned \$6,701.

The staff in the Assessor's office is limited. Currently, I have two full time employees besides myself and one part-time staff. From late January through late July of 2011, I had only one full time employee besides myself. In comparison with the Treasurer's and the Clerk's/Election offices, they each retained a fully staffed office for a full budget year which included three full time employees plus the elected official of each office. Taking a look then at the final expenditures of the salaries in each of the three offices; the Assessor's Office paid out \$87,962, the Treasurer's office paid out \$108,366, and the Clerk's/Election Office paid out \$128,435. I did not include the part-time appraiser's salary from the Assessor's budget as that is a contract with Pritchard and Abbot for oils and minerals, and I also did not include the part time salaries of the Election budget that should be used during election times only. These figures show an extreme difference in what is paid out of each office.

This then brings me to the point of Ruth Sorenson, Property Tax Administrator being called in regards to how many employees my office should need and what exact duties the Assessor's Office should be carrying on after the Order from the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division was issued in 2009. If you would take a look at the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division website, you will find an Assessor Calendar that explains all of the deadlines that must be met on a regular basis through the Assessor's Office. This includes reports to the Board of Equalization, several different publications to local newspapers, (some of which your board secretary is to publish, and I furnish her the information), and the reports and filings that go to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, which are detrimental to all of the taxing entities located within Morrill County. Since I took over the position of Morrill County Assessor, my skeletal staff and I have met all of these deadlines, completed the majority of the Order, and continue to work through every Real Estate and Personal Property record to update, correct and maintain accuracy. We continue to find past errors and correct them on a regular basis. Every day we answer the public's questions and concerns. Was someone in Lincoln contacted to verify the work and staff numbers needed in the Treasurer's and Clerk's/Election Offices? Do you also know what their deadlines, reports due, and work duties are?

Many times we have worked without breaks and sometimes even skipping lunch hours in order to be available to assist the taxpayers and requests of business people. In loosing these break and lunch times, the Assessor's Office has not paid out overtime. In addition we do not sit at our desks, there is never a time when we have other employees of the courthouse sitting at our desks, drinking coffee, or sitting on the floor visiting. The Assessor's Office staff has taken very little vacation time again this year, and we may have to look at carrying it over again into 2012 or paying for that vacation time not taken.

I would also like to bring to light, that when services are contracted out, there should really be less in salary paid out, and definitely little or no overtime. I have seen countless dollars paid out this way in the last two budget years. A couple of suggestions would be to run a shorter shift, a part time employee instead of full time, or let each of the offices do the duties of that employee as each office can handle it, and most definitely the elected official should be present and working the majority of the time that overtime is requested.

I was asked earlier this year by the County Board when signing Stanard Appraisal Inc's maintenance contract to use less time from his company than last year. Last year, I did use his company sparingly. Three days were for your County Board protest hearings, four days were used for the Bridgeport Ethanol Plant's TERC hearing, and finally, I used his expertise for four days of clean up in the sales models, and some pickup/review work. I went out and collected most of the information myself for valuation reasons. Again, the amount of \$19,428 not used for this line item was turned back in to the county. Appraisal work is an annual function, it goes on unending.

Also, the furniture line item was totally taken out of the Assessor's budget. I am not sure if this was a mistake. However, I did buy a new desk for myself and one of my full time staff last budget year. These two new desks provide a much more efficient working

space. Have you ever looked at inventories of other offices to see when and how much office furniture has been purchased? This was the first furniture ever purchased by the Assessor's Office since 2005, when three used chairs were purchased by the previous Assessor.

I find it very disheartening for the Assessor's budget to be cut \$25,798 from the proposed amount. The County Board then cut from the proposed amounts in the Treasurer's Budget \$5,693, the Clerk's Budget \$2,794 and the Election budget \$997.

In the future, I would like to maintain our county records to the greatest accuracy possible. I would also like to have everything put in place in order to go online. Being online will make our office much more efficient, as it will cut down on phone calls and appraisers and public in the office looking at property record cards. In order to go "green", the Assessor's Office needs to be provided the means to scan and email information to those requesting it. These will be added expenses in the future that can be offset by the possibility of selling subscriptions to our website to businesses that seek more in-depth information than the typical taxpayer just wanting to know what the neighboring property is valued at or what others pay in taxes.

Thank you for understanding my concern over what happened to the Assessor's budget this year. It is with the work of ALL elected officials and heads of offices that we will make it through these tough budgeting times; and it is hoped that going forward all budgets will be scrutinized with purpose and equal consideration given to all in developing workable solutions that make us all accountable for our actions to the taxpayers of Morrill County.

Thank you,

Rose M Nelson
Morrill County Assessor

cc: Jeff Metz, Morrill County Board of Commissioners, Vice Chair
Gary Oltman, Morrill County Board of Commissioners, Commissioner

2012 Certification for Morrill 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 Morrill 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

