

# 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 Knox County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	144	Median	93.11
Total Sales Price	\$11,611,108	Mean	93.85
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$11,592,408	Wgt. Mean	88.54
Total Assessed Value	\$10,264,320	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$45,423
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$80,503	Avg. Assessed Value	\$71,280

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.33 to 95.61
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	85.97 to 91.11
95% Mean C.I	91.56 to 96.14
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	16.12
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.94
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.61

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	128	94	93.54
2011	165	93	93
2010	210	93	93
2009	284	94	94

## 2013 Commission Summary for Knox County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	12	Median	97.42
Total Sales Price	\$1,740,950	Mean	98.10
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,221,950	Wgt. Mean	98.16
Total Assessed Value	\$1,199,515	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$79,785
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$101,829	Avg. Assessed Value	\$99,960

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.84 to 99.96
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.43 to 101.90
95% Mean C.I	96.26 to 99.94
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.50
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.98
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.48

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	21		97.97
2011	24		98
2010	36	97	97
2009	42	100	100



## 2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Knox County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	93	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	71	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## 2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Knox County

The Sales Comparison approach was used to determine the changes needed to bring them into the ratio required by law.

1. Crofton- No Change.
2. Santee- Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Lowered Improv. 5%.
3. Niobrara- No Change.
4. Bloomfield- Raised Improvements 2%
5. Center- No Change.
6. Verdigre- Update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Lowered Improv. 5%.
7. Winnetoon- No Change.
8. Bazile Mills- No Change.
9. Creighton- Raised Improvements 5%.
10. Wausa- Updated to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Lowered Improv. 6%
11. Verdel- No Change.

Lake properties were evaluated using the Sales Comparison approach to determine if changes were needed. Each subdivision is treated separately first, and then combined as a whole to arrive at the ratio required by law. It is done this way because the subdivisions can vary in terrain, access and amenities, and yet they are in close proximity to each other. Started Lake Review in 2012 and will continue into 2013. Visiting each lake improved parcel for updates and changes. Data entry has been entered for the reviewed parcels. They are numbered in the order of placement, from west to east.

### Crofton Area

1. West Miller Creek- Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual.
2. Bon Homme – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Lowered Improv. 15%.
3. Prairie Ridge – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Lowered Improv. 20%.
4. Grandview – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Lowered Improv. 5%.
5. Kohles Acres – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Lowered Improv. 15%, Raised Lots comparable with like properties.
6. Walkers Valley View – No Change
7. Lakeview Terrace – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Lowered Improv. 20%, Raised Lots comparable with like properties.
8. Elkhorn Ridge – Lowered Lots 5%.
9. Merchant Hills – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual.
10. Merchant Valley - Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual.
11. Elk Ridge Estates – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Lowered Improv. 20%, Raised Lots 7.5%.
12. Deer Ridge – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Raised Lots comparable with like properties.

13. Cedar Hills – No change.
14. Hillcrest Deep Water – Raised lots 20%.
15. Autumn Oaks – No Change.
16. Eagle Ridge – No Change.
17. Hideaway Acres – No Change
18. Hideaway Estates – No change.
19. The Timbers- New Subdivision added, made comparable to like properties.
20. Lake Influence (90-94) – These areas are scattered in and among the subdivided areas of the Lake, but not part of a subdivision. They are treated similar to adjacent areas.  
Reviewed, updated to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual, lowered improvements.

**Santee Area**

1. Lakeview Heights, Lakeshore, Valley View, Lakes Hills-Reviewed all, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual, lowered lots 5%.
2. Devils Nest –Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Lowered Improv 5%.
3. Lindy – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual.

**West of Niobrara**

1. Lazy River Acres – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Raised lots 10%, Lowered Improv. 20%.
2. Lake Influence (96-99) – Reviewed, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Everything Surveyed & Platted after flood, valued lots comparable to like properties.
3. Newly platted areas that sold the lots to individual owners- value according to market value.
4. Newly platted areas that continue to lease individual lots as previously-placed leasehold value on each lot.

## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Knox County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Bloomfield, located in the eastern side of the county, K-12 school, active businesses, large commercial chicken facility, and call center for employment, well maintained.
	03	Bazile Mills, small population, no gas or grocery.
	05	Center, county seat, small population, no gas or grocery, only a post office and Bar/Grill.
	10	Creighton, located in the central area of the county, has school, hospital, care center, active business community, well maintained.
	15	Crofton, located in the northeast part of the county, closer to Yankton, SD community. K-12 school and Parochial grade school, typical business community and well maintained.
	20	Lake, residences located on the northern portion of the county along the Lewis and Clark lake, occupied either full or part time.
	26	Devil's Nest, is a subdivided area that has been in existence for a long time. A new developer is trying to revitalize and build the area.
	30	Niobrara, located in the northwestern, central portion of the county. K-12 school, Medical clinic and typical business community.
	35	Rural, residential property located outside the boundaries of the villages.
	37	Santee, located northern middle part of county along the Missouri River. It is Santee Sioux Indian Reservation with few taxpayers. College, school, grocery mainly for Native Americans.
	40	Verdel, located in the northwestern part of the county and has nothing to offer in the way of business or schools.
	45	Verdigre, located in the western portion of the county, K-12 school, medical clinic and typical business activity.
	50	Wausa, located in the southeastern portion of the county, K-12 school, care center and assisted living and typical small business community.
	55	Winnetoon, small community, not far from Center, has minimal business facilities, bank and café.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Sales approach	
4	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Valuation grouping 10–Creighton-2009 costing. Groupings valued at 2012 costing	

	are 37-Santee, 50-Wausa , 45-Verdigre and the west portion of the lake areas that were reviewed last summer and fall. Remaining at 2004 costing are 01-Bloomfield, 30-Niobrara, 15-Crofton, 05-Center, 03-Bazile Mills, 55-Winnetoon, 40-Verdel and 35-rural.
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>
	Local market as compared to CAMA depreciation.
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	No, however each groupings economic is adjusted according to the market.
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>
	2004/2009/2012 respectively
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	2004/2009/2012 respectively
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>
	Sales/market per square foot

**54 Knox**  
**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 : 144  
Total Sales Price : 11,611,108  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 11,592,408  
Total Assessed Value : 10,264,320  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 80,503  
Avg. Assessed Value : 71,280

MEDIAN : 93  
WGT. MEAN : 89  
MEAN : 94  
COD : 11.74  
PRD : 106.00

COV : 14.97  
STD : 14.05  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.93  
MAX Sales Ratio : 132.14  
MIN Sales Ratio : 62.29

95% Median C.I. : 90.33 to 95.61  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.97 to 91.11  
95% Mean C.I. : 91.56 to 96.14

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:38PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	18	98.97	97.53	93.40	09.57	104.42	77.59	131.76	89.53 to 104.25	75,145	70,184	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	12	92.59	92.07	91.34	06.03	100.80	79.00	103.40	84.25 to 99.26	69,167	63,175	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	18	94.48	93.12	89.00	11.00	104.63	71.32	114.60	81.39 to 103.23	71,172	63,346	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	18	94.53	96.21	90.97	09.10	105.76	78.66	118.80	87.88 to 100.03	115,639	105,200	
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	17	91.70	92.08	84.97	12.74	108.37	62.29	121.07	83.86 to 106.05	78,824	66,977	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	21	93.45	97.75	89.11	12.57	109.70	68.19	122.32	87.13 to 108.32	53,916	48,043	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	15	85.61	89.02	83.05	13.62	107.19	66.08	124.08	79.75 to 96.14	112,353	93,311	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	25	94.60	91.73	87.95	13.82	104.30	64.85	132.14	80.60 to 98.56	75,586	66,477	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	66	95.01	94.97	91.16	09.47	104.18	71.32	131.76	91.73 to 98.57	84,018	76,594	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	78	91.59	92.91	86.14	13.54	107.86	62.29	132.14	87.13 to 96.01	77,528	66,783	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	65	92.77	93.51	89.12	10.14	104.93	62.29	121.07	90.57 to 95.49	85,117	75,854	
<u>ALL</u>	144	93.11	93.85	88.54	11.74	106.00	62.29	132.14	90.33 to 95.61	80,503	71,280	

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
01	40	92.93	94.07	85.71	12.39	109.75	62.29	122.04	86.11 to 98.10	48,344	41,438	
05	1	84.41	84.41	84.41	00.00	100.00	84.41	84.41	N/A	16,000	13,505	
10	23	97.36	97.55	89.95	10.55	108.45	77.11	122.32	87.84 to 103.40	64,337	57,874	
15	14	93.55	95.41	93.90	09.02	101.61	79.31	116.98	85.49 to 106.59	71,857	67,473	
20	21	91.73	90.88	89.08	11.81	102.02	64.85	131.76	82.41 to 99.36	204,172	181,884	
30	4	93.69	101.73	97.13	12.42	104.74	87.41	132.14	N/A	47,875	46,500	
35	11	92.57	90.05	87.01	09.38	103.49	68.19	104.25	69.59 to 103.23	112,309	97,718	
45	15	96.01	93.77	86.35	13.17	108.59	66.47	124.08	79.75 to 105.16	47,467	40,987	
50	15	91.84	91.72	85.20	11.92	107.65	67.06	111.91	80.81 to 103.59	48,693	41,488	
<u>ALL</u>	144	93.11	93.85	88.54	11.74	106.00	62.29	132.14	90.33 to 95.61	80,503	71,280	

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
01	118	92.69	93.87	87.86	11.67	106.84	62.29	132.14	90.32 to 95.65	60,630	53,272	
06	21	91.73	90.88	89.08	11.81	102.02	64.85	131.76	82.41 to 99.36	204,172	181,884	
07	5	106.05	105.96	105.42	06.98	100.51	91.80	122.04	N/A	30,100	31,731	
<u>ALL</u>	144	93.11	93.85	88.54	11.74	106.00	62.29	132.14	90.33 to 95.61	80,503	71,280	

**54 Knox  
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 : 144  
 Total Sales Price : 11,611,108  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 11,592,408  
 Total Assessed Value : 10,264,320  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 80,503  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 71,280

MEDIAN : 93  
 WGT. MEAN : 89  
 MEAN : 94  
 COD : 11.74  
 PRD : 106.00

COV : 14.97  
 STD : 14.05  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.93  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.14  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 62.29

95% Median C.I. : 90.33 to 95.61  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.97 to 91.11  
 95% Mean C.I. : 91.56 to 96.14

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:38PM

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Low \$ Ranges</b>											
Less Than 5,000	1	99.80	99.80	99.80	00.00	100.00	99.80	99.80	N/A	2,500	2,495
Less Than 15,000	10	110.12	107.37	105.19	08.53	102.07	80.81	121.07	93.45 to 118.80	9,000	9,467
Less Than 30,000	37	105.16	104.53	103.96	10.53	100.55	80.81	132.14	96.72 to 111.06	18,154	18,873
<b>Ranges Excl. Low \$</b>											
Greater Than 4,999	143	92.77	93.81	88.54	11.80	105.95	62.29	132.14	90.33 to 95.49	81,048	71,761
Greater Than 14,999	134	92.46	92.85	88.41	11.31	105.02	62.29	132.14	90.02 to 95.24	85,839	75,893
Greater Than 29,999	107	90.57	90.16	87.60	10.63	102.92	62.29	131.76	87.30 to 93.46	102,063	89,402
<b>Incremental Ranges</b>											
0 TO 4,999	1	99.80	99.80	99.80	00.00	100.00	99.80	99.80	N/A	2,500	2,495
5,000 TO 14,999	9	111.91	108.21	105.34	08.12	102.72	80.81	121.07	93.45 to 118.80	9,722	10,241
15,000 TO 29,999	27	100.40	103.47	103.77	11.02	99.71	84.25	132.14	94.60 to 111.06	21,544	22,357
30,000 TO 59,999	39	93.69	93.63	93.01	10.56	100.67	66.47	120.54	87.41 to 98.57	44,001	40,925
60,000 TO 99,999	31	91.70	91.48	91.38	09.12	100.11	69.78	131.76	87.13 to 97.03	78,085	71,352
100,000 TO 149,999	19	89.62	87.63	86.82	08.47	100.93	67.06	103.23	79.75 to 95.24	118,256	102,671
150,000 TO 249,999	13	80.62	83.23	83.67	14.74	99.47	64.85	106.35	68.19 to 100.03	181,662	151,993
250,000 TO 499,999	4	83.83	81.31	81.03	10.69	100.35	62.29	95.30	N/A	293,888	238,150
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +	1	87.88	87.88	87.88	00.00	100.00	87.88	87.88	N/A	1,000,000	878,800
<b>ALL</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>93.11</b>	<b>93.85</b>	<b>88.54</b>	<b>11.74</b>	<b>106.00</b>	<b>62.29</b>	<b>132.14</b>	<b>90.33 to 95.61</b>	<b>80,503</b>	<b>71,280</b>



**2013 Correlation Section  
for Knox County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

Knox County is located in northeast Nebraska with South Dakota bordering on the north. There are several different Hwy's that pass through the county. The largest town is Creighton with a population of 1,154 based on the 2010 census. The county seat is Center that has a population of 94 based on the same census. There are several smaller towns or villages located throughout the county with populations ranging from 30-1030 people.

The assessor has a documented process of tracking the six-year inspection and review cycle of properties in the county and is on schedule to complete this requirement.

The assessor's office reviewed all residential sales. Sales reviews include questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. All efforts are made to talk to either the buyer or the seller. This past year the Property Assessment Division conducted a review of the county sales qualifications by going through the non-qualified sales roster. Several sales the liaison had questions on regarding the usability were given to the assessor for further review.

In 2011 the Division implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties within the state to review assessment practices. This is scheduled to be completed in Knox County in 2013.

The residential sales file for Knox County consists of 144 qualified sales. This sample will be considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. There is a close relationship between the median and mean measures of central tendency. The weighted mean is slightly below the range, but may be attributed to high dollar sales. The coefficient of dispersion is within the range while the price related differential is slightly above but not unreasonable. All valuation groupings that are adequately represented in the sales file are within the acceptable range.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 93% of market value for the residential class of real property.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox County**

Reviewed all commercial parcels, update to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual. Data entry has been entered & completed for all commercial parcels.

1. Crofton- Lowered Improvements 8%.
2. Santee- Only changes are due to review.
3. Niobrara- Lowered Improvements 5%.
4. Bloomfield- Lowered Improvements 8%
5. Center- Only changes are due to review.
6. Verdigre-Lowered Improvements 5%.
7. Winnetoon- Only changes are due to review.
8. Bazile Mills- Only changes are due to review.
9. Creighton- Only changes are due to review.
10. Wausa- Only changes are due to review.
11. Verdel- Only changes are due to review.
12. Rural- Lowered Improvements 8%.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Knox County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Bloomfield, located in the eastern side of the county, K-12 school, active businesses, large commercial chicken facility, call center, medical clinic, assisted living, care center, elevator , well maintained.
	03	Bazile Mills, small population, no gas or grocery.
	05	Center, county seat, small population, no gas or grocery, post office, welding and repair shops and Bar/Grill.
	10	Creighton, located in the central area of the county, school, hospital, care center, call center, active business community, well maintained.
	15	Crofton, located in the northeast part of the county, close to Yankton, SD, K-12 school and Parochial grade school, elevator,typical business community and well maintained.
	20	Lake, residences located on the northern portion of the county along the Lewis and Clark lake, occupied either full or part time.
	26	Devil's Nest, is a subdivided area that has been in existence for a long time. A new developer is trying to revitalize and build the area.
	30	Niobrara, located in the northwestern, central portion of the county. K-12 school, medical clinic, Ponca Agency and typical business community.
	35	Rural, residential property located outside the boundaries of the villages.
	37	Santee, located northern middle part of county along the Missouri River. It is Santee Sioux Indian Reservation with few taxpayers. College, school, grocery mainly for Native Americans.
	40	Verdel, located in the northwestern part of the county and has nothing to offer in the way of business or schools.
	45	Verdigre, located in the western portion of the county, K-12 school, medical clinic, care center, assisted living, elevator and typical business activity.
	50	Wausa, located in the southeastern portion of the county, K-12 school, care center, assisted living, elevator and NE child support call center and typical small business community.
	55	Winnetoon, small community, not far from Center, has minimal business facilities, bank, post office and café.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Sales Comparison	

3a.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>
	We use Marshall Swift costing and tie in with local sales.
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>
	2012
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>
	Local market as compared to CAMA depreciation
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	No, however each groupings economic is adjusted according to the market.
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>
	2012
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	2012
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>
	Sales/Market square foot

**54 Knox**  
**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 : 12  
Total Sales Price : 1,740,950  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,221,950  
Total Assessed Value : 1,199,515  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 101,829  
Avg. Assessed Value : 99,960

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 98  
MEAN : 98  
COD : 02.33  
PRD : 99.94

COV : 02.95  
STD : 02.89  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 02.27  
MAX Sales Ratio : 103.97  
MIN Sales Ratio : 94.09

95% Median C.I. : 95.84 to 99.96  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.43 to 101.90  
95% Mean C.I. : 96.26 to 99.94

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:39PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	94.09	94.09	94.09	00.00	100.00	94.09	94.09	N/A	155,000	145,845
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	99.95	99.95	99.95	00.00	100.00	99.95	99.95	N/A	80,000	79,960
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	99.96	99.96	99.96	00.00	100.00	99.96	99.96	N/A	57,500	57,475
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	99.75	100.37	102.96	02.20	97.48	97.39	103.97	N/A	113,817	117,185
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	96.59	96.59	96.59	00.00	100.00	96.59	96.59	N/A	32,000	30,910
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	97.95	97.95	95.90	03.22	102.14	94.80	101.09	N/A	139,500	133,783
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	96.26	96.52	96.10	00.56	100.44	95.84	97.45	N/A	92,333	88,735
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	3	99.95	98.00	96.85	01.96	101.19	94.09	99.96	N/A	97,500	94,427
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	4	98.57	99.43	102.41	02.48	97.09	96.59	103.97	N/A	93,363	95,616
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	5	96.26	97.09	96.00	01.64	101.14	94.80	101.09	N/A	111,200	106,754
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	99.96	99.96	99.95	00.01	100.01	99.95	99.96	N/A	68,750	68,718
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	98.57	99.43	102.41	02.48	97.09	96.59	103.97	N/A	93,363	95,616
<u>ALL</u>	12	97.42	98.10	98.16	02.33	99.94	94.09	103.97	95.84 to 99.96	101,829	99,960

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	3	95.84	95.74	95.37	00.63	100.39	94.80	96.59	N/A	152,333	145,277
10	4	98.60	99.36	102.20	02.54	97.22	96.26	103.97	N/A	96,000	98,113
20	1	94.09	94.09	94.09	00.00	100.00	94.09	94.09	N/A	155,000	145,845
30	2	99.24	99.24	99.44	01.86	99.80	97.39	101.09	N/A	44,225	43,978
35	1	99.96	99.96	99.96	00.00	100.00	99.96	99.96	N/A	57,500	57,475
45	1	99.95	99.95	99.95	00.00	100.00	99.95	99.95	N/A	80,000	79,960
<u>ALL</u>	12	97.42	98.10	98.16	02.33	99.94	94.09	103.97	95.84 to 99.96	101,829	99,960

**54 Knox  
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 : 12  
 Total Sales Price : 1,740,950  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,221,950  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,199,515  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 101,829  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 99,960

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 98  
 MEAN : 98  
 COD : 02.33  
 PRD : 99.94

COV : 02.95  
 STD : 02.89  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 02.27  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 103.97  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 94.09

95% Median C.I. : 95.84 to 99.96  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.43 to 101.90  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.26 to 99.94

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:39PM

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	12	97.42	98.10	98.16	02.33	99.94	94.09	103.97	95.84 to 99.96	101,829	99,960
04											
<u>ALL</u>	12	97.42	98.10	98.16	02.33	99.94	94.09	103.97	95.84 to 99.96	101,829	99,960

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000											
Less Than 30,000	1	99.75	99.75	99.75	00.00	100.00	99.75	99.75	N/A	20,000	19,950
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	12	97.42	98.10	98.16	02.33	99.94	94.09	103.97	95.84 to 99.96	101,829	99,960
Greater Than 14,999	12	97.42	98.10	98.16	02.33	99.94	94.09	103.97	95.84 to 99.96	101,829	99,960
Greater Than 29,999	11	97.39	97.94	98.14	02.32	99.80	94.09	103.97	94.80 to 101.09	109,268	107,233
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	1	99.75	99.75	99.75	00.00	100.00	99.75	99.75	N/A	20,000	19,950
30,000 TO 59,999	4	96.99	96.92	96.87	00.52	100.05	96.26	97.45	N/A	38,363	37,161
60,000 TO 99,999	2	100.53	100.53	100.48	00.57	100.05	99.96	101.09	N/A	53,250	53,505
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999	2	97.02	97.02	96.09	03.02	100.97	94.09	99.95	N/A	117,500	112,903
250,000 TO 499,999	3	95.84	98.20	98.74	03.19	99.45	94.80	103.97	N/A	235,667	232,702
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	12	97.42	98.10	98.16	02.33	99.94	94.09	103.97	95.84 to 99.96	101,829	99,960

**54 Knox**  
**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 : 12  
 Total Sales Price : 1,740,950  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,221,950  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,199,515  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 101,829  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 99,960

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 98  
 MEAN : 98  
 COD : 02.33  
 PRD : 99.94

COV : 02.95  
 STD : 02.89  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 02.27  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 103.97  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 94.09

95% Median C.I. : 95.84 to 99.96  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.43 to 101.90  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.26 to 99.94

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:39PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
343	1	95.84	95.84	95.84	00.00	100.00	95.84	95.84	N/A	195,000	186,890
350	1	97.39	97.39	97.39	00.00	100.00	97.39	97.39	N/A	39,450	38,420
352	2	98.84	98.84	99.31	02.28	99.53	96.59	101.09	N/A	40,500	40,223
353	5	97.45	98.45	99.43	02.60	99.01	94.80	103.97	N/A	122,800	122,096
386	1	94.09	94.09	94.09	00.00	100.00	94.09	94.09	N/A	155,000	145,845
528	2	99.96	99.96	99.95	00.01	100.01	99.95	99.96	N/A	68,750	68,718
<u>ALL</u>	12	97.42	98.10	98.16	02.33	99.94	94.09	103.97	95.84 to 99.96	101,829	99,960



## **2013 Correlation Section for Knox County**

---

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

Knox County is located in northeast Nebraska with South Dakota bordering on the north. There are several different Hwy's that pass through the county. The largest town is Creighton with a population of 1,154 based on the 2010 census. The county seat is Center that has a population of 94 based on the same census. There are several smaller towns or villages located throughout the county with populations ranging from 30-1030 people. These towns provide various types of services, goods and jobs.

This past year, in-house, the county reviewed and inspected all commercial properties countywide meeting the 6 year review and inspection requirement. New depreciation and Marshal-Swift costing was put on.

The assessor's office reviewed all commercial sales. Sale reviews include questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. All efforts are made to talk to either the buyer or the seller. This past year the Property Assessment Division conducted a review of the county sales qualifications by going through the non-qualified sales roster. Several sales the liaison had questions on regarding the usability were given to the assessor for further review.

In 2011 the Division implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties within the state to review assessment practices. This is scheduled to be completed in Knox County in 2013.

A review of the statistical analysis reveals 12 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate the level of value is within the acceptable range, there are not a sufficient number of sales to have confidence in the calculated statistics. Further stratification of the sample by valuation grouping displays six different valuation groupings as well as six different occupancy codes. The measurement of these small samples is unrealistic and will not be relied upon to determine a level of value for Knox County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality. The coefficient of dispersion is somewhat lower than would typically be expected. However, analysis of the sold properties and the abstract shows similar movement of sold and unsold properties.

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox County**

For assessment year 2013 a market study of land was performed to determine values and to bring the land values into the statutory required level of value. In all three market areas irrigated, dry and grassland values were raised based on the market analysis.

Raised Home Sites to \$8,000, raised Improvements 5%. Update Outbuildings to 2012 Marshall & Swift Manual, raised outbuilding improvements 20%.

The assessor reviewed all agricultural sales by sending out questionnaires to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible. When necessary, phone calls were made to gather additional information.

All pick up work was completed and placed on the assessment roll for 2013.

## 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Knox County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Area 1 is the south eastern portion of the county with borders of Cedar and Pierce Counties. This area has a substantial amount of uplands, silty soil, with abundant irrigation pivots scattered throughout the area. This area has some of the same characteristics as the bordering counties and does have more tillable acres. This area has significant rainfall.
	2	Area 2 is the western portion of the county with borders of Holt and Antelope Counties. This area is utilized more for the grassland characteristics. Sandy soils are abundant with silty, clay subsoils. Majority hilly, wooded, gullies, rough rangeland acres. Less cropland available. Extreme less rainfall.
	3	Area 3 is the north eastern portion of the county with the north border as the Missouri River and the eastern border Cedar County with a portion dropping down into the central portion of the county. This area tends to have a mixture of dry and grass characteristics and minimal irrigation wells. This area becomes hilly with sandy soils and less rainfall as you gradually travel in northwesterly direction. Much rangeland. Geo 677 has the Bazile Creek winding through the southern portion with rough hilly areas to the south and west. Geo 463 has cropland with majority of grassland with waste and gullies becoming more prevalent as you travel North.
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Market areas were established in 2010 using factors such as soil type, irrigation potential, land use and topography. We totally revamped the county according to detailed soil and rainfall charts. Each year I plot all the sales on a county map and monitor the markets in each established area.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Rural residential land is 20 acres or less. Recreational land has lake influence. Recreational may also now include agland that is no longer used to sustain agricultural purposes.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Yes they carry the same value.	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Sales are closely monitored. Questionnaires are studied looking for any non-agricultural characteristics and these are kept on record.	

7.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>
	Yes, two parties have filed special valuation. At this time there is nothing to indicate that special value should be recognized. The parcels approved for special value have the same value as all other agricultural land.
8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>
	We value WRP by maintaining the LVG codes, whether grass or waste. Currently no sales on typical WRP land so as a basis we value at one-half of the regular grass value. We maintain that there are at least two types of WRP-the typical area along a creek bed that floods regularly and is not sustainable for recreation and the second is the upland areas that are sustained for more specific activities with ideal characteristics for recreation.

**54 Knox**  
**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 : 140  
Total Sales Price : 49,706,741  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 49,447,046  
Total Assessed Value : 35,750,013  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 353,193  
Avg. Assessed Value : 255,357

MEDIAN : 71  
WGT. MEAN : 72  
MEAN : 75  
COD : 23.00  
PRD : 104.12

COV : 29.14  
STD : 21.94  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.43  
MAX Sales Ratio : 170.00  
MIN Sales Ratio : 26.00

95% Median C.I. : 68.91 to 75.05  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.96 to 76.64  
95% Mean C.I. : 71.65 to 78.91

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:40PM

**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	16	82.87	86.61	87.12	16.88	99.41	56.97	113.66	71.31 to 100.07	344,627	300,256
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	10	73.39	83.59	81.02	23.76	103.17	57.15	118.28	60.59 to 112.37	397,810	322,303
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	9	95.20	91.31	97.40	19.57	93.75	45.66	127.10	60.70 to 117.19	242,699	236,397
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	6	90.94	97.26	80.89	35.37	120.24	53.70	170.00	53.70 to 170.00	147,613	119,409
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	20	75.22	82.14	80.25	19.29	102.36	55.64	122.43	69.63 to 96.29	445,090	357,206
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	11	79.71	80.44	78.67	18.37	102.25	43.04	107.02	58.64 to 102.54	194,791	153,240
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	8	80.92	78.32	79.04	10.78	99.09	59.33	93.58	59.33 to 93.58	204,836	161,901
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	10	60.62	62.48	54.92	12.06	113.77	44.00	82.64	54.00 to 74.24	244,726	134,413
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	20	66.61	68.80	67.56	13.18	101.84	49.85	104.65	60.72 to 74.59	472,366	319,149
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	18	59.88	58.29	55.65	25.77	104.74	26.00	100.99	45.41 to 73.64	415,239	231,096
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	9	62.90	59.71	59.94	20.24	99.62	28.56	90.91	35.76 to 70.41	412,158	247,064
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	58.27	57.07	57.28	05.42	99.63	51.73	61.21	N/A	374,491	214,493
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	41	84.59	88.46	86.54	23.06	102.22	45.66	170.00	74.22 to 100.07	306,393	265,150
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	49	74.24	77.12	75.80	18.72	101.74	43.04	122.43	69.17 to 81.50	308,785	234,063
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	50	62.78	62.68	61.64	18.91	101.69	26.00	104.65	58.56 to 68.82	435,090	268,195
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	45	83.20	86.31	82.83	23.56	104.20	45.66	170.00	72.19 to 96.81	354,441	293,582
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	49	70.16	71.68	68.31	16.76	104.93	43.04	107.02	62.77 to 77.38	319,918	218,530
<u>ALL</u>	140	71.43	75.28	72.30	23.00	104.12	26.00	170.00	68.91 to 75.05	353,193	255,357

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	33	70.81	76.81	73.02	25.50	105.19	44.00	170.00	60.72 to 83.20	579,850	423,388
2	88	71.97	75.67	72.59	22.58	104.24	26.00	127.10	68.55 to 75.60	288,736	209,598
3	19	71.48	70.86	67.99	20.13	104.22	32.20	103.81	57.72 to 79.71	258,064	175,452
<u>ALL</u>	140	71.43	75.28	72.30	23.00	104.12	26.00	170.00	68.91 to 75.05	353,193	255,357

**54 Knox**  
**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 : 140  
Total Sales Price : 49,706,741  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 49,447,046  
Total Assessed Value : 35,750,013  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 353,193  
Avg. Assessed Value : 255,357

MEDIAN : 71  
WGT. MEAN : 72  
MEAN : 75  
COD : 23.00  
PRD : 104.12

COV : 29.14  
STD : 21.94  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.43  
MAX Sales Ratio : 170.00  
MIN Sales Ratio : 26.00

95% Median C.I. : 68.91 to 75.05  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.96 to 76.64  
95% Mean C.I. : 71.65 to 78.91

Printed:3/21/2013 4:47:40PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	2	72.24	72.24	72.45	02.74	99.71	70.26	74.22	N/A	443,575	321,355
2	2	72.24	72.24	72.45	02.74	99.71	70.26	74.22	N/A	443,575	321,355
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	19	70.41	69.03	62.96	19.05	109.64	28.56	103.81	55.64 to 77.49	359,376	226,257
1	9	64.15	63.62	60.89	17.57	104.48	44.00	84.59	49.85 to 76.56	531,480	323,617
2	3	70.41	67.17	54.07	35.02	124.23	28.56	102.54	N/A	199,082	107,653
3	7	75.38	76.77	73.46	11.37	104.51	57.72	103.81	57.72 to 103.81	206,795	151,909
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	43	71.13	77.59	79.93	21.75	97.07	51.73	111.78	64.40 to 86.96	198,046	158,292
1	3	57.57	63.91	68.86	15.49	92.81	53.70	80.45	N/A	139,430	96,017
2	36	72.39	78.96	81.14	21.15	97.31	51.73	111.78	67.26 to 91.42	212,939	172,770
3	4	72.06	75.47	69.18	25.55	109.09	56.97	100.79	N/A	107,970	74,696
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>71.43</b>	<b>75.28</b>	<b>72.30</b>	<b>23.00</b>	<b>104.12</b>	<b>26.00</b>	<b>170.00</b>	<b>68.91 to 75.05</b>	<b>353,193</b>	<b>255,357</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	15	70.26	70.07	70.80	12.23	98.97	55.39	104.36	58.07 to 75.60	539,966	382,274
1	5	69.63	72.04	73.25	17.95	98.35	55.97	104.36	N/A	658,565	482,400
2	8	70.79	69.17	70.74	07.83	97.78	55.39	77.72	55.39 to 77.72	464,084	328,290
3	2	68.73	68.73	63.60	15.52	108.07	58.06	79.39	N/A	547,000	347,895
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	38	72.02	69.88	65.46	21.97	106.75	26.00	118.28	60.72 to 76.56	351,961	230,382
1	14	71.91	72.16	69.22	21.17	104.25	44.00	108.09	54.00 to 89.57	524,863	363,288
2	15	70.41	65.19	56.08	28.86	116.24	26.00	118.28	43.04 to 81.50	266,190	149,280
3	9	74.24	74.16	70.28	11.91	105.52	57.72	103.81	58.56 to 79.71	225,952	158,807
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	54	69.25	76.41	76.34	21.36	100.09	51.73	122.43	64.40 to 80.45	234,926	179,338
1	3	57.57	63.91	68.86	15.49	92.81	53.70	80.45	N/A	139,430	96,017
2	47	69.32	77.29	76.86	21.06	100.56	51.73	122.43	66.61 to 82.09	251,826	193,562
3	4	72.06	75.47	69.18	25.55	109.09	56.97	100.79	N/A	107,970	74,696
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>71.43</b>	<b>75.28</b>	<b>72.30</b>	<b>23.00</b>	<b>104.12</b>	<b>26.00</b>	<b>170.00</b>	<b>68.91 to 75.05</b>	<b>353,193</b>	<b>255,357</b>

## Knox County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Knox	1	4,750	4,734	4,523	4,523	4,230	4,242	3,951	3,970	4,341
Pierce	1	3,892	3,753	3,518	3,459	3,391	3,291	2,622	2,485	3,387
Cedar	1	4,860	4,860	4,800	4,800	4,240	4,240	3,680	3,680	4,300
Knox	3	3,430	3,472	3,400	3,296	3,189	3,087	2,479	2,457	2,962
Knox	2	2,440	2,333	2,227	2,073	1,984	1,905	1,724	1,645	2,071
Boyd	1	2,070	2,070	1,935	1,935	1,835	1,835	1,500	1,430	1,781
Holt	4001	3,200	3,181	3,097	3,098	2,872	2,898	2,298	2,300	2,834
Antelope	1	3,200	3,190	3,180	3,175	3,160	3,150	2,500	1,900	3,092

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Knox	1	3,565	3,565	3,420	3,275	3,190	2,985	2,790	2,790	3,180
Pierce	1	3,130	3,030	2,855	2,724	2,580	2,510	1,595	1,395	2,702
Cedar	1	3,190	3,190	3,155	3,153	3,120	3,120	2,360	2,360	2,858
Knox	3	2,054	1,985	1,905	1,880	1,829	1,730	1,535	1,270	1,766
Knox	2	1,325	1,300	1,210	1,100	1,070	1,070	1,040	1,040	1,152
Boyd	1	1,145	1,145	1,015	1,015	915	915	825	825	1,020
Holt	4001	1,198	1,172	1,049	1,049	914	920	800	800	997
Antelope	1	1,900	1,900	1,875	1,850	1,800	1,725	1,100	900	1,750

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Knox	1	1,159	1,170	1,169	1,170	1,160	1,160	1,158	1,160	1,162
Pierce	1	1,486	1,749	1,457	1,367	1,394	1,276	1,010	859	1,186
Cedar	1	1,452	1,634	1,413	1,510	1,325	1,400	1,212	1,009	1,219
Knox	3	1,000	1,000	985	985	975	975	975	975	978
Knox	2	900	899	851	880	867	868	882	885	882
Boyd	1	870	870	710	710	640	640	640	640	659
Holt	4001	655	676	679	677	629	647	511	480	551
Antelope	1	899	938	924	966	921	944	826	770	876

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

Knox County Assessor  
PO Box 87  
Center, NE 68724

Monica J McManigal Assessor  
Christa Beckmann Deputy Assessor

402-288-5601 Telephone  
402-288-5602 Fax  
knoxassessor@gpcom.net

**2013 Methodology Report for Special Valuation**  
**Knox County, Nebraska**

**There is nothing at this time to indicate implementing special value in Knox County. The parcels approved for special value have no different value than the other agricultural parcels within the county.**

**Monica J Mc Manigal**  
**Knox County Assessor**  
**March 1, 2013**



## 2013 Correlation Section for Knox County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Knox County is located in northeast Nebraska along the South Dakota border. Center is the county seat. The county is comprised of 10% irrigated, 32% dry crop and 54% grass/pasture land. Knox County has three market areas. Area 1 is the southeastern portion of the county with borders of Cedar and Pierce. This area has the same characteristics as the bordering counties and tends to have more tillable acres. This area has significant rainfall. Area 2 is the western portion of the county with borders of Boyd, Holt and Antelope. This area is utilized more for grassland characteristics, has less cropland available and extreme less rainfall. Area 3 is the northeastern portion of the county with the north border as the Missouri River and the eastern border Cedar County with a portion dropping down into the central portion of the county. This area tends to have a mixture of dry and grass characteristics and minimal irrigation wells or potential. This area becomes hilly with sandy soils and less rainfall as you gradually travel in a northwesterly direction. Geo code 677 has the Bazile Creek winding through the southern portion with rough hilly areas to the south and west. Geo 463 has some cropland with majority of grassland with waste and gullies becoming more prevalent as you travel north.

Generally, the southeast corner of Boyd, eastern Holt, northern Antelope and Pierce and the western portion of Cedar County where they all adjoin Knox have similar characteristics and comparable markets. Three Natural Resource Districts split this county. The Lower Niobrara governs the western part of the county. The Lewis & Clark NRD governs the majority of the eastern part of the county, while the Lower Elkhorn NRD governs a small portion of the southeast corner of the county.

In analyzing the agricultural sales within Knox County the land use of the sales in market areas two and three matched that of the County market areas as a whole. Market area one sales land use however wasn't representative. When analyzing the agricultural sales within each of the three market areas the sales were not proportionately distributed among the study period years. All three samples were expanded using sales from the defined comparable areas as described above.

The resulting sample for each of the three market areas are now proportionately distributed, representative of the majority land uses found in the population and large enough to produce a reliable measurement. The overall statistics are a result of 140 total sales with 33 sales in area 1, 88 sales in area 2 and 19 sales in area 3. The overall calculated median is 71%. The statistical profile also breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use. The 80% MLU provides the more representative sampling. When looking at the 80% MLU subclass it shows that all subclasses that are adequately represented in the sales file are within the acceptable range. Further more, each market area is demonstrating that an acceptable level of value has been attained.

Based on the consideration of all available information and consideration of surrounding counties value it is determined that uniform and proportionate treatment exists within and across county lines. The overall median of 71% will be used in determining the level of value for the agricultural class of real property within Knox County.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox 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 Knox County**

---

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

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

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

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



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 10,958</b>	<b>Value : 1,379,874,680</b>	<b>Growth 10,977,622</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	-------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	309	1,199,500	16	56,950	15	741,425	340	1,997,875	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,244	7,198,845	71	2,026,400	297	7,832,510	2,612	17,057,755	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,289	91,948,735	77	5,108,165	326	20,091,400	2,692	117,148,300	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,598	100,347,080	93	7,191,515	341	28,665,335	3,032	136,203,930	1,587,120
<b>% of Res Total</b>	85.69	73.67	3.07	5.28	11.25	21.05	27.67	9.87	14.46
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	58	164,585	5	9,815	5	26,490	68	200,890	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	466	1,703,140	26	281,615	25	5,423,740	517	7,408,495	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	476	22,868,580	27	2,453,295	35	15,418,490	538	40,740,365	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	534	24,736,305	32	2,744,725	40	20,868,720	606	48,349,750	1,368,855
<b>% of Com Total</b>	88.12	51.16	5.28	5.68	6.60	43.16	5.53	3.50	12.47
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1,214	10,026,120	1,214	10,026,120	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	2	88,200	626	13,614,365	628	13,702,565	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	3	85,665	648	62,418,915	651	62,504,580	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	3	173,865	1,862	86,059,400	1,865	86,233,265	3,625,697
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.20	99.84	99.80	17.02	6.25	33.03
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,598	100,347,080	96	7,365,380	2,203	114,724,735	4,897	222,437,195	5,212,817
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	53.05	45.11	1.96	3.31	44.99	51.58	44.69	16.12	47.49
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	534	24,736,305	32	2,744,725	40	20,868,720	606	48,349,750	1,368,855
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	88.12	51.16	5.28	5.68	6.60	43.16	5.53	3.50	12.47
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	3,132	125,083,385	128	10,110,105	2,243	135,593,455	5,503	270,786,945	6,581,672
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	56.91	46.19	2.33	3.73	40.76	50.07	50.22	19.62	59.96

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	11,380	710,825	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	11,380	710,825
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	11,380	710,825

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	399	77	721	1,197

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	232	25,095,745	3,817	657,275,260	4,049	682,371,005
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	104	20,834,720	1,251	326,171,400	1,355	347,006,120
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	105	6,108,660	1,301	73,601,950	1,406	79,710,610
30. Ag Total							5,455	1,109,087,735

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	8,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	84	89.00	760,400	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	86	87.00	4,789,425	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	26	49.08	65,540	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	99	445.73	482,015	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	68	0.00	1,319,235	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	419.96	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	13	13.00	104,000	14	14.00	112,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	905	959.82	7,677,315	989	1,048.82	8,437,715	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,024	952.82	44,506,785	1,110	1,039.82	49,296,210	4,395,950
34. HomeSite Total				<b>1,124</b>	<b>1,062.82</b>	<b>57,845,925</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	259	569.83	603,210	285	618.91	668,750	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,197	6,587.84	6,710,295	1,296	7,033.57	7,192,310	
37. FarmSite Improvements	915	0.00	29,095,165	983	0.00	30,414,400	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,268</b>	<b>7,652.48</b>	<b>38,275,460</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	10,032.82	0	0	10,452.78	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>2,392</b>	<b>19,168.08</b>	<b>96,121,385</b>	<b>4,395,950</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	7	888.00	674,025	7	888.00	674,025

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,731.38	7.80%	12,974,220	8.54%	4,750.06
46. 1A	10,010.23	28.60%	47,387,635	31.19%	4,733.92
47. 2A1	2,397.75	6.85%	10,845,835	7.14%	4,523.34
48. 2A	1,720.33	4.92%	7,780,960	5.12%	4,522.95
49. 3A1	3,478.05	9.94%	14,712,355	9.68%	4,230.06
50. 3A	1,042.36	2.98%	4,422,080	2.91%	4,242.37
51. 4A1	13,169.84	37.63%	52,035,230	34.25%	3,951.09
52. 4A	450.69	1.29%	1,789,105	1.18%	3,969.70
53. Total	35,000.63	100.00%	151,947,420	100.00%	4,341.28
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	5,231.56	6.03%	18,650,500	6.76%	3,565.00
55. 1D	28,039.51	32.34%	99,960,850	36.26%	3,565.00
56. 2D1	3,998.02	4.61%	13,673,185	4.96%	3,419.99
57. 2D	3,452.33	3.98%	11,304,780	4.10%	3,274.54
58. 3D1	8,814.20	10.17%	28,117,310	10.20%	3,190.00
59. 3D	1,652.02	1.91%	4,931,315	1.79%	2,985.02
60. 4D1	34,734.34	40.06%	96,908,860	35.15%	2,790.00
61. 4D	774.28	0.89%	2,160,245	0.78%	2,790.00
62. Total	86,696.26	100.00%	275,707,045	100.00%	3,180.15
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	450.41	1.53%	522,075	1.52%	1,159.11
64. 1G	4,193.51	14.21%	4,906,370	14.31%	1,169.99
65. 2G1	1,732.26	5.87%	2,024,265	5.91%	1,168.57
66. 2G	1,836.84	6.23%	2,149,095	6.27%	1,170.00
67. 3G1	1,790.66	6.07%	2,077,155	6.06%	1,159.99
68. 3G	3,175.42	10.76%	3,683,490	10.75%	1,160.00
69. 4G1	10,685.53	36.22%	12,374,205	36.10%	1,158.03
70. 4G	5,639.41	19.11%	6,541,640	19.08%	1,159.99
71. Total	29,504.04	100.00%	34,278,295	100.00%	1,161.82
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	35,000.63	23.07%	151,947,420	32.88%	4,341.28
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	86,696.26	57.15%	275,707,045	59.65%	3,180.15
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	29,504.04	19.45%	34,278,295	7.42%	1,161.82
72. Waste	147.51	0.10%	7,405	0.00%	50.20
73. Other	337.80	0.22%	249,585	0.05%	738.85
74. Exempt	1,045.66	0.69%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	151,686.24	100.00%	462,189,750	100.00%	3,047.01

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	3,378.79	12.68%	8,244,225	14.94%	2,439.99
46. 1A	2,871.50	10.78%	6,697,955	12.14%	2,332.56
47. 2A1	3,745.26	14.06%	8,342,370	15.12%	2,227.45
48. 2A	5,359.73	20.12%	11,112,185	20.14%	2,073.27
49. 3A1	3,257.85	12.23%	6,463,730	11.72%	1,984.05
50. 3A	2,917.56	10.95%	5,557,965	10.08%	1,905.00
51. 4A1	4,367.42	16.40%	7,531,085	13.65%	1,724.38
52. 4A	739.42	2.78%	1,216,205	2.20%	1,644.81
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>26,637.53</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>55,165,720</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,070.98</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	10,974.17	14.41%	14,539,145	16.57%	1,324.85
55. 1D	11,645.78	15.29%	15,136,290	17.25%	1,299.72
56. 2D1	6,718.07	8.82%	8,128,455	9.27%	1,209.94
57. 2D	15,920.05	20.91%	17,511,165	19.96%	1,099.94
58. 3D1	5,581.88	7.33%	5,972,480	6.81%	1,069.98
59. 3D	3,738.82	4.91%	3,999,695	4.56%	1,069.77
60. 4D1	19,068.61	25.04%	19,831,345	22.61%	1,040.00
61. 4D	2,504.67	3.29%	2,604,770	2.97%	1,039.97
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>76,152.05</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>87,723,345</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,151.95</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	2,298.08	0.96%	2,068,705	0.98%	900.19
64. 1G	7,870.48	3.30%	7,071,660	3.36%	898.50
65. 2G1	5,911.11	2.48%	5,030,930	2.39%	851.10
66. 2G	15,220.59	6.38%	13,397,390	6.37%	880.21
67. 3G1	8,487.75	3.56%	7,361,315	3.50%	867.29
68. 3G	14,999.50	6.29%	13,023,785	6.19%	868.28
69. 4G1	70,907.61	29.72%	62,557,125	29.73%	882.23
70. 4G	112,856.99	47.31%	99,932,345	47.49%	885.48
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>238,552.11</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>210,443,255</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>882.17</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>26,637.53</b>	<b>7.37%</b>	<b>55,165,720</b>	<b>15.54%</b>	<b>2,070.98</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>76,152.05</b>	<b>21.06%</b>	<b>87,723,345</b>	<b>24.71%</b>	<b>1,151.95</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>238,552.11</b>	<b>65.98%</b>	<b>210,443,255</b>	<b>59.28%</b>	<b>882.17</b>
72. Waste	13,307.01	3.68%	1,233,670	0.35%	92.71
73. Other	6,919.60	1.91%	432,930	0.12%	62.57
74. Exempt	12,263.36	3.39%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>361,568.30</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>354,998,920</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>981.83</b>

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	476.00	4.26%	1,632,670	4.93%	3,429.98
46. 1A	2,207.79	19.76%	7,664,655	23.16%	3,471.64
47. 2A1	829.03	7.42%	2,818,530	8.52%	3,399.79
48. 2A	1,654.56	14.81%	5,454,215	16.48%	3,296.47
49. 3A1	618.22	5.53%	1,971,505	5.96%	3,189.00
50. 3A	330.07	2.95%	1,018,940	3.08%	3,087.04
51. 4A1	4,754.29	42.55%	11,784,670	35.61%	2,478.74
52. 4A	303.12	2.71%	744,775	2.25%	2,457.03
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>11,173.08</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>33,089,960</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,961.58</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	4,319.42	8.41%	8,872,785	9.79%	2,054.16
55. 1D	12,691.84	24.71%	25,191,500	27.78%	1,984.86
56. 2D1	3,588.35	6.99%	6,835,570	7.54%	1,904.93
57. 2D	5,567.53	10.84%	10,464,685	11.54%	1,879.59
58. 3D1	2,818.84	5.49%	5,154,985	5.69%	1,828.76
59. 3D	566.97	1.10%	980,865	1.08%	1,730.01
60. 4D1	20,714.59	40.34%	31,796,890	35.07%	1,535.00
61. 4D	1,085.89	2.11%	1,379,165	1.52%	1,270.08
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>51,353.43</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>90,676,445</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,765.73</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	484.60	0.66%	484,560	0.68%	999.92
64. 1G	4,771.05	6.52%	4,771,005	6.67%	999.99
65. 2G1	2,811.41	3.84%	2,769,295	3.87%	985.02
66. 2G	2,425.07	3.31%	2,388,715	3.34%	985.01
67. 3G1	2,292.74	3.13%	2,235,490	3.12%	975.03
68. 3G	1,189.01	1.62%	1,159,305	1.62%	975.02
69. 4G1	25,940.17	35.44%	25,291,955	35.35%	975.01
70. 4G	33,277.37	45.47%	32,445,515	45.35%	975.00
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>73,191.42</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>71,545,840</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>977.52</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>11,173.08</b>	<b>7.96%</b>	<b>33,089,960</b>	<b>16.90%</b>	<b>2,961.58</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>51,353.43</b>	<b>36.58%</b>	<b>90,676,445</b>	<b>46.32%</b>	<b>1,765.73</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>73,191.42</b>	<b>52.13%</b>	<b>71,545,840</b>	<b>36.54%</b>	<b>977.52</b>
72. Waste	2,284.42	1.63%	114,290	0.06%	50.03
73. Other	2,400.64	1.71%	351,145	0.18%	146.27
74. Exempt	11,690.11	8.33%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>140,402.99</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>195,777,680</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,394.40</b>

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	3,297.21	10,948,070	69,514.03	229,255,030	72,811.24	240,203,100
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	12,309.42	24,054,295	201,892.32	430,052,540	214,201.74	454,106,835
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	10,306.22	9,544,965	330,941.35	306,722,425	341,247.57	316,267,390
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	634.49	42,585	15,104.45	1,312,780	15,738.94	1,355,365
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	327.50	24,595	9,330.54	1,009,065	9,658.04	1,033,660
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	1,907.33	0	23,091.80	0	24,999.13	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26,874.84</b>	<b>44,614,510</b>	<b>626,782.69</b>	<b>968,351,840</b>	<b>653,657.53</b>	<b>1,012,966,350</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	72,811.24	11.14%	240,203,100	23.71%	3,298.98
<b>Dry Land</b>	214,201.74	32.77%	454,106,835	44.83%	2,120.00
<b>Grass</b>	341,247.57	52.21%	316,267,390	31.22%	926.80
<b>Waste</b>	15,738.94	2.41%	1,355,365	0.13%	86.12
<b>Other</b>	9,658.04	1.48%	1,033,660	0.10%	107.03
<b>Exempt</b>	24,999.13	3.82%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>653,657.53</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,012,966,350</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,549.69</b>

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

54 Knox

	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	124,800,755	136,203,930	11,403,175	9.14%	1,587,120	7.87%
02. Recreational	74,400,040	86,233,265	11,833,225	15.90%	3,625,697	11.03%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	48,985,630	57,845,925	8,860,295	18.09%	4,395,950	9.11%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>248,186,425</b>	<b>280,283,120</b>	<b>32,096,695</b>	<b>12.93%</b>	<b>9,608,767</b>	<b>9.06%</b>
05. Commercial	44,388,395	48,349,750	3,961,355	8.92%	1,368,855	5.84%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	26,542,325	38,275,460	11,733,135	44.21%	0	44.21%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>70,930,720</b>	<b>86,625,210</b>	<b>15,694,490</b>	<b>22.13%</b>	<b>1,368,855</b>	<b>20.20%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>319,117,145</b>	<b>366,908,330</b>	<b>47,791,185</b>	<b>14.98%</b>	<b>10,977,622</b>	<b>11.54%</b>
11. Irrigated	153,015,465	240,203,100	87,187,635	56.98%		
12. Dryland	349,589,615	454,106,835	104,517,220	29.90%		
13. Grassland	263,907,040	316,267,390	52,360,350	19.84%		
14. Wasteland	1,595,190	1,355,365	-239,825	-15.03%		
15. Other Agland	342,910	1,033,660	690,750	201.44%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>768,450,220</b>	<b>1,012,966,350</b>	<b>244,516,130</b>	<b>31.82%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,087,567,365</b>	<b>1,379,874,680</b>	<b>292,307,315</b>	<b>26.88%</b>	<b>10,977,622</b>	<b>25.87%</b>

## 2012 Knox County 3 year Plan of Assessment

<u>Real Estate Only</u>	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% total parcels</u>	<u>Valuation</u>	<u>% total valuation</u>
Residential/Recreational	4857	45%	\$ 198,090,540	18.21%
Commercial	609	6%	\$ 44,238,315	4.07%
Agricultural	<u>5457</u>	<u>49%</u>	\$ <u>845,472,345</u>	<u>77.72%</u>
<u>2012 Abstract Totals</u>	<u>10,923</u>	100%	\$ <u>1,087,801,200</u>	100.00%

Personal Property Schedules 1,578

### 2012-2013 Proposed Budget

Assessor Budget-\$ 163,514.14

Re-Appraisal Budget-\$ 56,264.00

### Staff

1 Assessor

1 Deputy Assessor

2 Full Time Clerks/Appraisers

1 Part-time Clerk/Appraiser

All staff functions are performed by everyone in the office. This makes all help accessible at all times to any customer. The Assessor does all of the reports.

Contract Appraiser-none

### Training

As the Assessor, I have attended all workshops and completed my educational hours needed to maintain my Assessor Certificate. The Deputy Assessor, Assessor Assistant and the office clerks all try to attend school on a regular basis. The GoToMeeting training is being utilized, it being a good idea for education that is otherwise hard to acquire.

### 2012 R & O Statistics

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	94.00%	12.32	106.64
Commercial	98.00%	11.35	104.27
Agricultural	71.00%	21.38	105.86

## **3 Year Appraisal Plan**

### **Current 2012**

#### **Residential**

**Lake-Lake** review and field inspections along the Missouri and Niobrara Rivers are beginning in July, 2012. Individual physical inspections are being completed on each of the lake areas. All statistics are being verified and new digital photos taken. New colored file jackets are being utilized using different colors for each of the 34 lake areas. The 2011 flooded lake area in Northern-Western Knox will cause us to spend more time than anticipated and/or allowed for on our residential time line. Because of the flooding, we will be spending a lot of time this fall and winter on yearly pickup work. That area is being entirely removed of flooded homes and new either being brought in or built. After the flooding last summer, my office inspected each parcel in September, took photographs and jotted notes on each. January 5, 2012 we returned and again made notes on what was there, what was gone and the condition of each parcel. The entire area was devastated and destroyed-over \$7M in valuation alone.

**Towns/Lake**-Yearly appraisal maintenance will be done for the lake and city parcels, which includes sales review and pickup work. Sale review includes a physical inspection of the property. If it has been inspected recently, we will use the information that the buyer and/or the seller provides for us in our sale review. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

#### **Commercial**

We will begin commercial property review in fall 2012. I have employed an ex-employee to review each and every commercial property. A physical inspection will take place. The entire review will be completed in 2013 with changes, if any, being placed on the tax role for 2014.

Normal commercial maintenance will take place. Knox County normally does not have a large number of sales in commercial property. A market analysis will continue to be done as in the past. Sales review and pickup work will continue as before. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

## **Agricultural**

The farm review data entry was finalized for the 2012 abstract. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map showing market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house using all the information collected. The advice of the state liaison is always utilized. Sales review and pickup work will be completed for agricultural properties. Personnel will continue to update ag land properties as changes are deemed necessary. GIS updates will be a priority as a new 2012 aerial is to be provided to us by the USDA. This will be a large project because it was reported to us by the FSA Office that Knox County had over 8,000 acres of grassland converted to crop for 2012.

## **Other**

Personnel will continue with entering land use into the GIS system. We shall gather personal property, file homestead exemptions, work within the sales rosters and set the yearly values, file abstract, implement 521's sale transfers, change property names, handle the splits, maintain property record cards, generate yearly records, review all sales, keep mapping up to date, generate the valuation change notices, prepare omitted and undervalued notices, hear protests, review and visit each protest sight, figure growth, prepare centrally assessed values, generate valuations and distribute, certify school values, correct sales file roster, prepare charitable exemptions, combine and balance levies, prepare Certified Tax List, prepare school aid reports, generate tax roles, tax list corrections, prepare update with FSA records, work with local NRD's, update CRP records and prepare for TERC.

## **2013**

### **Residential**

**Lake-**Reviews and field inspections along the Missouri and Niobrara Rivers are continuing. Individual physical inspections are being completed on each lake area. All information is being verified and new digital photos are being taken. New color-coded file jackets are being utilized for each of the 34 lake areas. The flooded area in Western Knox has caused us to spend more time than anticipated or allowed for on our residential time line. With over \$7M of devastation in 2011, all is being rebuilt with the gradual re-building of homes that could be saved, new homes being built and/or new homes being moved in.

**Towns/Lake-**Yearly appraisal maintenance will be done for the lake and city parcels, which includes sales review and pickup work. Sale review includes a physical inspection of the property. If it has been inspected recently, we will use the information that the buyer and/or the seller provides for us in our sale review. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

### **Commercial**

The commercial review shall continue. Commercial maintenance will be conducted for 2013. Knox County normally does not have a large number of sales in commercial property. A market analysis will continue to be done as in the past. Sales review and pickup work will continue as before. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

### **Agricultural**

The farm review data entry was last finalized on the 2012 abstract. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map showing market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house using all the information collected. The advice of the state liaison is always utilized. Sales review and pickup work will be completed for agricultural properties. Personnel will continue to update ag land properties as changes are deemed necessary. GIS updates will be a priority as a new 2012 aerial is to be provided to us by the USDA. This will be a large project because it was reported to us by the FSA Office that Knox County had over 8,000 acres of grassland converted to crop for 2012. We will need to review and inspect many, many acres for accuracy on the land uses. This will be an on going project for many years to come.

### **Other**

Personnel will continue with entering land use into the GIS system. We shall gather personal property, file homestead exemptions, work within the sales rosters and set the yearly values, file abstract, implement 521's sale transfers, change property names, handle the splits, maintain property record cards, generate yearly records, review all sales, keep mapping up to date, generate the valuation change notices, prepare omitted and undervalued notices, hear protests, review and visit each protest sight, figure growth, prepare centrally assessed values, generate valuations and distribute, certify school values, correct sales file roster, prepare charitable exemptions, combine and balance levies, prepare Certified Tax List, prepare school aid reports, generate tax roles, tax list corrections, prepare update with FSA records, work with local NRD's, update CRP records and prepare for TERC.

## 2014

### Residential

**Lake**-Review work shall continue to be updated on the lake properties and should be finalized for 2014.

**Towns**-Town review shall begin. This will be a two to three year process. Again, as in the past, all towns will be walked door-to-door looking for new growth and updating the current information if needed.

Yearly maintenance will include sale reviews and pickup work. Sale reviews include questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to talk to either the buyer or the seller. All building permits and information statements are physically reviewed. We continually review all files for accuracy and correct statistics.

### Commercial

Commercial review should be finalized and updated on the appraisal side. Appraisal maintenance will be the agenda for all commercial properties. Knox County generally has a low number of commercial sales with many single type sales. Normally it is very hard to compare because of the uniqueness and the small number of properties selling. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

### Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification groupings will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map in our office showing the market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house, by myself, using all information collected. My liaison is also asked for advice. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed by the office staff. GIS updates are continuing.

### Other

Personnel shall continue to transfer all information, gather personal property, file homestead exemptions, work within the sales rosters and set the yearly values, file abstract, handle all 521 transfer statements and get the required original into the state

department one and one-half months after the sale date, implement 521 sale transfers, change property names, handle the splits, maintain property record cards, generate yearly records, review all sales, keep mapping up to date, generate the valuation change notices, prepare omitted and undervalued notices, hear protests, review and visit each protest sight, figure growth, prepare centrally assessed values, generate valuations and distribute, certify school values, correct sales file roster, prepare charitable exemptions, combine and balance levies, prepare Certified Tax List, prepare school aid reports, generate tax roles, tax list corrections, prepare update with FSA records, work with the local NRD's, update CRP records and prepare for TERC.

## 2015

### Residential

The cycle shall continue with inspections of each town in Knox County. Yearly appraisal maintenance will be done for the residential lake and city, which includes sales review and pickup work. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

### Commercial

Appraisal maintenance will be the agenda for all commercial properties. Knox County generally has a low number of commercial sales with many single type sales. Normally it is very hard to compare because of the uniqueness and the small number of properties selling. Sale review includes either a physical inspection of the property and/or questionnaires, telephone calls or physical inspection of the property. We make all efforts to contact either the buyer or the seller or the realtor involved. Pickup work includes physical inspection of all building permits. We will continually review each file for accuracy and correct statistics.

### Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification groupings will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. As in the past, all sales will be plotted on a county map in our office showing the market areas and the price paid. The market analysis is conducted in house, by myself, using all information collected. My liaison is also asked for advice. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed by the office staff. GIS updates are continuing. .

**Other**

Personnel shall continue to transfer all information, gather personal property, file homestead exemptions, work within the sales rosters and set the yearly values, file abstract, handle all 521 transfer statements and get the required original into the state department one and one-half months after the sale date, implement 521 sale transfers, change property names, handle the splits, maintain property record cards, generate yearly records, review all sales, keep mapping up to date, generate the valuation change notices, prepare omitted and undervalued notices, hear protests, review and visit each protest sight, figure growth, prepare centrally assessed values, generate valuations and distribute, certify school values, correct sales file roster, prepare charitable exemptions, combine and balance levies, prepare Certified Tax List, prepare school aid reports, generate tax roles, tax list corrections, prepare update with FSA records, work with local NRD's, update CRP records and prepare for TERC.

<u>Class</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>
<u>Residential</u>	Begin Lake Review Market Analysis	Continue Lake Review Market Analysis	Finalize Lake Review Begin Town Review Market Analysis	Continue Town Review Market Analysis	Finalize Town Review Market Analysis
<u>Commercial</u>	Begin Review Market Analysis	Continue Review Market Analysis	Finalize Commercial Market Analysis	Market Analysis	Market Analysis
<u>Agricultural</u>	Finalize farm review GIS Updates Market Analysis	GIS Updates 2012 Aerial updates Market Analysis	GIS Updates Aerial Updates Market Analysis	GIS Updates Aerial Updates Market Analysis	GIS Updates Aerial Updates Market Analysis

## 2013 Assessment Survey for Knox County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	One
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	None
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	Two
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	One
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	None
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$ 163,514.14
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	----
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	---
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$ 56,264.00
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$ 22,000.00
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$ 1,500.00
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	---
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$ 17,478.00

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	We use GIS but still maintain cadastral milars
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	All Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	GIS Workshop

6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes – knox.gisworkshop.com
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Deputy Assessor
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Thomson Reuters formally Terra Scan

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	All towns and villages
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	July 1995

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	In-house
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	none

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	None
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	---
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	---
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	---
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	---



# 2013 Certification for Knox 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 Knox County Assessor.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



