

# 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 Jefferson County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	155	Median	97.07
Total Sales Price	\$8,372,968	Mean	105.66
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$8,408,468	Wgt. Mean	92.91
Total Assessed Value	\$7,811,893	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$46,945
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$54,248	Avg. Assessed Value	\$50,399

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.07 to 101.25
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.88 to 96.93
95% Mean C.I	96.27 to 115.05
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	14.81
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.21
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.52

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	148	98	98.42
2011	162	98	98
2010	171	99	99
2009	212	98	98

## 2013 Commission Summary for Jefferson County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	9	Median	99.35
Total Sales Price	\$529,445	Mean	94.33
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$529,445	Wgt. Mean	124.27
Total Assessed Value	\$657,944	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$115,442
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$58,827	Avg. Assessed Value	\$73,105

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	45.97 to 149.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	80.62 to 167.92
95% Mean C.I	54.25 to 134.41
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.02
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.78
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.12

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	13		98.40
2011	24		97
2010	24	97	97
2009	32	94	94



## 2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Jefferson 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
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	73	Does not meet 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 Jefferson County**

For 2013, Jefferson County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all residential pickup work.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process.

The county inspected and updated all of the remaining residential property in the town of Fairbury. This was started in partially done in past years.

The inspection process includes a going house to house with the existing record to verify or update the measurements, description of property characteristics, observations of quality and condition and take new photos. The parcels were all viewed from off site to note and record changes in condition. If needed, the inspection was done on site to review changes that needed measurement or closer inspection.

## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor, Staff and occasionally the non-staff appraiser, as needed	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Fairbury: The largest town; it is analyzed in 3 separate areas for valuation purposes; the main trade and employment center in the county; the county seat; has a K-12 school system.
	08	Plymouth: Located closer to a larger trade and employment center (Beatrice); the market for residential properties is unique. The Tri-County School District, a K-12 system is only 2 to 3 miles from Plymouth. The COOP is a very large one and is an important business and employer to the community.
	11	Rural: The locations are scattered across the county; the market for acreages is distinctly different than the market in the small villages.
	12	Daykin, Diller, Endicott and Jansen: These villages are grouped together for valuation purposes; they are located throughout the county; they have a limited but stable market for residential property; they have somewhat limited infrastructure; they have few school facilities and feed students into consolidated school districts.
	15	Harbine, Reynolds, and Steel City: These villages are grouped together for valuation purposes; they are located throughout the county; they have no organized market for residential property; they have very limited infrastructure; they have no school facilities and feed students into consolidated school districts.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	The county uses both the Sales Comparison approach to value and Cost Approach to value (replacement cost new less depreciation). The values are reconciled with the Sales Comparison approach carrying the most weight.	

4	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>
	2005 for Plymouth, and Diller; 2008 for Fairbury and rural residential; and Dec 2001 for the remainder of County. The County is in the process of changing to Dec 2008 costing and adjusting depreciation.
5.	<b>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?</b>
	Local market information is used to develop the depreciation schedules.
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	Individual tables are developed with the assistance of the non-staff appraiser.
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>
	The depreciation tables are redone whenever the costs are updated. They tend to be the same or nearly the same date as the cost tables.
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	Lot sales are analyzed (if sales occur) on an ongoing basis. When the valuation groups are reviewed and re-appraised they verify whether the lot values are holding or if the values need to be adjusted before the improvements are appraised. Going forward, this practice will continue and the lots will be either affirmed or updated whenever the class or subclass is inspected, reviewed and recosted.
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>
	Current local sales are used to determine lot and land values. The unit of comparison used for residential lot studies and application is by the square foot.

**48 Jefferson  
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 : 155  
 Total Sales Price : 8,372,968  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,408,468  
 Total Assessed Value : 7,811,893  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 54,248  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 50,399

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 106  
 COD : 30.28  
 PRD : 113.72

COV : 56.47  
 STD : 59.67  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 29.39  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 630.68  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 41.11

95% Median C.I. : 91.07 to 101.25  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.88 to 96.93  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.27 to 115.05

Printed:4/10/2013 10:03:36AM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										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-10 To 31-DEC-10	17	103.62	101.44	88.47	19.46	114.66	64.40	153.60	80.95 to 112.85	82,361	72,863
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	16	80.06	98.07	85.33	43.75	114.93	45.83	351.59	61.64 to 113.18	43,446	37,073
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	14	95.06	99.72	95.45	15.84	104.47	69.31	158.50	84.27 to 114.83	59,893	57,171
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	24	98.23	100.09	96.05	15.43	104.21	50.92	148.50	96.50 to 109.32	52,442	50,373
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	14	106.70	108.18	111.27	20.79	97.22	47.73	150.78	86.73 to 141.10	40,470	45,031
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	13	91.07	109.20	88.54	38.05	123.33	62.66	237.37	69.75 to 154.55	50,192	44,442
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	24	101.29	117.79	94.35	38.15	124.84	58.45	297.56	82.52 to 123.17	44,227	41,728
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	33	92.32	106.78	90.98	41.26	117.37	41.11	630.68	76.27 to 107.18	58,653	53,365
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	71	97.44	99.89	91.62	22.41	109.03	45.83	351.59	88.66 to 103.62	59,048	54,101
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	84	95.62	110.53	94.18	37.39	117.36	41.11	630.68	86.93 to 107.09	50,191	47,270
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	68	97.46	101.21	96.25	23.09	105.15	45.83	351.59	93.75 to 104.62	49,395	47,544
<u>ALL</u>	155	97.07	105.66	92.91	30.28	113.72	41.11	630.68	91.07 to 101.25	54,248	50,399

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	113	96.72	104.66	93.04	30.69	112.49	44.20	630.68	86.93 to 101.45	48,242	44,883
08	9	105.34	150.84	108.77	56.23	138.68	79.00	351.59	91.07 to 297.56	53,278	57,949
11	15	93.02	100.22	93.49	18.71	107.20	63.56	148.75	82.95 to 113.79	103,592	96,853
12	15	97.44	92.81	82.13	26.47	113.00	41.11	162.55	63.94 to 121.34	58,425	47,983
15	3	97.38	99.17	97.18	02.43	102.05	96.50	103.62	N/A	15,795	15,349
<u>ALL</u>	155	97.07	105.66	92.91	30.28	113.72	41.11	630.68	91.07 to 101.25	54,248	50,399

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	155	97.07	105.66	92.91	30.28	113.72	41.11	630.68	91.07 to 101.25	54,248	50,399
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	155	97.07	105.66	92.91	30.28	113.72	41.11	630.68	91.07 to 101.25	54,248	50,399

**48 Jefferson  
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 : 155  
 Total Sales Price : 8,372,968  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,408,468  
 Total Assessed Value : 7,811,893  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 54,248  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 50,399

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 106  
 COD : 30.28  
 PRD : 113.72

COV : 56.47  
 STD : 59.67  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 29.39  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 630.68  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 41.11

95% Median C.I. : 91.07 to 101.25  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.88 to 96.93  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.27 to 115.05

Printed: 4/10/2013 10:03:36AM

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	4	100.35	98.54	97.41	10.28	101.16	79.37	114.11	N/A	10,950	10,667	
Less Than 15,000	26	114.35	151.17	141.66	57.01	106.71	47.73	630.68	96.43 to 148.50	10,638	15,070	
Less Than 30,000	59	106.25	127.30	115.52	44.00	110.20	44.20	630.68	96.43 to 124.30	17,842	20,611	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	151	96.87	105.84	92.88	30.86	113.95	41.11	630.68	90.64 to 101.25	55,395	51,452	
Greater Than 14,999	129	94.80	96.48	91.25	22.64	105.73	41.11	297.56	87.13 to 99.02	63,038	57,520	
Greater Than 29,999	96	92.72	92.36	89.67	19.28	103.00	41.11	162.55	85.56 to 98.64	76,623	68,707	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	4	100.35	98.54	97.41	10.28	101.16	79.37	114.11	N/A	10,950	10,667	
5,000 TO 14,999	22	120.53	160.73	149.98	61.34	107.17	47.73	630.68	93.75 to 177.04	10,581	15,870	
15,000 TO 29,999	33	101.02	108.49	106.21	30.90	102.15	44.20	297.56	85.46 to 126.75	23,518	24,977	
30,000 TO 59,999	39	98.83	95.88	94.44	22.46	101.52	41.11	162.55	83.96 to 107.09	42,321	39,967	
60,000 TO 99,999	40	95.84	92.06	91.83	16.04	100.25	51.41	126.09	84.40 to 101.13	78,298	71,900	
100,000 TO 149,999	10	88.28	85.08	83.10	15.51	102.38	60.71	113.79	63.94 to 107.18	121,704	101,140	
150,000 TO 249,999	6	81.44	84.92	84.85	07.34	100.08	77.48	96.72	77.48 to 96.72	171,056	145,145	
250,000 TO 499,999	1	84.50	84.50	84.50	00.00	100.00	84.50	84.50	N/A	330,000	278,846	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	155	97.07	105.66	92.91	30.28	113.72	41.11	630.68	91.07 to 101.25	54,248	50,399	



## 2013 Correlation Section for Jefferson County

---

### A. Residential Real Property

Jefferson County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. Fairbury is the largest town and the county seat. The county has divided the residential analysis and valuation work into 5 Valuation Groups. Most of these groups are centered on individual towns, clusters of like towns and rural residential parcels. The characteristics of each Valuation Group are described in in the Residential Survey. The county believes that each grouping is unique with differing combinations of population, schools, commercial activity, healthcare services and employment outside the agricultural sector. During the past few years there have been no significant economic events that have impacted the value of residential property. Some locations have shown some positive residential growth and some have been stable.

The Six Year Inspection and Review process will be completed prior to 2014. All of the urban residences, rural residences and residences on agricultural will be up to date. Based on that, the process used to value the residential property is expected to be consistent and uniform.

During the past year, the Department reviewed the documentation of three years of the county's sale verification process posted in the comments in the sales file. The county has posted comments when required on nearly all of the sales reviewed. In most cases, the comments were complete enough to conclude why the sale was not used or adjusted for the ratio study. There was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process.

Since 2009, the Department has reviewed a sample from the Assessed Value Updates submitted each year to confirm that the assessment practices of the county were consistent, accurate and not reported to bias the measurement of the county. In 2011, the Department began an expanded analysis for each county on a three year cycle to determine if the annual assessment actions were applied uniformly to like parcels whether sold or unsold. Jefferson County is scheduled for the expanded review in 2013. The sale verification information and property characteristics of the sold parcels have been reported accurately in the sales file.

The Department is confident that the current R&O Statistics are meaningful to measure the entire class partly because the sample is adequate and partly because the assessment actions are good. For 2013, the median ratio for the 155 qualified sales is 97% for the residential property. When the entire residential class is considered; the COD is above the acceptable range and the PRD is above the acceptable range. When the impact of the small dollar sales is removed, the 96 sales at \$30,000 and above have a COD that is above and PRD within the acceptable range. There are no notable subclasses outside the acceptable range.

The apparent level of value for the residential class is 97%, the quality of the assessment, based on the assessment actions of the assessor, is acceptable and there are no recommendations for the adjustment of the class or for any subclasses.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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 Jefferson County**

For 2013, Jefferson County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all commercial pickup work.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process.

The county has completed the commercial inspection and update process so no additional commercial inspections and reviews were conducted during 2012.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Non-staff Appraiser	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	19	Includes all Assessor Locations: All commercial sales in Jefferson County are grouped together for analysis and valuation.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	RCNLD (replacement cost new less depreciation) and if sufficient data is available, a Market Approach (sales comparison approach) and the two values are reconciled correlated for a final value.	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.</b>	
	The assessor relies heavily on the experience of the non-staff appraiser when unique commercial property is appraised. The non-staff appraiser has familiarity with the appraisal techniques, sales and procedures used in other counties. There is also an exchange of information among other assessors that have similar parcels. This process helps to determine a value and to value unique property similarly to other like property in nearby jurisdictions.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2008	
5.	<b>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?</b>	
	The local market	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes; but there is only one valuation group in commercial.	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	The depreciation tables are redone whenever the costs are updated. They tend to be the same or nearly the same date as the cost tables.	

8.	<p><b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b></p> <p>Lot sales are analyzed (if sales occur) on an ongoing basis. When the commercial parcels are reviewed and re-appraised they verify whether the lot values are holding or if the values need to be adjusted before the improvements are appraised. Going forward, this practice will continue and the lots will be either affirmed or updated whenever the class or subclass is inspected, reviewed, recosted, and reappraised.</p>
9.	<p><b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b></p> <p>The county uses sales of vacant land calculated by square foot for the common unit of comparison.</p>

**48 Jefferson**  
**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 : 9  
Total Sales Price : 529,445  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 529,445  
Total Assessed Value : 657,944  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 58,827  
Avg. Assessed Value : 73,105

MEDIAN : 99  
WGT. MEAN : 124  
MEAN : 94  
COD : 36.55  
PRD : 75.91

COV : 55.27  
STD : 52.14  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 36.31  
MAX Sales Ratio : 187.95  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.21

95% Median C.I. : 45.97 to 149.23  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 80.62 to 167.92  
95% Mean C.I. : 54.25 to 134.41

Printed:4/10/2013 10:03:38AM

**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	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	21,000	21,000
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	99.35	99.35	99.35	00.00	100.00	99.35	99.35	N/A	46,000	45,700
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	97.60	97.60	140.13	52.90	69.65	45.97	149.23	N/A	181,723	254,656
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	187.95	187.95	187.95	00.00	100.00	187.95	187.95	N/A	20,000	37,590
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	97.08	97.08	97.08	00.00	100.00	97.08	97.08	N/A	24,000	23,300
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	101.00	101.00	101.00	00.00	100.00	101.00	101.00	N/A	3,000	3,030
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	34.18	34.18	34.64	35.02	98.67	22.21	46.15	N/A	26,000	9,007
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	5	100.00	116.50	136.22	38.37	85.52	45.97	187.95	N/A	90,089	122,720
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	2	99.04	99.04	97.52	01.98	101.56	97.08	101.00	N/A	13,500	13,165
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	2	34.18	34.18	34.64	35.02	98.67	22.21	46.15	N/A	26,000	9,007
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	124.29	120.63	137.99	38.60	87.42	45.97	187.95	N/A	107,361	148,150
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	99.04	99.04	97.52	01.98	101.56	97.08	101.00	N/A	13,500	13,165
<u>ALL</u>	9	99.35	94.33	124.27	36.55	75.91	22.21	187.95	45.97 to 149.23	58,827	73,105

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
19	9	99.35	94.33	124.27	36.55	75.91	22.21	187.95	45.97 to 149.23	58,827	73,105
<u>ALL</u>	9	99.35	94.33	124.27	36.55	75.91	22.21	187.95	45.97 to 149.23	58,827	73,105

**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	9	99.35	94.33	124.27	36.55	75.91	22.21	187.95	45.97 to 149.23	58,827	73,105
04											
<u>ALL</u>	9	99.35	94.33	124.27	36.55	75.91	22.21	187.95	45.97 to 149.23	58,827	73,105

**48 Jefferson**  
**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 : 9  
Total Sales Price : 529,445  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 529,445  
Total Assessed Value : 657,944  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 58,827  
Avg. Assessed Value : 73,105

MEDIAN : 99  
WGT. MEAN : 124  
MEAN : 94  
COD : 36.55  
PRD : 75.91

COV : 55.27  
STD : 52.14  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 36.31  
MAX Sales Ratio : 187.95  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.21

95% Median C.I. : 45.97 to 149.23  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 80.62 to 167.92  
95% Mean C.I. : 54.25 to 134.41

Printed: 4/10/2013 10:03:38AM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<b>Low \$ Ranges</b>												
Less Than 5,000	1	101.00	101.00	101.00	00.00	100.00	101.00	101.00	N/A	3,000	3,030	
Less Than 15,000	1	101.00	101.00	101.00	00.00	100.00	101.00	101.00	N/A	3,000	3,030	
Less Than 30,000	6	98.54	92.40	85.78	37.80	107.72	22.21	187.95	22.21 to 187.95	20,000	17,156	
<b>Ranges Excl. Low \$</b>												
Greater Than 4,999	8	98.22	93.49	124.40	41.38	75.15	22.21	187.95	22.21 to 187.95	65,806	81,864	
Greater Than 14,999	8	98.22	93.49	124.40	41.38	75.15	22.21	187.95	22.21 to 187.95	65,806	81,864	
Greater Than 29,999	3	99.35	98.18	135.55	34.65	72.43	45.97	149.23	N/A	136,482	185,004	
<b>Incremental Ranges</b>												
0 TO 4,999	1	101.00	101.00	101.00	00.00	100.00	101.00	101.00	N/A	3,000	3,030	
5,000 TO 14,999												
15,000 TO 29,999	5	97.08	90.68	85.39	45.24	106.20	22.21	187.95	N/A	23,400	19,981	
30,000 TO 59,999	2	72.66	72.66	77.45	36.73	93.82	45.97	99.35	N/A	39,000	30,206	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999	1	149.23	149.23	149.23	00.00	100.00	149.23	149.23	N/A	331,445	494,600	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<b>ALL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>99.35</b>	<b>94.33</b>	<b>124.27</b>	<b>36.55</b>	<b>75.91</b>	<b>22.21</b>	<b>187.95</b>	<b>45.97 to 149.23</b>	<b>58,827</b>	<b>73,105</b>	

<b>OCCUPANCY CODE</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
326	2	73.49	73.49	50.69	37.45	144.98	45.97	101.00	N/A	17,500	8,871	
352	1	149.23	149.23	149.23	00.00	100.00	149.23	149.23	N/A	331,445	494,600	
353	4	99.68	121.10	114.95	22.95	105.35	97.08	187.95	N/A	27,750	31,898	
406	2	34.18	34.18	34.64	35.02	98.67	22.21	46.15	N/A	26,000	9,007	
<b>ALL</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>99.35</b>	<b>94.33</b>	<b>124.27</b>	<b>36.55</b>	<b>75.91</b>	<b>22.21</b>	<b>187.95</b>	<b>45.97 to 149.23</b>	<b>58,827</b>	<b>73,105</b>	



## 2013 Correlation Section for Jefferson County

---

### **A. Commercial Real Property**

Jefferson County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. Most of the commercial properties in the county either directly service or support agriculture or the people involved in agriculture. Fairbury is the predominant location for commercial property. In all, the commercial values are stable in Fairbury but generally flat in other parts of the county.

The Six Year Inspection and Review process was completed prior to 2011. All of the commercial and industrial records are up to date. Based on that, the process used to value the commercial property is considered to be consistent and uniform.

The Department's review of the county's sale verification process reported in the residential correlation was done for all 3 classes of property at the same time. The findings, that there was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process also applies to the commercial sales.

The Department's review of the Assessed Value Update that was reported in the residential correlation was done for all 3 classes of property at the same time. The commercial assessment procedures reviewed were acceptable. The assessed value information and property characteristics of the sold parcels have been reported accurately in the sales file.

The key statistics considered for measurement are as follows: there are 9 qualified sales; the median ratio is 99%; the COD is 36.55; and the PRD is 75.91. Of the 9 qualified sales, all 9 are in Fairbury. When the 4 different occupancy codes are reviewed, there are 4 sales in code 353 (retail store) and the remaining 3 codes have no more than 2 sales each. It is notable that the class of commercial and industrial is so broad that the value of the class is impacted by both local and regional economic forces. The use of the statistics to determine a level of value is problematic as it is likely that neither the class of commercial and industrial property nor any subclass is adequately represented.

The county has implemented consistent assessment actions that should produce consistent valuations. The median ratio calculated from this group of sales is not considered to be representative of the commercial and industrial property in Jefferson County so there is not enough information to call a level of value.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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 Jefferson County**

For 2013, Jefferson County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

The county completed all pickup work of new improvements on agricultural parcels. They also update the land use on all parcels where changes have been reported or observed.

The county conducted a thorough sale verification and analysis process. Following that, they implemented new values for agricultural land throughout the county.

The county has completed the inspection and update process for all agricultural improvements so no additional inspections and reviews were conducted during 2012.

## 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Market Area 1: This area covers the top one fourth of the county where the terrain has less of a slope and larger field sizes than the other two market areas also less grass and more irrigation potential with more access to ground water and is mostly developed for irrigation.
	2	Market Area 2: This area covers the middle one half of the county and is a cross section of market area 1 and 3 with significantly more dry land than market area 1, similar soils to Market Area 1 but with no ground water access for irrigation well development limiting irrigation development.
	3	Market Area 3: This area covers the lower one fourth of the county and in this area the terrain is rougher and steeper with smaller field sizes.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The county has a strong sale verification and analysis process. This keeps them constantly aware of market trends and changes in agricultural land values.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Agricultural land is identified by its present and predominant use; it is defined in the state statutes as the commercial production of agricultural products. Residential is not used for the commercial production for agricultural products and Recreational is predominantly used for rest and relaxation on an occasional basis. There is currently no land valued as Recreational.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Yes; the first (home site) acre, for both farm home and rural residential home sites is valued the same at \$10,000. This home site acre value is the same throughout the county. The outbuilding site acres are valued at \$2,000 per acre and the excess or yard acres are valued at \$1,500 per acre. The area of the site is determined on a parcel by parcel basis using GIS and FSA data.	

6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>
	Sale verification; information obtained from buyers and sellers is the key technique.
7.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>
	No
8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>
	The assessor estimates that there are only 2 or 3 parcels that have WRP acres on them. There are no large tracts of land that are all WRP land, rather minor inclusions of acres within larger agricultural parcels. There have been no known sales within the county of WRP parcels. The county has adopted the procedure of valuing the acres at the same use and LCG that they were when they went into the program. The only change is that they are valued at 100% of the ag use value.

**48 Jefferson**  
**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 : 76  
Total Sales Price : 31,113,078  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 31,609,078  
Total Assessed Value : 21,411,334  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 415,909  
Avg. Assessed Value : 281,728

MEDIAN : 73  
WGT. MEAN : 68  
MEAN : 75  
COD : 23.74  
PRD : 110.05

COV : 32.09  
STD : 23.92  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.23  
MAX Sales Ratio : 148.64  
MIN Sales Ratio : 31.80

95% Median C.I. : 65.43 to 75.90  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.03 to 74.45  
95% Mean C.I. : 69.17 to 79.93

Printed:4/10/2013 10:03:40AM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	88.42	104.64	109.10	30.40	95.91	74.76	148.64	N/A	204,552	223,156	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	6	96.30	94.20	103.43	21.73	91.08	59.06	120.54	59.06 to 120.54	264,191	273,257	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	90.10	97.02	101.49	18.05	95.60	74.11	140.52	74.11 to 140.52	147,467	149,663	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	6	75.92	80.31	79.38	22.27	101.17	58.13	111.35	58.13 to 111.35	255,002	202,432	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	73.80	79.75	74.26	16.65	107.39	52.46	131.82	67.79 to 96.17	279,750	207,739	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	3	72.56	69.22	70.42	05.00	98.30	62.11	72.99	N/A	477,325	336,134	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	78.77	75.49	74.90	12.54	100.79	54.34	89.79	N/A	285,703	213,986	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	8	64.26	66.81	71.59	18.71	93.32	45.62	96.68	45.62 to 96.68	424,119	303,628	
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	12	59.96	63.47	60.03	15.36	105.73	44.12	84.20	55.86 to 73.74	673,334	404,190	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	8	57.88	59.28	57.28	17.92	103.49	38.58	83.81	38.58 to 83.81	668,756	383,096	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	55.38	54.05	57.29	23.13	94.34	34.17	72.59	N/A	697,395	399,523	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	32.24	39.47	36.77	23.36	107.34	31.80	54.38	N/A	577,813	212,447	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	23	85.89	93.58	96.92	23.51	96.55	58.13	148.64	75.43 to 107.75	218,379	211,648	
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	27	72.56	73.96	72.80	15.90	101.59	45.62	131.82	66.26 to 78.77	345,581	251,574	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	26	57.41	58.33	56.51	19.61	103.22	31.80	84.20	52.14 to 65.43	663,680	375,037	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	29	82.03	86.43	85.31	20.65	101.31	52.46	140.52	72.11 to 95.88	244,042	208,181	
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	28	65.85	67.19	65.29	16.64	102.91	44.12	96.68	57.96 to 73.74	511,909	334,201	
<u>ALL</u>	76	72.58	74.55	67.74	23.74	110.05	31.80	148.64	65.43 to 75.90	415,909	281,728	

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
1	20	74.28	82.81	70.53	32.50	117.41	45.62	148.64	59.40 to 96.68	663,125	467,685	
2	32	73.77	73.91	66.26	23.87	111.55	31.80	140.52	64.64 to 81.55	366,715	242,981	
3	24	68.66	68.51	64.77	15.39	105.77	44.12	94.30	58.13 to 75.43	275,487	178,427	
<u>ALL</u>	76	72.58	74.55	67.74	23.74	110.05	31.80	148.64	65.43 to 75.90	415,909	281,728	

**48 Jefferson**  
**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 : 76  
Total Sales Price : 31,113,078  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 31,609,078  
Total Assessed Value : 21,411,334  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 415,909  
Avg. Assessed Value : 281,728

MEDIAN : 73  
WGT. MEAN : 68  
MEAN : 75  
COD : 23.74  
PRD : 110.05

COV : 32.09  
STD : 23.92  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.23  
MAX Sales Ratio : 148.64  
MIN Sales Ratio : 31.80

95% Median C.I. : 65.43 to 75.90  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.03 to 74.45  
95% Mean C.I. : 69.17 to 79.93

Printed: 4/10/2013 10:03:40AM

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	3	65.43	90.68	72.38	46.20	125.28	57.96	148.64	N/A	1,001,567	724,976
1	3	65.43	90.68	72.38	46.20	125.28	57.96	148.64	N/A	1,001,567	724,976
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	10	73.43	77.12	70.00	17.42	110.17	45.62	111.35	65.28 to 94.30	277,127	193,979
1	3	84.24	80.40	65.73	26.01	122.32	45.62	111.35	N/A	361,756	237,798
2	4	70.80	73.19	70.58	09.41	103.70	65.28	85.89	N/A	240,250	169,565
3	3	73.05	79.08	75.61	11.13	104.59	69.90	94.30	N/A	241,667	182,712
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	12	66.32	68.71	69.03	15.76	99.54	55.97	84.85	58.13 to 82.03	197,097	136,061
1	1	59.40	59.40	59.40	00.00	100.00	59.40	59.40	N/A	208,052	123,589
2	2	79.09	79.09	80.32	04.03	98.47	75.90	82.27	N/A	129,753	104,214
3	9	60.52	67.43	68.55	15.99	98.37	55.97	84.85	56.47 to 82.03	210,844	144,524
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>72.58</b>	<b>74.55</b>	<b>67.74</b>	<b>23.74</b>	<b>110.05</b>	<b>31.80</b>	<b>148.64</b>	<b>65.43 to 75.90</b>	<b>415,909</b>	<b>281,728</b>

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	10	74.28	81.23	72.74	26.53	111.67	51.42	148.64	57.96 to 105.03	850,345	618,556
1	9	72.99	81.50	72.27	29.13	112.77	51.42	148.64	57.96 to 105.03	875,583	632,743
2	1	78.77	78.77	78.77	00.00	100.00	78.77	78.77	N/A	623,200	490,876
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	19	73.05	75.52	65.58	26.64	115.16	34.17	135.94	54.34 to 85.89	290,946	190,803
1	5	111.35	101.79	78.56	24.77	129.57	45.62	135.94	N/A	266,562	209,402
2	9	65.28	62.18	57.80	18.40	107.58	34.17	85.89	52.14 to 73.80	332,158	191,986
3	5	73.05	73.27	70.53	12.27	103.88	54.34	94.30	N/A	241,150	170,074
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	17	72.11	67.82	68.21	14.23	99.43	31.80	84.85	58.13 to 77.75	215,169	146,763
1	1	59.40	59.40	59.40	00.00	100.00	59.40	59.40	N/A	208,052	123,589
2	5	75.90	67.73	64.43	14.61	105.12	31.80	82.27	N/A	148,551	95,705
3	11	72.11	68.63	69.92	12.92	98.16	55.97	84.85	56.47 to 82.03	246,097	172,078
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>72.58</b>	<b>74.55</b>	<b>67.74</b>	<b>23.74</b>	<b>110.05</b>	<b>31.80</b>	<b>148.64</b>	<b>65.43 to 75.90</b>	<b>415,909</b>	<b>281,728</b>

## Jefferson County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Jefferson	1	4,660	6,088	4,654	4,670	4,334	N/A	4,150	3,025	5,269
Fillmore	1	4,900	4,800	4,700	4,600	4,300	N/A	3,900	3,750	4,677
Gage	1	3,702	3,730	3,336	3,344	2,996	3,006	2,767	2,748	3,387
Saline	2	3,598	3,597	3,533	3,246	3,044	2,600	2,597	2,521	3,371
Thayer	1	4,025	4,025	3,930	3,450	3,270	3,120	3,085	3,060	3,757
Jefferson	2	4,050	5,256	3,574	3,340	2,919	N/A	2,727	2,000	4,057
Gage	1	3,702	3,730	3,336	3,344	2,996	3,006	2,767	2,748	3,387
Thayer	2	3,790	3,790	3,430	3,200	2,950	N/A	2,690	2,675	3,298
Jefferson	3	3,785	3,764	2,959	2,545	2,253	N/A	2,170	2,640	3,018
Gage	1	3,702	3,730	3,336	3,344	2,996	3,006	2,767	2,748	3,387
Thayer	2	3,790	3,790	3,430	3,200	2,950	N/A	2,690	2,675	3,298

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Jefferson	1	2,710	4,117	2,705	2,714	2,474	N/A	2,075	1,210	3,133
Fillmore	1	2,655	2,615	2,515	2,465	2,303	N/A	2,021	1,955	2,504
Gage	1	2,800	2,800	2,500	2,500	2,100	2,100	1,665	1,665	2,303
Saline	2	2,899	2,897	2,698	2,646	2,565	2,250	2,246	2,147	2,691
Thayer	1	2,490	2,490	2,280	2,130	1,980	1,830	1,830	1,800	2,257
Jefferson	2	2,355	3,548	2,149	1,929	1,599	N/A	1,365	800	2,479
Gage	1	2,800	2,800	2,500	2,500	2,100	2,100	1,665	1,665	2,303
Thayer	2	2,025	2,010	1,930	1,820	1,770	1,652	1,625	1,600	1,855
Jefferson	3	2,200	2,507	1,727	1,480	1,323	N/A	1,085	920	1,709
Gage	1	2,800	2,800	2,500	2,500	2,100	2,100	1,665	1,665	2,303
Thayer	2	2,025	2,010	1,930	1,820	1,770	1,652	1,625	1,600	1,855

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Jefferson	1	1,887	2,277	1,296	1,789	1,143	N/A	1,784	611	1,308
Fillmore	1	1,060	1,040	980	920	900	N/A	800	800	886
Gage	1	984	1,377	1,196	1,402	1,125	983	992	712	1,036
Saline	2	1,373	1,509	1,234	1,502	1,440	515	1,353	976	1,215
Thayer	1	1,141	1,243	1,107	1,084	1,107	1,053	1,080	1,036	1,087
Jefferson	2	659	782	613	864	921	N/A	909	638	784
Gage	1	984	1,377	1,196	1,402	1,125	983	992	712	1,036
Thayer	2	1,090	1,150	1,024	1,027	1,099	N/A	1,020	993	1,028
Jefferson	3	1,025	1,300	920	907	1,178	N/A	1,023	891	972
Gage	1	984	1,377	1,196	1,402	1,125	983	992	712	1,036
Thayer	2	1,090	1,150	1,024	1,027	1,099	N/A	1,020	993	1,028

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



## 2013 Correlation Section for Jefferson County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Jefferson County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. The prevalent crops are row crops with corn, soybeans, and some grain sorghum. The county land use is approximately 25% irrigated land, 43% dry land, 31% grass land and 1% other uses. Jefferson County is bordered on the north by Saline County, on the south by the state of Kansas, on the east by Gage County and on the west by Thayer County. The agricultural land is valued using three market areas that are more fully described in the survey. Area 1, (the north fourth of the county) is about 57% irrigated crop land; and Area 2, (the middle half of the county) has a mix of uses but is about 54% dry crop land; and Area 3, (the south fourth of the county) is about 59% grass land.

The county reports that the improvements on the agricultural parcels have all been inspected and reviewed prior to 2012, so the first cycle of the 6 year inspection and review process of all agricultural improvements in the county has been completed.

The Department's review of the county's sale verification process reported in the residential correlation was done for all 3 classes of property at the same time. The findings, that there was no reason to conclude that the county had selectively excluded sales to influence the measurement process applies to the agricultural sales too.

The Department's review of the Assessed Value Update that was reported in the residential correlation was done for all 3 classes of property at the same time. The agricultural assessment procedures reviewed were acceptable. The assessed value information and property characteristics of the sold parcels have been reported accurately in the sales file.

There was a total sample of 76 qualified sales used to determine the level of value of agricultural land in Jefferson County. The sample used was deemed adequate, proportional among study years and representative based on major land uses. Any comparable sales used were selected from a similar agricultural area within six miles of the subject county. The calculated median ratio is 73%. The 2013 abstract reports; overall agricultural land increased by 30.18%; irrigated land increased by nearly 40%, dry land increased by over 25%, and grass land increased by more than 14%. The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification of sales but there are questions raised when the output of the analysis of the sales is reviewed.

It is the opinion of the Department that the level of value for agricultural land of value falls at or near the median ratio. Neither the COD nor the PRD are particularly useful indicators of equity or regression because of the dramatic increases in the value of agland during the three year study period. In this case, the apparent level of value is 73%. There are no major subclasses that were measured outside the range. There are no recommended adjustments to the class or to any subclass of agricultural land. However in light of the concerns mentioned in this report, there is a question about some of the assessment practices and they are not entirely satisfactory.

When examining the assessment practices for the valuation of agricultural land, the Department typically reviews several things. If the county has market areas, they are reviewed to see if they fit into the general patterns of the market. The market areas should be somewhat

## **2013 Correlation Section for Jefferson County**

---

compatible with the market areas and valuation patterns of the surrounding counties. This is tested by comparing the average values for each major use. During the review of county to county comparability, it became apparent that the average values and most if the individual LCG values in Market areas 1 and 2 were higher than the surrounding counties. This was most apparent in the 1A and 1D LCGs. Market Area 3 fit among the surrounding counties. Further review revealed that the ranges of value from high to low were wider than the comparative counties. Some of the intervals between adjacent LCG's have extreme differences. In some instances, more prominently among the grass LCGs, the values displayed were not even close to hierarchal and displayed valuation patterns that are not typical causing concern about uniformity within the county and across county lines. Jefferson County has prepared their analysis and values using soil types, which includes additional values inside some LCG's. This is driven by the analysis and valuation of individual predominant soils separate from the other similarly classed soils with similar productivity characteristics. The county has supplied the Department with multiple years of values with each soil in each major use for all 3 market areas. A review of this data revealed an erratic pattern of valuation prior to 2011. Since that time, the valuations have become progressively more consistent and similar among the LCG groupings. The department believes that this is likely to result in more uniform values. These observations lead the Department to conclude that presently, the assessment practices for agricultural land valuation are not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal procedures.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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.



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 7,063</b>	<b>Value : 1,166,200,582</b>	<b>Growth 5,067,327</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	358	909,916	22	168,738	174	1,004,837	554	2,083,491	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,544	7,265,969	29	513,236	562	9,667,112	3,135	17,446,317	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,545	94,187,823	29	5,063,221	533	51,958,677	3,107	151,209,721	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,903	102,363,708	51	5,745,195	707	62,630,626	3,661	170,739,529	1,358,278
<b>% of Res Total</b>	79.30	59.95	1.39	3.36	19.31	36.68	51.83	14.64	26.80
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	67	658,928	3	74,906	21	683,321	91	1,417,155	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	342	3,382,146	10	488,414	40	617,790	392	4,488,350	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	342	34,129,790	10	2,303,604	39	9,381,954	391	45,815,348	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	409	38,170,864	13	2,866,924	60	10,683,065	482	51,720,853	0
<b>% of Com Total</b>	84.85	73.80	2.70	5.54	12.45	20.66	6.82	4.43	0.00
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	6	16,398	0	0	3	47,696	9	64,094	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	8	141,396	2	129,962	6	162,985	16	434,343	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	8	1,699,887	2	529,192	6	4,080,577	16	6,309,656	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	14	1,857,681	2	659,154	9	4,291,258	25	6,808,093	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	56.00	27.29	8.00	9.68	36.00	63.03	0.35	0.58	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	10	487,379	10	487,379	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	7	603,340	7	603,340	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	7	834,250	7	834,250	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	17	1,924,969	17	1,924,969	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.24	0.17	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,903	102,363,708	51	5,745,195	724	64,555,595	3,678	172,664,498	1,358,278
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	78.93	59.28	1.39	3.33	19.68	37.39	52.07	14.81	26.80
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	423	40,028,545	15	3,526,078	69	14,974,323	507	58,528,946	0
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	83.43	68.39	2.96	6.02	13.61	25.58	7.18	5.02	0.00
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	3,326	142,392,253	66	9,271,273	793	79,529,918	4,185	231,193,444	1,358,278
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	79.47	61.59	1.58	4.01	18.95	34.40	59.25	19.82	26.80

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	5	179,103	4,420,102	0	0	0
20. Industrial	2	258,465	245,235	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	5	179,103	4,420,102
20. Industrial	0	0	0	2	258,465	245,235
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				7	437,568	4,665,337

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	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	264	37	80	381

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	2,020	576,830,034	2,020	576,830,034
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	858	284,226,368	858	284,226,368
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	858	73,950,736	858	73,950,736
30. Ag Total							2,878	935,007,138

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	19	18.43	184,300	19	18.43	184,300	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	515	524.91	5,248,100	515	524.91	5,248,100	
33. HomeSite Improvements	539	0.00	40,721,980	539	0.00	40,721,980	137,110
34. HomeSite Total				<b>558</b>	<b>543.34</b>	<b>46,154,380</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	176	516.74	614,925	176	516.74	614,925	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	771	2,743.89	4,915,915	771	2,743.89	4,915,915	
37. FarmSite Improvements	848	0.00	33,228,756	848	0.00	33,228,756	3,571,939
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,024</b>	<b>3,260.63</b>	<b>38,759,596</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	2,400	6,682.79	0	2,400	6,682.79	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,582</b>	<b>10,486.76</b>	<b>84,913,976</b>	<b>3,709,049</b>

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	26	2,501.45	2,939,931	26	2,501.45	2,939,931

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	1,342.96	2.71%	6,258,194	2.40%	4,660.00
46. 1A	25,117.12	50.70%	152,908,240	58.59%	6,087.81
47. 2A1	3,073.70	6.20%	14,305,978	5.48%	4,654.32
48. 2A	9,109.10	18.39%	42,536,509	16.30%	4,669.67
49. 3A1	5,741.63	11.59%	24,883,868	9.53%	4,333.94
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	4,014.86	8.10%	16,661,672	6.38%	4,150.00
52. 4A	1,137.47	2.30%	3,440,880	1.32%	3,025.03
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>49,536.84</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>260,995,341</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>5,268.71</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	687.91	2.72%	1,864,236	2.35%	2,710.00
55. 1D	10,196.27	40.27%	41,982,854	52.93%	4,117.47
56. 2D1	1,056.54	4.17%	2,857,902	3.60%	2,704.96
57. 2D	5,878.82	23.22%	15,955,963	20.11%	2,714.14
58. 3D1	4,042.29	15.96%	9,998,742	12.60%	2,473.53
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	2,865.16	11.32%	5,945,317	7.49%	2,075.04
61. 4D	594.52	2.35%	719,369	0.91%	1,210.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>25,321.51</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>79,324,383</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,132.69</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	203.83	1.80%	384,554	2.59%	1,886.64
64. 1G	818.54	7.21%	1,864,160	12.56%	2,277.42
65. 2G1	853.12	7.52%	1,105,383	7.45%	1,295.69
66. 2G	2,075.26	18.29%	3,712,569	25.02%	1,788.97
67. 3G1	1,952.36	17.21%	2,231,968	15.04%	1,143.22
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	1,888.44	16.64%	3,369,267	22.70%	1,784.15
70. 4G	3,554.45	31.33%	2,172,912	14.64%	611.32
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>11,346.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>14,840,813</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,308.02</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>49,536.84</b>	<b>56.87%</b>	<b>260,995,341</b>	<b>73.46%</b>	<b>5,268.71</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>25,321.51</b>	<b>29.07%</b>	<b>79,324,383</b>	<b>22.33%</b>	<b>3,132.69</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>11,346.00</b>	<b>13.03%</b>	<b>14,840,813</b>	<b>4.18%</b>	<b>1,308.02</b>
72. Waste	895.41	1.03%	152,221	0.04%	170.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>87,099.76</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>355,312,758</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,079.38</b>

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,349.54	4.25%	5,465,314	4.25%	4,049.76
46. 1A	13,375.51	42.17%	70,303,061	54.62%	5,256.10
47. 2A1	2,347.21	7.40%	8,388,742	6.52%	3,573.92
48. 2A	6,559.25	20.68%	21,905,776	17.02%	3,339.68
49. 3A1	5,163.72	16.28%	15,074,698	11.71%	2,919.35
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	2,362.20	7.45%	6,441,190	5.00%	2,726.78
52. 4A	564.30	1.78%	1,128,600	0.88%	2,000.00
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>31,721.73</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>128,707,381</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,057.39</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	3,803.15	4.27%	8,956,462	4.05%	2,355.01
55. 1D	35,088.78	39.37%	124,489,903	56.34%	3,547.85
56. 2D1	6,043.85	6.78%	12,990,183	5.88%	2,149.32
57. 2D	19,900.14	22.33%	38,387,570	17.37%	1,929.01
58. 3D1	15,802.77	17.73%	25,274,776	11.44%	1,599.39
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	7,214.72	8.09%	9,846,388	4.46%	1,364.76
61. 4D	1,282.30	1.44%	1,025,840	0.46%	800.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>89,135.71</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>220,971,122</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,479.04</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	409.05	0.98%	269,690	0.82%	659.31
64. 1G	2,842.78	6.81%	2,222,532	6.79%	781.82
65. 2G1	3,154.35	7.56%	1,932,163	5.91%	612.54
66. 2G	8,104.79	19.42%	6,999,465	21.39%	863.62
67. 3G1	8,668.24	20.77%	7,981,117	24.39%	920.73
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	5,421.52	12.99%	4,929,861	15.07%	909.31
70. 4G	13,134.65	31.47%	8,384,359	25.63%	638.34
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>41,735.38</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>32,719,187</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>783.97</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>31,721.73</b>	<b>19.14%</b>	<b>128,707,381</b>	<b>33.61%</b>	<b>4,057.39</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>89,135.71</b>	<b>53.77%</b>	<b>220,971,122</b>	<b>57.70%</b>	<b>2,479.04</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>41,735.38</b>	<b>25.18%</b>	<b>32,719,187</b>	<b>8.54%</b>	<b>783.97</b>
72. Waste	3,172.32	1.91%	539,296	0.14%	170.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>165,765.14</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>382,936,986</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,310.12</b>

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	592.87	17.73%	2,244,015	22.24%	3,785.00
46. 1A	894.26	26.75%	3,365,849	33.36%	3,763.84
47. 2A1	238.87	7.15%	706,856	7.01%	2,959.17
48. 2A	346.60	10.37%	882,101	8.74%	2,545.01
49. 3A1	593.30	17.75%	1,336,825	13.25%	2,253.20
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	500.73	14.98%	1,086,584	10.77%	2,170.00
52. 4A	176.50	5.28%	465,980	4.62%	2,640.11
53. Total	3,343.13	100.00%	10,088,210	100.00%	3,017.59
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,640.09	8.69%	5,808,198	11.18%	2,200.00
55. 1D	7,609.97	25.04%	19,079,577	36.74%	2,507.18
56. 2D1	2,016.73	6.64%	3,483,209	6.71%	1,727.16
57. 2D	7,255.18	23.87%	10,737,665	20.68%	1,480.00
58. 3D1	5,151.62	16.95%	6,815,837	13.12%	1,323.05
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	4,548.03	14.97%	4,934,240	9.50%	1,084.92
61. 4D	1,167.61	3.84%	1,073,925	2.07%	919.76
62. Total	30,389.23	100.00%	51,932,651	100.00%	1,708.92
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	419.33	0.82%	430,001	0.87%	1,025.45
64. 1G	1,536.37	3.01%	1,997,182	4.03%	1,299.94
65. 2G1	1,169.91	2.29%	1,076,581	2.17%	920.23
66. 2G	5,110.16	10.02%	4,636,631	9.35%	907.34
67. 3G1	7,244.23	14.21%	8,536,349	17.21%	1,178.37
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	9,525.44	18.68%	9,744,391	19.65%	1,022.99
70. 4G	25,989.59	50.96%	23,167,244	46.72%	891.40
71. Total	50,995.03	100.00%	49,588,379	100.00%	972.42
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	3,343.13	3.89%	10,088,210	9.02%	3,017.59
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	30,389.23	35.34%	51,932,651	46.43%	1,708.92
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	50,995.03	59.31%	49,588,379	44.34%	972.42
72. Waste	1,198.39	1.39%	203,728	0.18%	170.00
73. Other	60.90	0.07%	30,450	0.03%	500.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	85,986.68	100.00%	111,843,418	100.00%	1,300.71

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	84,601.70	399,790,932	84,601.70	399,790,932
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	144,846.45	352,228,156	144,846.45	352,228,156
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	104,076.41	97,148,379	104,076.41	97,148,379
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,266.12	895,245	5,266.12	895,245
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	60.90	30,450	60.90	30,450
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>338,851.58</b>	<b>850,093,162</b>	<b>338,851.58</b>	<b>850,093,162</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	84,601.70	24.97%	399,790,932	47.03%	4,725.57
<b>Dry Land</b>	144,846.45	42.75%	352,228,156	41.43%	2,431.73
<b>Grass</b>	104,076.41	30.71%	97,148,379	11.43%	933.43
<b>Waste</b>	5,266.12	1.55%	895,245	0.11%	170.00
<b>Other</b>	60.90	0.02%	30,450	0.00%	500.00
<b>Exempt</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>338,851.58</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>850,093,162</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,508.75</b>

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

48 Jefferson

	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	168,028,176	170,739,529	2,711,353	1.61%	1,358,278	0.81%
02. Recreational	1,802,726	1,924,969	122,243	6.78%	0	6.78%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	46,395,220	46,154,380	-240,840	-0.52%	137,110	-0.81%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>216,226,122</b>	<b>218,818,878</b>	<b>2,592,756</b>	<b>1.20%</b>	<b>1,495,388</b>	<b>0.51%</b>
05. Commercial	51,501,091	51,720,853	219,762	0.43%	0	0.43%
06. Industrial	6,808,093	6,808,093	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	35,848,859	38,759,596	2,910,737	8.12%	3,571,939	-1.84%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>94,158,043</b>	<b>97,288,542</b>	<b>3,130,499</b>	<b>3.32%</b>	<b>3,571,939</b>	<b>-0.47%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>310,384,165</b>	<b>316,107,420</b>	<b>5,723,255</b>	<b>1.84%</b>	<b>5,067,327</b>	<b>0.21%</b>
11. Irrigated	286,020,111	399,790,932	113,770,821	39.78%		
12. Dryland	281,142,125	352,228,156	71,086,031	25.28%		
13. Grassland	84,999,257	97,148,379	12,149,122	14.29%		
14. Wasteland	861,874	895,245	33,371	3.87%		
15. Other Agland	0	30,450	30,450			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>653,023,367</b>	<b>850,093,162</b>	<b>197,069,795</b>	<b>30.18%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>963,407,532</b>	<b>1,166,200,582</b>	<b>202,793,050</b>	<b>21.05%</b>	<b>5,067,327</b>	<b>20.52%</b>

**2012 Plan of Assessment for Jefferson County  
Assessment Years 2013, 2014, and 2015  
Date: June 15, 2012**

Yellow highlighted areas were amended on October 18, 2012

**Plan of Assessment Requirements:**

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. Section 77-1311.02 RS Supp 2005, on or before June 15 each year, the county assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

**Real Property Assessment Requirements:**

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-112 (Reissue September 2010).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

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

**General Description of Real Property in Jefferson County:**

Per 2012 County Abstract, Jefferson County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels
Residential	4218	55%
Commercial	483	6%
Industrial	25	1%
Recreational	18	0%
Agricultural	2863	38%

Agricultural land – 338,701.07 acres

New Property: For assessment year 2012, an estimated 155 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions, demolitions, land use changes, etc., in the county. The county added **one two** new T.I.F. projects for 2012 **and added on to an existing T.I.F. project.**

For more information see 2012 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

**Current Resources:**

A. Staff includes:

- 2 Full-time employees
- 1 Part-time employee

Budget for 2011-2012 including salaries for above employees was \$152,337. This was a decrease from the previous two budget years. **Official estimation for 2012-2013 budget was \$152,261. Board proposed and adopted a budget of \$147,690. This is a decrease of \$4,647 from the previous budget year.**

The Assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education by December 31, 2014 in order to renew her Assessor’s certificate. This certificate is required by law in order to hold the position of Assessor or Deputy Assessor. The Property Tax Administrator must approve this education. The 60 hours of continuing education must be attained within a 4 year time period for re-certification. The cost of this education includes registration fees, lodging, meals and any supplies needed. (Section 77-702, R.S. Supp., 2002 and 77-414, R.S. Supp., 2003.)

Reg.-71-006.02A – Assessors assuming office on or after January 1, 2003, shall, within four years from the date of assuming the office, complete IAAO course 101 - Fundamentals of Real Property Appraisal, and IAAO course 300 – Fundamentals of Mass Appraisal, or the equivalent thereof.

In 2011 a change in Assessor's was the result of the incumbent retiring and the general election. Vacancies in the office were filled with 1 full-time and 1 part-time person which were previously held by 2 full-time employees. Until the new employees were hired, (2/14/2011) the newly elected Assessor prepared all personal property and homestead exemptions for mailing. In addition, the new Assessor was learning the administrative procedures, policies and reports required by the Property Assessment Department. The initial shortage and consequently new personnel in three positions created a hardship for the office in 2011.

December 2011 one full-time employee resigned. Once again the office experienced a shortage of staff. The assessor, with the assistance of the part-time employee, prepared the personal property and homestead exemptions for mailing. Applications and interviews were conducted after the holidays. A full-time employee was hired 2/27/2012 with training being an ongoing process..

## B. Cadastral Maps

Cadastral Map Books were printed in 1984. The information in these books have been updated each time there is a change of ownership and the maps marked if there is a change in parcel lines. These books are used a great deal by our office, realtors, surveyors and the general public. The pages of these books are showing extreme wear. Both the Cadastral Maps and the GIS have to be changed each time a split or combination of a parcel is made. We are in the process of running new GIS produced Cadastral Maps. We have decided to make an individual book for each precinct in the county and the maps will be one page per section. Following Reg-10-.004.4 - .004.03G is our goal and we are saving the County money by doing this project within the office. Due to staffing and time involved, this is an ongoing project.

FSA maps were purchased for \$1.00 each for every section of land in Jefferson County in approximately 1989. The FSA office will no longer supply maps unless a written statement (on a form approved by FSA) signed by the landowner or tenant is presented at the FSA office. New maps have been requested from the land owner each time there has been a land use change reported or discovered and also if a protest has been made on a rural property.

Aerial photos were flown in the fall of 2010 which we have done every two years to keep up to date on rural buildings. These are shared with the Zoning Manager, Emergency Manager and the Weed Superintendent. The Law Enforcement Agency of Jefferson County has also requested various copies of these pictures. In September of 2010 a six year contract was signed with Pictometry International Corporation. The contract will run thru fall 2015 and include 2 flights. Pictometry software is installed in the offices of the County Assessor, County Clerk, Register of Deeds, Planning & Zoning Management, Emergency Management, Weed Control, Highway Department and all county and city offices at the Law Enforcement Center.

It is important that we continue to have new aerial photos taken in at least a **two year** cycle so each new home site or building site has a picture in its property record card and available for other departments to use. Taking photos in late fall (Nov/Dec) does not allow enough time for a side-by-side comparison of old photos versus new photos. Time is also needed to do a site/physical inspection of any changes noted from the side-by-side comparison.

All of the Farmers Cooperative properties in the county were reviewed by a hired appraiser for 2011. Adjustments in value were made for new additions and to equalize with like properties.

### C. Property Record Cards

Property record cards are kept for taxable residential, commercial, industrial, improvements on leased land, TIF, and partially taxed parcels. Non-taxable properties such as tax exempt (permissive exempt or government exempt) and centrally assessed utility companies also have a property record card. Property record cards are color coded in the file cabinets and filed by legal description. Each taxable and permissive exempt property record card has, according to REG-10-004, the legal description of the parcel, book and page of the last deed of record during the past five years, current owner name and address, situs address of parcel, cadastral map book and page, current property classification code, tax district code and current and one or more prior years assessed value of land and improvements except property that receives an exemption pursuant to section 77-202 (1) (a) (b) (c) (d).

Each record card with buildings contains a picture, sketch of the house, and aerial photographs, if available. The front of the card has a parcel identification number, school district codes, land classification, history of valuation changes, and codes for reason of change of the assessment body or official ordering the change; the status, property type, zoning, location, city size and parcel size.

A cost approach, income summary and comparable approach are included in each real estate card if applicable. Also found within each card is land size (square footage or acres) and value.

All taxable property record cards are also entered into the computer CAMA system with most of the above information. The Assessment Administration computer system is Mips-County Solutions and includes most information in the property record card plus two years of valuations for each parcel. This system links with the CAMA system and also the GIS system that will eventually replace our old cadastral maps. Our property record card information has been made accessible through [www.nebraskataxesonline.us](http://www.nebraskataxesonline.us) since 2006. Updates to this information will be made yearly after taxes have been certified to the County Treasurer in the fall.

## **Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property**

### A. Discover, List & Inventory all property

Real estate transfer statements, plus a copy of the deed, is given to the Assessor's Office by the Register of Deeds. Appropriate real estate cards are pulled from the files to be changed to the new owners' name and address. Sales worksheets are filled out with the information needed for the PAD's sales file. Sales history is added to the real estate card, and the administrative computer program is changed for new owner, address and sales history. Alphabetical index file and cadastral maps are updated for ownership. Sales questionnaires are sent to new property owners of most transactions. CAMA system is updated and sales are added to sales file. Sales sheets for the sales books are run and added to current book of sales. Properties that require a split are done on the GIS system before any other changes are made. Copy of real estate card and transfer are made to be used when our hired appraiser goes physically to the property and inventories the information that is on the card to what was actually there when the sale took place. Any differences are noted and brought back to the Assessor's office to correct the CAMA sales file. Real estate cards are tabbed for the next year to correct information. This on sight verification may also determine whether the sale was an arms-length transaction or not. New pictures are taken of the improvements or lot for each residential and commercial property. Income data is collected, if applicable. Rural land sales are categorized on a computer program as to number of acres of each soil type, classification and percent that each soil type attributes to the sale price. The clerk that works with rural land sales, splits and GIS programs attends most rural land auctions and verifies other sales.

Building permits are received from the rural zoning manager, the Fairbury city engineer, and the village clerks of Plymouth and Diller. Letters are sent every August to remind all village clerks to forward permits to the office and what should be reported and to whom. The County Assessor and Clerk/Lister inspect other small towns, by driving each street and alley of the town to verify if any changes have been made. All appropriate real estate cards are pulled and tabbed. Information statements received in the Assessor's office are also tabbed.

### B. Data Collection

All cards tabbed for new structures, additions, changes or demolition are pulled from the files and physically inspected by the County Assessor, Clerk/Lister or a hired appraiser between September and February of the assessment year. The property record card is used for listing additions or changes to buildings so current data may be updated. New structures are measured and a form filled out for all the

components needed to produce a new cost approach on our CAMA program. Commercial properties are listed and measured by a hired appraiser who also collects income data. New or corrected sketches are made and digital pictures are taken. Data entry is a combined effort between the appraiser and employees of the Assessor's office. The County Assessor approves the final value before it is placed on the property record card or computer administrative program.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.

Sales studies are done in the office and compared to the sales analysis provided by the Property Assessment Division. Between these two sales studies and knowledge of the current sales not within the sales study, the Assessor determines where and what changes need to be made to valuation for the current assessment year. This is to stay in compliance with the laws of Nebraska and to have a fair and equitable assessment of real estate within Jefferson County.

D. Approaches to Value

The Assessor and County Board of Commissioners/Equalization hire appraisers to do mass appraisal within the County. The appraisers hired use the counties sales studies and comparisons to do a market approach that is in compliance with the IAAO standards. Cost approach is done on the CAMA system using Marshall-Swift pricing and the current depreciation study at the time of the appraisal. The hired appraiser also does income approach. He collects the income and expense data to be entered in the Counties CAMA system and runs an analysis from the market.

Land valuation studies are done within the County using a spreadsheet program developed in the Assessor's office to analyze land valuations and check established market areas within the County.

New, established values replace the old values. New statistics are ran using the same sales in our sales study to determine a cost approach to value. These statistics verify the fact that county valuations are in compliance with the laws of Nebraska.

Notices are mailed to all land owners in the County that have had either an increase or decrease in value from the previous assessment year. These notices are mailed on or before June 1 of each year. Any changes made after the 19<sup>th</sup> of March are made by the County Board of Equalization and also mailed. Approximately 3144 notice of valuation changes were mailed for the 2012 tax assessment year.

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2012:**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	98%	31.61	120.77
Commercial	NEI		
Agricultural	73%	16.96	101.32

For assessment year 2011 and 2012, the PAD recommended to TERC that a level of value for commercial property be rendered “not enough information” to establish statistics.

\*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.  
For more information regarding statistical measures see 2012 Reports & Opinions.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:**

Residential:

Finish the review of the three neighborhoods in Fairbury. No adjustment to neighborhood lines at this time. Adjust land values in some neighborhoods to reflect sales study. Digital pictures will be added to the CAMA system, as needed. Appraiser has physically reviewed all revalued properties to help ensure equality. Depreciation tables for Fairbury have been developed by the appraiser. Updated cost factor sheets for Fairbury will be run. All other small towns that show a need for adjustment, based on their statistics, will be reviewed and valuations changed according to sales study. All pick up work of reported or discovered changes to residential parcels will be reviewed. Begin review of Daykin, Endicott, Harbine, Jansen, Reynolds and Steele City.

Commercial:

Commercial property statistics will be reviewed and analyzed for 2013 by the Assessor and a hired appraiser to determine any changes that need to be made in either land or building values. All new construction and changes reported on improvement statements, city permits or rural permits will be physically inspected, pictures taken and new sketches made for all changes. Income and expense information will be obtained on appropriate parcels and sales verifications will be made. An appraiser will be hired to help do this work. Downtown commercial buildings will be physically reviewed by our hired appraiser to better equalize like property.

Agricultural Land:

An employee of the County Assessor’s office attends most agricultural auction sales. Verification of rural sales is done by phone, in person with buyer; seller, auctioneer or realtor

and occasionally an attorney may be contacted. A yearly review of all agricultural sales within the study period set forth by TERC and PAD is done to determine any changes in land value according to the market in Jefferson County. The study of agricultural land sales is done by breaking each sale down by total number of acres, soil type and land use in each parcel sold. Using this study the weighted average value per acre is determined. If there were no sales of a certain type of soil, the value is determined by using values within the same land classification. Our three neighborhoods are also reviewed to determine if changes in area lines need to be made to keep equality in the valuations for Jefferson County. An increase in values will be made again in agricultural land values for the 2013 tax roll in order to stay within the 69% to 75% level of assessment based on the three year sales study in Jefferson County. All land use changes reported are verified and files are changed to reflect current land use. New FSA maps are requested from property owners and the GIS system and County Solutions are changed accordingly.

Update GIS maps to most current flight taken by FSA aerial if new ones are available.

Pickup work is done annually with an on sight inspection of each reported improvement or demolition. Unreported improvements that come to the attention of the County Assessor are visually inspected, if possible, and also reported to the Zoning Manager. Requests by real estate owners to review property are also done at this time. Digital pictures are taken of new homes to be added to the CAMA system. All new or changed improvements are listed and entered into the Assessor's CAMA system and priced out using the Marshall Swift pricing.

No special value has been determined in Jefferson County at this time.

Contact the State Archives to determine what information we need to supply them in order to have assessor office documents archived to help free space for other things that need to be stored.

Staff will keep updating and correcting information on GIS layers and will probably add more layers and information as it is collected. It is also planned to link County GIS systems, so information obtained from other offices will be shared with information on GIS layers. The city of Fairbury is sharing information layers with us to use in our GIS system and they are using some of our layers. The County Emergency Manager, Weed Manager and Zoning Manager also use the Assessor's layers with their GIS program.

The GIS program is being used to make new up-to-date cadastral maps for Jefferson County.

Begin developing sales data files to put on the county website. This will be an ongoing project.

Look at the MIPS V2 residential and commercial costing program, sketch and administrative programs for possible implementation in 2014.

## **Assessment Actions Planned for 2014**

### Residential:

Begin to review aerial photos taken in fall 2013 by pictometry and make necessary changes on our real estate cards after they have been physically inspected. Run new cost sheets using Marshall Swift cost factors. Physically inspect and list all new or changed construction and update all records accordingly. Continue to review Daykin, Endicott, Harbine, Jansen, Reynolds, and Steele City. Develop depreciation tables and run updated cost factor sheets for these villages. Begin review of Diller and Plymouth. Hired appraiser will help with the review of villages and development of depreciation tables. Hire appraiser to review sales.

### Commercial:

Update Marshall Swift unit costs to most current figures.

Review depreciation.

Run new cost sheets.

Review income and expense on appropriate commercial properties and run new income summary.

Review all Commercial Properties in Fairbury, downtown Fairbury may not be reviewed at this time as they were done in 2013 due to being used for comparison on a protest and rural area.

Study sales statistics to determine if any changes need to be made.

Hire appraiser to help review sales and valuations and to do pickup work of all new or changed construction by physically inspecting, listing and updating all records.

Have digital pictures available on GIS system

### Agricultural Land:

Verify sales.

Review sales study to determine changes of valuations per soil type and land use.

Review neighborhood boundaries.

Make all known changes to land use.

Physical inspections of all pickup work and change all records accordingly.

Run new irrigation listing for Jefferson County from Internet

Continue updating the GIS system.

Print maps on GIS to replace old cadastral maps, land ownership and parcel lines.

Continue to work on developing sales data files for county website.

Consider converting to the new MIPS V2 program in fall of 2014.

## **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015**

### Residential:

Complete review of Daykin, Endicott, Harbine, Jansen, Reynolds, Steele City, run updated cost factor sheets using most current Marshall Swift costing available on our computer system.  
Develop depreciation tables for Daykin, Endicott, Harbine, Jansen, Reynolds, and Steele City.  
Continue to review Diller and Plymouth.  
Review depreciation table for Diller and Plymouth.  
Physically review parcels with changes.  
Hire an appraiser to help accomplish this project.  
Review statistics to determine what other towns or subclasses may need to be reviewed.

### Commercial:

Review sales  
Study statistics  
Physically review all Commercial properties in the small towns  
Hire an appraiser to help with this physical review and to do pickup work

### Agricultural Land:

Verify sales  
Study sales  
Make changes to reported or discovered changes  
Get new FSA maps if available  
Change valuations according to sales analysis  
Do pickup work by physically inspecting, listing and changing records.

Continue working on sales file data for the county website. Update the files already on the website, as needed.

Print maps on GIS to replace old cadastral maps, update ownership & parcel lines.

Convert to the MIPS V2 programs this year if not done in 2014.

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

1. Record maintenance, mapping updates, and ownership changes are a continuous project that usually takes about 1 to 2 weeks to get everything changed. Records that need to be split take longer than just a change of ownership. Changes to a record card also have to be changed on the CAMA program, the County Solutions program, and the GIS program if there is a split or combination, the cadastral books, the alphabetical index cards, and the Register of Deeds program (for all transfers filed in the deed book or miscellaneous book) before the card may be refiled. Each transfer statement has to have a sales worksheet filled out if there are doc stamps of a \$2.25 or more or total purchase price is \$100 or more. This is all done electronically using our County Solutions program which is linked with the Property Assessment Divisions computer system.

2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports with the Property Tax Administrator as required by statute/regulation:

Abstract of Assessment for Real Estate

Assessor Survey

Sales information to PAD, rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract

Certification of Value to Political Sub Divisions and a copy of each to the County Clerk

School District Taxable Value Report

Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report

Amended Homestead Exemption Summary Certificate (as needed)

Certificate of Taxes Levied Report and a copy for the County Treasurer

Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds

Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property

Annual Plan of Assessment Report

Three Year Plan of Assessment

3. Administer annual personal property filings. For 2011 there were 996 schedules on the tax roll. Prepare schedules for mailing to anyone who filed the previous year and anyone that the office feels may need to file. Prepare notices of change, unsigned schedule notices, reminder of schedules due (July 5-10), and penalty notices. Help people review schedule mailed them; fill out schedule for new schedules and contact personal property owner when needed to obtain more information regarding the filed personal property. Obtain the federal depreciation worksheet, whenever possible, to verify all equipment reported for personal property.

4. Permissive Exemption Application (Form 451) or Statement of Reaffirmation of Tax Exemption (Form 451A) are prepared and mailed to the previous years' applicant. Reminder notices are mailed on or about Dec 1 to any applicant that has not returned their form. Review and make recommendations to county board.

5. Taxable Government Owned Property – make an annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax on or before March 1<sup>st</sup> of each year and attend protest hearing if entity files a protest.
6. Homestead Exemption Applications and Income Statements – 416 applications were mailed out for 2012 to people who had filed in 2011. An additional 44 were mailed to people who requested they be sent forms. For 2011 we had 430 approved applications and 23 disapproved. Taxpayer assistance is given at counter, applications are processed as to ownership and verified that forms are filled out properly. The Assessor approves or disapproves the owner/occupancy requirements and signs the application. Original exemption form and income statement are forwarded to PAD. A copy of the exemption application and income statement are returned to applicant after the current valuation is entered on the form. Assessor's office retains a copy of the application only. Reminder notices are sent to applicants that haven't filed by June 1.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records for each subdivision taxed to each company and tax billing for tax list given the County Treasurer.
8. Tax Increment Financing (T.I.F.) – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax. Two parcels for each TIF property, one real estate card with the base value and one for the excess value of the property are maintained. Copies of the applications are forwarded to PAD and county treasurer.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists - prepare and certify tax list to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval and file with County Clerk and County Treasurer.
12. County Board of Equalization – attends county board of equalization meetings/hearings for valuation protests; permissive exemptions; assemble and provide information on behalf of the assessor's office.
13. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC and defend valuation as determined by the Assessor. If the taxpayer is appealing a valuation set by the County Board of Equalization, the board will defend the value.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings by phone, website or in person, to defend values as determined by the Assessor, if applicable, and/or implement orders of the TERC, which requires an amended abstract be filed with the PAD.

16. Pull real estate cards; make copies; answer inquiries via phone, in person, mail and email from realtors, appraisers, lending institutions, property owners, lawyers, other county offices, surveyors and the general public. As more people are searching for information online at [www.nebraskataxesonline.us](http://www.nebraskataxesonline.us), we field many questions on how to search for assessor data. We must be able to communicate the steps in finding the data via phone or email.

17. Attend Southeast District Assessor's meetings, NACO meetings & conferences, Nebraska Assessor's Workshops and other meetings/classes that provide hours of continuing education credit to keep my Assessor's certificate current as required by the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Regulations. (Reg-71-006 and Reg-71-007)

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature *Vicki L. Haskell* Date June 14, 2012  
Vicki L. Haskell

## 2013 Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	2
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$152,261
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$147,960 –all health care, retirement and social security are paid from county general.
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$10,000
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$50,000 controlled by commissioners for projects and other appraisal contracts
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	0; computer costs now come entirely from the county general budget
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$3,500; This fund is also for all dues (IAAO, S.E. Assessors Association, and NACO), newspaper subscriptions and other publications, Marshal Swift books and updates, and any newspaper ads from the assessor's office.
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	None
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$26,018.01

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	County Solutions
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	County Solutions
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	No
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	County Solutions

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	No
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Diller, Fairbury, and Plymouth
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	August of 2001

## D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b> Knoche Appraisal and Consulting LLC; is the county's non-staff appraiser
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b> GIS Workshop
2.	<b>Other services:</b> MIPS/County Solutions –administrative and appraisal software maintenance

## E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b> Yes; Knoche Appraisal and Consulting LLC
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b> No; There is only a verbal agreement for services as needed. The requirements vary from year to year, but usually center on commercial properties, sales review, and the 6 year inspection and review process.
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b> There is no specific certification required but the county prefers that the appraiser maintains a license. The county is more concerned with the appraiser's experience. They want him to be capable of doing mass appraisal and be familiar with Jefferson County property.
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b> No; There are no written contracts.
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b> The appraiser collaborates with the assessor on all final values. He develops the process, does most of the field work and prepares a preliminary estimate of value. The assessor reviews each parcel of the appraisers work and either approves it or works with him to modify it.



# 2013 Certification for Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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



