

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 Keya Paha County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	Median	97.00
Total Sales Price	\$350,250	Mean	96.82
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$350,250	Wgt. Mean	91.13
Total Assessed Value	\$319,180	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$22,141
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$31,841	Avg. Assessed Value	\$29,016

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	74.10 to 102.60
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	80.25 to 102.01
95% Mean C.I	84.45 to 109.19
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	3.07
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.65
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.47

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	8		106.73
2011	8		110
2010	9	100	89
2009	17	99	99

2013 Commission Summary for Keya Paha County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	6	Median	98.41
Total Sales Price	\$128,686	Mean	149.78
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$128,686	Wgt. Mean	93.27
Total Assessed Value	\$120,030	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$29,700
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$21,448	Avg. Assessed Value	\$20,005

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	61.53 to 428.20
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	40.69 to 145.85
95% Mean C.I	2.04 to 297.52
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	0.69
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.57
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.77

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	2		104.57
2011	2		126
2010	4	100	97
2009	6	100	95

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Keya Paha County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	70	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

***A level of value displayed as NEI (not enough information) represents a class of property with insufficient information to determine a level of value.*

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Keya Paha County

All residential properties within valuation grouping four which is the village of Springview were reviewed and inspected on the county's five year plan with new depreciation being implemented for assessment year 2013.

Pick up work was also completed and placed on the assessment rolls.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor, staff and appraiser when needed.	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Burton, Jamison, Mills & Norden: all improved and unimproved properties located within these villages. These villages contain very few livable houses.
	02	Meadville: all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Meadville. Approximately 20-25 lots with 10-15 having improvements. The village is located on the Niobrara River and contains a Bar/Grill/Store. Also located next to the river is a village park for camping that is privately owned.
	03	Rural: all improved and unimproved properties located outside the village limits in the rural areas.
	04	Springview: all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Springview. Population of approximately 290. K-12 Public School, convenience store, bank, post office, newspaper, bar/grill, grocery store, hair salon, green house nursery, public library, and welding shop/mechanic shops.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June 2005 Marshall-Swift is used for each valuation grouping.	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Depreciation studies are based on local market information.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Springview- 2013 Meadville, Burton, Jamison, Mills & Norden-2009	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	Springview- 2007 Meadville, Burton, Jamison, Mills & Norden-2009	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	The lot values were established by completing a sales study using a price per square foot analysis.	

52 Keya Paha

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 : 11
 Total Sales Price : 350,250
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 350,250
 Total Assessed Value : 319,180
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 31,841
 Avg. Assessed Value : 29,016

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 91
 MEAN : 97
 COD : 10.40
 PRD : 106.24

COV : 19.01
 STD : 18.41
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.09
 MAX Sales Ratio : 141.56
 MIN Sales Ratio : 68.13

95% Median C.I. : 74.10 to 102.60
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 80.25 to 102.01
 95% Mean C.I. : 84.45 to 109.19

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:26PM

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-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	99.75	99.75	99.75	00.00	100.00	99.75	99.75	N/A	20,000	19,950
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	102.60	102.60	102.60	00.00	100.00	102.60	102.60	N/A	5,000	5,130
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	107.83	107.83	86.75	31.28	124.30	74.10	141.56	N/A	24,000	20,820
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	2	97.56	97.56	97.76	00.57	99.80	97.00	98.12	N/A	53,750	52,545
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	95.27	86.22	81.35	09.50	105.99	68.13	95.27	N/A	35,750	29,083
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	96.60	96.60	96.19	00.89	100.43	95.74	97.45	N/A	31,250	30,060
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	4	101.18	104.50	91.40	17.37	114.33	74.10	141.56	N/A	18,250	16,680
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	7	95.74	92.43	91.06	05.06	101.50	68.13	98.12	68.13 to 98.12	39,607	36,066
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	102.60	106.09	88.25	21.92	120.22	74.10	141.56	N/A	17,667	15,590
<u>ALL</u>	11	97.00	96.82	91.13	10.40	106.24	68.13	141.56	74.10 to 102.60	31,841	29,016

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	1	141.56	141.56	141.56	00.00	100.00	141.56	141.56	N/A	9,000	12,740
03	1	68.13	68.13	68.13	00.00	100.00	68.13	68.13	N/A	55,000	37,470
04	9	97.00	95.03	93.96	04.30	101.14	74.10	102.60	95.27 to 99.75	31,806	29,886
<u>ALL</u>	11	97.00	96.82	91.13	10.40	106.24	68.13	141.56	74.10 to 102.60	31,841	29,016

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	9	95.74	96.73	90.09	12.68	107.37	68.13	141.56	74.10 to 102.60	33,194	29,906
06											
07	2	97.23	97.23	97.15	00.24	100.08	97.00	97.45	N/A	25,750	25,015
<u>ALL</u>	11	97.00	96.82	91.13	10.40	106.24	68.13	141.56	74.10 to 102.60	31,841	29,016

**52 Keya Paha
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 : 11
Total Sales Price : 350,250
Total Adj. Sales Price : 350,250
Total Assessed Value : 319,180
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 31,841
Avg. Assessed Value : 29,016

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 91
MEAN : 97
COD : 10.40
PRD : 106.24

COV : 19.01
STD : 18.41
Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.09
MAX Sales Ratio : 141.56
MIN Sales Ratio : 68.13

95% Median C.I. : 74.10 to 102.60
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 80.25 to 102.01
95% Mean C.I. : 84.45 to 109.19

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:26PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	2	122.08	122.08	127.64	15.96	95.64	102.60	141.56	N/A	7,000	8,935	
Less Than 30,000	5	99.75	107.33	103.57	10.32	103.63	95.27	141.56	N/A	13,950	14,448	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	11	97.00	96.82	91.13	10.40	106.24	68.13	141.56	74.10 to 102.60	31,841	29,016	
Greater Than 14,999	9	95.74	91.20	89.61	06.91	101.77	68.13	99.75	74.10 to 98.12	37,361	33,479	
Greater Than 29,999	6	95.51	88.06	88.04	09.31	100.02	68.13	98.12	68.13 to 98.12	46,750	41,157	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	2	122.08	122.08	127.64	15.96	95.64	102.60	141.56	N/A	7,000	8,935	
15,000 TO 29,999	3	97.45	97.49	97.52	01.53	99.97	95.27	99.75	N/A	18,583	18,123	
30,000 TO 59,999	5	95.27	86.05	84.52	10.60	101.81	68.13	97.00	N/A	41,600	35,160	
60,000 TO 99,999	1	98.12	98.12	98.12	00.00	100.00	98.12	98.12	N/A	72,500	71,140	
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	11	97.00	96.82	91.13	10.40	106.24	68.13	141.56	74.10 to 102.60	31,841	29,016	

**2013 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

A. Residential Real Property

Keya Paha County is located in north central Nebraska with South Dakota bordering on the north. Hwy 12 travels east and west with Hwy's 137 and 183 going north and south. The county seat is Springview with a population of 242 based on the 2010 census. Springview is where the majority of the residential sales are. The K-12 public school system is also located here. The Niobrara River runs on the southern border of the county.

Keya Paha County has completed the statutory six year review requirement and is keeping up to date as the county is set up on a five year review cycle. All residential parcels within Springview were reviewed and inspected for assessment year 2013.

The Keya Paha County Assessor reviews all residential sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. The assessor also serves as the county clerk and register of deeds. Many times when deeds are filed questions are asked at this time regarding the sale of properties eliminating the need to mail a questionnaire. If there is still a question with the sale a phone call will be made to gather more information. This past year the Property Assessment Division conducted a review of the county sales qualifications by going through the non-qualified sales roster. This also included reviewing any sales verification documentation the assessor had on file. After completing this review, the Division is confident that all available arms' length transactions were available for use in the measurement of real property within the county.

In 2011 the Division implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties within the state to review assessment practices. This review was performed in 2012 in Keya Paha County. Based on the findings from that review it was determined the assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently to the residential class of property. All property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

The statistical profile indicates eleven qualified sales that occurred during the two-year period of the sales study. Nine of these sales occurred in the village of Springview which contains approximately 53% of the counties residential value. There is a fairly close relationship between all three measures of central tendency. The coefficient of dispersion is within the range while the price related differential is slightly above, but not unreasonable.

Therefore, based on an analysis of all available information the level of value for residential property in Keya Paha County is 97%, and with the knowledge of the County's assessment practices, it is further believed that residential property is assessed in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha County

The only actions taken in the commercial class of property were that of pick up work.

Starting the fall of 2013 all commercial properties will be reviewed and inspected on the county's five year plan with new depreciation and values being implemented for assessment year 2014.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor, staff and appraiser when needed.	
2.	List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Burton, Jamison, Mills, Norden, Meadville, Rural and Springview: all improved and unimproved properties located within these villages. The old school house in Burton is now a taxidermy business. Norden has the county fairgrounds along with a Dance Hall. Meadville has a bar/grill/general store. Rural area consists of a Coop, canoe outfitters and hair salons. Springview has a population of approximately 290. K-12 Public School, convenience store, bank, post office, newspaper, bar/grill, grocery store, hair salon, green house nursery, public library, and welding shop/mechanic shops.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.	
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.	
	Unique properties are valued by the contract appraisal company when needed.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June 2005 Marshall-Swift	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Depreciation studies are based on local market information.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	One is used for all commercial.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Springview, Meadville, Burton, Jamison, Mills & Norden-2009	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	Springview, Meadville, Burton, Jamison, Mills & Norden-2009	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	The lot values were established by completing a sales study using a price per square foot analysis.	

**52 Keya Paha
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 : 6
 Total Sales Price : 128,686
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 128,686
 Total Assessed Value : 120,030
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 21,448
 Avg. Assessed Value : 20,005

MEDIAN : 98
 WGT. MEAN : 93
 MEAN : 150
 COD : 84.51
 PRD : 160.59

COV : 93.98
 STD : 140.76
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 83.17
 MAX Sales Ratio : 428.20
 MIN Sales Ratio : 61.53

95% Median C.I. : 61.53 to 428.20
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 40.69 to 145.85
 95% Mean C.I. : 2.04 to 297.52

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:27PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	104.57	104.57	71.09	41.16	147.10	61.53	147.60	N/A	22,500	15,995
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	275.63	275.63	184.08	55.36	149.73	123.05	428.20	N/A	12,500	23,010
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	1	64.52	64.52	64.52	00.00	100.00	64.52	64.52	N/A	13,686	8,830
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	73.76	73.76	73.76	00.00	100.00	73.76	73.76	N/A	45,000	33,190
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	2	104.57	104.57	71.09	41.16	147.10	61.53	147.60	N/A	22,500	15,995
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	2	275.63	275.63	184.08	55.36	149.73	123.05	428.20	N/A	12,500	23,010
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	2	69.14	69.14	71.60	06.68	96.56	64.52	73.76	N/A	29,343	21,010
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	104.57	104.57	71.09	41.16	147.10	61.53	147.60	N/A	22,500	15,995
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	123.05	205.26	141.78	98.52	144.77	64.52	428.20	N/A	12,895	18,283
<u>ALL</u>	6	98.41	149.78	93.27	84.51	160.59	61.53	428.20	61.53 to 428.20	21,448	20,005

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
04	6	98.41	149.78	93.27	84.51	160.59	61.53	428.20	61.53 to 428.20	21,448	20,005
<u>ALL</u>	6	98.41	149.78	93.27	84.51	160.59	61.53	428.20	61.53 to 428.20	21,448	20,005

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
02											
03	6	98.41	149.78	93.27	84.51	160.59	61.53	428.20	61.53 to 428.20	21,448	20,005
04											
<u>ALL</u>	6	98.41	149.78	93.27	84.51	160.59	61.53	428.20	61.53 to 428.20	21,448	20,005

**52 Keya Paha
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 : 6
 Total Sales Price : 128,686
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 128,686
 Total Assessed Value : 120,030
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 21,448
 Avg. Assessed Value : 20,005

MEDIAN : 98
 WGT. MEAN : 93
 MEAN : 150
 COD : 84.51
 PRD : 160.59

COV : 93.98
 STD : 140.76
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 83.17
 MAX Sales Ratio : 428.20
 MIN Sales Ratio : 61.53

95% Median C.I. : 61.53 to 428.20
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 40.69 to 145.85
 95% Mean C.I. : 2.04 to 297.52

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:27PM

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												
Less Than 15,000	3	147.60	213.44	158.83	82.13	134.38	64.52	428.20	N/A	7,895	12,540	
Less Than 30,000	4	135.33	190.84	142.45	71.72	133.97	64.52	428.20	N/A	10,922	15,558	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	6	98.41	149.78	93.27	84.51	160.59	61.53	428.20	61.53 to 428.20	21,448	20,005	
Greater Than 14,999	3	73.76	86.11	78.49	27.81	109.71	61.53	123.05	N/A	35,000	27,470	
Greater Than 29,999	2	67.65	67.65	68.00	09.05	99.49	61.53	73.76	N/A	42,500	28,900	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	3	147.60	213.44	158.83	82.13	134.38	64.52	428.20	N/A	7,895	12,540	
15,000 TO 29,999	1	123.05	123.05	123.05	00.00	100.00	123.05	123.05	N/A	20,000	24,610	
30,000 TO 59,999	2	67.65	67.65	68.00	09.05	99.49	61.53	73.76	N/A	42,500	28,900	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	6	98.41	149.78	93.27	84.51	160.59	61.53	428.20	61.53 to 428.20	21,448	20,005	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
326	1	64.52	64.52	64.52	00.00	100.00	64.52	64.52	N/A	13,686	8,830	
344	1	428.20	428.20	428.20	00.00	100.00	428.20	428.20	N/A	5,000	21,410	
349	2	92.29	92.29	82.03	33.33	112.51	61.53	123.05	N/A	30,000	24,610	
470	1	147.60	147.60	147.60	00.00	100.00	147.60	147.60	N/A	5,000	7,380	
554	1	73.76	73.76	73.76	00.00	100.00	73.76	73.76	N/A	45,000	33,190	
<u>ALL</u>	6	98.41	149.78	93.27	84.51	160.59	61.53	428.20	61.53 to 428.20	21,448	20,005	

**2013 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Keya Paha County is located in north central Nebraska with South Dakota bordering on the north. Hwy 12 travels east and west with Hwy's 137 and 183 going north and south. The county seat is Springview with a population of 242 based on the 2010 census. The county is experiencing a decreasing population. The Niobrara River runs on the southern border of the county. The K-12 public school system is located in Springview.

Keya Paha County is on track with the statutory six year review requirement. All commercial parcels countywide are scheduled for review starting the summer or fall of 2013. In 2011 the Division implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties within the state to review assessment practices. This review was performed in 2012 in Keya Paha County. Based on the findings from that review it was determined the assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently to the commercial class of property. All property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

The Keya Paha County Assessor reviews all commercial sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. The assessor also serves as the county clerk and register of deeds. Many times when deeds are filed questions are asked at this time regarding the sale of properties eliminating the need to mail a questionnaire. If there is still a question with the sale a phone call will be made to gather more information. This past year the Property Assessment Division conducted a review of the county sales qualifications by going through the non-qualified sales roster. This also included reviewing any sales verification documentation the assessor had on file. After completing this review, the Division is confident that all available arms' length transactions were available for use in the measurement of real property within the county.

With only six qualified commercial sales. The calculated median from the sample will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Keya Paha County, nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality. Such a small sample would not be considered adequate for statistical reliability and would not be representative of the population.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha County

The assessor performed a market analysis on all qualified agricultural sales. Based on the analysis it was determined that changes in land valuation would be made to land capability groups in all classes.

All sales are plotted on a map within the assessor's office. This is beneficial to both the assessor as well as the public.

All pick up work and sales verification was completed for assessment year 2013.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor, staff and appraiser when needed.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Soils, land use and geographic characteristics.
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Each year agricultural sales and characteristics are studied and plotted to see if the market is showing any trend that may say a market area or areas are needed.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Residential is land directly associated with a residence, and is defined in Regulation 10.001.05A. Recreational land is defined according to Regulation 10.001.05E. Sales are reviewed and inspected before a determination is made as to usage.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?	
	Yes	
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales are monitored and studied on a yearly basis to see if there are any non-agricultural characteristics.	
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.	
	Yes, at this time there is nothing to indicate implementing special value. The parcels approved for special value have the same value as all other agricultural land.	
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.	
	N/A	

52 Keya Paha
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 : 54
Total Sales Price : 26,069,615
Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,034,865
Total Assessed Value : 19,912,963
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 482,127
Avg. Assessed Value : 368,759

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 76
MEAN : 79
COD : 30.93
PRD : 103.86

COV : 35.83
STD : 28.46
Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.79
MAX Sales Ratio : 142.99
MIN Sales Ratio : 42.39

95% Median C.I. : 65.65 to 75.92
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 69.94 to 83.03
95% Mean C.I. : 71.85 to 87.03

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:28PM

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	56.11	56.11	56.11	00.00	100.00	56.11	56.11	N/A	177,750	99,732
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	83.58	90.18	93.95	14.37	95.99	74.92	118.66	N/A	492,744	462,929
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	92.24	91.56	95.54	31.11	95.83	49.68	125.66	49.68 to 125.66	232,461	222,100
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	6	120.16	109.47	105.71	19.49	103.56	65.50	138.58	65.50 to 138.58	568,833	601,293
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	62.61	78.39	70.91	43.48	110.55	45.35	142.99	N/A	394,671	279,853
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	74.97	74.37	61.91	26.14	120.13	48.88	98.67	N/A	491,278	304,143
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	7	69.50	77.63	75.03	30.75	103.47	46.66	114.41	46.66 to 114.41	250,829	188,206
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	48.79	48.79	48.78	00.10	100.02	48.74	48.84	N/A	159,425	77,760
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	7	69.76	82.94	80.29	22.66	103.30	61.14	130.97	61.14 to 130.97	343,543	275,841
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	5	72.43	73.53	72.09	15.74	102.00	56.19	101.30	N/A	697,381	502,736
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	70.13	66.50	60.02	09.08	110.80	55.13	74.24	N/A	1,108,982	665,653
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	5	42.77	53.36	65.33	25.18	81.68	42.39	73.30	N/A	848,256	554,136
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	17	85.72	95.47	99.07	31.04	96.37	49.68	138.58	68.14 to 123.58	409,205	405,401
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	17	63.30	73.65	67.79	34.58	108.64	45.35	142.99	48.84 to 98.67	330,497	224,056
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	20	69.71	70.73	68.44	20.01	103.35	42.39	130.97	61.14 to 74.24	672,997	460,611
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	20	83.58	94.02	94.66	33.90	99.32	45.35	142.99	68.23 to 121.42	417,871	395,574
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	20	69.58	75.95	71.69	27.35	105.94	46.66	130.97	60.66 to 89.27	322,228	231,021
<u>ALL</u>	54	70.45	79.44	76.49	30.93	103.86	42.39	142.99	65.65 to 75.92	482,127	368,759

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	54	70.45	79.44	76.49	30.93	103.86	42.39	142.99	65.65 to 75.92	482,127	368,759
<u>ALL</u>	54	70.45	79.44	76.49	30.93	103.86	42.39	142.99	65.65 to 75.92	482,127	368,759

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
<u>Dry</u>											
County	1	56.11	56.11	56.11	00.00	100.00	56.11	56.11	N/A	177,750	99,732
1	1	56.11	56.11	56.11	00.00	100.00	56.11	56.11	N/A	177,750	99,732
<u>Grass</u>											
County	30	69.71	78.15	77.03	32.41	101.45	42.39	142.99	61.14 to 81.43	211,162	162,662
1	30	69.71	78.15	77.03	32.41	101.45	42.39	142.99	61.14 to 81.43	211,162	162,662
<u>ALL</u>	54	70.45	79.44	76.49	30.93	103.86	42.39	142.99	65.65 to 75.92	482,127	368,759

52 Keya Paha
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 : 54
 Total Sales Price : 26,069,615
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,034,865
 Total Assessed Value : 19,912,963
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 482,127
 Avg. Assessed Value : 368,759

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 76
 MEAN : 79
 COD : 30.93
 PRD : 103.86

COV : 35.83
 STD : 28.46
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.79
 MAX Sales Ratio : 142.99
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.39

95% Median C.I. : 65.65 to 75.92
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 69.94 to 83.03
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.85 to 87.03

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:28PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	3	75.92	80.15	68.22	18.98	117.49	60.66	103.88	N/A	932,333	636,061
1	3	75.92	80.15	68.22	18.98	117.49	60.66	103.88	N/A	932,333	636,061
_____Dry_____											
County	4	56.55	68.09	59.75	30.70	113.96	45.35	113.93	N/A	196,771	117,573
1	4	56.55	68.09	59.75	30.70	113.96	45.35	113.93	N/A	196,771	117,573
_____Grass_____											
County	41	72.43	80.83	79.92	32.16	101.14	42.39	142.99	68.14 to 85.72	438,708	350,634
1	41	72.43	80.83	79.92	32.16	101.14	42.39	142.99	68.14 to 85.72	438,708	350,634
_____ALL_____											
	54	70.45	79.44	76.49	30.93	103.86	42.39	142.99	65.65 to 75.92	482,127	368,759

Keya Paha County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Keya Paha	1	1,800	1,800	1,700	1,700	1,600	1,600	1,500	1,500	1,594
Rock	3	N/A	2,000	1,900	1,900	1,850	1,846	1,850	1,634	1,846
Brown	1	N/A	2,089	2,161	2,213	1,770	1,764	1,557	1,661	1,916
Boyd	1	2,070	2,070	1,935	1,935	1,835	1,835	1,500	1,430	1,781
Cherry	1	N/A	1,550	1,550	1,550	1,373	1,368	1,389	1,400	1,421

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Keya Paha	1	660	660	625	625	605	605	570	570	616
Rock	3	N/A	650	650	650	625	625	550	550	609
Brown	1	N/A	690	690	690	630	515	455	455	595
Boyd	1	1,145	1,145	1,015	1,015	915	915	825	825	1,020
Cherry	1	N/A	550	525	475	450	425	425	425	470

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Keya Paha	1	560	560	520	520	500	500	480	490	493
Rock	3	N/A	523	473	486	457	440	399	386	413
Brown	1	N/A	495	495	494	462	375	280	280	303
Boyd	1	870	870	710	710	640	640	640	640	659
Cherry	1	N/A	425	400	380	355	330	240	240	257

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

2013 Methodology Report for Special Valuation

Keya Paha County

There is nothing at this time to indicate implementing special value. The parcels approved for special value are no different than the rest of the agricultural land.

Suzy Wentworth

Keya Paha County Assessor

**2013 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha County**

A. Agricultural Land

Keya Paha County is located in north central Nebraska. The county is comprised of approximately 5% irrigated, 8% dry crop and 86% grass/pasture land. Two Natural Resource Districts split this county. The Middle Niobrara governs the western side while the Lower Niobrara governs the eastern side. The county currently has no defined market areas, however sales are reviewed and plotted annually to verify accuracy of the one market area determination. The comparable neighboring counties are Cherry, northern Brown, northern Rock and the southwest corner of Boyd. All these areas share similar market characteristics that are comparable in soils and topography.

In analyzing the agricultural sales within Keya Paha County the land use of the sales generally matched the county as a whole. However, the sample of sales is more heavily weighted with newer sales. The way the sales are distributed over the study period may cause this area to be compared to a different time standard than others as the oldest and middle years of the study period are under-represented in comparison to the newest year. Therefore the sample was expanded using sales from the comparable markets as described above. The resulting statistical sample now made of 54 sales is proportionately distributed and representative of the majority land uses found in the population and suggests the values are within the acceptable range and adequate for measurement purposes. The calculated median is 70%. The statistical profile also further breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use. The 80% MLU provides the more representative sampling. The 80% MLU shows the grass subclass falls within the acceptable range. Both the irrigated and dry subclasses with so few sales are unreliable for statistical inference.

In comparison with adjoining counties the assessor recognized the movement of irrigated and dry values within the county as well as in the comparable neighboring markets and adjusted these values accordingly. Grass land values also closely relate between the comparable neighboring counties. When comparing the three classes across county lines the indication is relatively similar movement in the market and the values appear fairly equalized across county lines. From the assessor's analysis of the agricultural market irrigated land values were increased 37%, dry and grass land raised 10% for assessment year 2013.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 70% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha County**

high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

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

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 2,458	Value : 299,208,670	Growth 2,232,628	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	106	133,200	0	0	38	212,170	144	345,370	
02. Res Improve Land	167	409,070	0	0	30	220,150	197	629,220	
03. Res Improvements	171	4,368,550	0	0	100	3,845,370	271	8,213,920	
04. Res Total	277	4,910,820	0	0	138	4,277,690	415	9,188,510	861,555
% of Res Total	66.75	53.45	0.00	0.00	33.25	46.55	16.88	3.07	38.59
05. Com UnImp Land	4	12,980	0	0	1	1,070	5	14,050	
06. Com Improve Land	44	134,270	4	21,250	5	16,210	53	171,730	
07. Com Improvements	45	1,074,220	4	408,330	16	410,660	65	1,893,210	
08. Com Total	49	1,221,470	4	429,580	17	427,940	70	2,078,990	555,260
% of Com Total	70.00	58.75	5.71	20.66	24.29	20.58	2.85	0.69	24.87
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	277	4,910,820	0	0	138	4,277,690	415	9,188,510	861,555
% of Res & Rec Total	66.75	53.45	0.00	0.00	33.25	46.55	16.88	3.07	38.59
Com & Ind Total	49	1,221,470	4	429,580	17	427,940	70	2,078,990	555,260
% of Com & Ind Total	70.00	58.75	5.71	20.66	24.29	20.58	2.85	0.69	24.87
17. Taxable Total	326	6,132,290	4	429,580	155	4,705,630	485	11,267,500	1,416,815
% of Taxable Total	67.22	54.42	0.82	3.81	31.96	41.76	19.73	3.77	63.46

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	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				0	0	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	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	47	4	103	154

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	2	108,330	1,567	202,233,170	1,569	202,341,500
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	1,050	3	240,320	384	67,289,230	388	67,530,600
29. Ag Improvements	1	5,700	3	221,140	400	17,842,230	404	18,069,070
30. Ag Total							1,973	287,941,170

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	1	1.00	1,050	3	3.20	3,290	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	5,700	3	0.00	221,140	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.99	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	5	5.00	5,250	5	5.00	5,250	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	205	225.00	236,250	205	225.00	236,250	
33. HomeSite Improvements	295	198.00	12,203,670	295	198.00	12,203,670	815,813
34. HomeSite Total				300	230.00	12,445,170	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	19	70.40	64,800	19	70.40	64,800	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	169	338.31	293,960	173	342.51	298,300	
37. FarmSite Improvements	361	0.00	5,638,560	365	0.00	5,865,400	0
38. FarmSite Total				384	412.91	6,228,500	
39. Road & Ditches	0	3,381.88	0	0	3,382.87	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				684	4,025.78	18,673,670	815,813

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	7	1,325.01	623,010	7	1,325.01	623,010

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	169	43,666.14	22,575,460	169	43,666.14	22,575,460
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	182.18	0.72%	327,930	0.82%	1,800.03
46. 1A	694.74	2.76%	1,250,560	3.12%	1,800.04
47. 2A1	2,189.13	8.70%	3,721,530	9.28%	1,700.00
48. 2A	4,169.32	16.57%	7,086,420	17.67%	1,699.66
49. 3A1	1,578.05	6.27%	2,524,900	6.29%	1,600.01
50. 3A	6,833.33	27.16%	10,933,300	27.26%	1,600.00
51. 4A1	5,832.32	23.18%	8,749,010	21.81%	1,500.09
52. 4A	3,680.02	14.63%	5,520,610	13.76%	1,500.16
53. Total	25,159.09	100.00%	40,114,260	100.00%	1,594.42
Dry					
54. 1D1	537.28	1.43%	354,610	1.53%	660.01
55. 1D	5,910.12	15.74%	3,900,690	16.87%	660.00
56. 2D1	4,325.47	11.52%	2,703,510	11.69%	625.02
57. 2D	10,608.53	28.25%	6,630,660	28.67%	625.03
58. 3D1	2,740.14	7.30%	1,657,790	7.17%	605.00
59. 3D	6,377.08	16.98%	3,857,760	16.68%	604.94
60. 4D1	3,789.60	10.09%	2,160,080	9.34%	570.00
61. 4D	3,264.40	8.69%	1,860,920	8.05%	570.06
62. Total	37,552.62	100.00%	23,126,020	100.00%	615.83
Grass					
63. 1G1	897.72	0.22%	502,700	0.24%	559.97
64. 1G	4,829.91	1.16%	2,704,760	1.31%	560.00
65. 2G1	5,555.92	1.33%	2,889,060	1.40%	520.00
66. 2G	23,613.11	5.66%	12,278,870	5.97%	520.00
67. 3G1	16,176.24	3.88%	8,089,810	3.93%	500.10
68. 3G	75,759.70	18.17%	37,886,820	18.42%	500.09
69. 4G1	82,711.59	19.84%	39,701,550	19.30%	480.00
70. 4G	207,413.76	49.74%	101,632,900	49.41%	490.00
71. Total	416,957.95	100.00%	205,686,470	100.00%	493.30
Irrigated Total	25,159.09	5.19%	40,114,260	14.90%	1,594.42
Dry Total	37,552.62	7.75%	23,126,020	8.59%	615.83
Grass Total	416,957.95	86.06%	205,686,470	76.39%	493.30
72. Waste	4,383.17	0.90%	212,410	0.08%	48.46
73. Other	440.18	0.09%	128,340	0.05%	291.56
74. Exempt	384.07	0.08%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	484,493.01	100.00%	269,267,500	100.00%	555.77

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	205.12	314,110	24,953.97	39,800,150	25,159.09	40,114,260
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	6.68	3,890	37,545.94	23,122,130	37,552.62	23,126,020
78. Grass	0.00	0	56.89	27,360	416,901.06	205,659,110	416,957.95	205,686,470
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	4,383.17	212,410	4,383.17	212,410
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	440.18	128,340	440.18	128,340
81. Exempt	14.48	0	0.00	0	369.59	0	384.07	0
82. Total	0.00	0	268.69	345,360	484,224.32	268,922,140	484,493.01	269,267,500

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	25,159.09	5.19%	40,114,260	14.90%	1,594.42
Dry Land	37,552.62	7.75%	23,126,020	8.59%	615.83
Grass	416,957.95	86.06%	205,686,470	76.39%	493.30
Waste	4,383.17	0.90%	212,410	0.08%	48.46
Other	440.18	0.09%	128,340	0.05%	291.56
Exempt	384.07	0.08%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	484,493.01	100.00%	269,267,500	100.00%	555.77

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

52 Keya Paha

	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	9,067,880	9,188,510	120,630	1.33%	861,555	-8.17%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	12,495,670	12,445,170	-50,500	-0.40%	815,813	-6.93%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	21,563,550	21,633,680	70,130	0.33%	1,677,368	-7.45%
05. Commercial	2,084,380	2,078,990	-5,390	-0.26%	555,260	-26.90%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	6,118,520	6,228,500	109,980	1.80%	0	1.80%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	8,202,900	8,307,490	104,590	1.28%	555,260	-5.49%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	29,766,450	29,941,170	174,720	0.59%	2,232,628	-6.91%
11. Irrigated	28,412,660	40,114,260	11,701,600	41.18%		
12. Dryland	20,715,140	23,126,020	2,410,880	11.64%		
13. Grassland	183,847,530	205,686,470	21,838,940	11.88%		
14. Wasteland	212,280	212,410	130	0.06%		
15. Other Agland	-437,950	128,340	566,290			
16. Total Agricultural Land	232,749,660	269,267,500	36,517,840	15.69%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	262,516,110	299,208,670	36,692,560	13.98%	2,232,628	13.13%

**Keya Paha County Plan of Assessment
Assessment Years 2013, 2014 & 2015
October 2012**

INTRODUCTION

The Plan of Assessment is a required documentation of the assessor to the Property Tax Administrator and the County Board of Equalization to help them understand the plans and workings of the Keya Paha County Assessor's Office. This plan is to be submitted by July 31st to the CBOE and October 31st to PA&T.

LEVEL OF VALUE

The level of value for Keya Paha for the 2012 year is as follows:

Residential Class Not Applicable - lack of enough sales
Commercial Class Not Applicable - lack of enough sales
Agricultural Class is 71% COD of 26.05 and a PRD of 104.17

PARCEL COUNT

The 2011 County Abstract record shows 2,419 parcels.

STAFF AND EQUIPMENT

The Keya Paha County Assessor is also the County Clerk and has one full time deputy to perform all the duties of the ex-officio office. The Assessor and Deputy attend schooling and workshops offered by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. Working around board meetings and workload is a juggling act to work in the required continuing education hours, especially during an election year. A weeklong class is a burden for the office, having one person gone makes it difficult to clerk commissioners meetings, answering phone and etc. The Deputy has passed her Assessors test.

The Assessor budget submitted for the 2012-2013 year is \$59,950 which would include a percentage of the office personnel salaries on a shared basis with all of the positions. There is \$46,000 budgeted for appraisal. The GIS site is up and running with all the information current

The property record cards are very well kept and always current. They contain all pertinent information required plus some extra information. They include: name, address, legal, acres, and current land use and value. The record also includes historic information dating back at least 15 years.

The records are kept in pull out file cabinets that are very well marked with townships and ranges so that anyone can easily access a file. The folders have a metal clasp so that all records are secure and kept in the same order for each record so that similar information can easily be compared to other parcels.

The Marshall & Swift pricing for all improvements is done with the use of Terra Scan. Keya Paha County will have all assessment information available on GIS and a website in the near future; the process began in 2010 and is complete.

PROCEEDURES MANUAL

The Property Tax Division's "Assessor Reference Manual" is the main book of reference for filing deadlines and reposts. A policy and procedure manual was developed in 2002. It describes the steps taken in the office when changes are made and values are set. It outlines real and personal property procedures in the office.

REPORT GENERATION

The reports required by the State are all filed in a timely manner from the Terra Scan program. The Assessor completes and files all of the reports. The reports are generated as well as supporting documents to compare that all information is correct. The reports are kept in chronological order and easily accessible. The tax corrections are in a bound book and numbered. The Treasurer is also on Terra Scan so all tax rolls are easily delivered to her and both have the same information available at all times.

REAL PROPERTY

Discovery is done by building permits from the Zoning Administrator, Village Clerk and personal knowledge of county officials and employees.

When new improvements are discovered through sales process, building permits, and information received there is a list compiled for the appraiser. The appraiser does the data collection and measurements, along with the yearly review of property according to the 5 year plan of reappraisal.

The Real Estate Transfer Statements are received with the Deeds at the time of recording. This office is also the Register of Deeds and Clerk so there is no waiting to receive them. The property record cards are changed and updated along with the recording process. The Assessor does the 521's monthly and the 521's are sent to the Department of Revenue along with the revenue.

Each 521 is reviewed along with the Property Record Card. After a deed is recorded the property record card is left with the 521 until the sale is reviewed. The sale properties are not physically reviewed at the time of the sale, as this is a small county the Assessor and Deputy are familiar with most properties in the county. The Assessor and Deputy visit about the sale as the review is conducted. All pertinent sales information is put into a binder containing all the sales for that year. We also have a sales map on display in the office that has a different color for each year and a flag stating the book and page of recording as well as the price per acre. The map is placed where the public can easily see it and it is a great point of interest to most visitors in the office.

After the sales are added to the sales file and the preliminary statistics are released by PA&T the valuation studies are done on all classes of property. Use is determined and ag studies are done. The market approach is applied to all sales properties as well as unsold properties. A review of improvements is done on the 5 year cycle depending on the study that is to be done that year.

Valuation change notices are mailed timely after the abstract is submitted and the report and opinion is rendered and no shoe cause hearing changes any value. The appeal process for

valuation protest is as prescribed by law. Taxpayer fills the appropriate forms for protest and submits them to the County Clerk and a schedule of hearing dates is set up for the County Board of Equalization hearings. Hearings are held on protests and a final review and determination is made by the CBOE. The Clerk notifies the taxpayer of the CBOE decision as prescribed by law within the time allowed.

Taxpayers may then appeal to the TERC if not satisfied by the CBOE's decision. The Assessor attends any hearings and show cause hearings to defend values and preparation of any defense of that value.

PERSONAL PROPERTY

A postcard is sent to all who have personal property on record to remind them that they must bring in their depreciation sheet and file by May 1. Non residents as well as new taxpayers are also sent a postcard at the same time to let them know about Nebraska personal property law. The personal property files are included in the Terra Scan program and easily and quickly accessed by the staff. A personal property roster is printed as soon after the 1st of January as possible. This roster includes the schedule number, name and all property that was listed the prior year. The roster also includes the type, year, adjusted basis, recovery, depreciation percent and tax value. The roster is compared to the depreciation sheets as the taxpayer is in the office so that they do not have to make follow-up trips to the office. Every effort is made to get everything done for them to file in a timely manner with only one trip to the courthouse. Follow up reminders are sent after the filing deadline in June and August to get all the schedules filed and all the personal property in the county listed. The schedules are filed in alphabetical order as received and kept in a secure place as personal property lists are not available to the public. The roster printed for the office use is shredded after the taxpayer files.

PLAN BREAKDOWN BY YEAR

2013-The Residential re-valuation that was done in 2012 will be implemented, along with our fire area reval, our County had 70,000 acres burn so we had our appraiser go over the area to make sure that we had building that were gone removed. Commercial revaluation will be done and all pick-up work will be completed

2014-All pick-up work will be completed

2015—Rural improvements will be revalued. All pick-up work will be completed.

CONCLUSION

We continue to struggle to get all things accomplished in our ex-officio office. The coming year is an election year and will be exceptionally challenging to keep up with the work of the Clerk, Assessor, Register of Deeds, Clerk of the District Court and the Election Commissioner.

The three year plan, that of reviewing the property classes on a 5 year cycle, would also include continued growth in knowledge and implementation of the changes that need to be made

to keep the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment equal to statutory and administrative guidelines.

Suzy Wentworth, Assessor

Date

2013 Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	None
3.	Other full-time employees:
	None
4.	Other part-time employees:
	None
5.	Number of shared employees:
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$59,950
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same as above
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$46,000
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	Na
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$5,000
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,650
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	None
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$33,270 stays in for the next year.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and Deputy
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes – keyapaha.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop with input from the assessor
8.	Personal Property software:
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	None
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1995

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Stanard Appraisal as needed.
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop
3.	Other services:
	None

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Yes, as needed.
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Meet the qualifications of the NE Real Property Appraiser Board.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	There have been no contracts as of late.
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	When they're used they provide a value subject to assessor's opinion.

2013 Certification for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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

