

# 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 Rock County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	18	Median	95.26
Total Sales Price	\$552,500	Mean	102.29
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$552,500	Wgt. Mean	97.37
Total Assessed Value	\$537,960	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$33,558
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$30,694	Avg. Assessed Value	\$29,887

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	80.40 to 126.04
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.58 to 115.16
95% Mean C.I	85.89 to 118.69
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	6.82
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.42
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.16

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	25	97	96.87
2011	38	97	97
2010	47	97	97
2009	39	97	97

## 2013 Commission Summary for Rock County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	10	Median	88.75
Total Sales Price	\$969,290	Mean	129.96
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$969,290	Wgt. Mean	72.83
Total Assessed Value	\$705,905	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$50,353
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$96,929	Avg. Assessed Value	\$70,591

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	62.46 to 164.51
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	52.53 to 93.12
95% Mean C.I	41.09 to 218.83
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	1.94
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.09
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	9.94

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	6		97.36
2011	3		97
2010	6	100	99
2009	6	100	96



## 2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Rock 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>	<b>95</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>73</b>	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 Rock County**

The only action performed this year is the ongoing physical review/inspection to meet the six year review and inspection requirement.

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

## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Rock County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and Deputy	
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	Bassett- all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of Bassett. The population is approximately 740. The City consists of various services and goods such as two banks, convenience/gas store, restaurants, hardware/lumberyard store, grocery store, local newspaper, and sale barn.
	02	Bassett Suburban and Bassett Suburban Vacant- all improved and unimproved properties located outside of the limits of the City of Bassett, but within the legal jurisdiction of the incorporated City.
	03	Newport, Newport Suburban- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Newport. Also, all improved and unimproved properties located outside of the limits of the Village of Newport, but within the legal jurisdiction of the incorporated Village. Newport's population is approximately 97. The convenience/gas station along HWY 20 is currently closed.
	04	Rural- all improved and unimproved properties located outside the City limits in the rural areas.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010	
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>	
	Depreciation studies are based on local market information.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	No	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2004	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>	
	A vacant land sales analysis was performed on five years' worth of sales.	

**75 Rock**  
**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 : 18  
Total Sales Price : 552,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 552,500  
Total Assessed Value : 537,960  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 30,694  
Avg. Assessed Value : 29,887

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 97  
MEAN : 102  
COD : 25.81  
PRD : 105.05

COV : 32.24  
STD : 32.98  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.59  
MAX Sales Ratio : 171.25  
MIN Sales Ratio : 57.43

95% Median C.I. : 80.40 to 126.04  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.58 to 115.16  
95% Mean C.I. : 85.89 to 118.69

Printed:3/21/2013 4:54:51PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	64.33	64.33	64.33	00.00	100.00	64.33	64.33	N/A	30,500	19,620
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	72.99	72.99	72.99	00.00	100.00	72.99	72.99	N/A	35,000	25,545
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	94.06	103.44	103.39	20.69	100.05	79.79	145.85	N/A	30,500	31,534
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	6	87.06	94.27	94.28	14.09	99.99	80.40	126.04	80.40 to 126.04	35,167	33,156
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	129.08	131.92	140.03	17.23	94.21	99.98	166.70	N/A	23,667	33,140
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	1	100.13	100.13	100.13	00.00	100.00	100.13	100.13	N/A	43,000	43,055
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12											
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	114.34	114.34	63.13	49.77	181.12	57.43	171.25	N/A	20,000	12,625
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	12	85.86	93.06	92.91	18.48	100.16	64.33	145.85	79.79 to 103.00	33,208	30,853
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	6	114.61	120.76	108.91	30.47	110.88	57.43	171.25	57.43 to 171.25	25,667	27,954
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	14	95.26	103.44	102.51	21.97	100.91	72.99	166.70	80.40 to 129.08	31,357	32,145
<u>ALL</u>	18	95.26	102.29	97.37	25.81	105.05	57.43	171.25	80.40 to 126.04	30,694	29,887

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	12	100.06	108.49	104.34	26.98	103.98	57.43	171.25	79.79 to 145.85	31,667	33,040
02	2	82.81	82.81	82.95	00.91	99.83	82.06	83.55	N/A	62,750	52,053
03	3	80.40	81.56	72.26	14.76	112.87	64.33	99.94	N/A	13,667	9,875
04	1	129.08	129.08	129.08	00.00	100.00	129.08	129.08	N/A	6,000	7,745
<u>ALL</u>	18	95.26	102.29	97.37	25.81	105.05	57.43	171.25	80.40 to 126.04	30,694	29,887

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	17	90.57	102.25	97.32	27.95	105.07	57.43	171.25	79.79 to 129.08	32,206	31,342
06											
07	1	103.00	103.00	103.00	00.00	100.00	103.00	103.00	N/A	5,000	5,150
<u>ALL</u>	18	95.26	102.29	97.37	25.81	105.05	57.43	171.25	80.40 to 126.04	30,694	29,887

**75 Rock  
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 : 18  
 Total Sales Price : 552,500  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 552,500  
 Total Assessed Value : 537,960  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 30,694  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 29,887

MEDIAN : 95  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 102  
 COD : 25.81  
 PRD : 105.05

COV : 32.24  
 STD : 32.98  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.59  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 171.25  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 57.43

95% Median C.I. : 80.40 to 126.04  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.58 to 115.16  
 95% Mean C.I. : 85.89 to 118.69

Printed:3/21/2013 4:54:51PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	2	125.83	125.83	120.78	36.10	104.18	80.40	171.25	N/A	2,250	2,718	
Less Than 15,000	6	101.47	111.97	105.42	22.14	106.21	80.40	171.25	80.40 to 171.25	5,417	5,710	
Less Than 30,000	7	99.98	110.26	103.05	19.26	107.00	80.40	171.25	80.40 to 171.25	8,214	8,465	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	16	95.26	99.35	97.18	23.08	102.23	57.43	166.70	79.79 to 126.04	34,250	33,283	
Greater Than 14,999	12	87.06	97.45	96.87	27.67	100.60	57.43	166.70	72.99 to 126.04	43,333	41,975	
Greater Than 29,999	11	83.55	97.22	96.71	29.67	100.53	57.43	166.70	64.33 to 145.85	45,000	43,519	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	2	125.83	125.83	120.78	36.10	104.18	80.40	171.25	N/A	2,250	2,718	
5,000 TO 14,999	4	101.47	105.05	102.95	10.83	102.04	88.17	129.08	N/A	7,000	7,206	
15,000 TO 29,999	1	99.98	99.98	99.98	00.00	100.00	99.98	99.98	N/A	25,000	24,995	
30,000 TO 59,999	9	90.57	100.68	102.58	32.13	98.15	57.43	166.70	64.33 to 145.85	39,444	40,464	
60,000 TO 99,999	2	81.67	81.67	81.81	02.30	99.83	79.79	83.55	N/A	70,000	57,265	
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	18	95.26	102.29	97.37	25.81	105.05	57.43	171.25	80.40 to 126.04	30,694	29,887	



## **2013 Correlation Section for Rock County**

---

### **A. Residential Real Property**

Rock County is located in north central Nebraska with Hwy 20 running through the county east and west and Hwy 183 running north and south. Bassett is the largest town and the county seat with a population of 619 based on the 2010 census. The county is experiencing a decreasing population. The K-12 public school system is located in town.

Rock County has completed the statutory six year review requirement for residential property. In 2011 the Division implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties within the state to review assessment practices. Rock County was one of those selected for review. Based on the findings from that review it was determined the assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently to the residential class of property. All property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

Residential sales are reviewed to determine if they are arms length transactions by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. Phone calls are also made when there are further questions regarding the sale. Many times sellers or buyers come to the assessor's office and details of the sale are discussed at that time. This past year the Property Assessment Division conducted a review of the county sales qualifications by going through the non-qualified sales roster. This also included reviewing any sales verification documentation the assessor had on file. After completing this review, the Division is confident that all available arms' length transactions were available for use in the measurement of real property within the county.

The statistical sampling of 18 residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of property in Rock County. The calculated median is 95%. Both the median and weighted mean are within the acceptable range and correlate closely, the mean is slightly above. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are above the ranges, however based on the known assessment practices it is believed the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 95% of market value for the residential class of property.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock County**

The only changes made to the commercial file were those found through sales review and pick up work.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Rock County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and Deputy	
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	Bassett- all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of Bassett. The population is approximately 740. The City consists of various services and goods such as two banks, convenience/gas store, restaurants, hardware/lumberyard store, grocery store, local newspaper, and sale barn.
	02	Suburban- all improved and unimproved properties located outside of the limits of the City of Bassett and Newport, but within the legal jurisdiction of the incorporated City.
	03	Newport- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Newport. Newport's population is approximately 97. The convenience/gas station along HWY 20 is currently closed.
	04	Rural- all improved and unimproved properties located outside the City limits in the rural areas.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>	
	At this time the assessor hasn't had any unique properties to value. When the situation arises similar properties in surrounding counties would be used as comparables as well as properties statewide.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2006	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The depreciation study is developed based on local market information.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	No	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2006	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2006	

9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>
	A vacant land sales analysis was performed.

**75 Rock**  
**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 : 10  
Total Sales Price : 969,290  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 969,290  
Total Assessed Value : 705,905  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 96,929  
Avg. Assessed Value : 70,591

MEDIAN : 89  
WGT. MEAN : 73  
MEAN : 130  
COD : 66.22  
PRD : 178.44

COV : 95.60  
STD : 124.24  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 58.77  
MAX Sales Ratio : 472.57  
MIN Sales Ratio : 55.34

95% Median C.I. : 62.46 to 164.51  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 52.53 to 93.12  
95% Mean C.I. : 41.09 to 218.83

Printed:3/21/2013 4:54:52PM

**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											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	81.59	81.59	81.59	00.00	100.00	81.59	81.59	N/A	41,000	33,450
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	472.57	472.57	472.57	00.00	100.00	472.57	472.57	N/A	3,500	16,540
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	101.21	101.21	101.21	00.00	100.00	101.21	101.21	N/A	61,000	61,740
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	92.21	92.21	79.93	21.29	115.36	72.58	111.83	N/A	181,500	145,080
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	93.50	93.50	93.50	00.00	100.00	93.50	93.50	N/A	42,000	39,270
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	109.93	109.93	57.31	49.66	191.82	55.34	164.51	N/A	215,145	123,310
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	84.00	84.00	84.00	00.00	100.00	84.00	84.00	N/A	1,500	1,260
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	62.46	62.46	62.46	00.00	100.00	62.46	62.46	N/A	27,000	16,865
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	2	277.08	277.08	112.34	70.55	246.64	81.59	472.57	N/A	22,250	24,995
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	6	97.36	99.83	71.16	26.73	140.29	55.34	164.51	55.34 to 164.51	149,382	106,298
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	2	73.23	73.23	63.60	14.71	115.14	62.46	84.00	N/A	14,250	9,063
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	101.21	218.46	105.91	128.77	206.27	81.59	472.57	N/A	35,167	37,243
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	5	93.50	99.55	68.96	31.74	144.36	55.34	164.51	N/A	167,058	115,210
<u>ALL</u>	10	88.75	129.96	72.83	66.22	178.44	55.34	472.57	62.46 to 164.51	96,929	70,591

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	97.36	104.20	84.97	22.24	122.63	72.58	164.51	72.58 to 164.51	85,798	72,906
03	3	84.00	206.34	108.33	162.74	190.47	62.46	472.57	N/A	10,667	11,555
04	1	55.34	55.34	55.34	00.00	100.00	55.34	55.34	N/A	422,500	233,805
<u>ALL</u>	10	88.75	129.96	72.83	66.22	178.44	55.34	472.57	62.46 to 164.51	96,929	70,591

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	1	101.21	101.21	101.21	00.00	100.00	101.21	101.21	N/A	61,000	61,740
03	9	84.00	133.15	70.92	75.45	187.75	55.34	472.57	62.46 to 164.51	100,921	71,574
04											
<u>ALL</u>	10	88.75	129.96	72.83	66.22	178.44	55.34	472.57	62.46 to 164.51	96,929	70,591

**75 Rock  
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 : 10  
 Total Sales Price : 969,290  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 969,290  
 Total Assessed Value : 705,905  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 96,929  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 70,591

MEDIAN : 89  
 WGT. MEAN : 73  
 MEAN : 130  
 COD : 66.22  
 PRD : 178.44

COV : 95.60  
 STD : 124.24  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 58.77  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 472.57  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 55.34

95% Median C.I. : 62.46 to 164.51  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 52.53 to 93.12  
 95% Mean C.I. : 41.09 to 218.83

Printed:3/21/2013 4:54:52PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	2	278.29	278.29	356.00	69.82	78.17	84.00	472.57	N/A	2,500	8,900	
Less Than 15,000	3	164.51	240.36	239.37	78.73	100.41	84.00	472.57	N/A	4,263	10,205	
Less Than 30,000	4	124.26	195.89	119.33	98.71	164.16	62.46	472.57	N/A	9,948	11,870	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	8	87.55	92.88	71.36	28.43	130.16	55.34	164.51	55.34 to 164.51	120,536	86,013	
Greater Than 14,999	7	81.59	82.64	70.60	20.33	117.05	55.34	111.83	55.34 to 111.83	136,643	96,470	
Greater Than 29,999	6	87.55	86.01	70.84	18.47	121.41	55.34	111.83	55.34 to 111.83	154,917	109,738	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	2	278.29	278.29	356.00	69.82	78.17	84.00	472.57	N/A	2,500	8,900	
5,000 TO 14,999	1	164.51	164.51	164.51	00.00	100.00	164.51	164.51	N/A	7,790	12,815	
15,000 TO 29,999	1	62.46	62.46	62.46	00.00	100.00	62.46	62.46	N/A	27,000	16,865	
30,000 TO 59,999	2	87.55	87.55	87.61	06.81	99.93	81.59	93.50	N/A	41,500	36,360	
60,000 TO 99,999	2	106.52	106.52	106.81	04.98	99.73	101.21	111.83	N/A	64,500	68,893	
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999	2	63.96	63.96	62.43	13.48	102.45	55.34	72.58	N/A	358,750	223,960	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	10	88.75	129.96	72.83	66.22	178.44	55.34	472.57	62.46 to 164.51	96,929	70,591	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	101.21	101.21	101.21	00.00	100.00	101.21	101.21	N/A	61,000	61,740	
304	1	72.58	72.58	72.58	00.00	100.00	72.58	72.58	N/A	295,000	214,115	
327	1	472.57	472.57	472.57	00.00	100.00	472.57	472.57	N/A	3,500	16,540	
344	3	93.50	114.00	104.01	28.71	109.60	84.00	164.51	N/A	17,097	17,782	
353	1	111.83	111.83	111.83	00.00	100.00	111.83	111.83	N/A	68,000	76,045	
442	1	62.46	62.46	62.46	00.00	100.00	62.46	62.46	N/A	27,000	16,865	
476	1	55.34	55.34	55.34	00.00	100.00	55.34	55.34	N/A	422,500	233,805	
528	1	81.59	81.59	81.59	00.00	100.00	81.59	81.59	N/A	41,000	33,450	
<u>ALL</u>	10	88.75	129.96	72.83	66.22	178.44	55.34	472.57	62.46 to 164.51	96,929	70,591	



## **2013 Correlation Section for Rock County**

---

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

Rock County is located in north central Nebraska with Hwy 20 running through the county east and west and Hwy 183 running north and south. Bassett is the largest town and the county seat with a population of 619 based on the 2010 census. The county is experiencing a decreasing population. Bassett has your basic grocery store, bar/grill, hardware/lumberyard, bank and convenience/gas store. The K-12 public school system is located in town.

Rock County is on track with the statutory six year review requirement for commercial property. In 2011 the Division implemented an expanded review of one-third of the counties within the state to review assessment practices. Rock County was one of those selected for review. Based on the findings from that review it was determined the assessment practices are reliable and being applied consistently to the commercial class of property. All property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

Commercial sales are reviewed to determine if they are arms length transactions by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. Phone calls are also made when there are further questions regarding the sale. Many times sellers or buyers come to the assessor's office and details of the sale are discussed at that time. This past year the Property Assessment Division conducted a review of the county sales qualifications by going through the non-qualified sales roster. This also included reviewing any sales verification documentation the assessor had on file. After completing this review, the Division is confident that all available arms' length transactions were available for use in the measurement of real property within the county.

The statistical sample for the commercial class of property is made up of 10 sales and will not be relied upon to determine a level of value for Rock County. Further stratification of the sample by valuation grouping displays three different valuation groupings as well as seven different occupancy codes. The measurement of these small samples is unrealistic and will not be relied upon to determine a level of value for Rock County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock County**

For assessment year 2013 the assessor performed a market analysis on all qualified agricultural sales. Based on the analysis it was determined the irrigated, dry land and grass values would be increased..

The Assessor and Deputy reviewed through GIS the usability of all parcels eighty acres and less. All land use changes were physically reviewed and verified by the assessor.

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

## 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Rock County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and Deputy	
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	The majority is wet meadow, hay ground and pasture. Valentine, Tryon, Loup, and Elsmere soils which are predominately hay meadows.
	2	Mostly rolling sand hills with valentine soils.
	3	Pivot-valentine complex soils, associations related to pivot complex soils and hard grass pastures. Majority of irrigated land in the county.
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The market areas are developed by similar topography, soil characteristics and geographic characteristics.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Land is classified as rural residential or recreational land based on the primary use of the parcel at assessment date. Rural residential land is directly associated with a residence and has no agricultural use. Recreational land is defined according to Regulation 10.001.05E.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Yes, however if the site is located within the suburban area it does have a different value based on the market.	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Sales are monitored and studied on a yearly basis to see if there are any non-agricultural characteristics.	
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>	
	<b>No</b>	
8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>	
	All of the parcel is valued at 100% of Agland based on sales.	

**75 Rock**  
**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 : 78  
Total Sales Price : 31,171,433  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 30,763,433  
Total Assessed Value : 21,543,212  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 394,403  
Avg. Assessed Value : 276,195

MEDIAN : 73  
WGT. MEAN : 70  
MEAN : 75  
COD : 21.19  
PRD : 106.41

COV : 26.03  
STD : 19.40  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.54  
MAX Sales Ratio : 137.44  
MIN Sales Ratio : 45.69

95% Median C.I. : 66.98 to 78.63  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.53 to 74.53  
95% Mean C.I. : 70.21 to 78.83

Printed:3/21/2013 4:54:53PM

**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	90.44	90.44	90.44	00.00	100.00	90.44	90.44	N/A	367,360	332,225
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	54.31	67.15	69.44	25.61	96.70	52.13	92.03	N/A	334,468	232,243
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	11	78.63	82.10	76.72	25.12	107.01	47.23	137.44	56.80 to 102.44	337,329	258,785
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	6	87.34	92.30	86.65	19.43	106.52	74.10	115.90	74.10 to 115.90	196,887	170,594
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	81.41	77.15	72.00	13.23	107.15	60.98	96.99	N/A	352,773	254,013
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	7	66.98	65.74	62.72	16.35	104.82	45.69	92.09	45.69 to 92.09	886,552	556,008
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	12	81.69	78.93	78.94	13.43	99.99	46.69	100.33	68.42 to 90.43	262,067	206,872
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	4	68.57	73.79	74.51	27.37	99.03	46.44	111.57	N/A	510,610	380,469
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	5	83.84	77.54	73.94	13.75	104.87	52.61	91.16	N/A	386,100	285,463
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	7	63.46	64.23	65.40	20.42	98.21	46.46	94.65	46.46 to 94.65	343,521	224,647
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	10	72.19	73.59	71.59	14.30	102.79	51.29	103.71	56.04 to 91.73	389,788	279,068
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	5	52.31	53.58	50.07	11.99	107.01	45.76	62.93	N/A	488,360	244,517
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	23	78.63	81.87	77.38	23.49	105.80	47.23	137.44	65.26 to 95.32	301,376	233,202
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	28	73.35	74.58	69.67	18.36	107.05	45.69	111.57	64.25 to 82.10	469,892	327,374
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	27	68.64	68.19	65.70	19.46	103.79	45.76	103.71	53.02 to 76.38	395,364	259,745
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	27	78.63	80.68	75.66	22.12	106.63	47.23	137.44	64.25 to 95.32	308,450	233,388
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	28	73.35	74.65	69.98	18.68	106.67	45.69	111.57	66.98 to 86.11	475,843	332,990
<u>ALL</u>	78	73.35	74.52	70.03	21.19	106.41	45.69	137.44	66.98 to 78.63	394,403	276,195

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	20	71.79	72.55	68.39	21.38	106.08	45.69	137.44	56.80 to 81.50	403,321	275,832
2	32	73.83	74.65	71.21	17.72	104.83	45.76	111.57	63.84 to 86.11	318,600	226,889
3	26	73.37	75.88	70.12	25.45	108.21	46.46	115.90	56.83 to 91.16	480,839	337,159
<u>ALL</u>	78	73.35	74.52	70.03	21.19	106.41	45.69	137.44	66.98 to 78.63	394,403	276,195

**75 Rock**  
**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 : 78  
Total Sales Price : 31,171,433  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 30,763,433  
Total Assessed Value : 21,543,212  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 394,403  
Avg. Assessed Value : 276,195

MEDIAN : 73  
WGT. MEAN : 70  
MEAN : 75  
COD : 21.19  
PRD : 106.41

COV : 26.03  
STD : 19.40  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.54  
MAX Sales Ratio : 137.44  
MIN Sales Ratio : 45.69

95% Median C.I. : 66.98 to 78.63  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.53 to 74.53  
95% Mean C.I. : 70.21 to 78.83

Printed:3/21/2013 4:54:53PM

**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>Grass</b>											
County	51	73.14	74.37	74.01	19.35	100.49	45.76	115.90	68.42 to 81.50	301,819	223,371
1	12	71.79	71.57	73.04	14.26	97.99	46.44	96.36	66.84 to 81.87	458,662	334,988
2	26	73.83	73.49	71.41	15.81	102.91	45.76	98.16	63.84 to 83.47	288,521	206,033
3	13	70.77	78.72	84.41	31.74	93.26	46.46	115.90	51.29 to 103.71	183,638	155,016
<b>ALL</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>73.35</b>	<b>74.52</b>	<b>70.03</b>	<b>21.19</b>	<b>106.41</b>	<b>45.69</b>	<b>137.44</b>	<b>66.98 to 78.63</b>	<b>394,403</b>	<b>276,195</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	10	66.54	75.61	64.93	33.35	116.45	47.23	137.44	52.31 to 96.99	674,236	437,773
1	2	92.34	92.34	56.48	48.85	163.49	47.23	137.44	N/A	624,000	352,440
2	2	76.51	76.51	70.37	20.30	108.73	60.98	92.03	N/A	554,000	389,860
3	6	62.84	69.74	65.96	26.69	105.73	52.31	96.99	52.31 to 96.99	731,059	482,189
<b>Grass</b>											
County	61	73.14	73.82	72.37	19.66	102.00	45.69	115.90	66.98 to 81.41	298,906	216,310
1	18	71.79	70.35	70.57	16.77	99.69	45.69	96.36	56.80 to 81.50	378,801	267,320
2	29	73.55	73.24	70.10	16.38	104.48	45.76	98.16	63.84 to 83.47	304,123	213,176
3	14	80.05	79.48	84.81	27.71	93.72	46.46	115.90	51.29 to 103.71	185,378	157,215
<b>ALL</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>73.35</b>	<b>74.52</b>	<b>70.03</b>	<b>21.19</b>	<b>106.41</b>	<b>45.69</b>	<b>137.44</b>	<b>66.98 to 78.63</b>	<b>394,403</b>	<b>276,195</b>

## Rock County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Rock	3	N/A	2,000	1,900	1,900	1,850	1,846	1,850	1,634	1,846
Brown	1	N/A	2,089	2,161	2,213	1,770	1,764	1,557	1,661	1,916
Keya Paha	1	1,800	1,800	1,700	1,700	1,600	1,600	1,500	1,500	1,594
Holt	4001	3,200	3,181	3,097	3,098	2,872	2,898	2,298	2,300	2,834
Rock	1	N/A	1,400	1,300	1,300	1,275	1,275	1,150	1,150	1,218
Holt	4003	N/A	2,179	2,025	1,925	1,868	1,879	1,556	1,400	1,703
Rock	2	N/A	1,400	N/A	1,300	1,200	1,200	1,100	1,100	1,139
Garfield	1	N/A	2,750	2,390	2,080	2,040	1,955	1,235	1,195	1,844
Loup	1	N/A	2,520	N/A	2,240	1,770	1,615	1,615	945	1,982

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Rock	3	N/A	650	650	650	625	625	550	550	609
Brown	1	N/A	690	690	690	630	515	455	455	595
Keya Paha	1	660	660	625	625	605	605	570	570	616
Holt	4001	1,198	1,172	1,049	1,049	914	920	800	800	997
Rock	1	N/A	N/A	650	N/A	625	625	550	550	620
Holt	4003	N/A	1,100	1,050	1,045	918	920	800	799	891
Rock	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	500	480	430	430	455
Garfield	1	N/A	1,070	950	910	820	740	660	580	799
Loup	1	N/A	705	N/A	475	455	395	240	240	395

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Rock	3	N/A	523	473	486	457	440	399	386	413
Brown	1	N/A	495	495	494	462	375	280	280	303
Keya Paha	1	560	560	520	520	500	500	480	490	493
Holt	4001	655	676	679	677	629	647	511	480	551
Rock	1	N/A	562	560	562	560	526	500	451	535
Holt	4003	680	680	680	673	661	727	602	512	608
Rock	2	N/A	449	440	439	428	429	326	291	336
Garfield	1	N/A	535	535	535	495	470	417	343	370
Loup	1	N/A	640	N/A	495	350	350	325	305	311

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



## 2013 Correlation Section for Rock County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Rock County is located in north central Nebraska with Bassett being the county seat. The county is comprised of approximately 8% irrigated, 1% dry crop and 89% grass/pasture land. Rock County has three market areas. In area 1 the majority is hay meadow and pasture, area 2 consists of sand hills, and market area 3 is more of a mixture of hard grassland and irrigated land. Generally, all of Brown, Keya Paha, Holt, northwest Garfield, and Loup counties are comparable to Rock. These areas share similar characteristics with Rock County that are comparable in soils and topography. Four Natural Resource Districts split this county. The Lower Niobrara NRD governs a small portion of the northern part of the county; the Middle Niobrara governs a very small portion in the northwest and does have a moratorium and well restrictions. The Lower Loup NRD governs the southern part of the county, while the Upper Elkhorn governs the largest part of the county which is the central part and currently has a 2500 acre annual new well maximum.

In analyzing the agricultural sales within Rock County the land use of the sales in each market area generally matched the County as a whole with exception to market area 3. In all market areas the sales were not proportionately distributed among the study years. However all three samples were expanded using sales from the comparable areas to maximize the sample sizes while maintaining appropriate thresholds for land use representation.

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 78 total sales with 20 sales in area 1, 32 sales in area 2 and 26 sales in area 3. The overall calculated median is 73%. All statistical indications support that assessments are acceptable and values are within the acceptable range. The statistical profile further breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use. The 95% MLU shows the grass subclasses for each area fall within the acceptable range. When you look at the 80% MLU grass subclass for area three you will notice the median to be above the range. This can be attributed to one arms length outlier sale.

In comparison with adjoining counties the irrigated values in area 3 correlates closely with Brown and Keya Paha counties. Holt County is slightly higher, but can be attributed to better soils. The assessor has recognized the movement of irrigated land in areas 1 and 2 and adjusted those values accordingly. Dry and grass values relate fairly closely between the comparable neighboring counties where they adjoin.

Based on knowledge of the assessment practices in Rock County and after consideration of surrounding counties' value it is determined that uniform and proportionate treatment exists within and across county lines. The overall median of 73% will be used in determining the level of value for the agricultural class of real property within Rock County.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 Rock 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 : 3,045</b>	<b>Value : 365,586,985</b>	<b>Growth 1,461,490</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>	84	133,390	38	114,765	4	14,055	126	262,210	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	437	869,505	92	519,140	49	615,630	578	2,004,275	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	447	11,890,205	92	6,334,520	61	3,708,935	600	21,933,660	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	531	12,893,100	130	6,968,425	65	4,338,620	726	24,200,145	536,595
<b>% of Res Total</b>	73.14	53.28	17.91	28.79	8.95	17.93	23.84	6.62	36.72
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	15	51,595	5	185,570	4	15,180	24	252,345	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	80	370,105	12	126,055	16	193,600	108	689,760	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	81	3,729,020	13	513,405	23	1,915,300	117	6,157,725	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	96	4,150,720	18	825,030	27	2,124,080	141	7,099,830	135,505
<b>% of Com Total</b>	68.09	58.46	12.77	11.62	19.15	29.92	4.63	1.94	9.27
<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	10	396,745	10	396,745	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	4	93,085	4	93,085	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	7	243,300	7	243,300	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	17	733,130	17	733,130	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.56	0.20	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	531	12,893,100	130	6,968,425	82	5,071,750	743	24,933,275	536,595
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	71.47	51.71	17.50	27.95	11.04	20.34	24.40	6.82	36.72
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	96	4,150,720	18	825,030	27	2,124,080	141	7,099,830	135,505
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	68.09	58.46	12.77	11.62	19.15	29.92	4.63	1.94	9.27
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	627	17,043,820	148	7,793,455	109	7,195,830	884	32,033,105	672,100
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	70.93	53.21	16.74	24.33	12.33	22.46	29.03	8.76	45.99

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	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	45	12	191	248

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	24	2,123,085	1,763	244,705,755	1,787	246,828,840
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	10	709,130	360	68,007,050	370	68,716,180
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	10	260,905	364	17,747,955	374	18,008,860
30. Ag Total							2,161	333,553,880

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	2	2.00	12,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	2	2.00	139,525	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	5.90	4,450	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	9	34.00	43,000	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	10	0.00	121,380	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	28.76	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	7	7.00	32,000	7	7.00	32,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	254	305.50	1,833,000	256	307.50	1,845,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	257	289.50	10,637,785	259	291.50	10,777,310	789,390
34. HomeSite Total				<b>266</b>	<b>314.50</b>	<b>12,654,310</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	62	269.05	264,050	64	274.95	268,500	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	327	1,688.84	2,833,840	336	1,722.84	2,876,840	
37. FarmSite Improvements	336	0.00	7,110,170	346	0.00	7,231,550	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>410</b>	<b>1,997.79</b>	<b>10,376,890</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	3,050.76	0	0	3,079.52	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>676</b>	<b>5,391.81</b>	<b>23,031,200</b>	<b>789,390</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	10	907.00	254,430	10	907.00	254,430

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	137.08	3.20%	191,910	3.68%	1,399.99
47. 2A1	55.00	1.28%	71,500	1.37%	1,300.00
48. 2A	256.25	5.98%	333,125	6.38%	1,300.00
49. 3A1	852.28	19.90%	1,086,660	20.82%	1,275.00
50. 3A	841.00	19.63%	1,072,275	20.55%	1,275.00
51. 4A1	2,113.00	49.33%	2,429,950	46.56%	1,150.00
52. 4A	29.00	0.68%	33,350	0.64%	1,150.00
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>4,283.61</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>5,218,770</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,218.31</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	59.00	31.89%	38,350	33.44%	650.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	13.00	7.03%	8,125	7.08%	625.00
59. 3D	81.00	43.78%	50,625	44.14%	625.00
60. 4D1	2.00	1.08%	1,100	0.96%	550.00
61. 4D	30.00	16.22%	16,500	14.39%	550.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>185.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>114,700</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>620.00</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	17,501.30	14.95%	9,831,930	15.69%	561.78
65. 2G1	73.00	0.06%	40,880	0.07%	560.00
66. 2G	9,866.35	8.43%	5,544,035	8.85%	561.91
67. 3G1	49,908.35	42.65%	27,925,870	44.57%	559.54
68. 3G	5,068.84	4.33%	2,668,140	4.26%	526.38
69. 4G1	21,536.55	18.40%	10,760,855	17.17%	499.66
70. 4G	13,073.70	11.17%	5,889,745	9.40%	450.50
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>117,028.09</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>62,661,455</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>535.44</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>4,283.61</b>	<b>3.43%</b>	<b>5,218,770</b>	<b>7.57%</b>	<b>1,218.31</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>185.00</b>	<b>0.15%</b>	<b>114,700</b>	<b>0.17%</b>	<b>620.00</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>117,028.09</b>	<b>93.64%</b>	<b>62,661,455</b>	<b>90.93%</b>	<b>535.44</b>
72. Waste	2,349.10	1.88%	234,910	0.34%	100.00
73. Other	1,131.60	0.91%	678,960	0.99%	600.00
74. Exempt	534.63	0.43%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>124,977.40</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>68,908,795</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>551.37</b>

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	70.00	0.70%	98,000	0.86%	1,400.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	890.00	8.91%	1,157,000	10.17%	1,300.00
49. 3A1	1,130.79	11.32%	1,356,950	11.92%	1,200.00
50. 3A	817.40	8.18%	980,880	8.62%	1,200.00
51. 4A1	5,775.12	57.82%	6,352,630	55.82%	1,100.00
52. 4A	1,304.50	13.06%	1,434,950	12.61%	1,100.00
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>9,987.81</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>11,380,410</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,139.43</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	35.00	15.98%	17,500	17.58%	500.00
59. 3D	59.00	26.94%	28,320	28.44%	480.00
60. 4D1	117.00	53.42%	50,310	50.53%	430.00
61. 4D	8.00	3.65%	3,440	3.45%	430.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>219.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99,570</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>454.66</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	14,206.93	4.49%	6,382,230	6.01%	449.23
65. 2G1	10.00	0.00%	4,400	0.00%	440.00
66. 2G	11,191.25	3.54%	4,915,255	4.63%	439.21
67. 3G1	50,480.01	15.97%	21,591,160	20.34%	427.72
68. 3G	1,743.60	0.55%	748,620	0.71%	429.35
69. 4G1	87,929.81	27.81%	28,708,425	27.05%	326.49
70. 4G	150,623.04	47.64%	43,799,340	41.26%	290.79
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>316,184.64</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>106,149,430</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>335.72</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>9,987.81</b>	<b>2.96%</b>	<b>11,380,410</b>	<b>9.51%</b>	<b>1,139.43</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>219.00</b>	<b>0.07%</b>	<b>99,570</b>	<b>0.08%</b>	<b>454.66</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>316,184.64</b>	<b>93.85%</b>	<b>106,149,430</b>	<b>88.72%</b>	<b>335.72</b>
72. Waste	8,574.83	2.55%	857,485	0.72%	100.00
73. Other	1,933.29	0.57%	1,159,975	0.97%	600.00
74. Exempt	3,580.07	1.06%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>336,899.57</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>119,646,870</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>355.14</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	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	416.00	1.15%	832,000	1.24%	2,000.00
47. 2A1	53.00	0.15%	100,700	0.15%	1,900.00
48. 2A	1,098.85	3.03%	2,087,815	3.12%	1,900.00
49. 3A1	4,917.68	13.55%	9,097,710	13.58%	1,850.00
50. 3A	14,026.34	38.66%	25,892,395	38.66%	1,845.98
51. 4A1	14,822.21	40.85%	27,415,265	40.93%	1,849.61
52. 4A	951.00	2.62%	1,553,835	2.32%	1,633.90
53. Total	36,285.08	100.00%	66,979,720	100.00%	1,845.93
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	443.91	12.21%	288,540	13.04%	650.00
56. 2D1	113.00	3.11%	73,450	3.32%	650.00
57. 2D	109.00	3.00%	70,850	3.20%	650.00
58. 3D1	519.98	14.30%	324,995	14.69%	625.01
59. 3D	1,435.77	39.49%	897,365	40.55%	625.01
60. 4D1	766.86	21.09%	421,775	19.06%	550.00
61. 4D	247.07	6.80%	135,895	6.14%	550.03
62. Total	3,635.59	100.00%	2,212,870	100.00%	608.67
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	2,221.78	1.78%	1,162,920	2.25%	523.42
65. 2G1	115.48	0.09%	54,625	0.11%	473.03
66. 2G	2,048.37	1.64%	994,955	1.93%	485.73
67. 3G1	16,625.85	13.31%	7,605,820	14.73%	457.47
68. 3G	20,270.80	16.23%	8,910,635	17.26%	439.58
69. 4G1	46,588.65	37.30%	18,593,090	36.01%	399.09
70. 4G	37,024.07	29.64%	14,306,560	27.71%	386.41
71. Total	124,895.00	100.00%	51,628,605	100.00%	413.38
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	36,285.08	21.77%	66,979,720	55.04%	1,845.93
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	3,635.59	2.18%	2,212,870	1.82%	608.67
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	124,895.00	74.92%	51,628,605	42.42%	413.38
72. Waste	505.50	0.30%	49,950	0.04%	98.81
73. Other	1,380.55	0.83%	828,330	0.68%	600.00
74. Exempt	1,076.26	0.65%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	166,701.72	100.00%	121,699,475	100.00%	730.04

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

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	64.00	15.56%	28,800	10.99%	450.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	24.00	5.83%	10,560	4.03%	440.00
67. 3G1	45.00	10.94%	25,200	9.61%	560.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	13.00	3.16%	6,500	2.48%	500.00
70. 4G	265.39	64.51%	191,080	72.89%	720.00
71. Total	411.39	100.00%	262,140	100.00%	637.21
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	411.39	97.86%	262,140	97.98%	637.21
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	9.00	2.14%	5,400	2.02%	600.00
74. Exempt	1.50	0.36%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	420.39	100.00%	267,540	100.00%	636.41

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	363.70	521,720	50,192.80	83,057,180	50,556.50	83,578,900
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	4,039.59	2,427,140	4,039.59	2,427,140
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	4,012.53	2,194,295	554,506.59	218,507,335	558,519.12	220,701,630
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	33.50	3,350	11,395.93	1,138,995	11,429.43	1,142,345
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	89.00	53,400	4,365.44	2,619,265	4,454.44	2,672,665
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	26.80	0	5,165.66	0	5,192.46	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,498.73</b>	<b>2,772,765</b>	<b>624,500.35</b>	<b>307,749,915</b>	<b>628,999.08</b>	<b>310,522,680</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	50,556.50	8.04%	83,578,900	26.92%	1,653.18
<b>Dry Land</b>	4,039.59	0.64%	2,427,140	0.78%	600.84
<b>Grass</b>	558,519.12	88.79%	220,701,630	71.07%	395.16
<b>Waste</b>	11,429.43	1.82%	1,142,345	0.37%	99.95
<b>Other</b>	4,454.44	0.71%	2,672,665	0.86%	600.00
<b>Exempt</b>	5,192.46	0.83%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>628,999.08</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>310,522,680</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>493.68</b>

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

75 Rock

	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	23,859,215	24,200,145	340,930	1.43%	536,595	-0.82%
02. Recreational	740,880	733,130	-7,750	-1.05%	0	-1.05%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	12,345,885	12,654,310	308,425	2.50%	789,390	-3.90%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>36,945,980</b>	<b>37,587,585</b>	<b>641,605</b>	<b>1.74%</b>	<b>1,325,985</b>	<b>-1.85%</b>
05. Commercial	7,075,985	7,099,830	23,845	0.34%	135,505	-1.58%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	10,156,810	10,376,890	220,080	2.17%	0	2.17%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>17,232,795</b>	<b>17,476,720</b>	<b>243,925</b>	<b>1.42%</b>	<b>135,505</b>	<b>0.63%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>54,178,775</b>	<b>55,064,305</b>	<b>885,530</b>	<b>1.63%</b>	<b>1,461,490</b>	<b>-1.06%</b>
11. Irrigated	72,200,160	83,578,900	11,378,740	15.76%		
12. Dryland	1,908,780	2,427,140	518,360	27.16%		
13. Grassland	200,728,720	220,701,630	19,972,910	9.95%		
14. Wasteland	1,142,345	1,142,345	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	2,661,865	2,672,665	10,800	0.41%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>278,641,870</b>	<b>310,522,680</b>	<b>31,880,810</b>	<b>11.44%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>332,820,645</b>	<b>365,586,985</b>	<b>32,766,340</b>	<b>9.85%</b>	<b>1,461,490</b>	<b>9.41%</b>

ROCK COUNTY PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

PURSUANT TO LB 263, THE ASSESSOR SHALL PREPARE A PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR THE COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION EACH YEAR ON OR BEFORE JUNE 15 DESCRIBING THE NEXT YEARS ASSESSMENT PLANS AND EACH OF THE NEXT TWO YEARS THEREAFTER. ON OR BEFORE JULY 31 EACH YEAR, THE ASSESSOR SHALL PRESENT THE PLAN TO THE COUNTY BOARD OF EQUALIZATION AND ON OR BEFORE OCTOBER 31 EACH YEAR THE ASSESSOR SHALL MAIL A COPY OF THE PLAN WITH ANY ADJUSTMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE. THE ASSESSOR SHALL UPDATE THE PLAN EACH YEAR. THE PLAN AND ANY UPDATES SHALL EXAMINE THE LEVEL, QUALITY, AND UNIFORMITY OF ASSESSMENT IN THE COUNTY AND MAY BE DERIVED FROM A PROGRESS REPORT DEVELOPED BY THE DEPARTMENT AND PRESENTED TO THE ASSESSOR ON OR BEFORE JULY 31.

-----

Rock County has a total valuation for Real Property in 2012 of \$332,066,535. The Parcel count for Real Property in 2012 is 3035. Permissive Exemptions filed and approved by our office and the Rock County Commissioners for 2012 were 16.

The levels of value of real property in Rock County for tax year 2011 satisfy the requirements of Neb. Const. .art. V111 §1, and Neb. Stat. §77-5023 (Cum. Supp 2008).

2012 Sales Statistics Ratio as determined by the Tax Equalization Commission.

No changes in Residential value -	Assessment Ratio - 97%
No changes in Commercial value -	Assessment Ratio – 97%
No changes in Agricultural land value -	Assessment Ratio - 72%

Residential photos were taken in 2010 for 2011 assessment year in Bassett and Newport with updated cost tables to 2010. For assessment year 2012 – We completed looking at Rural Improvements and revalued them using the updated 2010 cost tables, the 2010 aerial photos, and from 2011 completed Oblique Photos by GIS Workshop.

By doing this it will give us an opportunity to stay current with omitted property as well as any changes done to existing property.

We will continue to do our pickup work on a timely basis and this fall start checking for any changes revealed from the fly-over photos that may have been missed from prior years.

Our office will try to contact owners by phone prior to our visit. We prefer they accompany us. Great effort will be made to try to schedule in advance our on-site inspection when they or a representative can be present. Our focus will be to look for changes and any additions that we might have missed from prior years. We will verify measurements are correct. We will not do an interior inspection unless we are invited in and or the owner has given us prior permission if we notice there has been some renovation.

2012 – We do not have enough sales of Commercial Property to have to do a revalue, but because of the update to the cost tables, we will have to revalue this class of property in 2013.

2013 – Review the sales file and make changes as necessary.

2013 - Review and physical Inspect new irrigated ground.

2014 - The plan has been made to update cost tables for Improvements every 4 (four) years. This time frame will lessen the impact for taxpayers but will insure the office has been kept current. New tables and photos will be used for Residential Property for 2014 to be in effect for 2015, Rural Property for 2016 and Commercial Property for 2017.

2014 – GIS to fly Oblique Photo's, budget for 2014 & 2015

We continue to have talks with Brown, Keya Paha, Boyd and Holt Counties about an appraiser for our counties to assist us when needed. We always continue to work on our quality and uniformity of assessment.

Every parcel in the county will need to be looked at on a rotation or schedule over a six year period. The schedule is –

2010 - Looked at southeast corner of Rock, done.

2011 - Looked at the southwest, done

2012 - Looked at the east center portion, done.

2013 - The west center portion,

2014 - The northeast portion and

2015 - The northwest in 2015.

We plan on staying on a four year cycle with regards to our cost tables in keeping our values more current without such significant increases. In keeping with this

four year cycle we will have the county flown every four years by GIS Workshop. By doing this it will give us an opportunity to stay current with omitted property as well as any changes done to existing property.

Our budgets have not included any changes for appraisal work as because it will be mainly work that we can do ourselves. Hopefully, the mileage numbers will be sufficient to check the CRP acres along with the acres of dry land. These need to be physically checked for 2012. Beginning in 2013, an Appraisal Budget will include the costs to pay GIS Workshop for Oblique Photos.

Our Assessor program, Terra Scan Inc, sold effective Jan 1, 2012 to Thomson Reuters. As of 8-1-2011, we and the Treasurer signed three year agreements. As of July 31, 2013, we may be looking for a complete taxing change. We had to make the change in August 2004 to Terra Scan Inc.

Monica J Turpin  
Rock County Assessor

JUNE 15, 2012

## 2013 Assessment Survey for Rock 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>
	None
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	None
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	None
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$74,130
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	Same as above
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$600
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	N/A
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$3,808
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$800
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	\$450
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$230

### 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>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	GIS Workshop
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes

6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes – rock.assessor.gisworkshop.com
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS Workshop
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>
	Bassett
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1998

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	None
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>
	No
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	N/A
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	N/A
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	N/A
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	N/A



# 2013 Certification for Rock 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 Rock 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



