

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 Kimball County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	86	Median	97.33
Total Sales Price	\$5,215,149	Mean	109.45
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,215,149	Wgt. Mean	96.26
Total Assessed Value	\$5,020,260	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$55,118
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$60,641	Avg. Assessed Value	\$58,375

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.40 to 102.37
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.97 to 100.55
95% Mean C.I	99.28 to 119.62
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	21.40
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.69
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.97

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	71	95	95.11
2011	69	96	96
2010	75	94	94
2009	91	97	97

2013 Commission Summary for Kimball County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	19	Median	93.74
Total Sales Price	\$726,100	Mean	159.58
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$722,100	Wgt. Mean	120.24
Total Assessed Value	\$868,270	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$119,914
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$38,005	Avg. Assessed Value	\$45,698

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	85.42 to 239.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	83.33 to 157.16
95% Mean C.I	103.86 to 215.30
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	13.56
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.56
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.36

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	17	95	95.00
2011	27	100	100
2010	26	100	100
2009	36	98	98

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Kimball County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	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 Kimball County

Assessment actions taken to address residential property included the completion of the physical review of all residential property in the City of Kimball and the establishment of uniform rural residential property classification.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Kimball County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Kimball County Assessor's staff.	
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>
	10	Kimball—all residential parcels within the City of Kimball and all residential parcels considered suburban to Kimball, since there is no separate suburban market.
	20	Bushnell—all residential parcels within the Village of Bushnell.
	30	Dix—all residential parcels within the Village of Dix.
	80	Rural—all residential parcels not within the aforementioned valuation groupings.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Replacement cost new, less depreciation (the cost approach).	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Both by CAMA and, in the past, by market-derived depreciation tables.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	When the appraisal of the valuation groupings were completed.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2007	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	Cost per square foot, derived by the market approach.	

**53 Kimball
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 : 86
 Total Sales Price : 5,215,149
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,215,149
 Total Assessed Value : 5,020,260
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 60,641
 Avg. Assessed Value : 58,375

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 96
 MEAN : 109
 COD : 24.96
 PRD : 113.70

COV : 43.97
 STD : 48.13
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.29
 MAX Sales Ratio : 373.60
 MIN Sales Ratio : 55.89

95% Median C.I. : 91.40 to 102.37
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.97 to 100.55
 95% Mean C.I. : 99.28 to 119.62

Printed:3/26/2013 2:47:05PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Qrtrs											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	7	96.98	99.43	93.37	14.08	106.49	78.26	124.33	78.26 to 124.33	58,132	54,281
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	8	107.46	109.58	96.52	23.81	113.53	58.62	186.80	58.62 to 186.80	27,750	26,784
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	17	96.03	97.94	93.70	18.67	104.53	55.89	146.53	77.34 to 114.47	68,421	64,112
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	12	90.47	91.46	91.35	05.33	100.12	81.17	104.75	86.84 to 94.06	85,135	77,771
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	14	98.16	105.28	96.94	18.46	108.60	76.42	156.71	84.12 to 124.66	52,618	51,010
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	6	100.84	97.51	92.94	10.49	104.92	79.22	109.39	79.22 to 109.39	88,133	81,909
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	12	107.22	153.11	102.95	53.44	148.72	89.74	373.60	90.98 to 180.65	50,083	51,559
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	10	100.65	118.10	108.14	33.55	109.21	69.03	267.69	80.06 to 150.33	53,500	57,855
Study Yrs											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	44	92.88	98.53	93.02	17.04	105.92	55.89	186.80	88.68 to 100.88	63,948	59,486
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	42	100.65	120.89	100.06	32.21	120.82	69.03	373.60	95.00 to 109.39	57,177	57,211
Calendar Yrs											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	51	94.08	100.26	93.90	17.98	106.77	55.89	186.80	90.55 to 99.35	61,636	57,874
ALL	86	97.33	109.45	96.26	24.96	113.70	55.89	373.60	91.40 to 102.37	60,641	58,375

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
10	63	96.98	100.88	95.08	16.13	106.10	58.62	156.71	90.93 to 104.24	56,020	53,263
20	5	99.93	99.87	99.34	15.24	100.53	76.42	123.31	N/A	43,480	43,194
30	5	186.80	208.01	126.79	59.84	164.06	55.89	373.60	N/A	11,200	14,200
80	13	96.03	116.73	97.54	30.06	119.67	73.00	267.69	89.29 to 131.86	108,654	105,979
ALL	86	97.33	109.45	96.26	24.96	113.70	55.89	373.60	91.40 to 102.37	60,641	58,375

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	86	97.33	109.45	96.26	24.96	113.70	55.89	373.60	91.40 to 102.37	60,641	58,375
06											
07											
ALL	86	97.33	109.45	96.26	24.96	113.70	55.89	373.60	91.40 to 102.37	60,641	58,375

**53 Kimball
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 : 86
 Total Sales Price : 5,215,149
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,215,149
 Total Assessed Value : 5,020,260
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 60,641
 Avg. Assessed Value : 58,375

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 96
 MEAN : 109
 COD : 24.96
 PRD : 113.70

COV : 43.97
 STD : 48.13
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.29
 MAX Sales Ratio : 373.60
 MIN Sales Ratio : 55.89

95% Median C.I. : 91.40 to 102.37
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.97 to 100.55
 95% Mean C.I. : 99.28 to 119.62

Printed:3/26/2013 2:47:05PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	3	332.50	254.00	228.68	31.85	111.07	55.89	373.60	N/A	3,667	8,385	
Less Than 15,000	10	153.52	179.17	155.07	43.57	115.54	55.89	373.60	115.33 to 332.50	7,600	11,786	
Less Than 30,000	20	119.64	144.80	122.25	36.40	118.45	55.89	373.60	110.43 to 150.33	14,376	17,575	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	83	96.98	104.22	95.98	19.09	108.59	58.62	267.69	91.40 to 100.88	62,701	60,182	
Greater Than 14,999	76	95.05	100.27	95.39	16.31	105.12	58.62	267.69	90.93 to 99.93	67,620	64,505	
Greater Than 29,999	66	92.88	98.74	94.75	16.19	104.21	58.62	267.69	89.74 to 98.26	74,661	70,739	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	3	332.50	254.00	228.68	31.85	111.07	55.89	373.60	N/A	3,667	8,385	
5,000 TO 14,999	7	150.33	147.10	142.62	16.06	103.14	115.33	186.80	115.33 to 186.80	9,286	13,243	
15,000 TO 29,999	10	111.23	110.43	110.46	10.08	99.97	85.20	136.76	91.40 to 124.33	21,153	23,364	
30,000 TO 59,999	24	100.65	108.76	105.42	23.94	103.17	58.62	267.69	84.45 to 109.39	42,044	44,321	
60,000 TO 99,999	34	90.96	94.09	94.14	09.75	99.95	76.42	131.86	87.98 to 96.98	78,416	73,818	
100,000 TO 149,999	6	90.64	89.71	89.68	04.23	100.03	79.22	95.00	79.22 to 95.00	133,904	120,082	
150,000 TO 249,999	2	84.52	84.52	83.47	13.63	101.26	73.00	96.03	N/A	224,500	187,380	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	86	97.33	109.45	96.26	24.96	113.70	55.89	373.60	91.40 to 102.37	60,641	58,375	

2013 Correlation Section for Kimball County

A. Residential Real Property

With a population base of 3,821, Kimball County has a rather limited residential market. The county seat city of Kimball probably has the most residential activity within the County, and its residential valuation comprises 62.70% of all residential value; the village of Bushnell constitutes only 3.47% and the village of Dix only 5.94% of all residential value. The remaining 27.89% is made up of all rural residences. Occupations range from education, retail trade, agriculture and light manufacturing. Residential home ownership is 70.83%; rentals constitute 21.53% and vacant homes are 7.64% within the County.

The six-year physical review of residential property was completed this assessment year, and another assessment action included the establishment of a uniform rural residential property classification. In 2012 the Department conducted a review of each county's sales qualification process. This included a review of the sales deemed non-qualified as well as each county's sales verification documentation. Review of the qualification process utilized by the County indicated that no bias existed in the qualification of sales and the Assessor was utilizing all information available from the sales file to assist in developing valuations for all three property classes.

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Kimball County was selected for review in 2012. It has been confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. Therefore, it is believed there is uniform and proportionate treatment within the residential property class.

The residential sample consists of eighty-six qualified sales, sixty-three of these occurred in valuation group 10 (Kimball) and the remainder were found in the other three valuation groupings (20, 30 and 80). Two of the three overall measures of central tendency are within range (the median and the weighted mean). It is interesting to note that the valuation grouping with 73% (rounded) of all sales--10 Kimball has the same rounded median as the overall measure. Also, the COD tends to support the median for this valuation group at (16.13%).

Therefore, based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for all residential property, 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 Kimball County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

2013 Correlation Section for Kimball County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

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

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

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

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

2013 Correlation Section for Kimball County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 Kimball 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 Kimball County

The review of commercial properties with the exception of Clean Harbors and grain elevators was completed for 2013. Grain bins on separate land were properly classified as commercial (due to use).

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Kimball County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The Kimball County Assessor's staff.	
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>
	10	Kimball—all commercial properties within the City of Kimball and all commercial properties considered suburban to Kimball, since there is no separate suburban commercial market.
	20	Bushnell—all commercial parcels within the Village of Bushnell.
	30	Dix—all commercial parcels within the Village of Dix.
	80	Rural—all commercial parcels not within the aforementioned valuation groupings.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Replacement cost new, less depreciation (the cost approach).	
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.	
	An appraisal firm/individual with the appropriate expertise would be contracted to assist with these properties.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Tables provided by the CAMA vendor.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes, and in Kimball, by location.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2007	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2008	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Market approach using vacant commercial lot sales. They are then priced per square foot for each valuation grouping.	

53 Kimball
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 : 19
Total Sales Price : 726,100
Total Adj. Sales Price : 722,100
Total Assessed Value : 868,270
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 38,005
Avg. Assessed Value : 45,698

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 120
MEAN : 160
COD : 80.47
PRD : 132.72

COV : 72.44
STD : 115.60
Avg. Abs. Dev : 75.43
MAX Sales Ratio : 415.70
MIN Sales Ratio : 72.09

95% Median C.I. : 85.42 to 239.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 83.33 to 157.16
95% Mean C.I. : 103.86 to 215.30

Printed:3/26/2013 2:47:06PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	92.30	92.30	90.74	03.76	101.72	88.83	95.77	N/A	81,500	73,955	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	85.42	85.42	85.42	00.00	100.00	85.42	85.42	N/A	25,000	21,355	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	110.80	110.80	110.80	00.00	100.00	110.80	110.80	N/A	5,000	5,540	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	160.00	160.00	160.00	00.00	100.00	160.00	160.00	N/A	15,000	24,000	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10												
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	85.66	85.66	85.66	00.00	100.00	85.66	85.66	N/A	14,500	12,420	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	90.22	97.17	88.75	21.10	109.49	72.09	129.20	N/A	70,000	62,127	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	4	82.48	154.22	90.76	90.08	169.92	79.92	372.00	N/A	17,000	15,430	
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	89.63	89.63	91.95	04.59	97.48	85.52	93.74	N/A	57,500	52,873	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	346.88	346.88	346.88	00.00	100.00	346.88	346.88	N/A	1,600	5,550	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	316.12	316.12	316.12	00.00	100.00	316.12	316.12	N/A	26,000	82,190	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	327.47	327.47	272.73	26.95	120.07	239.23	415.70	N/A	39,500	107,730	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	5	95.77	108.16	95.58	20.16	113.16	85.42	160.00	N/A	41,600	39,761	
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	8	85.35	124.26	89.07	52.75	139.51	72.09	372.00	72.09 to 372.00	36,563	32,565	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	6	277.68	249.53	184.54	39.63	135.22	85.52	415.70	85.52 to 415.70	36,933	68,158	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	110.80	118.74	113.10	22.44	104.99	85.42	160.00	N/A	15,000	16,965	
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	10	85.59	117.33	89.88	43.03	130.54	72.09	372.00	79.92 to 129.20	40,750	36,627	
<u>ALL</u>	19	93.74	159.58	120.24	80.47	132.72	72.09	415.70	85.42 to 239.23	38,005	45,698	

VALUATION GROUPING											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
10	16	91.98	139.22	119.72	60.72	116.29	72.09	415.70	85.03 to 160.00	44,000	52,679	
20	1	85.66	85.66	85.66	00.00	100.00	85.66	85.66	N/A	14,500	12,420	
30	2	359.44	359.44	360.83	03.49	99.61	346.88	372.00	N/A	1,800	6,495	
<u>ALL</u>	19	93.74	159.58	120.24	80.47	132.72	72.09	415.70	85.42 to 239.23	38,005	45,698	

PROPERTY TYPE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
02	1	93.74	93.74	93.74	00.00	100.00	93.74	93.74	N/A	90,000	84,365	
03	18	93.00	163.24	124.02	85.61	131.62	72.09	415.70	85.42 to 239.23	35,117	43,550	
04												
<u>ALL</u>	19	93.74	159.58	120.24	80.47	132.72	72.09	415.70	85.42 to 239.23	38,005	45,698	

53 Kimball
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 : 19
Total Sales Price : 726,100
Total Adj. Sales Price : 722,100
Total Assessed Value : 868,270
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 38,005
Avg. Assessed Value : 45,698

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 120
MEAN : 160
COD : 80.47
PRD : 132.72

COV : 72.44
STD : 115.60
Avg. Abs. Dev : 75.43
MAX Sales Ratio : 415.70
MIN Sales Ratio : 72.09

95% Median C.I. : 85.42 to 239.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 83.33 to 157.16
95% Mean C.I. : 103.86 to 215.30

Printed:3/26/2013 2:47:06PM

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Low \$ Ranges											
Less Than 5,000	2	359.44	359.44	360.83	03.49	99.61	346.88	372.00	N/A	1,800	6,495
Less Than 15,000	4	228.84	228.84	133.98	57.07	170.80	85.66	372.00	N/A	5,775	7,738
Less Than 30,000	12	120.00	188.93	160.37	84.22	117.81	79.92	415.70	85.42 to 346.88	15,425	24,737
Ranges Excl. Low \$											
Greater Than 4,999	17	90.22	136.07	119.04	58.56	114.31	72.09	415.70	85.03 to 160.00	42,265	50,311
Greater Than 14,999	15	90.22	141.11	119.79	64.51	117.80	72.09	415.70	85.03 to 160.00	46,600	55,821
Greater Than 29,999	7	90.22	109.27	106.41	28.94	102.69	72.09	239.23	72.09 to 239.23	76,714	81,633
Incremental Ranges											
0 TO 4,999	2	359.44	359.44	360.83	03.49	99.61	346.88	372.00	N/A	1,800	6,495
5,000 TO 14,999	2	98.23	98.23	92.10	12.80	106.66	85.66	110.80	N/A	9,750	8,980
15,000 TO 29,999	8	107.36	168.98	164.13	80.37	102.95	79.92	415.70	79.92 to 415.70	20,250	33,236
30,000 TO 59,999	2	90.40	90.40	91.47	05.94	98.83	85.03	95.77	N/A	37,500	34,303
60,000 TO 99,999	3	93.74	135.02	131.18	59.43	102.93	72.09	239.23	N/A	71,333	93,575
100,000 TO 149,999	2	89.53	89.53	89.56	00.78	99.97	88.83	90.22	N/A	124,000	111,050
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
ALL	19	93.74	159.58	120.24	80.47	132.72	72.09	415.70	85.42 to 239.23	38,005	45,698

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	1	110.80	110.80	110.80	00.00	100.00	110.80	110.80	N/A	5,000	5,540
326	3	85.42	180.82	95.27	111.99	189.80	85.03	372.00	N/A	19,000	18,102
349	1	129.20	129.20	129.20	00.00	100.00	129.20	129.20	N/A	20,000	25,840
352	2	82.92	82.92	85.08	13.06	97.46	72.09	93.74	N/A	75,000	63,810
353	4	127.89	173.22	99.13	62.73	174.74	90.22	346.88	N/A	47,900	47,483
384	2	79.92	79.92	79.92	00.00	100.00	79.92	79.92	N/A	18,000	14,385
391	1	88.83	88.83	88.83	00.00	100.00	88.83	88.83	N/A	118,000	104,815
406	1	415.70	415.70	415.70	00.00	100.00	415.70	415.70	N/A	15,000	62,355
471	1	85.52	85.52	85.52	00.00	100.00	85.52	85.52	N/A	25,000	21,380
494	1	316.12	316.12	316.12	00.00	100.00	316.12	316.12	N/A	26,000	82,190
531	1	239.23	239.23	239.23	00.00	100.00	239.23	239.23	N/A	64,000	153,105
555	1	85.66	85.66	85.66	00.00	100.00	85.66	85.66	N/A	14,500	12,420
ALL	19	93.74	159.58	120.24	80.47	132.72	72.09	415.70	85.42 to 239.23	38,005	45,698

2013 Correlation Section for Kimball County

A. Commercial Real Property

As of 2010, Kimball County had a population of 3,821. The city of Kimball is the county seat and the other two villages are Bushnell and Dix. Commercial activity includes some light manufacturing, retail and service businesses. However, with the re-routing of Highway 71 that connects with Interstate 80 East, unless an individual wishes to travel west on the Interstate, the new section of Hwy 71 bypasses the city of Kimball completely. It is highly improbable that at this point there is a viable, competitive commercial market within the County.

Regarding the six-year inspection cycle, Kimball County completed the physical review of all commercial property (with the exception of the specialty commercial--Clean Harbors and commercial grain elevators) in assessment year 2013. The Department in 2012 conducted a review of each county's sales qualification process. This included a review of the sales deemed non-qualified as well as each county's sales verification documentation. Review of the qualification process utilized by the County indicated that no bias existed in the qualification of sales and the Assessor was utilizing all information available from the sales file to assist in developing valuations for all three property classes.

The Department utilizes a yearly analysis of one-third of the counties within the state to systematically review assessment practices. Kimball County was selected for review in 2012. It has been confirmed that the assessment practices are reliable and applied consistently. Therefore, it is believed there is uniform and proportionate treatment within the commercial property class.

The statistical profile indicates nineteen qualified sales that occurred during the three-year period of the sales study. Sixteen of these sales occurred in the city of Kimball (valuation grouping 10). Although the median is at 94%, the mean is at 120% and the weighted mean is a rather large 160%. The COD does not provided support for the median, since it is an off-the-charts 80% and the price-related differential is approximately 133% (rounded). These radical statistics are in part the product of erratic sales activity--three sales are low dollar (less than \$6,000); one was a foreclosed property "dumped" on the market; one was a building that was flat valued, with an uncertain future for commercial development and one parcel was obviously purchased at a bargain price based on the size of the building. All of this erratic sales activity, coupled with the commercial traffic dilemma of the re-routing of Hwy 71 indicates that Kimball County does not have a viable commercial market.

Therefore, it is believed that the level of value cannot be determined for the Kimball County commercial property class.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

2013 Correlation Section for Kimball County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

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

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

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

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

2013 Correlation Section for Kimball County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 Kimball 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 Kimball County

The Assessor sent out a questionnaire to rural ag owners to confirm land use. The County also uses GIS imagery and field inspections to determine land use. The Assessor also obtained a list from the local FSA office of CRP participants that have received a payment. A letter was sent to all landowners on the list requesting an FSA map. The County then created a spreadsheet to track length of contracts.

Assessment actions taken to address agricultural land by market area were:

Area One: all irrigated and dry LCG's were raised to closer match 75% of the current market; two grass capability groups also received an increase (1G and 4G) as well as the four lowest CRP groups.

Area Two: all irrigated, dry and grass classifications were increased, and all but one CRP capability group (CRP 2) were also raised.

Area Three: with the exception of irrigated LCG 1A, all irrigated subclasses were increased to closer match the required range of the market; all dry classifications received an increase and except for the grass LCG 1G, all grass was also increased. The four lowest CRP subclasses were increased for assessment year 2013.

Area Four: with the exception of irrigated LCG 1A, all irrigated, dry, grass and CRP capability groups received an increase in value to closer match current market value.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Kimball County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The Kimball County Assessor's staff.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	This agricultural area borders Wyoming to the west and Colorado to the south. It consists of approximately two-thirds grass and about one-third dry land.
	2	The eastern border of this agricultural market area borders Cheyenne County and is surrounded by the three other market areas. Its land composition is almost evenly divided between dry and grass land.
	3	The western portion of this market area borders Wyoming, and the northern portion borders Banner County. It contains slightly more dry land than grass land.
	4	Located in the northeast area of the County, this agricultural market area shares borders with both Banner and Cheyenne counties. The land composition is more than 50% dry, and has almost twice the percentage of irrigated land than the other three market areas.
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Market activity within each area is reviewed to determine any changes or possible trends.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	The primary use of the land is used to distinguish rural residential land from agricultural land. Rural residential is valued by market comparison with other like properties. Recreational use has not been discovered within the County at this time.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?	
	Rural residential home sites are valued 11.5% higher than farm home sites. The 11.5% increase to rural residential home sites in 2012 was based on sales information and ratio studies for this subclass of property.	
6.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	There are no non-agricultural influences discovered at this time.	
7.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.	
	No.	
8.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.	
	There is currently no land enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program in Kimball County.	

53 Kimball
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 : 83
Total Sales Price : 13,458,757
Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,373,197
Total Assessed Value : 8,781,192
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 161,123
Avg. Assessed Value : 105,797

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 66
MEAN : 72
COD : 27.15
PRD : 109.37

COV : 33.06
STD : 23.74
Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.88
MAX Sales Ratio : 172.18
MIN Sales Ratio : 28.18

95% Median C.I. : 61.25 to 77.39
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.16 to 71.17
95% Mean C.I. : 66.70 to 76.92

Printed:3/26/2013 2:47:07PM

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	10	88.01	88.78	88.83	06.26	99.94	77.30	103.81	78.53 to 95.55	126,850	112,686
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	98.94	99.05	83.55	32.23	118.55	54.51	172.18	N/A	116,400	97,257
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	8	88.44	86.93	81.52	07.34	106.64	73.50	100.30	73.50 to 100.30	117,813	96,036
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	4	84.88	81.98	81.40	16.48	100.71	58.59	99.57	N/A	66,836	54,408
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	70.83	71.33	73.09	13.75	97.59	50.61	93.60	52.59 to 85.23	215,168	157,273
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	10	64.07	69.54	65.97	27.94	105.41	42.78	125.87	46.18 to 89.78	168,765	111,340
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	47.39	45.46	44.95	15.64	101.13	33.04	54.00	N/A	318,750	143,291
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	59.54	59.54	52.23	35.62	114.00	38.33	80.75	N/A	95,200	49,725
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	6	63.45	65.20	69.21	17.81	94.21	47.11	90.96	47.11 to 90.96	151,798	105,063
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	10	52.98	64.82	54.95	39.11	117.96	36.64	114.42	38.01 to 99.72	181,532	99,760
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	8	56.45	53.62	47.12	16.16	113.79	28.18	69.12	28.18 to 69.12	161,356	76,034
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	5	53.78	60.97	55.40	22.98	110.05	45.55	101.36	N/A	155,200	85,973
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	27	88.57	89.13	84.93	13.92	104.95	54.51	172.18	78.53 to 94.28	113,346	96,261
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	27	66.88	65.96	63.70	23.52	103.55	33.04	125.87	52.22 to 76.89	204,441	130,223
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	29	55.08	61.15	55.63	26.36	109.92	28.18	114.42	50.51 to 67.17	165,274	91,935
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	28	79.57	82.26	77.00	20.12	106.83	50.61	172.18	70.83 to 90.68	148,525	114,365
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	22	57.75	63.07	59.46	27.50	106.07	33.04	125.87	47.11 to 71.37	184,720	109,836
<u>ALL</u>	83	69.55	71.81	65.66	27.15	109.37	28.18	172.18	61.25 to 77.39	161,123	105,797

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	32	71.05	71.49	69.04	25.71	103.55	33.04	114.42	54.95 to 88.30	146,170	100,909
2	20	70.19	74.49	71.97	24.79	103.50	44.35	172.18	58.59 to 85.23	118,974	85,620
3	13	69.12	70.59	64.36	24.10	109.68	43.06	103.81	53.78 to 93.60	216,835	139,544
4	18	71.92	70.31	57.92	32.27	121.39	28.18	125.87	45.55 to 88.63	194,302	112,535
<u>ALL</u>	83	69.55	71.81	65.66	27.15	109.37	28.18	172.18	61.25 to 77.39	161,123	105,797

53 Kimball
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 : 83
Total Sales Price : 13,458,757
Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,373,197
Total Assessed Value : 8,781,192
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 161,123
Avg. Assessed Value : 105,797

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 66
MEAN : 72
COD : 27.15
PRD : 109.37

COV : 33.06
STD : 23.74
Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.88
MAX Sales Ratio : 172.18
MIN Sales Ratio : 28.18

95% Median C.I. : 61.25 to 77.39
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.16 to 71.17
95% Mean C.I. : 66.70 to 76.92

Printed:3/26/2013 2:47:07PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
___Dry___											
County	19	65.35	69.88	67.94	28.13	102.86	38.33	125.87	52.22 to 87.09	130,577	88,720
1	6	62.54	65.83	59.58	21.59	110.49	38.33	94.11	38.33 to 94.11	83,627	49,827
2	4	51.42	56.12	53.95	16.80	104.02	44.35	77.30	N/A	124,338	67,082
3	3	69.12	69.49	78.05	15.34	89.03	53.78	85.58	N/A	109,950	85,820
4	6	87.86	83.28	74.73	24.37	111.44	42.78	125.87	42.78 to 125.87	192,000	143,489
___Grass___											
County	6	61.26	61.48	62.12	11.90	98.97	49.08	75.50	49.08 to 75.50	143,283	89,005
1	3	54.88	59.82	58.30	16.05	102.61	49.08	75.50	N/A	133,333	77,728
2	3	63.92	63.13	65.44	04.32	96.47	58.59	66.88	N/A	153,233	100,282
___ALL___	83	69.55	71.81	65.66	27.15	109.37	28.18	172.18	61.25 to 77.39	161,123	105,797

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	73.50	66.10	60.97	17.55	108.41	43.06	81.75	N/A	501,000	305,435
3	3	73.50	66.10	60.97	17.55	108.41	43.06	81.75	N/A	501,000	305,435
___Dry___											
County	33	77.30	72.98	66.85	24.73	109.17	28.18	125.87	58.95 to 88.63	121,750	81,396
1	13	67.46	71.37	66.40	27.33	107.48	33.04	101.36	54.95 to 94.11	92,135	61,182
2	5	52.22	59.98	56.40	22.14	106.35	44.35	77.30	N/A	112,270	63,322
3	5	85.58	79.27	83.18	15.19	95.30	53.78	94.28	N/A	97,670	81,245
4	10	85.14	78.42	65.97	23.83	118.87	28.18	125.87	42.78 to 99.57	177,028	116,786
___Grass___											
County	10	61.26	66.76	69.94	20.83	95.45	49.08	114.42	52.07 to 76.89	231,220	161,705
1	6	65.19	70.47	72.53	28.32	97.16	49.08	114.42	49.08 to 114.42	282,083	204,608
2	3	63.92	63.13	65.44	04.32	96.47	58.59	66.88	N/A	153,233	100,282
3	1	55.35	55.35	55.35	00.00	100.00	55.35	55.35	N/A	160,000	88,563
___ALL___	83	69.55	71.81	65.66	27.15	109.37	28.18	172.18	61.25 to 77.39	161,123	105,797

Kimball County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Kimball	1	N/A	1,040	1,035	1,030	1,025	1,000	900	800	988
Kimball	2	N/A	1,012	1,007	1,015	1,025	989	899	798	968
Kimball	3	N/A	1,210	1,210	1,000	1,000	950	950	900	1,054
Kimball	4	N/A	1,210	1,210	1,000	1,000	950	950	900	1,015
Banner	1	N/A	1,200	1,200	1,100	1,100	1,050	1,050	832	1,069
Cheyenne	1	N/A	1,208	1,228	1,217	1,225	1,217	1,195	1,208	1,220
Cheyenne	3	N/A	1,700	1,685	1,670	1,665	1,660	1,655	1,650	1,691

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Kimball	1	N/A	340	320	295	250	230	220	200	262
Kimball	2	N/A	340	320	295	265	230	220	200	255
Kimball	3	N/A	410	410	410	300	280	210	200	327
Kimball	4	N/A	400	400	400	300	250	210	200	325
Banner	1	N/A	420	420	420	400	360	345	300	398
Cheyenne	1	N/A	350	325	295	275	200	200	190	292
Cheyenne	3	N/A	425	425	425	415	400	340	335	417

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Kimball	1	N/A	347	294	279	247	204	203	196	221
Kimball	2	N/A	314	278	291	245	204	208	201	216
Kimball	3	N/A	364	340	301	238	200	200	200	235
Kimball	4	N/A	409	364	327	276	211	200	200	222
Banner	1	N/A	304	303	295	261	253	233	221	245
Cheyenne	1	N/A	247	237	221	222	204	205	158	191
Cheyenne	3	N/A	348	380	351	342	333	314	210	303

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

2013 Correlation Section for Kimball County

A. Agricultural Land

Kimball County contains a total land area of 952 square miles. The agricultural land consists of approximately of 51% grass, 42% dry land and about 7% irrigated. The County currently has four clearly defined agricultural market areas based on topography, soil type and availability of water. Counties contiguous to Kimball are Banner to the north and Cheyenne to the east. The southern part of the County borders the State of Colorado, and the western portion is contiguous to the State of Wyoming. Neighboring Banner County has no defined agricultural market areas.

Kimball County lies within the South Platte NRD (SPNRD), part of the Platte River Basin, and this NRD, like others within the Platte River Basin, “use regulation such as moratoriums on new well drilling in fully appropriated areas or require well metering and limit ground water pumping as part of their long-term ground water management plans for protecting the basin’s stream flows” (quotation taken from the Platte River Basin web site). Further, “allocations of ground water used for irrigation will change in some areas beginning in the 2013 growing season...Continuing low ground water levels in portions of the SPNRD, particularly the tablelands of Kimball and Cheyenne Counties, remained among the top concerns throughout the process.”(taken from the South Platte NRD web site).

Preliminary analysis of the original sample indicated that only Area Two was time proportionate for the three years of the sales study period. Area One had a total of thirty-six sales, with seventeen occurring during the first year, seven during the second and twelve occurring during the third year of the sales study. Market Area Three contained eight sales, with only one in the third year. Agricultural Market Area Four had a total of twelve sales in the sample with seven of those occurring during the second year of the study. Representativeness by Majority Land Use did not exist countywide or by the first three market areas. Comparable sales from surrounding counties would need to be utilized in order to balance the time periods and also MLU. The difficulty in doing this for Area One is due to the fact that it is bordered on the west by Wyoming and on the south by Colorado.

Only two comparable sales could be found to supplement Area One's second year of the sales study. Therefore, to obtain time balance six sales were randomly removed from the first year of the study period. These were bk 71, pg 726; bk 71, pg 742; bk 72, pg 104; bk 72, pg 111; bk 72, pg 130 and bk 72, pg 390. The Area One sample now has thirty-two sales, with eleven in the first year, nine in the second and twelve remaining in the third. By Department thresholds, time proportionality was achieved. This process also balanced Majority Land Use.

For Area Two, there was a no time proportionality issue, but a MLU imbalance (i.e., grass was over-represented in the sample, dry land was under-represented and irrigated had no representation in the sample). Four comparable sales were utilized that provided irrigated representation, but Majority Land Use is still imbalanced—therefore 95% Majority Land Use statistics are unrealistic.

As mentioned above, Area 3 lacks time proportionality and MLU imbalance: irrigated land was over-represented in the sample (38% vs 7% base) and grass was under-represented (20%

2013 Correlation Section for Kimball County

sample vs 44% base). Five comparable sales were found to ensure time proportionality and attempt to bring the Majority Land Use closer to the Department's thresholds, but irrigated land is still over-represented by 1% as well as grass is under-represented by 1% of the 10% thresholds.

Area 4 had both time non-proportionality and MLU imbalance. The utilization of six comparable sales provided both time proportionality and Majority Land Use balance.

The utilization of comparable sales did not correct the entire MLU imbalance, but overall the County is now time and Majority Land Use balanced.

Assessment actions taken by the Kimball County Assessor to address agricultural land included the following (by market area): In Market Area One all irrigated land was given a significant increase (on average 119%); dry land was raised on average 12%; grass LCG's 1G and 4G were raised (7% and 3%, respectively), and the four lowest CRP classifications were raised 7-8%. Area Two irrigated was also increased on average by 112%; dry was raised 13% on average and grass LCG's were increased on average by 10% to closer match 75% of the market; and CRP classifications were increased by 3-10%. Areas Three and Four were given increases to irrigation (on average 19% and 12%, respectively); dry land was raised to closer match the market in both areas (an average of 29% and 19%, respectively); likewise, grass land was increased in Areas Three and Four (an average of 19% and 10%, respectively); The lowest four CRP classifications were raised 8-21% in Area Three and all CRP in Area Four was increased from 4-11%.

These actions resulted in a sampling of eighty-three sales that was used to determine the level of value of agricultural land in Kimball County. The overall calculated median is 70% with a COD of 27%. By market area, all four areas have medians and means within acceptable range. The coefficients of dispersion for Areas One through Four are respectively 26%, 25%, 24% and 32% (all figures rounded). Further review under the heading "95% MLU By Market Area" reveals no Area with statistically significant sample numbers for land classes.

A review of the comparable counties shows that the 2013 values applied by the Kimball County Assessor appear to be in line for irrigated land for Areas Three and Four that border Banner County, but lower than Cheyenne's (it must be taken into account that Cheyenne's Area Three has almost more than 2.75 times the irrigated acres than Kimball Area Four). Kimball dry land on average is lower than Banner overall, but more in line with Cheyenne County's Area One. Kimball Areas Three and Four upper grass classifications are higher than neighboring Banner's, but are lower for the remaining four LCG's. Kimball Areas One, Two and Four grass values are also on average higher than Cheyenne's Area One, but less overall than Cheyenne's Area Three. Reviewing the values of all land classes for Kimball County's market areas generally indicates good intra-county equalization and as a whole good inter-county equalization.

Based on consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 70%

**2013 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

of market value for the agricultural class of real 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.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Kimball County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

2013 Correlation Section for Kimball County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

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

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

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

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

2013 Correlation Section for Kimball County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 Kimball 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 : 4,846	Value : 472,322,074	Growth 2,987,368	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	146	513,640	17	136,645	36	336,720	199	987,005	
02. Res Improve Land	1,287	7,464,345	81	1,140,175	167	3,305,950	1,535	11,910,470	
03. Res Improvements	1,341	64,351,852	93	6,978,066	201	16,858,135	1,635	88,188,053	
04. Res Total	1,487	72,329,837	110	8,254,886	237	20,500,805	1,834	101,085,528	1,173,094
% of Res Total	81.08	71.55	6.00	8.17	12.92	20.28	37.85	21.40	39.27
05. Com UnImp Land	61	348,278	8	47,925	15	87,395	84	483,598	
06. Com Improve Land	341	2,983,963	37	312,016	61	309,510	439	3,605,489	
07. Com Improvements	341	16,902,949	37	6,403,807	61	2,200,521	439	25,507,277	
08. Com Total	402	20,235,190	45	6,763,748	76	2,597,426	523	29,596,364	248,299
% of Com Total	76.86	68.37	8.60	22.85	14.53	8.78	10.79	6.27	8.31
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	1	110,650	1	110,650	
10. Ind Improve Land	7	213,795	1	15,245	2	99,540	10	328,580	
11. Ind Improvements	7	2,061,025	1	259,184	2	31,678,250	10	33,998,459	
12. Ind Total	7	2,274,820	1	274,429	3	31,888,440	11	34,437,689	51,512
% of Ind Total	63.64	6.61	9.09	0.80	27.27	92.60	0.23	7.29	1.72
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	1,487	72,329,837	110	8,254,886	237	20,500,805	1,834	101,085,528	1,173,094
% of Res & Rec Total	81.08	71.55	6.00	8.17	12.92	20.28	37.85	21.40	39.27
Com & Ind Total	409	22,510,010	46	7,038,177	79	34,485,866	534	64,034,053	299,811
% of Com & Ind Total	76.59	35.15	8.61	10.99	14.79	53.86	11.02	13.56	10.04
17. Taxable Total	1,896	94,839,847	156	15,293,063	316	54,986,671	2,368	165,119,581	1,472,905
% of Taxable Total	80.07	57.44	6.59	9.26	13.34	33.30	48.87	34.96	49.30

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	26,398	1,515,431	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	1	26,398	1,515,431
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	26,398	1,515,431

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	246	104,981,498	246	104,981,498	1,135,290
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	276	135,879	276	135,879	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	522	105,117,377	522	105,117,377	1,135,290

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	116	66	297	479

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	15	819,420	1,446	125,250,685	1,461	126,070,105
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	19	2,123,995	476	51,183,245	495	53,307,240
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	19	1,029,110	476	21,678,661	495	22,707,771
30. Ag Total							1,956	202,085,116

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	4	4.00	21,800	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	12	29.49	160,740	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	12	0.00	686,389	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	5	6.28	1,375	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	14	49.62	10,920	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	18	0.00	342,721	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	20	39.46	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	48	51.00	269,250	52	55.00	291,050	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	197	225.05	1,171,970	209	254.54	1,332,710	
33. HomeSite Improvements	205	0.00	13,419,339	217	0.00	14,105,728	115,363
34. HomeSite Total				269	309.54	15,729,488	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	60	211.68	127,795	65	217.96	129,170	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	395	1,996.44	524,690	409	2,046.06	535,610	
37. FarmSite Improvements	473	0.00	8,259,322	491	0.00	8,602,043	263,810
38. FarmSite Total				556	2,264.02	9,266,823	
39. Road & Ditches	1,374	5,258.98	0	1,394	5,298.44	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				825	7,872.00	24,996,311	379,173

Schedule VII : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Detail - Game & Parks

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	863.16	8.35%	897,685	8.79%	1,040.00
47. 2A1	3,389.81	32.79%	3,508,455	34.34%	1,035.00
48. 2A	2,018.81	19.53%	2,079,375	20.35%	1,030.00
49. 3A1	309.92	3.00%	317,670	3.11%	1,025.01
50. 3A	681.44	6.59%	681,455	6.67%	1,000.02
51. 4A1	2,732.02	26.43%	2,458,785	24.07%	899.99
52. 4A	341.23	3.30%	272,950	2.67%	799.90
53. Total	10,336.39	100.00%	10,216,375	100.00%	988.39
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	6,419.18	8.69%	2,182,515	11.29%	340.00
56. 2D1	7,096.35	9.60%	2,270,845	11.74%	320.00
57. 2D	19,423.12	26.29%	5,729,750	29.63%	295.00
58. 3D1	9,452.37	12.79%	2,363,150	12.22%	250.01
59. 3D	697.69	0.94%	160,450	0.83%	229.97
60. 4D1	23,464.27	31.76%	5,162,090	26.70%	220.00
61. 4D	7,331.10	9.92%	1,466,140	7.58%	199.99
62. Total	73,884.08	100.00%	19,334,940	100.00%	261.69
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	4,226.37	2.91%	1,467,625	4.57%	347.25
65. 2G1	9,721.50	6.69%	2,858,175	8.91%	294.01
66. 2G	14,746.38	10.15%	4,110,660	12.81%	278.76
67. 3G1	7,912.01	5.45%	1,951,845	6.08%	246.69
68. 3G	7,969.11	5.49%	1,623,070	5.06%	203.67
69. 4G1	48,855.66	33.63%	9,925,790	30.93%	203.17
70. 4G	51,833.68	35.68%	10,154,190	31.64%	195.90
71. Total	145,264.71	100.00%	32,091,355	100.00%	220.92
Irrigated Total	10,336.39	4.50%	10,216,375	16.57%	988.39
Dry Total	73,884.08	32.20%	19,334,940	31.37%	261.69
Grass Total	145,264.71	63.30%	32,091,355	52.06%	220.92
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	229,485.18	100.00%	61,642,670	100.00%	268.61

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	1,938.05	13.93%	1,961,085	14.56%	1,011.89
47. 2A1	4,162.41	29.92%	4,193,120	31.13%	1,007.38
48. 2A	1,785.33	12.83%	1,812,100	13.45%	1,014.99
49. 3A1	818.24	5.88%	838,680	6.23%	1,024.98
50. 3A	1,000.98	7.20%	989,725	7.35%	988.76
51. 4A1	3,172.71	22.81%	2,851,455	21.17%	898.74
52. 4A	1,033.41	7.43%	824,725	6.12%	798.06
53. Total	13,911.13	100.00%	13,470,890	100.00%	968.35
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	1,281.90	1.55%	435,700	2.06%	339.89
56. 2D1	8,509.94	10.28%	2,723,140	12.90%	320.00
57. 2D	15,532.60	18.77%	4,582,130	21.70%	295.00
58. 3D1	21,421.98	25.88%	5,676,770	26.89%	265.00
59. 3D	904.44	1.09%	208,035	0.99%	230.02
60. 4D1	23,190.48	28.02%	5,101,610	24.16%	219.99
61. 4D	11,922.36	14.41%	2,384,440	11.29%	200.00
62. Total	82,763.70	100.00%	21,111,825	100.00%	255.09
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	573.39	0.63%	180,190	0.92%	314.25
65. 2G1	4,186.91	4.61%	1,164,220	5.93%	278.06
66. 2G	5,766.60	6.35%	1,676,345	8.54%	290.70
67. 3G1	6,148.42	6.78%	1,506,040	7.67%	244.95
68. 3G	8,274.88	9.12%	1,684,790	8.58%	203.60
69. 4G1	31,211.04	34.39%	6,480,570	33.01%	207.64
70. 4G	34,588.37	38.11%	6,937,535	35.34%	200.57
71. Total	90,749.61	100.00%	19,629,690	100.00%	216.31
Irrigated Total					
	13,911.13	7.42%	13,470,890	24.85%	968.35
Dry Total					
	82,763.70	44.16%	21,111,825	38.94%	255.09
Grass Total					
	90,749.61	48.42%	19,629,690	36.21%	216.31
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	187,424.44	100.00%	54,212,405	100.00%	289.25

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	643.97	9.17%	779,195	10.53%	1,209.99
47. 2A1	1,807.81	25.75%	2,187,450	29.56%	1,210.00
48. 2A	1,761.03	25.08%	1,761,010	23.80%	999.99
49. 3A1	213.74	3.04%	213,745	2.89%	1,000.02
50. 3A	463.54	6.60%	440,370	5.95%	950.02
51. 4A1	2,019.58	28.77%	1,918,555	25.93%	949.98
52. 4A	110.82	1.58%	99,730	1.35%	899.93
53. Total	7,020.49	100.00%	7,400,055	100.00%	1,054.07
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	4,820.11	9.95%	1,976,225	12.49%	410.00
56. 2D1	4,255.77	8.79%	1,744,875	11.03%	410.00
57. 2D	17,969.21	37.10%	7,367,340	46.58%	410.00
58. 3D1	2,070.04	4.27%	620,985	3.93%	299.99
59. 3D	896.62	1.85%	251,050	1.59%	280.00
60. 4D1	17,146.18	35.40%	3,600,670	22.76%	210.00
61. 4D	1,280.65	2.64%	256,095	1.62%	199.97
62. Total	48,438.58	100.00%	15,817,240	100.00%	326.54
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1,535.82	3.41%	559,695	5.28%	364.43
65. 2G1	3,184.52	7.08%	1,084,210	10.24%	340.46
66. 2G	7,756.03	17.24%	2,336,390	22.06%	301.24
67. 3G1	2,889.88	6.42%	687,265	6.49%	237.82
68. 3G	2,069.21	4.60%	413,845	3.91%	200.00
69. 4G1	17,650.30	39.23%	3,530,035	33.33%	200.00
70. 4G	9,904.66	22.02%	1,980,890	18.70%	200.00
71. Total	44,990.42	100.00%	10,592,330	100.00%	235.44
Irrigated Total					
	7,020.49	6.99%	7,400,055	21.89%	1,054.07
Dry Total					
	48,438.58	48.22%	15,817,240	46.78%	326.54
Grass Total					
	44,990.42	44.79%	10,592,330	31.33%	235.44
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	100,449.49	100.00%	33,809,625	100.00%	336.58

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	1,206.87	12.65%	1,460,310	15.07%	1,210.00
47. 2A1	648.11	6.79%	784,210	8.09%	1,210.00
48. 2A	3,259.39	34.16%	3,259,325	33.64%	999.98
49. 3A1	39.79	0.42%	39,790	0.41%	1,000.00
50. 3A	575.35	6.03%	546,575	5.64%	949.99
51. 4A1	3,334.77	34.95%	3,167,975	32.70%	949.98
52. 4A	477.99	5.01%	430,190	4.44%	900.00
53. Total	9,542.27	100.00%	9,688,375	100.00%	1,015.31
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	6,945.04	17.15%	2,777,995	21.09%	400.00
56. 2D1	3,623.86	8.95%	1,449,530	11.01%	400.00
57. 2D	13,078.42	32.30%	5,231,330	39.72%	400.00
58. 3D1	1,615.80	3.99%	484,720	3.68%	299.99
59. 3D	965.35	2.38%	241,350	1.83%	250.01
60. 4D1	13,155.42	32.49%	2,762,585	20.98%	210.00
61. 4D	1,111.95	2.75%	222,365	1.69%	199.98
62. Total	40,495.84	100.00%	13,169,875	100.00%	325.22
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	517.90	2.52%	211,865	4.64%	409.08
65. 2G1	319.24	1.55%	116,115	2.54%	363.72
66. 2G	2,077.51	10.12%	678,990	14.87%	326.83
67. 3G1	322.37	1.57%	88,940	1.95%	275.89
68. 3G	1,030.58	5.02%	217,035	4.75%	210.60
69. 4G1	6,698.04	32.62%	1,339,595	29.34%	200.00
70. 4G	9,566.69	46.59%	1,913,315	41.90%	200.00
71. Total	20,532.33	100.00%	4,565,855	100.00%	222.37
<hr/>					
Irrigated Total	9,542.27	13.52%	9,688,375	35.33%	1,015.31
Dry Total	40,495.84	57.38%	13,169,875	48.02%	325.22
Grass Total	20,532.33	29.09%	4,565,855	16.65%	222.37
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	70,570.44	100.00%	27,424,105	100.00%	388.61

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	2,423.27	2,257,260	38,387.01	38,518,435	40,810.28	40,775,695
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	244.37	72,900	245,337.83	69,360,980	245,582.20	69,433,880
78. Grass	0.00	0	2,038.10	418,420	299,498.97	66,460,810	301,537.07	66,879,230
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	4,705.74	2,748,580	583,223.81	174,340,225	587,929.55	177,088,805

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	40,810.28	6.94%	40,775,695	23.03%	999.15
Dry Land	245,582.20	41.77%	69,433,880	39.21%	282.73
Grass	301,537.07	51.29%	66,879,230	37.77%	221.79
Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	587,929.55	100.00%	177,088,805	100.00%	301.21

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

53 Kimball

	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	99,993,598	101,085,528	1,091,930	1.09%	1,173,094	-0.08%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	15,872,307	15,729,488	-142,819	-0.90%	115,363	-1.63%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	115,865,905	116,815,016	949,111	0.82%	1,288,457	-0.29%
05. Commercial	29,697,151	29,596,364	-100,787	-0.34%	248,299	-1.18%
06. Industrial	34,221,235	34,437,689	216,454	0.63%	51,512	0.48%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	9,196,756	9,266,823	70,067	0.76%	263,810	-2.11%
08. Minerals	110,726,359	105,117,377	-5,608,982	-5.07	1,135,290	-6.09
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	183,841,501	178,418,253	-5,423,248	-2.95%	1,698,911	-3.87%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	299,707,406	295,233,269	-4,474,137	-1.49%	2,987,368	-2.49%
11. Irrigated	28,290,670	40,775,695	12,485,025	44.13%		
12. Dryland	58,927,725	69,433,880	10,506,155	17.83%		
13. Grassland	61,594,100	66,879,230	5,285,130	8.58%		
14. Wasteland	0	0	0			
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	148,812,495	177,088,805	28,276,310	19.00%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	448,519,901	472,322,074	23,802,173	5.31%	2,987,368	4.64%

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

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (hereinafter referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 of each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes 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.

See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2009).

General Description of Real Property in Kimball County:

According to the 2012 County Abstract, Kimball County consists of the following real property types:

<u>Base</u>	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Value</u>
Residential	1842	38.05%	22.22%
Commercial	518	10.70%	6.59%
Industrial	9	.20%	7.60%
Recreational	0		

Minerals	513	10.59%	24.98%
Agricultural	1959	40.46%	38.60%

Kimball County has 588,151.49 acres of agricultural land; comprised of 6.94% irrigated land, 41.87% dryland, and 51.19% grassland.

New Property: For assessment year 2012, several building permits and/or Information Statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county. Our yearly pickup work incorporated these permits and Information Statements and included newly constructed buildings, improvements, removed or deteriorated improvements, updating land uses, etc. Kimball County had an estimated \$5,755,372 of growth for 2012.

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

Current Resources:

Staff: Deputy Assessor and three clerks.

Budget: For 2011-2012 the assessor’s office and reappraisal budget request was \$183,356. The adopted budget was for the same amount.

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

Cadastral Maps accuracy/condition, other land use maps, aerial photos: Cadastral cards and Geographic Information System (GIS) maps are updated when a split or combination of a parcel is made or whenever a transfer occurs.

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

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

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

Web based – property record information access website: <http://kimball.gisworkshop.com>

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

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

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

Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions: Spreadsheets of residential, commercial, and agricultural sales are prepared each year based on the qualified sales rosters. Miscellaneous "what-ifs" are run to determine the most appropriate percentage increases/decreases to apply to bring values within the required statistical ranges. My state Property Assessment Division liaison works with me on the ratio studies.

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

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

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

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

Notices and Public Relations: By June 1st of each year, notices of valuation changes are sent to the owners of record. The media (newspaper and radio) are sent our statistics for the current year and they are also posted in our office. We mail reminders about timely filing for both personal property returns and homestead applications. I run notices in the newspaper regarding filing dates in addition to notices about field work, permissive exemptions, etc. Public

relations begin in the office. Each interaction with a taxpayer is an opportunity to help them understand the assessment process and corresponding connections to the tax system. The assessor's website needs to be updated so that it is more helpful and informative to the public.

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

Kimball County

PROPERTY CLASS	MEDIAN	COEFFICIENT OF DISPERSION	PRICE RELATED DIFFERENTIAL
RESIDENTIAL	95.00	19.26	106.22
COMMERCIAL	95.00	17.13	108.2
AGRICULTURAL	70.00	21.06	108.17

Nebraska law requires the county assessor to inspect and review a portion of the taxable real property parcels in the county each year to assure that all parcels in the county are examined no less frequently than every six years. See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.03. I took office in January 2011 and recently discovered that only the rural properties in Kimball County have been inspected and reviewed since the passage of LB 334 in 2007.

All residential and commercial properties in Kimball, Dix and Bushnell need to be inspected by March 19, 2014 in order to comply with the six year inspection and review requirement. I plan to have all residential properties in Kimball inspected and reviewed by the end of 2012. If time allows, we will begin reviewing residential properties in Dix and Bushnell as well.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Residential Property:

We will inspect and review residential property in the Villages of Dix and Bushnell. New pictures will be taken and compared with the old pictures in the file. Changes will be noted on the write-ups that are kept in the property record card. If the property owner is at home, field liaisons will ask whether any changes have been made to the property. If they are not at home, a door hanger containing a property questionnaire is left. Interior inspections are done for new construction, protests, and when invited in by the homeowner. Necessary adjustments to valuation will be made once the review is completed.

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. The Assessor's office obtains building permits from the City of Kimball, gathers information from the local newspaper, and notes observations concerning changes to real estate to identify potential pickup work. The property is visited as close to December 31st as possible. It is assigned a partial value for the amount of construction completed. Residential real estate sales will be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted for each class and subclass of property and adjustments made as necessary to reflect market values.

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

Commercial Property:

This fall I and two staff members will be attending a class in “Evaluating Commercial Construction.” We hope to gain the knowledge needed to inspect and review the commercial properties in Kimball, Dix and Bushnell. If so, we will do the inspection and review of such property. If I feel that we are not skilled enough to do the review or cannot finish it within the required time, I will ask the Board of Equalization to raise my budget so that I can hire an appraisal firm to do a portion of it. Necessary adjustments to valuation will be made once the review is completed.

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. The Assessor’s office obtains building permits from the City of Kimball, gathers information from the local newspaper, and records observations concerning changes to real estate to identify potential pickup work. The property is visited as close to December 31st as possible. It is assigned a partial value for the amount of construction completed. Commercial real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted for each class and subclass of property.

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

Agricultural Land:

As real estate transfers are received, we send out a questionnaire confirming the land use. We obtain a list from our local FSA office of CRP participants that have received a payment. (The FSA will not furnish the names of those who have been accepted but have not yet received a program payment.) We then send a letter to all landowners on the list and request an FSA map. A majority of those to whom we request a map bring or send it to our office. We then update our records from this information. We also use GIS imagery and field inspections to try to determine land use.

Ratio studies will be conducted by market areas for each class and subclass of land. With sales information and the aid of statistical information provided by the State, when warranted, annual adjustments will be made.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:

Residential Property:

Inspection and review of residential improvements on agricultural parcels and farm buildings will begin. I plan to complete the inspection of Township/Range 12-53 through 14-55 in 2014. New pictures will be taken and compared with the old pictures in the file. Changes will be noted on the write-ups that are kept in the property record card. If the property owner is at home, field liaisons will ask whether any changes have been made to the property. If they are not at home, a door hangar containing a property questionnaire is left. Interior inspections are done for new construction, protests, and when invited in by the homeowner. Necessary adjustments to valuation will be made once the review is completed.

Pickup work will be continuing for this term. The Assessor’s office obtains building permits from the City of Kimball, gathers information from the local newspaper, and records observations concerning changes to real estate to identify potential pickup work. The property is visited as

close to December 31st as possible. It is assigned a partial value for the amount of construction completed. Residential real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted for each class and subclass of property and adjusted as necessary to reflect market values.

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

Commercial Property:

Pickup work will be continuing for this term. The Assessor's office obtains building permits from the City of Kimball, gathers information from the local newspaper, and records observations concerning changes to real estate to identify potential pickup work. The property is visited as close to December 31st as possible. It is assigned a partial value for the amount of construction completed. Commercial real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted for each class and subclass of property.

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

Agricultural Land:

As real estate transfers are received, we send out a questionnaire confirming the land use. We obtain a list from our local FSA office of CRP participants that have received a payment. (The FSA will not furnish the names of those who have been accepted but have not yet received a program payment.) We then send a letter to all landowners on the list and request an FSA map. A majority of those to whom we request a map bring or send it to our office. We then update our records from this information. We also use GIS imagery and field inspections to try to determine land use.

Ratio studies will be conducted by market areas for each class and subclass of land. With sales information and the aid of statistical information provided by the State, when warranted, annual adjustments will be made.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:

Residential Property:

Inspection and review of residential improvements on agricultural parcels and farm buildings will begin. I plan to complete the inspection of Township/Range 14-56 through 14-59 and 16-53 through 16-59 in 2015. New pictures will be taken and compared with the old pictures in the file. Changes will be noted on the write-ups that are kept in the property record card. If the property owner is at home, field liaisons will ask whether any changes have been made to the property. If they are not at home, a door hanger containing a property questionnaire is left. Interior inspections are done for new construction, protests, and when invited in by the homeowner. Necessary adjustments to valuation will be made once the review is completed.

Pickup work will be continuing for this term. The Assessor's office obtains building permits from the City of Kimball, gathers information from the local newspaper, and records observations concerning changes to real estate to identify potential pickup work. The property is visited as close to December 31st as possible. It is assigned a partial value for the amount of construction

completed. Residential real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted for each class and subclass of property and adjusted as necessary to reflect market values.

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

Commercial Property:

I plan to hire an appraisal firm to appraise the grain elevators in Kimball County as well as Clean Harbors, a hazardous waste disposal facility.

Pickup work will be continuing for this term. The Assessor's office obtains building permits from the City of Kimball, gathers information from the local newspaper, and records observations concerning changes to real estate to identify potential pickup work. The property is visited as close to December 31st as possible. It is assigned a partial value for the amount of construction completed. Commercial real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted for each class and subclass of property.

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

Agricultural Land:

As real estate transfers are received, we send out a questionnaire confirming the land use. We obtain a list from our local FSA office of CRP participants that have received a payment. (The FSA will not furnish the names of those who have been accepted but have not yet received a program payment.) We then send a letter to all landowners on the list and request an FSA map. A majority of those to whom we request a map bring or send it to our office. We then update our records from this information. We also use GIS imagery and field inspections to try to determine land use.

Ratio studies will be conducted by market areas for each class and subclass of land. With sales information and the aid of statistical information provided by the State, when warranted, annual adjustments will be made.

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

1. Personal Property: Assist taxpayers with preprinted schedules mailed to them and prepare new schedules when there are changes. Prepare notices of failure to file, penalties, unsigned returns, etc. as required.
2. Homestead Exemption Program: Assist applicants with forms. Send reminders or telephone previous year applicants that haven't filed by June 15th. Process applications before mailing to State.
3. Annually prepare and file administrative reports as required by law or regulation with the Property Tax Administrator including:
 - Real Property Abstract
 - Annual Plan of Assessment
 - Assessor Survey
 - School District Taxable Value Report
 - Average Residential Value for Homestead Exemption purposes
 - Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
 - Certificate of Taxes Levied Report

4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Annually review government owned property not used for a public purpose and send notice of intent to tax.
6. Certify values to Political Subdivisions.
7. Record maintenance, mapping updates, and ownership changes.
8. On or before June 1st send Notices of Valuation Change to owners of record.
9. Centrally Assessed: review of valuations of entities as certified by PAD for railroad and public service entities. Establish assessment records for each subdivision taxed to each company and tax billing for tax list provided to the County Treasurer.
10. Tax Increment Financing: management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax. Two parcels for each TIF property, one real estate card with the base value and one for the excess value of the property are maintained.
11. 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.
12. Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed property.
13. Tax List Corrections: prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
14. Annual Inventory: update report designating personal property of the assessor's office by August 25th each year.
15. County Board of Equalization: attend all County Board of Equalization meetings. Assemble and provide information for valuation protests.
16. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC.
17. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.
18. Pull real estate cards, make copies, and answer questions in person, over the phone or through email. Among those we assist are appraisers, realtors, lending institutions, property owners, attorneys, surveyors, property owners, and other county offices.
19. Education: Assessor and Deputy Assessor must attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

Conclusion:

We strive to operate a well-organized, non-adversarial, congenial office that serves the public and educates them about the assessment process. Our aim is equalization and uniformity of valuation of all property in the county and completing the duties and responsibilities required of the assessor by Nebraska Statutes, Regulations and Directives.

Respectfully submitted to the Kimball County Board of Equalization:

Debora Huff
Kimball County Assessor
July 17, 2012

2013 Assessment Survey for Kimball County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	None
3.	Other full-time employees:
	Three
4.	Other part-time employees:
	One temporary
5.	Number of shared employees:
	One
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$185,755
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$182,933
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$40,578
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$11,100
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$3,300
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	Postage, cellular phone, County car usage and a copier are funded from the General Fund.
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$2,850

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

	Yes.
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes, both property records and maps. http://kimball.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop and Staff Clerks.
8.	Personal Property software:
	County Solutions

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	The City of Kimball and the Villages of Bushnell and Dix.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	County zoning was implemented in 2010. It is unknown when the municipalities zoning was implemented.

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Physical inspection and valuation for all three property classes are done “in-house.” Pritchard & Abbott is the contracted appraisal service for oil, gas and mineral interests.
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Workshop is contracted for both GIS and the County’s internet GIS web site.
3.	Other services:
	County Solutions for administrative, CAMA and personal property software.

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Yes, Pritchard & Abbott for oil, gas and mineral interests.
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Expertise in the mass appraisal of oil, gas and mineral interests for ad valorem tax purposes.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	Yes.
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the

	county?
	Yes, for the aforementioned interests.

2013 Certification for Kimball 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 Kimball 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

