

Table of Contents

2013 Commission Summary

2013 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 Land Statistics
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- 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

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

2013 Commission Summary for Dixon County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	108	Median	96.15
Total Sales Price	\$8,184,464	Mean	100.66
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$8,244,464	Wgt. Mean	94.20
Total Assessed Value	\$7,766,605	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$52,450
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$76,338	Avg. Assessed Value	\$71,913

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.98 to 98.70
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.08 to 97.33
95% Mean C.I	95.23 to 106.09
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	12.42
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.89
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.70

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	81	96	95.98
2011	101	96	96
2010	91	98	98
2009	101	97	97

2013 Commission Summary for Dixon County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	Median	86.83
Total Sales Price	\$466,000	Mean	145.60
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$466,000	Wgt. Mean	80.35
Total Assessed Value	\$374,410	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$127,045
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$42,364	Avg. Assessed Value	\$34,037

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	50.00 to 470.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	58.86 to 101.83
95% Mean C.I	35.95 to 255.25
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.76
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.14
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.84

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	18		97.47
2011	27	96	96
2010	38	95	95
2009	43	96	96

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Dixon 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	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	71	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 5th day of April, 2013.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Dixon County

For the assessment year 2013, we revalued the towns of Maskell, Concord, Dixon and Allen. All these towns were had complete reappraisals. Allen is the only town which saw much change in valuation due to the reappraisal, the market in Allen has seen the smaller lower quality homes sell for less and the newest homes have sold for more. These four towns were revalued using 09/2011 pricing.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Dixon County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Ponca
	5	Wakefield
	10	Emerson
	15	Allen
	20	Newcastle
	25	Concord, Dixon, Maskell, Martinsburg and Waterbury
	30	Rural
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Cost approach is used. The depreciation is gathered from the market in each location.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2006 and 2011	
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?	
	We have developed our own economic depreciations, and had always used CAMA vendors physical, except for remodeling. With the new program we currently developed physical and economic 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?	
	The depreciation tables were updated for each valuation group when that particular group was reviewed.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	Lot values were studied during each valuation grouping review.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	We currently use square foot method on residential lot valuation and vacant lots were used to set these values.	

26 Dixon
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 108
 Total Sales Price : 8,184,464
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,244,464
 Total Assessed Value : 7,766,605
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 76,338
 Avg. Assessed Value : 71,913

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 101
 COD : 15.84
 PRD : 106.86

COV : 28.58
 STD : 28.77
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.23
 MAX Sales Ratio : 267.38
 MIN Sales Ratio : 20.18

95% Median C.I. : 93.98 to 98.70
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.08 to 97.33
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.23 to 106.09

Printed:3/27/2013 9:50:06AM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	9	98.19	103.64	98.05	11.92	105.70	86.51	156.64	92.51 to 115.29	65,278	64,008
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	7	93.91	94.31	94.11	03.35	100.21	90.12	100.81	90.12 to 100.81	78,557	73,932
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	9	93.63	110.04	92.94	30.31	118.40	69.15	267.38	80.42 to 114.54	79,856	74,214
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	28	99.34	98.63	97.06	12.50	101.62	20.18	150.46	95.47 to 103.98	77,399	75,127
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	10	94.16	106.76	96.69	17.08	110.41	84.17	194.90	91.30 to 129.08	71,190	68,831
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	13	98.36	102.48	98.24	12.91	104.32	77.82	151.46	88.44 to 118.00	73,523	72,229
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	15	93.62	90.57	81.91	14.47	110.57	44.53	128.12	77.71 to 101.42	76,200	62,418
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	17	95.49	103.99	94.86	21.45	109.62	58.31	219.11	88.97 to 112.56	82,971	78,705
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	53	98.19	100.85	96.07	14.52	104.98	20.18	267.38	93.63 to 99.80	75,911	72,926
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	55	95.49	100.48	92.43	16.86	108.71	44.53	219.11	93.62 to 99.62	76,749	70,937
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	54	95.95	101.48	95.89	15.75	105.83	20.18	267.38	93.85 to 99.60	76,809	73,654
<u>ALL</u>	108	96.15	100.66	94.20	15.84	106.86	20.18	267.38	93.98 to 98.70	76,338	71,913

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	17	95.51	105.57	97.78	18.46	107.97	69.15	267.38	90.12 to 109.59	80,298	78,519
05	21	99.08	101.53	97.96	15.38	103.64	77.48	156.64	88.44 to 113.05	65,214	63,886
10	10	99.07	110.02	93.94	27.59	117.12	68.79	194.90	69.16 to 148.33	41,830	39,294
15	12	97.47	97.64	97.03	06.87	100.63	83.26	120.70	93.22 to 101.97	58,442	56,704
20	15	95.74	107.69	99.72	15.72	107.99	88.97	219.11	92.51 to 101.42	37,667	37,563
25	9	100.29	93.82	92.07	14.13	101.90	20.18	114.07	91.95 to 112.56	40,867	37,626
30	24	93.81	92.20	90.09	12.87	102.34	44.53	150.46	86.51 to 98.38	144,063	129,781
<u>ALL</u>	108	96.15	100.66	94.20	15.84	106.86	20.18	267.38	93.98 to 98.70	76,338	71,913

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	108	96.15	100.66	94.20	15.84	106.86	20.18	267.38	93.98 to 98.70	76,338	71,913
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	108	96.15	100.66	94.20	15.84	106.86	20.18	267.38	93.98 to 98.70	76,338	71,913

26 Dixon
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 108
Total Sales Price : 8,184,464
Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,244,464
Total Assessed Value : 7,766,605
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 76,338
Avg. Assessed Value : 71,913

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 101
COD : 15.84
PRD : 106.86

COV : 28.58
STD : 28.77
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.23
MAX Sales Ratio : 267.38
MIN Sales Ratio : 20.18

95% Median C.I. : 93.98 to 98.70
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.08 to 97.33
95% Mean C.I. : 95.23 to 106.09

Printed:3/27/2013 9:50:06AM

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	3	194.90	171.43	114.68	20.32	149.49	100.29	219.11	N/A	23,133	26,528	
Less Than 15,000	7	101.42	152.46	126.60	55.92	120.43	84.11	267.38	84.11 to 267.38	15,579	19,724	
Less Than 30,000	21	101.42	126.25	117.86	30.57	107.12	84.11	267.38	96.75 to 148.33	19,241	22,678	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	105	95.74	98.64	94.03	14.11	104.90	20.18	267.38	93.91 to 98.60	77,858	73,210	
Greater Than 14,999	101	95.51	97.07	93.77	12.70	103.52	20.18	156.64	93.91 to 98.38	80,549	75,530	
Greater Than 29,999	87	94.84	94.48	92.98	11.48	101.61	20.18	156.64	93.62 to 98.21	90,120	83,797	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	3	194.90	171.43	114.68	20.32	149.49	100.29	219.11	N/A	23,133	26,528	
5,000 TO 14,999	4	100.71	138.23	147.47	45.84	93.73	84.11	267.38	N/A	9,914	14,620	
15,000 TO 29,999	14	103.32	113.14	114.63	17.56	98.70	88.97	151.46	91.30 to 148.33	21,071	24,155	
30,000 TO 59,999	28	97.73	96.62	95.04	15.77	101.66	20.18	156.64	91.95 to 104.42	45,969	43,687	
60,000 TO 99,999	32	94.99	95.47	95.10	09.05	100.39	58.31	129.08	92.91 to 99.08	74,247	70,608	
100,000 TO 149,999	13	95.47	90.80	90.64	12.23	100.18	44.53	117.10	77.82 to 99.60	125,682	113,917	
150,000 TO 249,999	14	93.50	91.36	91.48	05.93	99.87	76.84	103.98	80.50 to 98.36	181,679	166,198	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	108	96.15	100.66	94.20	15.84	106.86	20.18	267.38	93.98 to 98.70	76,338	71,913	

**2013 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

A. Residential Real Property

Dixon County is located in the northeastern region of the State of Nebraska. The community with the largest population in the county is the city of Wakefield (Valuation Group 10). The city of Wakefield is split between Dixon and Wayne Counties. The second largest community by population is the city of Ponca (Valuation Group 1). Ponca is located in the northern portion of the county and is the county seat. The Village of Allen (Valuation Group 15) is located approximately ten miles north of Wakefield on Highway 9 and the Village of Newcastle (Valuation Group 20) is located west of Ponca on Highway 12. There are five villages in Dixon County with a population less than 170. Those communities include Concord, Dixon, Maskell, Martinsburg and Waterbury (Valuation Group 25).

The residential sales file for Dixon County consists of 108 qualified arm's length sales. The sample is considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. The relationship between all three measures of central tendency is reasonably close and the calculated median is 96%. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are considered to be at acceptable levels.

Dixon County reported a complete revaluation of the towns of Maskell, Concord, Dixon and Allen updating the pricing to September, 2011.

The Division has implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties to review the assessment practices of the county with Dixon County selected in 2012. Based on the findings from that review, the county has been aggressive in completing the residential cyclical review. A second review was also implemented concerning the verification of sales. The Division is confident that all available arm's length transactions were available when determining the level of value for the county.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Dixon 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.

2013 Correlation Section for Dixon 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.

2013 Correlation Section for Dixon 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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

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 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.

2013 Commercial Assessment Actions for Dixon County

In the assessment year 2013 the commercial property in Dixon County was reviewed. No changes were made, as there are so few sales and when sales do occur they do not usually sell for the same use. We are currently working on getting all the commercial properties drawn in the computer as much of that data did not transfer when we updated to the newer version of MIPS/County Solutions.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Dixon County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	County Assessor & Clerks.	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Ponca
	5	Wakefield
	10	Emerson
	15	Allen
	20	Newcastle
	25	Concord, Dixon, Maskell, Martinsburg and Waterbury
	30	Rural
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	We currently use cost approach. The majority of our commercial properties are owned and occupied by the same people, we have very little rental commercial properties. The only commercial properties which are rented are apartments.	
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.	
	We use Marshall & Swift costing and contact other counties & our field liaison for sales of like properties.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	Costing is the same for each grouping, unless changes have been made to the property. The valuation groupings do not all have the same costing, as it is based on when they were last updated.	
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?	
	We develop our own economic & functional depreciations, and use vendor tables for physical depreciation,	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Depreciation tables were developed with the towns were reviewed.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	The lot values have been studied each time a town is reviewed and been adjusted according to the market.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	We currently use front foot for commercial property, we are trying to move to the sq ft method as we have few commercial sales and in failing communities street front	

	is not important as many of the buildings sell for storage.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------

26 Dixon
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 11
Total Sales Price : 466,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 466,000
Total Assessed Value : 374,410
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,364
Avg. Assessed Value : 34,037

MEDIAN : 87
WGT. MEAN : 80
MEAN : 146
COD : 105.87
PRD : 181.21

COV : 112.10
STD : 163.22
Avg. Abs. Dev : 91.93
MAX Sales Ratio : 470.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 29.00

95% Median C.I. : 50.00 to 470.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.86 to 101.83
95% Mean C.I. : 35.95 to 255.25

Printed:3/27/2013 9:50:07AM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	60.77	60.77	61.08	15.99	99.49	51.05	70.48	N/A	31,000	18,935	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10												
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	50.00	50.00	50.00	00.00	100.00	50.00	50.00	N/A	25,000	12,500	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10												
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	29.00	29.00	29.00	00.00	100.00	29.00	29.00	N/A	50,000	14,500	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	470.50	470.50	470.50	00.00	100.00	470.50	470.50	N/A	2,000	9,410	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	135.67	233.16	123.38	92.67	188.98	93.32	470.50	N/A	14,000	17,273	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	93.02	93.02	93.02	00.00	100.00	93.02	93.02	N/A	215,000	200,000	
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11												
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12												
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	86.83	86.83	86.83	00.00	100.00	86.83	86.83	N/A	35,000	30,390	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	51.20	51.20	51.20	00.00	100.00	51.20	51.20	N/A	35,000	17,920	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	3	51.05	57.18	57.90	13.38	98.76	50.00	70.48	N/A	29,000	16,790	
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	6	114.50	215.34	89.23	125.38	241.33	29.00	470.50	29.00 to 470.50	51,500	45,955	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	2	69.02	69.02	69.01	25.82	100.01	51.20	86.83	N/A	35,000	24,155	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	39.50	39.50	36.00	26.58	109.72	29.00	50.00	N/A	37,500	13,500	
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	5	135.67	252.60	100.86	111.25	250.45	93.02	470.50	N/A	51,800	52,246	
<u>ALL</u>	11	86.83	145.60	80.35	105.87	181.21	29.00	470.50	50.00 to 470.50	42,364	34,037	

VALUATION GROUPING											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
01	2	90.08	90.08	89.71	03.61	100.41	86.83	93.32	N/A	31,500	28,260	
05	2	39.50	39.50	36.00	26.58	109.72	29.00	50.00	N/A	37,500	13,500	
10	3	470.50	330.73	94.21	29.71	351.06	51.20	470.50	N/A	13,000	12,247	
15	1	93.02	93.02	93.02	00.00	100.00	93.02	93.02	N/A	215,000	200,000	
20	3	70.48	85.73	73.18	40.03	117.15	51.05	135.67	N/A	24,667	18,050	
<u>ALL</u>	11	86.83	145.60	80.35	105.87	181.21	29.00	470.50	50.00 to 470.50	42,364	34,037	

26 Dixon
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 11
Total Sales Price : 466,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 466,000
Total Assessed Value : 374,410
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,364
Avg. Assessed Value : 34,037

MEDIAN : 87
WGT. MEAN : 80
MEAN : 146
COD : 105.87
PRD : 181.21

COV : 112.10
STD : 163.22
Avg. Abs. Dev : 91.93
MAX Sales Ratio : 470.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 29.00

95% Median C.I. : 50.00 to 470.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.86 to 101.83
95% Mean C.I. : 35.95 to 255.25

Printed:3/27/2013 9:50:07AM

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	86.83	145.60	80.35	105.87	181.21	29.00	470.50	50.00 to 470.50	42,364	34,037
04											
<u>ALL</u>	11	86.83	145.60	80.35	105.87	181.21	29.00	470.50	50.00 to 470.50	42,364	34,037

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	2	470.50	470.50	470.50	00.00	100.00	470.50	470.50	N/A	2,000	9,410
Less Than 15,000	3	470.50	358.89	219.38	23.72	163.59	135.67	470.50	N/A	5,333	11,700
Less Than 30,000	5	135.67	244.00	106.86	117.59	228.34	50.00	470.50	N/A	13,800	14,746
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	9	70.48	73.40	76.97	35.88	95.36	29.00	135.67	50.00 to 93.32	51,333	39,510
Greater Than 14,999	8	60.84	65.61	75.40	33.37	87.02	29.00	93.32	29.00 to 93.32	56,250	42,414
Greater Than 29,999	6	60.84	63.60	75.74	32.63	83.97	29.00	93.02	29.00 to 93.02	66,167	50,113
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	2	470.50	470.50	470.50	00.00	100.00	470.50	470.50	N/A	2,000	9,410
5,000 TO 14,999	1	135.67	135.67	135.67	00.00	100.00	135.67	135.67	N/A	12,000	16,280
15,000 TO 29,999	2	71.66	71.66	72.89	30.23	98.31	50.00	93.32	N/A	26,500	19,315
30,000 TO 59,999	5	51.20	57.71	55.32	30.18	104.32	29.00	86.83	N/A	36,400	20,136
60,000 TO 99,999											
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999	1	93.02	93.02	93.02	00.00	100.00	93.02	93.02	N/A	215,000	200,000
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	11	86.83	145.60	80.35	105.87	181.21	29.00	470.50	50.00 to 470.50	42,364	34,037

26 Dixon
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 11
Total Sales Price : 466,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 466,000
Total Assessed Value : 374,410
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,364
Avg. Assessed Value : 34,037

MEDIAN : 87
WGT. MEAN : 80
MEAN : 146
COD : 105.87
PRD : 181.21

COV : 112.10
STD : 163.22
Avg. Abs. Dev : 91.93
MAX Sales Ratio : 470.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 29.00

95% Median C.I. : 50.00 to 470.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.86 to 101.83
95% Mean C.I. : 35.95 to 255.25

Printed:3/27/2013 9:50:07AM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	1	470.50	470.50	470.50	00.00	100.00	470.50	470.50	N/A	2,000	9,410
344	1	50.00	50.00	50.00	00.00	100.00	50.00	50.00	N/A	25,000	12,500
352	1	86.83	86.83	86.83	00.00	100.00	86.83	86.83	N/A	35,000	30,390
353	1	93.32	93.32	93.32	00.00	100.00	93.32	93.32	N/A	28,000	26,130
406	4	60.84	71.59	55.24	51.76	129.60	29.00	135.67	N/A	32,250	17,814
442	1	51.05	51.05	51.05	00.00	100.00	51.05	51.05	N/A	30,000	15,315
477	1	470.50	470.50	470.50	00.00	100.00	470.50	470.50	N/A	2,000	9,410
841	1	93.02	93.02	93.02	00.00	100.00	93.02	93.02	N/A	215,000	200,000
<u>ALL</u>	11	86.83	145.60	80.35	105.87	181.21	29.00	470.50	50.00 to 470.50	42,364	34,037

2013 Correlation Section for Dixon County

A. Commercial Real Property

The commercial base in Dixon County is the strongest in the city of Wakefield (Valuation Group 5). The Michael's Food facility, an egg processing plant is the largest employer in the county and draws employees from several surrounding counties. The communities of Emerson (Valuation Group 10) and Ponca (Valuation Group 1) have commercial services of medical offices, grocery stores, banks, mini marts and other retail services. The communities of Allen (Valuation Group 15) and Newcastle (Valuation Group 20) tend to be declining in the available services to the communities and the remainder of the small towns (Valuation Group 25) is very limited in the commercial services available to the communities.

Dixon County utilized as many sales as possible to represent the commercial market in the county. There are 11 qualified sales in the statistical analysis. Those 11 sales are distributed amongst eight valuation groupings. The occupancy codes represented are numerous and do not support any one type of property.

Dixon County reported in the assessment actions portion of the survey that the commercial property was reviewed and no changes were implemented in 2013. The property record files are being updated to include sketches of the physical characteristics of the parcels.

The Division has implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties to review the assessment practices of the county with Dixon County selected in 2012. Based on the findings from that review, the county has been aggressive in completing the commercial cyclical review. A second review was also implemented concerning the verification of sales. The Division is confident that all available arm's length transactions were available when determining the level of value for the county.

Based on all information available including the assessment practices of the county and the declining market it is determined that there is not enough information available to determine a level of value for the commercial class of property for Dixon County.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Dixon 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.

2013 Correlation Section for Dixon 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.

2013 Correlation Section for Dixon 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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

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 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.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Dixon County

Both market areas in Dixon County saw increases. The increases would have been more substantial had borrowed sales not been used. Dixon County sales showed that the county needed to see increases of 30% to Irrigated & Dry. However, when borrowed sales were added to the oldest year the statistics showed the county could increase only 25 % on irrigated land, 20% dry and 15% grass in Area 1. The same thing happened in Area 2 the borrowed sales affected the sales file. Increases in Area 2 were 25% irrigated, 17% dry and 15% grass.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Dixon County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	County Assessor & Clerks	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Generally more flat land, larger fields. Areas of hills are more rolling than steep, soil types are typically better. More irrigation is used in this area as topography makes irrigation easier.
	2	Hills are steep, tree cover in northern areas is becoming more dense in many hilly areas allow the river bluffs. Soils are of lesser quality and the northern area has more pasture land than southern areas. Field sizes are typically smaller in Area 2
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Monitor the sales which occur in each area & review land uses in each area.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Our recreational land has consistently been along the river and is made up of small mobile home parks. Our rural residential has been classified as under 20 acres. Since the valuations continue to be the same for rural res. & home sites we do have any issues using this method.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?	
	We currently use the same value for farm sites and rural residents.	
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	We use GIS, FSA & physical inspection to update our land use.	
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.	
	No	
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.	
	We have 2 parcels; sales from surrounding counties were used to set value, as we have none.	

26 Dixon
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 63
Total Sales Price : 27,871,312
Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,871,312
Total Assessed Value : 17,862,173
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 442,402
Avg. Assessed Value : 283,527

MEDIAN : 71
WGT. MEAN : 64
MEAN : 71
COD : 29.50
PRD : 111.25

COV : 41.99
STD : 29.94
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.91
MAX Sales Ratio : 202.58
MIN Sales Ratio : 08.43

95% Median C.I. : 63.40 to 75.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 56.89 to 71.29
95% Mean C.I. : 63.91 to 78.69

Printed:3/27/2013 9:50:08AM

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-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	101.34	114.89	95.44	31.61	120.38	75.05	202.58	N/A	194,454	185,582
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	72.16	77.48	79.92	19.83	96.95	45.87	135.20	45.87 to 135.20	334,136	267,038
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	85.43	102.84	93.98	21.37	109.43	84.16	138.93	N/A	244,340	229,619
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	84.09	84.03	78.98	14.85	106.39	63.40	105.95	N/A	420,174	331,832
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	73.88	72.72	74.86	21.72	97.14	08.43	108.32	61.64 to 98.01	454,128	339,983
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	5	64.78	63.53	64.96	20.39	97.80	44.33	84.46	N/A	375,634	243,994
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	86.17	84.15	79.87	11.25	105.36	66.88	97.38	N/A	279,293	223,078
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	3	55.70	63.62	60.28	15.42	105.54	54.69	80.46	N/A	620,333	373,948
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	9	46.68	53.96	47.17	31.15	114.39	30.74	88.80	38.83 to 73.47	699,351	329,892
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	7	44.11	46.43	49.32	14.96	94.14	37.04	63.27	37.04 to 63.27	629,679	310,533
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	4	42.29	47.63	51.19	37.03	93.05	31.12	74.81	N/A	293,134	150,070
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	20	82.77	92.28	83.73	26.86	110.21	45.87	202.58	73.42 to 101.34	307,256	257,260
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	23	73.88	71.52	70.79	20.64	101.03	08.43	108.32	64.78 to 82.05	428,337	303,215
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	20	44.91	50.06	48.36	27.05	103.52	30.74	88.80	38.83 to 55.56	593,722	287,152
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	26	74.53	79.65	78.25	22.58	101.79	08.43	138.93	69.97 to 85.43	391,087	306,042
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	21	64.78	63.37	55.63	25.66	113.91	30.74	97.38	46.68 to 80.46	530,976	295,388
<u>ALL</u>	63	70.87	71.30	64.09	29.50	111.25	08.43	202.58	63.40 to 75.00	442,402	283,527

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	33	69.61	69.44	68.33	25.79	101.62	32.81	114.06	55.70 to 79.48	434,616	296,974
2	30	73.79	73.34	59.59	32.46	123.07	08.43	202.58	54.69 to 80.46	450,966	268,734
<u>ALL</u>	63	70.87	71.30	64.09	29.50	111.25	08.43	202.58	63.40 to 75.00	442,402	283,527

26 Dixon
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 63
Total Sales Price : 27,871,312
Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,871,312
Total Assessed Value : 17,862,173
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 442,402
Avg. Assessed Value : 283,527

MEDIAN : 71
WGT. MEAN : 64
MEAN : 71
COD : 29.50
PRD : 111.25

COV : 41.99
STD : 29.94
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.91
MAX Sales Ratio : 202.58
MIN Sales Ratio : 08.43

95% Median C.I. : 63.40 to 75.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 56.89 to 71.29
95% Mean C.I. : 63.91 to 78.69

Printed:3/27/2013 9:50:08AM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	39.36	39.36	39.36	00.00	100.00	39.36	39.36	N/A	1,258,000	495,160
1	1	39.36	39.36	39.36	00.00	100.00	39.36	39.36	N/A	1,258,000	495,160
Dry											
County	35	68.69	67.26	63.10	28.59	106.59	08.43	138.93	54.69 to 75.00	346,144	218,416
1	20	67.79	65.36	66.84	27.02	97.79	32.81	114.06	44.33 to 75.89	323,512	216,224
2	15	74.11	69.79	58.82	28.38	118.65	08.43	138.93	53.95 to 84.09	376,321	221,339
Grass											
County	2	49.71	49.71	49.94	37.40	99.54	31.12	68.29	N/A	79,000	39,455
1	1	68.29	68.29	68.29	00.00	100.00	68.29	68.29	N/A	80,000	54,634
2	1	31.12	31.12	31.12	00.00	100.00	31.12	31.12	N/A	78,000	24,275
ALL	63	70.87	71.30	64.09	29.50	111.25	08.43	202.58	63.40 to 75.00	442,402	283,527

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	2	55.76	55.76	51.58	29.41	108.10	39.36	72.16	N/A	1,002,450	517,051
1	2	55.76	55.76	51.58	29.41	108.10	39.36	72.16	N/A	1,002,450	517,051
Dry											
County	44	73.77	74.74	68.69	31.25	108.81	08.43	202.58	61.64 to 84.16	355,918	244,472
1	25	69.61	69.78	71.06	27.90	98.20	32.81	114.06	55.56 to 85.43	356,629	253,413
2	19	74.94	81.27	65.56	36.10	123.96	08.43	202.58	54.69 to 90.29	354,982	232,708
Grass											
County	2	49.71	49.71	49.94	37.40	99.54	31.12	68.29	N/A	79,000	39,455
1	1	68.29	68.29	68.29	00.00	100.00	68.29	68.29	N/A	80,000	54,634
2	1	31.12	31.12	31.12	00.00	100.00	31.12	31.12	N/A	78,000	24,275
ALL	63	70.87	71.30	64.09	29.50	111.25	08.43	202.58	63.40 to 75.00	442,402	283,527

Dixon County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Dixon	1	4,015	3,940	3,750	3,625	3,375	3,310	3,065	2,940	3,602
Cedar	2	5,410	5,410	5,215	5,215	5,140	5,140	4,160	4,160	4,930
Dakota	2	N/A								
Thurston	1	3,750	3,735	3,450	3,380	3,305	3,300	3,020	2,730	3,514
Wayne	10	4,660	4,660	4,620	4,620	3,530	2,825	2,680	2,530	3,691
Dixon	2	4,015	3,940	3,750	3,625	3,375	3,310	3,065	2,940	3,513
Cedar	1	4,860	4,860	4,800	4,800	4,240	4,240	3,680	3,680	4,300
Cedar	2	5,410	5,410	5,215	5,215	5,140	5,140	4,160	4,160	4,930
Dakota	2	N/A								

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Dixon	1	3,490	3,260	3,145	3,025	2,849	2,675	2,560	2,339	2,892
Cedar	2	4,780	4,780	4,625	4,623	4,510	4,510	3,530	3,530	4,343
Dakota	2	3,885	3,848	3,809	3,790	3,589	3,525	3,394	3,322	3,526
Thurston	1	3,625	3,565	3,220	3,220	3,220	3,125	2,875	2,500	3,226
Wayne	10	4,165	3,955	3,670	3,385	3,090	2,800	2,510	2,225	3,262
Dixon	2	3,345	3,160	3,160	3,040	2,810	2,690	2,455	2,461	2,784
Cedar	1	3,190	3,190	3,155	3,153	3,120	3,120	2,360	2,360	2,858
Cedar	2	4,780	4,780	4,625	4,623	4,510	4,510	3,530	3,530	4,343
Dakota	2	3,885	3,848	3,809	3,790	3,589	3,525	3,394	3,322	3,526

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Dixon	1	1,945	1,840	1,580	N/A	1,383	1,150	1,065	980	1,399
Cedar	2	1,700	1,697	1,547	1,545	1,402	1,395	1,250	1,255	1,424
Dakota	2	1,872	2,203	1,938	2,523	2,199	2,263	1,937	1,248	1,711
Thurston	1	892	869	812	820	711	706	694	638	775
Wayne	10	2,457	2,433	2,145	2,044	2,086	1,766	1,591	1,270	2,016
Dixon	2	1,712	1,803	1,549	1,440	1,265	1,148	1,032	867	1,133
Cedar	1	1,452	1,634	1,413	1,510	1,325	1,400	1,212	1,009	1,219
Cedar	2	1,700	1,697	1,547	1,545	1,402	1,395	1,250	1,255	1,424
Dakota	2	1,872	2,203	1,938	2,523	2,199	2,263	1,937	1,248	1,711

Source: 2013 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX

2013 Correlation Section for Dixon County

A. Agricultural Land

Dixon County is currently divided into two market areas. Market Area 1 is the southern portion of the county and the land use as reported on the county abstract indicated approximately 15% irrigated, 77% dry land and the remainder is grass and waste. The terrain in this portion of the county is not as hilly as the northern portion of the county. Market Area 2 is the northern portion of the county and is bordered on the north edge by the Missouri River. The land use as reported on the county abstract indicates approximately 8% irrigated, 63% dry land and the remainder is grass and waste. The market for the agricultural land is strong and it is getting difficult to recognize characteristics in the market to justify the independent market areas. Annually the county reviews the market information to verify the need to have the two areas. After the review it was determined that to combine them this year would not be reasonable.

All adjoining counties have land characteristics similar to Dixon County, and were considered comparable. The analysis of the agricultural sales sample revealed that the county was lacking sales to proportionately distribute sales by time primarily in the oldest year of the study period and the statistical profile was skewed with the newer sales. The analysis was completed to utilize comparable sales and all thresholds were met. The agricultural land sales sample was expanded by 21 sales and resulted in 63 qualified arm's length sales.

The county increased values in both market areas for the 2013 assessment year. The increase for Dixon County for the 2013 assessment year resulted in a 19% increase in the agricultural total value as reported on the County Abstract compared to the 2012 Certificate of Taxes Levied. This increase is considered reasonable in comparison to surrounding counties. The statistics support that the two market areas have been assessed at similar portions of market value.

The Division has conducted an expanded review in 2012 of Dixon County and confirmed the inspection and review process for the six year cycle is being completed. Additionally the Division conducted a review of each county's sales verification and documentation. The liaison determined that there was no bias in the sales verification and that the Dixon County Assessor utilized all arm's length transactions available.

Therefore, based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value in the agricultural class is determined to be 71%. The majority land use of 80% is the truest representation of the agricultural base representing 70% of the qualified sales and is also considered reliable for the dry land subclass.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Dixon 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.

2013 Correlation Section for Dixon 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.

2013 Correlation Section for Dixon 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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Dixon County**

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 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 : 5,595	Value : 933,410,500	Growth 2,390,305	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	190	632,665	75	235,465	0	0	265	868,130	
02. Res Improve Land	1,303	6,196,000	113	772,060	0	0	1,416	6,968,060	
03. Res Improvements	1,327	65,086,830	190	15,479,715	315	26,305,365	1,832	106,871,910	
04. Res Total	1,517	71,915,495	265	16,487,240	315	26,305,365	2,097	114,708,100	915,800
% of Res Total	72.34	62.69	12.64	14.37	15.02	22.93	37.48	12.29	38.31
05. Com UnImp Land	59	118,585	14	38,755	10	1,213,330	83	1,370,670	
06. Com Improve Land	204	710,270	30	296,530	12	2,053,660	246	3,060,460	
07. Com Improvements	207	7,608,970	30	4,167,930	17	1,137,520	254	12,914,420	
08. Com Total	266	8,437,825	44	4,503,215	27	4,404,510	337	17,345,550	65,610
% of Com Total	78.93	48.65	13.06	25.96	8.01	25.39	6.02	1.86	2.74
09. Ind UnImp Land	1	4,035	2	41,795	0	0	3	45,830	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	3	51,425	7	1,106,715	10	1,158,140	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	3	8,500,760	7	17,415,595	10	25,916,355	
12. Ind Total	1	4,035	5	8,593,980	7	18,522,310	13	27,120,325	0
% of Ind Total	7.69	0.01	38.46	31.69	53.85	68.30	0.23	2.91	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	4	68,470	4	68,470	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	113	1,138,710	113	1,138,710	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	113	1,207,180	113	1,207,180	39,665
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	2.02	0.13	1.66
Res & Rec Total	1,517	71,915,495	265	16,487,240	428	27,512,545	2,210	115,915,280	955,465
% of Res & Rec Total	68.64	62.04	11.99	14.22	19.37	23.74	39.50	12.42	39.97
Com & Ind Total	267	8,441,860	49	13,097,195	34	22,926,820	350	44,465,875	65,610
% of Com & Ind Total	76.29	18.99	14.00	29.45	9.71	51.56	6.26	4.76	2.74
17. Taxable Total	1,784	80,357,355	314	29,584,435	462	50,439,365	2,560	160,381,155	1,021,075
% of Taxable Total	69.69	50.10	12.27	18.45	18.05	31.45	45.76	17.18	42.72

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	51	880,105	247,470	6	71,910	1,655
19. Commercial	9	70,610	3,480	1	47,745	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	57	952,015	249,125
19. Commercial	0	0	0	10	118,355	3,480
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				67	1,070,370	252,605

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
25. Total	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	235	42	289	566

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	12	25,035	90	3,822,075	2,031	460,734,190	2,133	464,581,300
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	119	5,829,385	1,088	250,765,650	1,207	256,595,035
29. Ag Improvements	5	31,895	43	3,237,455	853	48,583,660	901	51,853,010
30. Ag Total							3,034	773,029,345

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	13	14.23	65,420	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	110	303.53	1,382,640	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	36	0.00	3,042,520	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	13	27.99	15,515	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	23	67.53	37,500	
37. FarmSite Improvements	5	0.00	31,895	25	0.00	194,935	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	37	43.58	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	1	0.92	5,980	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	54	121.73	517,400	67	135.96	582,820	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	811	2,167.60	10,150,185	921	2,471.13	11,532,825	
33. HomeSite Improvements	531	0.00	31,979,490	567	0.00	35,022,010	844,640
34. HomeSite Total				634	2,607.09	47,137,655	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	116	412.55	229,155	129	440.54	244,670	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	653	3,196.84	1,759,165	676	3,264.37	1,796,665	
37. FarmSite Improvements	736	0.00	16,604,170	766	0.00	16,831,000	524,590
38. FarmSite Total				895	3,704.91	18,872,335	
39. Road & Ditches	2,400	5,423.95	0	2,437	5,467.53	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	3	5.00	19,000	4	5.92	24,980	
41. Total Section VI				1,529	11,785.45	66,034,970	1,369,230

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	4	637.38	2,064,645	4	637.38	2,064,645

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,456.35	16.03%	9,862,255	17.87%	4,015.00
46. 1A	2,522.52	16.47%	9,938,735	18.01%	3,940.00
47. 2A1	1,291.52	8.43%	4,843,285	8.78%	3,750.07
48. 2A	2,507.27	16.37%	9,088,910	16.47%	3,625.02
49. 3A1	3,286.02	21.45%	11,090,485	20.10%	3,375.05
50. 3A	1,521.57	9.93%	5,036,385	9.13%	3,309.99
51. 4A1	1,726.24	11.27%	5,290,930	9.59%	3,065.00
52. 4A	8.47	0.06%	24,900	0.05%	2,939.79
53. Total	15,319.96	100.00%	55,175,885	100.00%	3,601.57
Dry					
54. 1D1	3,187.97	4.16%	11,126,050	5.02%	3,490.01
55. 1D	15,180.48	19.79%	49,488,355	22.31%	3,260.00
56. 2D1	4,182.41	5.45%	13,153,675	5.93%	3,145.00
57. 2D	5,826.51	7.60%	17,625,225	7.95%	3,025.01
58. 3D1	20,271.69	26.43%	57,753,945	26.04%	2,849.00
59. 3D	9,251.95	12.06%	24,749,015	11.16%	2,675.01
60. 4D1	17,723.15	23.10%	45,371,230	20.46%	2,560.00
61. 4D	1,085.09	1.41%	2,537,850	1.14%	2,338.84
62. Total	76,709.25	100.00%	221,805,345	100.00%	2,891.51
Grass					
63. 1G1	171.50	2.28%	333,565	3.16%	1,944.99
64. 1G	1,330.85	17.65%	2,448,220	23.22%	1,839.59
65. 2G1	974.10	12.92%	1,538,665	14.59%	1,579.58
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	2,580.71	34.23%	3,569,400	33.85%	1,383.11
68. 3G	521.50	6.92%	599,770	5.69%	1,150.09
69. 4G1	1,583.90	21.01%	1,686,560	15.99%	1,064.81
70. 4G	375.81	4.99%	368,300	3.49%	980.02
71. Total	7,538.37	100.00%	10,544,480	100.00%	1,398.77
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	15,319.96	15.31%	55,175,885	19.19%	3,601.57
Dry Total					
Dry Total	76,709.25	76.68%	221,805,345	77.13%	2,891.51
Grass Total					
Grass Total	7,538.37	7.54%	10,544,480	3.67%	1,398.77
72. Waste	467.66	0.47%	42,495	0.01%	90.87
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	100,035.24	100.00%	287,568,205	100.00%	2,874.67

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,053.99	7.58%	4,231,775	8.67%	4,015.00
46. 1A	2,671.99	19.22%	10,527,645	21.56%	3,940.00
47. 2A1	1,650.50	11.87%	6,189,490	12.67%	3,750.07
48. 2A	547.17	3.94%	1,983,500	4.06%	3,625.02
49. 3A1	3,805.39	27.37%	12,843,330	26.30%	3,375.04
50. 3A	1,155.76	8.31%	3,825,580	7.83%	3,310.01
51. 4A1	2,901.06	20.87%	8,891,740	18.21%	3,065.00
52. 4A	116.13	0.84%	341,435	0.70%	2,940.11
53. Total	13,901.99	100.00%	48,834,495	100.00%	3,512.77
Dry					
54. 1D1	4,607.12	4.04%	15,410,805	4.86%	3,345.00
55. 1D	22,299.59	19.57%	70,466,780	22.21%	3,160.00
56. 2D1	9,031.84	7.93%	28,540,615	9.00%	3,160.00
57. 2D	1,077.27	0.95%	3,274,895	1.03%	3,039.99
58. 3D1	25,582.33	22.46%	71,886,555	22.66%	2,810.01
59. 3D	6,698.63	5.88%	18,019,350	5.68%	2,690.01
60. 4D1	34,266.99	30.08%	84,125,595	26.52%	2,455.00
61. 4D	10,357.91	9.09%	25,489,415	8.04%	2,460.86
62. Total	113,921.68	100.00%	317,214,010	100.00%	2,784.49
Grass					
63. 1G1	356.66	0.77%	610,560	1.16%	1,711.88
64. 1G	5,858.73	12.62%	10,565,260	20.08%	1,803.34
65. 2G1	2,272.15	4.89%	3,520,345	6.69%	1,549.35
66. 2G	193.66	0.42%	278,855	0.53%	1,439.92
67. 3G1	5,711.55	12.30%	7,226,880	13.74%	1,265.31
68. 3G	1,185.33	2.55%	1,360,915	2.59%	1,148.13
69. 4G1	13,910.90	29.95%	14,358,640	27.29%	1,032.19
70. 4G	16,950.71	36.50%	14,688,405	27.92%	866.54
71. Total	46,439.69	100.00%	52,609,860	100.00%	1,132.86
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	13,901.99	7.68%	48,834,495	11.64%	3,512.77
Dry Total					
Dry Total	113,921.68	62.95%	317,214,010	75.63%	2,784.49
Grass Total					
Grass Total	46,439.69	25.66%	52,609,860	12.54%	1,132.86
72. Waste	6,697.59	3.70%	767,805	0.18%	114.64
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.01	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	180,960.95	100.00%	419,426,170	100.00%	2,317.77

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	154.55	570,205	29,067.40	103,440,175	29,221.95	104,010,380
77. Dry Land	8.05	25,035	1,921.71	5,625,210	188,701.17	533,369,110	190,630.93	539,019,355
78. Grass	0.00	0	1,624.57	1,939,795	52,353.49	61,214,545	53,978.06	63,154,340
79. Waste	0.00	0	88.70	9,195	7,076.55	801,105	7,165.25	810,300
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.01	0	0.01	0
82. Total	8.05	25,035	3,789.53	8,144,405	277,198.61	698,824,935	280,996.19	706,994,375

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	29,221.95	10.40%	104,010,380	14.71%	3,559.32
Dry Land	190,630.93	67.84%	539,019,355	76.24%	2,827.55
Grass	53,978.06	19.21%	63,154,340	8.93%	1,170.00
Waste	7,165.25	2.55%	810,300	0.11%	113.09
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.01	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	280,996.19	100.00%	706,994,375	100.00%	2,516.03

2013 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2012 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

26 Dixon

	2012 CTL County Total	2013 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2013 form 45 - 2012 CTL)	Percent Change	2013 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	118,581,580	114,708,100	-3,873,480	-3.27%	915,800	-4.04%
02. Recreational	1,103,255	1,207,180	103,925	9.42%	39,665	5.82%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	41,255,470	47,137,655	5,882,185	14.26%	844,640	12.21%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	160,940,305	163,052,935	2,112,630	1.31%	1,800,105	0.19%
05. Commercial	16,824,715	17,345,550	520,835	3.10%	65,610	2.71%
06. Industrial	27,045,475	27,120,325	74,850	0.28%	0	0.28%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	18,511,410	18,872,335	360,925	1.95%	524,590	-0.88%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	62,381,600	63,338,210	956,610	1.53%	590,200	0.59%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	223,321,905	226,416,125	3,094,220	1.39%	2,390,305	0.32%
11. Irrigated	80,724,930	104,010,380	23,285,450	28.85%		
12. Dryland	455,209,340	539,019,355	83,810,015	18.41%		
13. Grassland	56,365,010	63,154,340	6,789,330	12.05%		
14. Wasteland	810,825	810,300	-525	-0.06%		
15. Other Agland	81,370	0	-81,370	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	593,191,475	706,994,375	113,802,900	19.18%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	816,513,380	933,410,500	116,897,120	14.32%	2,390,305	14.02%

AMY WATCHORN

DIXON COUNTY ASSESSOR

302 3RD ST

PO BOX 369

PONCA, NE 68770

PHONE: (402) 755-5601

FAX: (402) 755-5650

DIXON COUNTY 2012

3 YEAR PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

Purpose – Submit plan to the County Board of Equalization and the Department Of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31, 2012.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE COUNTY

In 2012 Dixon County has a total of 6,203 parcels, of that approximately 6% are commercial and approximately industrial, 9% are exempt, approximately 35% are residential and 50% are agricultural. 623 Personal property schedules(not including centrally assessed schedules) were filed in the county this year and 211 Homesteads Applications were accepted. Dixon County's total valuation for 2012 is 871,066,414.

BUDGET

2012 General Budget = \$105,627.20

(Salaries for one clerk, county deputy and the county assessor salary, office supplies, mileage, schooling, postage, misc.)

2012 Reappraisal Budget = 43,523.20

(One clerks salary, postage, computer expense, mileage, schooling, dues, and supplies, GIS)

RESPONSIBILITES

The office currently has 2 employees besides me. The Deputy Assessor duties include: assists with pickup work, enters information in the CAMA system, makes sales books for office and public use, prices out buildings using the Marshall & Swift pricing, she also prices out the commercial property and also assisting with personal property and homestead filings. The Deputy also works in the sales file. Currently, the Deputy position is open.

Two clerks work 5 days a week. One of the clerks handles all transfer statements, land splits and keeps the cadastral maps current, as well as keeping the property record cards current. These duties are done as soon as the paperwork is received from the County Clerk's Office. This clerk is also responsible for the GIS system. She also assists with personal property and homesteads.

The other clerk handles the majority of the personal property and homestead filings. The clerk handles the majority of phone calls and faxes that come into the office.

As the Assessor I file all reports when they are due following the statutes, Assist with pickup work, enter information into the CAMA system, price out improvements, and calculate depreciation percentages for improvements. I and one of my staff do all the data collection and physically inspect property as needed. We perform sales ratio studies in-house as well as doing our own modeling for depreciation tables. We use the cost approach and get our depreciations from the market. I also calculate all valuation changes for agland, residential and commercial properties. We currently have our administrative and cama packages with MIPS. We do not have any other contracts for pickup work or appraisal services.

All the staff in the office is able to assist the taxpayer with any questions or concerns they may have. We have developed sales books, which are helpful to both the taxpayers and appraisers who come into our office. Along with the valuation notices that are sent out, we send a flyer for land sales and residential and rural homes and commercial properties which have sold. This seemed to be a very helpful tool for getting information to people who may not come in the office informed of what the market is in their town. We make an effort to make the public feel comfortable when they come into our office and are very honest with them about what is going on with them and their values. I believe this has helped a great deal during protest time. I also think this is the reason we have relatively few protest. We attempt to talk to every taxpayer requesting a protest form. We show them how there values were arrived at and many times they don't protest because we have shown them why their value changed and what the changes were based upon. Our hope is that they leave the office more informed about what this office does and why these things have to be done.

RESIDENTIAL

Dixon County has been through all the towns & villages now and updated the Marshall & Swift pricing in order to meet the changing trends in the market.

We will continue to use the CAMA system to reappraise our towns as needed. Currently the median in our towns look pretty good, we will continue to monitor this and make the changes necessary to improve our assessment practices. We have valued lots using the square foot method at the same time we revalue the town so we can have a more accurate picture of the properties true market value. The CAMA pricing currently being used on all the houses is 9/2011. We are working very hard to get all the properties drawn, new pics & reviewed so we will be able to go online hopefully, by the beginning of 2013.

2012 – Wakefield, Concord, Dixon, Maskell
2013-Allen, Emerson, Waterbury, Newcastle
2014 – Ponca, Martinsburg

COMMERCIAL

A complete reappraisal of commercial properties was completed in 1999 by the Assessor's office staff. Industrial properties were reappraised in 2001. Pricing was done

on the 1999 Marshall & Swift computer program. Several towns have had the commercial properties updated by occupancy code. Dixon County has so few commercial properties and even fewer sales, it can be very difficult to find market value. Final valuation is by the sales comparison approach. Income and expense data was gathered but there was insufficient rental information to utilize the income approach to value. Commercial properties will continue to be monitored and adjustments made when deemed necessary by the market.

2012 – Appraisal maintenance

2013 – Appraisal maintenance

2014-Appraisal Maintenance

AGRICULTURAL

Rural residences were reappraised in 1997 and updated in 2005 using 2000 Marshall & Swift computer pricing. We are also studying the market to see how distance from pavement, towns etc. are impacting rural sales. Site values will continue to be studied.

Agricultural land will continue to be reviewed annually as will the current market areas, for changes in the market. We no longer go to the FSA office to review land use changes unless we have problems. We will begin getting their CD's and using the GIS to update each year of land use changes. Land use changes which we are made aware of or discover, will be treated as pick up work and revalued for the year the change occurred. We also will continue to study market area lines to ensure they are appropriate for current sales. Last summer's flooding had an impact on a small amount of land in our county. The majority was for loss of acres so there were not many changes to correct for this year concerning the flooding. We have also seen a lot of ground broken up, the majority of which was in CRP and already being valued as dry.

2012 – Monitor market by LCG

2013 – Monitor market by LCG

2014 - Monitor market by LCG

SALES REVIEW

Dixon County currently reviews all sales by sending a verification form to the buyer in a self- addressed stamp envelope. We have also contacted the seller, realtor, or physically inspected the property sold if we need more information than we were able to obtain from the buyer. We had been seeing approximately 75% return on our verification form, however, this last year we are only seeing about 55%. Several of the forms we received back have said it is none of our business or contact the buyers attorney they will not be answering any of our questions. We have always had these types of comments over the years; however, they are becoming more frequent.

CONCLUSION

We are currently working to get all properties drawn, new pictures & reviewed to be able to go online early in 2013. A GIS system for the county was purchased in late 2004. This has taken a majority of one of my Clerk's time. We feel this has made our office more efficient and accurate. Also, it will make it much easier to get the taxpayer current maps. Each year our office reviews all statistical information to ensure that our values are within the acceptable ranges. **We will also try to improve our PRD & COD on all types of property each year. We use a good deal of our sales throwing out only the sales we feel are not arms length transactions. This office does everything in-house with the number of employees that we have, we do all the TERC Appeal, County Board of Equalization Meetings, prepare tax lists, consolidate levies, etc. We also have exceeded the educational hours required every year since they were enacted.**

Sincerely,

Amy Watchorn
Dixon County Assessor

6 YEAR REVIEW CYCLE

**2012- WAKEFIELD, CONCORD, DIXON,
MASKELL**

**2013 – ALLEN, EMERSON, NEWCASTLE,
WATERBURY**

2014 – COMMERCIAL

2015 – PONCA & MARTINSBURG

2016 – RURAL RESIDENCE

**2017 - WAKEFIELD, CONCORD, DIXON,
MASKELL**

**AGRICULTURAL LAND IS REVIEWED
YEARLY FOR USE CHANGES AND THE
MARKETS MONITORED ON A YEARLY
BASIS**

**During these years property is to be reviewed, not necessarily
revalued.**

2013 Assessment Survey for Dixon County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	Currently, I am without a Deputy.
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	NA
3.	Other full-time employees:
	3 (we just hired a new staff member 1-2013)
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$105,627.20
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$43,523.20 This amount includes a staff, mileage, computers, supplies and postage.
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$8,200.00
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,500.00
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	N/A
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$17,995.64

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS/County Solutions
2.	CAMA software:
	Marshall and Swift
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	No
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS/County Solutions

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	No
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Allen, Ponca and Wakefield
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	N/A

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	N/A
2.	GIS Services:
	N/A
3.	Other services:
	N/A

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	No
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	N/A
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	N/A
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	N/A
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	N/A

2013 Certification for Dixon County

This is to certify that the 2013 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 Dixon County Assessor.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

