

Table of Contents

2010 Commission Summary

2010 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

Residential Correlation

- Residential Real Property
 - 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
- R&O Statistics

Commercial Correlation

- Commercial Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
 - III. Measure of Central Tendency
 - IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Analysis Statistics
- Special Valuation Methodology

Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

- Agricultural or Special Valuation Land
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
 - III. Measure of Central Tendency
 - IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

County Reports

2010 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
2010 County Agricultural Land Detail
2010 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2009
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
Geo Codes
Soil Classes

Valuation History Charts

2010 Commission Summary

55 Lancaster

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	6,976	Median	95
Total Sales Price	\$1,148,782,048	Mean	95
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,148,782,048	Wgt. Mean	94
Total Assessed Value	\$1,083,318,500	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$137,032
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$164,676	Avg. Assessed Value	\$155,292

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.38 to 94.68
95% Mean C.I	95.60 to 96.71
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.15 to 94.73

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	68.64
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.78
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.82

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2009	8,339	94	94
2008	9,828	96	96
2007	10,532	99	99
2006	14,170		92

2010 Commission Summary

55 Lancaster

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	351	Median	92
Total Sales Price	\$270,940,549	Mean	92
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$270,940,549	Wgt. Mean	82
Total Assessed Value	\$223,206,900	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$657,050
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$771,910	Avg. Assessed Value	\$635,917

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.14 to 93.27
95% Mean C.I	89.91 to 94.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	76.69 to 88.07

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	26.00
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.96
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.80

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2009	326	92	92
2008	413	96	96
2007	448	97	97
2006	520		94

2010 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Lancaster 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 (R. S. Supp., 2005). 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 this 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.

Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Lancaster County is 95% of market value. The quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Lancaster County indicates the assessment practices meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Lancaster County is 92% of market value. The quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Lancaster County indicates the assessment practices meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation in Lancaster County is 72%. The quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation in Lancaster County indicates the assessment practices meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2010.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2010 Assessment Actions for Lancaster County

taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Residential

Completed valuation of new construction and remodeling value changes. Continued field on site inspections for general review of parcels for the 2012 scheduled revaluation and continuously verified sales, within the month that they were filed.

2010 Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

Residential Appraisal Information

1.	Valuation data collection done by:
	Assessors appraisal staff
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County:
	Assessors appraisal staff
a.	Describe the specific characteristics of the valuation groupings that make them unique.
	Lancaster County uses neighborhood, neighborhood groupings, clusters, and market models as market valuation groupings.
3.	What approach(es) to value is/are used for this class to estimate the market value of properties? List or describe.
	The Market Comparison Approach to value is used by the county to establish the assessed value for the residential properties, utilizing automated market modeling and MRA.
4	When was the last lot value study completed?
	Every year they are studied.
a.	What methodology was used to determine the residential lot values?
	Market sales analysis and field rating of each parcels land characteristics tied to market value based tables.
5.	Is the same costing year for the cost approach being used for the entire valuation grouping? If not, identify and explain the differences?
	Yes
6.	Does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the County use the tables provided by their CAMA vendor?
	The cost approach is available in the counties CAMA program but is not relied on for assessment.
a.	How often does the County update depreciation tables?
	Every three year reappraisal cycle.
7.	Pickup work:
a.	Is pickup work done annually and is it completed by March 19th?
	Yes
b.	By Whom?
	The counties appraisal staff.
c.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as the one that was used for the valuation group?
	Yes
8.	What is the County's progress with the 6 year inspection and review requirement? (Statute 77-1311.03)
	We are on a schedule that assures the field inspection of all parcels in the county within the required period.

a.	<p>Does the County maintain a tracking process? If yes describe. Our computer system has an area called inspection history which is used to track every visit or drive by of a parcel.</p>
b.	<p>How are the results of the portion of the properties inspected and reviewed applied to the balance of the county?</p>
	<p>Each appraiser is responsible to track their progress on inspections completed to parcels still needing inspection and the work load is adjusted to meet the guidelines.</p>

PAD 2010 R&O Statistics

Query: 7594

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 03/02/2010

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	6976	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	9.44	95% Median C.I.:	94.38 to 94.67
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,148,782,048	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	8.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.11 to 94.49
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,148,782,048	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.52	95% Mean C.I.:	94.81 to 95.23
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,083,318,500						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	164,676	COD:	5.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	233.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	155,292	PRD:	100.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.89		

Printed: 04/13/2010 17:04:27

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1200	93.63	93.58	93.50	4.70	100.09	44.52	153.66	93.21 to 93.92	166,530	155,708
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	845	93.94	94.56	93.95	4.89	100.65	71.12	204.35	93.65 to 94.39	163,084	153,214
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	655	94.56	95.33	94.32	5.47	101.07	31.51	200.86	93.97 to 94.94	172,683	162,874
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1085	94.50	95.13	94.28	5.19	100.90	65.38	199.41	94.15 to 94.74	160,194	151,033
07/01/08 TO 09/30/08	1008	93.97	93.98	93.49	6.02	100.52	0.89	135.98	93.48 to 94.55	167,837	156,915
10/01/08 TO 12/31/08	613	95.58	96.08	94.88	6.83	101.27	66.90	219.79	94.97 to 96.40	165,440	156,971
01/01/09 TO 03/31/09	513	96.79	97.53	95.92	7.33	101.68	68.33	192.29	95.95 to 97.76	167,038	160,222
04/01/09 TO 06/30/09	1057	95.69	95.89	95.19	6.80	100.73	68.49	233.20	95.00 to 96.15	158,878	151,238
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3785	94.09	94.54	93.97	5.04	100.62	31.51	204.35	93.92 to 94.25	165,009	155,051
07/01/08 TO 06/30/09	3191	95.22	95.59	94.70	6.71	100.93	0.89	233.20	94.92 to 95.57	164,280	155,577
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/08 TO 12/31/08	3361	94.56	95.00	94.16	5.81	100.89	0.89	219.79	94.37 to 94.75	165,877	156,188
<u>ALL</u>											
	6976	94.52	95.02	94.30	5.84	100.76	0.89	233.20	94.38 to 94.67	164,676	155,292

VALUATION GROUP	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	3070	94.46	94.84	94.37	5.22	100.50	60.85	219.79	94.24 to 94.64	165,315	156,004
05	91	92.08	91.95	90.50	6.18	101.60	60.87	109.16	91.03 to 94.16	101,450	91,813
10	629	94.94	94.95	94.31	5.78	100.68	71.80	180.00	94.27 to 95.33	327,151	308,548
15	210	93.37	93.19	92.51	7.46	100.74	63.23	120.76	92.33 to 94.88	250,609	231,832
20	938	95.70	95.89	95.33	4.29	100.59	65.38	126.54	95.43 to 95.97	157,473	150,125
25	320	94.34	94.79	94.10	5.54	100.73	0.89	192.29	93.91 to 94.88	149,610	140,778
30	1718	93.82	95.32	94.03	7.53	101.37	31.51	233.20	93.44 to 94.10	103,632	97,440
<u>ALL</u>											
	6976	94.52	95.02	94.30	5.84	100.76	0.89	233.20	94.38 to 94.67	164,676	155,292

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	6976	94.52	95.02	94.30	5.84	100.76	0.89	233.20	94.38 to 94.67	164,676	155,292
<u>ALL</u>											
	6976	94.52	95.02	94.30	5.84	100.76	0.89	233.20	94.38 to 94.67	164,676	155,292

PAD 2010 R&O Statistics

Query: 7594

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 03/02/2010

NUMBER of Sales:	6976	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	9.44	95% Median C.I.:	94.38 to 94.67
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,148,782,048	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	8.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.11 to 94.49
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,148,782,048	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.52	95% Mean C.I.:	94.81 to 95.23
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,083,318,500						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	164,676	COD:	5.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	233.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	155,292	PRD:	100.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.89		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 04/13/2010 17:04:27

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	6976	94.52	95.02	94.30	5.84	100.76	0.89	233.20	94.38 to 94.67	164,676	155,292
06											
07											
ALL	6976	94.52	95.02	94.30	5.84	100.76	0.89	233.20	94.38 to 94.67	164,676	155,292

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	13	102.67	127.87	126.68	31.92	100.94	83.27	233.20	95.11 to 185.60	23,007	29,146
30000 TO 59999	137	102.86	109.27	108.51	16.75	100.70	44.52	219.79	99.29 to 106.55	49,232	53,424
60000 TO 99999	894	95.74	97.41	97.17	7.83	100.25	31.51	199.41	95.07 to 96.56	84,869	82,466
100000 TO 149999	2807	94.39	94.47	94.46	5.11	100.01	63.43	154.10	94.16 to 94.62	125,258	118,319
150000 TO 249999	2286	94.43	94.44	94.36	4.89	100.08	0.89	154.65	94.20 to 94.67	186,914	176,377
250000 TO 499999	773	93.45	93.16	93.12	5.62	100.05	66.90	133.03	92.78 to 93.93	318,314	296,405
500000 +	66	93.38	91.80	91.53	6.43	100.29	65.38	104.46	91.28 to 94.70	619,982	567,457
ALL	6976	94.52	95.02	94.30	5.84	100.76	0.89	233.20	94.38 to 94.67	164,676	155,292

**2010 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

The level of value for the residential real property in Lancaster County, as determined by the PTA is 95%. The mathematically calculated median is 95%.

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. Any of the three measures of central tendency could be used to indicate an acceptable level of value considering a spread of only two points. The sample size and the qualitative statistics, demonstrate that the statistics can be relied on as a representative sample of the residential class of property. When analyzing the sales study period the increasing median ratio is consistent with the indicators of a declining market in the class for the study period. The County is currently relying on their past assessor locations as their valuation groupings for the current year. The County is on track to meet the six year review cycle, and currently tracks the progress through their appraisal staff. The median is deemed as a reliable indicator for the level of value in the residential class of property.

**2010 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

II. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) 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 (2007), 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 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.

RESIDENTIAL: The County has a thorough sales review practice. All sales are reviewed by the appraisal staff within one month of being filed the review indicates the usability of the sale as well as reviewing present use of the property. In reviewing the practices in the County it is evident that the County utilizes all available arms length transactions.

**2010 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

III. Measure 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 in 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 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.

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	95	94	95

**2010 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

IV. 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 International Association of Assessing Officers 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.

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 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 of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, July,

**2010 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

2007, 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. 247.

The analysis in this section displays the calculated COD and PRD measures for Lancaster County, which are considered as one part of the analysis of the County's assessment practices.

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	5.84	100.76

RESIDENTIAL: The quality statistics are within the IAAO standards for the residential class of properties. This analysis supports that the sample is representative and that the statistics can be relied upon as a reliable indicator for the level of value in the class. Both the COD and the PRD support assessment uniformity within the residential class.

2010 Assessment Actions for Lancaster County

taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Commercial

Completed valuation of new construction and remodeling value changes. Continued field on site inspections for general review of parcels for the 2012 scheduled revaluation and continuously verified sales, within the month that they were filed.

2010 Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

Commercial / Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Valuation data collection done by:
	Assessors appraisal staff
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County:
	The county uses Primary Use as valuation groupings.
a.	Describe the specific characteristics of the valuation groupings that make them unique.
	Current use of the building.
3.	What approach(es) to value is/are used for this class to estimate the market value of properties? List or describe.
	Lancaster County uses the cost and income approaches for the valuation of all commercial properties.
4	When was the last lot value study completed?
	2009
a.	What methodology was used to determine the commercial lot values?
	Market sales analysis and field rating of each parcels land characteristics tied to market value based tables.
5.	Is the same costing year for the cost approach being used for entire valuation grouping? If not, identify and explain the differences?
	Yes
6.	Does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the County use the tables provided by their CAMA vendor?
	The County does a depreciation study during every reappraisal cycle.
a.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?
	Every reappraisal cycle
7.	Pickup work:
a.	Is pickup work done annually and is it completed by March 19th?
	Yes
b.	By Whom?
	County appraisal staff
c.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison, or income approach) used for the pickup work the same as the one that was used for the valuation group?
	Yes
8.	What is the Counties progress with the 6 year inspection and review requirement? (Statute 77-1311.03)
	We are on a schedule that assures the field inspection of all parcels in the county within the required period.
a.	Does the County maintain a tracking process? If yes describe.
	Our computer system has an area called inspection history which is used to track every visit or drive by of a parcel.

b.	How are the results of the portion of the properties inspected and reviewed applied to the balance of the county?
	Each appraiser is responsible to track their progress on inspections completed to parcels still needing inspection and the work load is adjusted to meet the guidelines.

PAD 2010 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 03/02/2010

NUMBER of Sales:	351	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	23.80	95% Median C.I.:	91.14 to 93.27	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	270,940,549	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.69 to 88.07	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	270,940,549	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.53	95% Mean C.I.:	89.91 to 94.50	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	223,206,900							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	771,910	COD:	12.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	311.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	635,917	PRD:	111.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.15			

Printed: 03/23/2010 15:48:29

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	32	90.12	89.38	79.27	7.18	112.76	57.61	113.69	87.54 to 93.46	679,676	538,750
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	41	89.01	86.20	74.95	13.57	115.01	31.84	147.65	85.42 to 92.17	1,686,402	1,263,990
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	30	92.61	95.49	101.82	13.42	93.78	29.06	175.18	90.53 to 98.50	611,245	622,390
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	27	89.32	88.53	81.40	10.72	108.75	47.87	133.79	85.50 to 92.46	1,022,890	832,662
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	32	93.51	93.43	72.36	9.42	129.11	57.85	125.21	89.06 to 96.08	877,375	634,878
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	35	90.90	91.06	84.97	16.37	107.16	20.15	173.85	86.87 to 95.64	840,661	714,345
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	21	95.41	92.20	84.23	7.11	109.46	61.39	103.87	88.94 to 98.79	468,904	394,957
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	29	91.97	89.30	90.37	8.71	98.82	27.65	106.00	87.11 to 95.67	841,187	760,162
07/01/08 TO 09/30/08	30	95.84	95.54	89.58	9.67	106.66	63.24	136.93	93.04 to 97.73	327,731	293,570
10/01/08 TO 12/31/08	21	89.76	96.80	98.49	20.14	98.28	50.00	211.34	85.94 to 98.55	489,919	482,523
01/01/09 TO 03/31/09	26	95.93	92.70	69.45	10.63	133.48	34.73	114.10	90.03 to 100.22	385,169	267,484
04/01/09 TO 06/30/09	27	93.70	100.13	93.62	20.43	106.96	68.67	311.00	81.02 to 100.00	452,507	423,629
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	130	90.53	89.61	80.54	11.48	111.26	29.06	175.18	88.36 to 91.96	1,052,673	847,824
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	117	92.71	91.48	82.47	10.94	110.92	20.15	173.85	91.12 to 94.72	784,107	646,641
07/01/08 TO 06/30/09	104	95.18	96.28	88.15	14.67	109.22	34.73	311.00	92.07 to 96.99	407,234	358,968
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	124	91.64	92.19	83.58	12.80	110.30	20.15	175.18	89.47 to 93.65	834,311	697,353
01/01/08 TO 12/31/08	101	94.41	93.32	90.65	11.01	102.94	27.65	211.34	91.98 to 95.93	538,234	487,909
<u>ALL</u>											
	351	92.07	92.21	82.38	12.52	111.93	20.15	311.00	91.14 to 93.27	771,910	635,917

PAD 2010 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 03/02/2010

NUMBER of Sales:	351	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	23.80	95% Median C.I.:	91.14 to 93.27	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	270,940,549	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.69 to 88.07	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	270,940,549	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.53	95% Mean C.I.:	89.91 to 94.50	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	223,206,900							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	771,910	COD:	12.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	311.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	635,917	PRD:	111.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.15			

Printed: 03/23/2010 15:48:29

VALUATION GROUP

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	85	94.41	95.23	93.34	8.78	102.03	35.89	171.47	92.38 to 96.11	269,343	251,395
05	1	98.08	98.08	98.08			98.08	98.08	N/A	475,000	465,900
10	17	85.63	83.87	77.93	14.08	107.62	27.65	123.23	74.29 to 93.03	1,930,770	1,504,617
15	33	90.10	90.73	77.82	15.85	116.60	34.73	175.18	82.69 to 96.90	1,762,566	1,371,548
20	4	87.66	83.30	62.53	12.80	133.21	57.85	100.03	N/A	4,404,375	2,754,200
25	32	88.09	91.96	88.49	15.49	103.93	29.06	159.89	86.02 to 98.07	820,129	725,721
30	43	92.76	94.78	93.52	8.27	101.35	75.76	147.65	91.23 to 95.93	416,160	389,176
35	5	89.10	90.51	85.96	10.72	105.29	78.16	105.55	N/A	4,134,705	3,554,220
40	18	84.71	86.87	79.14	23.55	109.77	47.33	173.85	65.57 to 93.70	1,494,103	1,182,400
45	27	91.14	87.43	79.08	10.59	110.57	31.84	114.71	86.87 to 94.88	708,629	560,351
50	18	97.73	94.88	93.64	5.35	101.33	72.59	106.98	91.19 to 98.91	150,539	140,961
55	22	91.85	103.43	96.46	27.51	107.22	47.87	311.00	82.56 to 98.53	80,187	77,350
60	46	90.75	87.83	89.36	9.29	98.30	20.15	106.00	87.65 to 94.02	514,191	459,467
ALL	351	92.07	92.21	82.38	12.52	111.93	20.15	311.00	91.14 to 93.27	771,910	635,917

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	349	91.98	91.34	81.21	11.67	112.47	20.15	211.34	91.13 to 93.07	767,010	622,917
2	2	243.09	243.09	178.52	27.94	136.17	175.18	311.00	N/A	1,626,875	2,904,300
ALL	351	92.07	92.21	82.38	12.52	111.93	20.15	311.00	91.14 to 93.27	771,910	635,917

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	351	92.07	92.21	82.38	12.52	111.93	20.15	311.00	91.14 to 93.27	771,910	635,917
04											
ALL	351	92.07	92.21	82.38	12.52	111.93	20.15	311.00	91.14 to 93.27	771,910	635,917

PAD 2010 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 03/02/2010

NUMBER of Sales:	351	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	23.80	95% Median C.I.:	91.14 to 93.27	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	270,940,549	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.69 to 88.07	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	270,940,549	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.53	95% Mean C.I.:	89.91 to 94.50	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	223,206,900							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	771,910	COD:	12.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	311.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	635,917	PRD:	111.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.15			

Printed: 03/23/2010 15:48:29

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
Total \$ _____											
10000 TO 29999	4	92.85	87.57	90.53	11.81	96.73	66.00	98.57	N/A	19,000	17,200
30000 TO 59999	9	86.80	105.63	107.47	28.13	98.28	73.71	211.34	77.74 to 129.90	45,272	48,655
60000 TO 99999	21	93.79	108.60	107.36	23.23	101.16	77.99	311.00	87.66 to 101.84	81,588	87,590
100000 TO 149999	45	96.08	96.38	96.43	6.32	99.95	75.76	138.95	93.70 to 97.73	121,297	116,966
150000 TO 249999	90	92.10	91.44	91.25	7.87	100.21	44.47	125.21	89.95 to 94.62	194,587	177,566
250000 TO 499999	92	91.85	90.32	89.56	10.70	100.85	27.65	147.65	89.82 to 94.02	349,665	313,155
500000 +	90	88.54	87.86	79.96	17.59	109.87	20.15	175.18	85.42 to 91.59	2,373,369	1,897,844
ALL	351	92.07	92.21	82.38	12.52	111.93	20.15	311.00	91.14 to 93.27	771,910	635,917

PAD 2010 R&O Statistics

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 03/02/2010

NUMBER of Sales:	351	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	23.80	95% Median C.I.:	91.14 to 93.27	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	270,940,549	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.69 to 88.07	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	270,940,549	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.53	95% Mean C.I.:	89.91 to 94.50	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	223,206,900							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	771,910	COD:	12.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	311.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	635,917	PRD:	111.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.15			

Printed: 03/23/2010 15:48:29

OCCUPANCY CODE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
157	17	89.82	95.59	89.76	19.39	106.49	47.87	211.34	77.96 to 100.70	220,605	198,023
300	3	89.06	91.58	91.34	3.05	100.27	88.77	96.92	N/A	127,000	116,000
308	1	173.85	173.85	173.85			173.85	173.85	N/A	1,600,000	2,781,600
309	3	114.71	119.89	116.32	9.57	103.07	106.00	138.95	N/A	298,000	346,633
319	1	88.94	88.94	88.94			88.94	88.94	N/A	3,025,000	2,690,500
323	2	101.02	101.02	101.19	0.28	99.83	100.73	101.30	N/A	775,000	784,200
326	1	90.92	90.92	90.92			90.92	90.92	N/A	895,000	813,700
341	2	124.50	124.50	79.17	37.73	157.26	77.52	171.47	N/A	2,137,500	1,692,200
343	5	85.51	91.20	89.08	10.01	102.37	80.58	105.55	N/A	1,639,000	1,460,060
344	46	91.29	86.79	74.17	15.18	117.01	29.06	133.79	86.69 to 96.94	1,115,188	827,128
349	6	94.26	93.13	92.20	6.01	101.01	75.10	101.25	75.10 to 101.25	462,833	426,733
350	5	96.53	95.69	81.34	13.75	117.64	61.70	116.00	N/A	589,999	479,920
351	1	74.94	74.94	74.94			74.94	74.94	N/A	255,000	191,100
352	102	92.79	93.37	93.20	5.68	100.18	71.43	125.21	91.74 to 94.59	388,372	361,973
353	8	80.59	81.02	67.82	16.51	119.46	42.74	123.23	42.74 to 123.23	965,000	654,487
356	1	74.87	74.87	74.87			74.87	74.87	N/A	175,500	131,400
380	3	76.45	79.15	75.84	9.28	104.36	69.85	91.14	N/A	7,450,000	5,650,000
381	2	88.22	88.22	87.20	2.62	101.17	85.91	90.53	N/A	239,000	208,400
384	4	87.72	90.85	86.59	12.11	104.91	79.55	108.40	N/A	108,812	94,225
391	14	90.49	105.18	93.12	25.06	112.95	66.00	311.00	82.20 to 99.22	308,357	287,142
392	1	100.02	100.02	100.02			100.02	100.02	N/A	460,298	460,400
406	6	81.44	75.18	76.57	12.76	98.19	35.89	87.75	35.89 to 87.75	1,867,666	1,430,116
408	1	65.12	65.12	65.12			65.12	65.12	N/A	183,500	119,500
412	1	77.69	77.69	77.69			77.69	77.69	N/A	870,000	675,900
423	1	107.84	107.84	107.84			107.84	107.84	N/A	310,000	334,300
426	4	91.31	92.28	92.77	4.21	99.47	87.11	99.39	N/A	328,125	304,400
436	2	85.63	85.63	86.15	2.01	99.40	83.91	87.35	N/A	500,000	430,750
442	7	87.20	77.62	65.67	20.86	118.20	27.65	101.69	27.65 to 101.69	580,900	381,471
444	2	100.46	100.46	100.33	0.74	100.13	99.72	101.20	N/A	122,500	122,900
446	1	89.24	89.24	89.24			89.24	89.24	N/A	4,700,000	4,194,100
453	15	91.19	87.17	78.78	11.52	110.66	20.15	106.98	82.91 to 98.00	229,047	180,433
483	1	103.20	103.20	103.20			103.20	103.20	N/A	200,000	206,400
494	2	92.71	92.71	92.47	1.95	100.26	90.90	94.52	N/A	1,015,000	938,550
528	2	87.52	87.52	95.58	13.43	91.56	75.76	99.27	N/A	406,250	388,300
529	1	70.13	70.13	70.13			70.13	70.13	N/A	300,000	210,400
530	1	86.18	86.18	86.18			86.18	86.18	N/A	34,000	29,300
531	5	116.33	118.04	150.05	25.85	78.66	68.67	175.18	N/A	896,950	1,345,900
534	30	95.43	92.76	69.79	9.68	132.90	57.61	129.90	89.33 to 97.73	1,063,608	742,330

PAD 2010 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 03/02/2010

NUMBER of Sales:	351	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	23.80	95% Median C.I.:	91.14 to 93.27			(!: Derived)	
TOTAL Sales Price:	270,940,549	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.69 to 88.07				
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	270,940,549	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.53	95% Mean C.I.:	89.91 to 94.50				
TOTAL Assessed Value:	223,206,900										
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	771,910	COD:	12.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	311.00						
AVG. Assessed Value:	635,917	PRD:	111.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.15						
554	37	93.47	92.87	93.58	11.80	99.25	44.47	159.89	87.65 to 96.07	648,230	606,591
582	1	73.71	73.71	73.71			73.71	73.71	N/A	35,000	25,800
588	1	99.47	99.47	99.47			99.47	99.47	N/A	3,000,000	2,984,100
594	1	57.85	57.85	57.85			57.85	57.85	N/A	15,150,000	8,764,400
595	1	100.04	100.04	100.04			100.04	100.04	N/A	4,276,525	4,278,400
<u>ALL</u>											
	351	92.07	92.21	82.38	12.52	111.93	20.15	311.00	91.14 to 93.27	771,910	635,917

Printed: 03/23/2010 15:48:29

**2010 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

The level of value for the commercial real property in Lancaster County, as determined by the PTA is 92%. The mathematically calculated median is 92%.

COMMERCIAL:Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. Two of the three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range with the weighted mean being below the range. The variability of the class is evident throughout the statistical analysis. The valuation groups within the class are based on the 2009 assessor locations. Within the various valuation groups there is a wide range of occupancy codes. While the county does its modeling with the valuation groups in mind the wide variety and the variability in the commercial market makes it difficult to rely on the valuation groups as a viable grouping for any adjustments to value. In analyzing the occupancy codes in the class it is noted that several are below the range for the class.

157(Maintenance Storage)

344(Office Building)

391(Material Storage Building)

453(Industrial Flex Building)

The occupancies have a wide range in the sales assessment ratios where any adjustment would not necessarily improve the assessment within the occupancy. One example would be for the material storage buildings where the ratios range from 66.00 to 311. The adjustment necessary to arrive at the midpoint of the range would not substantially improve the assessment within the subclass.

The County is on track to meet the six year review cycle, and currently tracks the progress through their appraisal staff. The median is deemed as a reliable indicator for the level of value in the commercial class of property.

**2010 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

II. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) 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 (2007), 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 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.

COMMERCIAL: The County has a thorough sales review practice. All sales are reviewed by the appraisal staff within one month of being filed the review indicates the usability of the sale. In reviewing the practices in the County it is evident that the County utilizes all available arms length transactions.

**2010 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

III. Measure 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 in 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 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.

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	92	82	92

**2010 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

IV. 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 International Association of Assessing Officers 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.

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 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 of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, July,

**2010 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

2007, 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. 247.

The analysis in this section displays the calculated COD and PRD measures for Lancaster County, which are considered as one part of the analysis of the County's assessment practices.

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	12.52	111.93

COMMERCIAL: The quality statistics are within the IAAO standards for the commercial class of properties. This analysis supports that the sample is representative and that the statistics can be relied upon as a reliable indicator for the level of value in the class. Both the COD and the PRD support assessment uniformity within the residential class.

**Agricultural or Special
Valuation Reports**

2010 Assessment Actions for Lancaster County

taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Agricultural

The County utilizes Special value on all agricultural properties for the agricultural land portion of the parcel. The Home and home site are valued by the same process as the residential properties in our county.

2010 Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Valuation data collection done by:
	Assessors appraisal staff
2.	Does the County maintain more than one market area / valuation grouping in the agricultural property class?
	No The agricultural land special value is one market area.
a.	What is the process used to determine and monitor market areas / valuation groupings? (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1363) List or describe. Class or subclass includes, but not limited to, the classifications of agricultural land listed in section 77-1363, parcel use, parcel type, location, geographic characteristics, zoning, city size, parcel size and market characteristics.
	Special value area is defined by the county line.
b.	Describe the specific characteristics of the market area / valuation groupings that make them unique?
	N/A
3.	Agricultural Land
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	Current use
b.	When is it agricultural land, when is it residential, when is it recreational?
	As defined in applicable statutes and regulations.
c.	Are these definitions in writing?
	See the State statutes and regulations.
d.	What are the recognized differences?
	Use as defined in the regulations and statutes
e.	How are rural home sites valued?
	The same as residential land, by market sales.
f.	Are rural home sites valued the same as rural residential home sites?
	yes
g.	Are all rural home sites valued the same or are market differences recognized?
	Market areas are recognized for the sites and improvements based on sales analysis.
h.	What are the recognized differences?
	Location factors that effect the market prices.
4.	What is the status of the soil conversion from the alpha to numeric notation?
	The software tables have been updated and the GIS soils are being converted to be completed by summer 2010.
a.	Are land capability groupings (LCG) used to determine assessed value?
	No
b.	What other land characteristics or analysis are/is used to determine assessed values?
	Special value
5.	Is land use updated annually?
	yes

a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Field inspection, GIS aerial map use and FSA maps as supplied by parcel owners.
6.	Is there agricultural land in the County that has a non-agricultural influence?
	Yes
a.	How is the County developing the value for non-agricultural influences?
	By using sales of comparable counties that have no non-ag influences.
b.	Has the County received applications for special valuation?
	Yes
c.	Describe special value methodology
	Sales from similar surrounding uninfluenced counties are analyzed (statistical studies of sales with predominately the same general classification to arrive at a value for the three major classifications of land.
7	Pickup work:
a.	Is pickup work done annually and is it completed by March 19th?
	Yes
b.	By Whom?
	County appraisal staff
c.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as what was used for the general population of the valuation group?
	Yes
d.	Is the pickup work schedule the same for the land as for the improvements?
	yes
8.	What is the counties progress with the 6 year inspection and review requirement as it relates to rural improvements? (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1311.03)
	We are on a schedule that assures the field inspection of all parcels in the county within the required period.
a.	Does the County maintain a tracking process?
	Our computer system has an area called inspection history which is used to track every visit, or drive by of a parcel.
b.	How are the results of the portion of the properties inspected and reviewed applied to the balance of the county?
	Each appraiser is responsible to track their progress on inspections completed to parcels still needing inspection and the work load is adjusted to meet the guidelines.

Lancaster County 2010 Analysis of Agricultural Land

Comp County	IRR Rate	IRR Rent EST	% IRR ACRES	DRY Rate	DRY Rent EST	% DRY ACRES	GRASS Rate	GRASS Rent EST	% GRASS ACRES
Gage	7.41%	12,632,492	10.57%	5.28%	35,766,803	65.80%	4.07%	4,726,296	21.59%
Johnson	8.45%	3,694,758	7.09%	6.52%	10,876,944	43.59%	3.63%	4,426,122	48.23%
Saline	7.55%	23,903,643	28.98%	6.43%	20,181,712	51.71%	3.78%	2,692,930	18.71%
Seward	7.09%	31,579,581	40.12%	5.01%	14,722,465	38.38%	4.52%	2,475,516	18.30%
Otoe	10.45%	890,395	1.08%	5.90%	37,468,809	78.81%	4.51%	2,869,553	18.09%
Butler	6.97%	29,792,695	34.48%	4.22%	19,695,055	46.44%	3.16%	2,280,755	16.20%

	RATE Correlate	2010 EST Rent	% ACRES		2010 ABST. Value	Indicated LOV	EST Value
Irrigated	7.75%	3,650,721	3.93%		32,588,653	69.18%	47,106,078
Dry	5.60%	36,086,845	75.32%		473,565,260	73.49%	644,407,938
Grass	4.10%	2,514,163	14.56%		38,700,397	63.11%	61,321,055
		42,251,729	93.81%	TOTALS	544,854,407	72.37%	752,835,070

**Agricultural or Special
Valuation Correlation**

2010 Correlation Section

For Lancaster County

Special Value for Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

The level of value for special valuation in Lancaster County was developed by capitalizing the estimated agricultural rental income of Lancaster County. The capitalization rate for this process was developed based on market information from uninfluenced counties that were considered comparable to Lancaster County. The estimated value produced by the income approach was verified against the weighted average selling price of the comparable counties to Lancaster County.

The level of value for the agricultural land in Lancaster County, as determined by the PTA is 72%.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 103,883	Value : 17,895,653,900	Growth 204,014,540	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	5,697	202,971,900	0	0	0	0	5,697	202,971,900	
02. Res Improve Land	84,270	2,953,958,300	0	0	0	0	84,270	2,953,958,300	
03. Res Improvements	83,946	9,127,049,600	0	0	0	0	83,946	9,127,049,600	
04. Res Total	89,643	12,283,979,800	0	0	0	0	89,643	12,283,979,800	133,299,809
% of Res Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	86.29	68.64	65.34
05. Com UnImp Land	1,386	244,104,100	0	0	0	0	1,386	244,104,100	
06. Com Improve Land	5,687	1,380,398,500	0	0	0	0	5,687	1,380,398,500	
07. Com Improvements	5,695	3,028,069,900	0	0	0	0	5,695	3,028,069,900	
08. Com Total	7,081	4,652,572,500	0	0	0	0	7,081	4,652,572,500	60,095,754
% of Com Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.82	26.00	29.46
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	89,643	12,283,979,800	0	0	0	0	89,643	12,283,979,800	133,299,809
% of Res & Rec Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	86.29	68.64	65.34
Com & Ind Total	7,081	4,652,572,500	0	0	0	0	7,081	4,652,572,500	60,095,754
% of Com & Ind Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.82	26.00	29.46
17. Taxable Total	96,724	16,936,552,300	0	0	0	0	96,724	16,936,552,300	193,395,563
% of Taxable Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	93.11	94.64	94.79

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	1,297	55,146,800	41,788,400	0	0	0
19. Commercial	646	151,939,600	153,168,900	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	1,297	55,146,800	41,788,400
19. Commercial	0	0	0	646	151,939,600	153,168,900
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1,943	207,086,400	194,957,300

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	2,858	0	0	2,858

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	4,297	387,376,600	4,297	387,376,600
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	2,199	256,747,000	2,199	256,747,000
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	2,862	314,978,000	2,862	314,978,000
30. Ag Total							7,159	959,101,600

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	27	0.00	1,849,100	27	0.00	1,849,100	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	2,014	0.00	91,665,200	2,014	0.00	91,665,200	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2,005	0.00	292,562,900	2,005	0.00	292,562,900	10,618,977
34. HomeSite Total				2,032	0.00	386,077,200	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	88	0.00	416,700	88	0.00	416,700	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	622	0.00	2,605,600	622	0.00	2,605,600	
37. FarmSite Improvements	844	0.00	19,309,100	844	0.00	19,309,100	0
38. FarmSite Total				932	0.00	22,331,400	
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	3,106,000	0	0.00	3,106,000	
41. Total Section VI				2,964	0.00	411,514,600	10,618,977

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	6,381	0.00	547,587,000	6,381	0.00	547,587,000
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,918.91	12.57%	4,084,761	12.53%	2,128.69
46. 1A	4,663.10	30.55%	9,958,547	30.56%	2,135.61
47. 2A1	1,892.32	12.40%	4,044,893	12.41%	2,137.53
48. 2A	3,778.83	24.76%	8,069,702	24.76%	2,135.50
49. 3A1	1,347.41	8.83%	2,892,870	8.88%	2,146.99
50. 3A	53.53	0.35%	96,159	0.30%	1,796.36
51. 4A1	1,270.46	8.32%	2,721,328	8.35%	2,142.00
52. 4A	337.00	2.21%	720,393	2.21%	2,137.66
53. Total	15,261.56	100.00%	32,588,653	100.00%	2,135.34
Dry					
54. 1D1	18,588.63	6.33%	29,858,724	6.31%	1,606.29
55. 1D	66,268.09	22.56%	106,873,761	22.57%	1,612.75
56. 2D1	46,770.51	15.92%	75,384,054	15.92%	1,611.79
57. 2D	88,541.20	30.14%	142,702,101	30.13%	1,611.70
58. 3D1	33,588.00	11.43%	54,190,573	11.44%	1,613.39
59. 3D	3,183.27	1.08%	5,118,263	1.08%	1,607.86
60. 4D1	32,372.62	11.02%	52,216,360	11.03%	1,612.98
61. 4D	4,466.46	1.52%	7,221,424	1.52%	1,616.81
62. Total	293,778.78	100.00%	473,565,260	100.00%	1,611.98
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,599.51	0.00%	1,020,836	2.58%	638.22
64. 1G	4,911.37	8.47%	3,385,548	8.55%	689.33
65. 2G1	4,981.59	8.59%	3,384,372	8.55%	679.38
66. 2G	7,736.77	13.34%	5,303,740	13.39%	685.52
67. 3G1	13,967.29	24.08%	9,698,707	24.49%	694.39
68. 3G	1,270.77	2.19%	885,971	2.24%	697.19
69. 4G1	12,844.35	22.15%	8,903,356	22.48%	693.17
70. 4G	10,681.30	18.42%	7,018,691	17.72%	657.10
71. Total	57,992.95	100.00%	39,601,221	100.00%	682.86
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	15,261.56	3.90%	32,588,653	5.95%	2,135.34
Dry Total					
Dry Total	293,778.78	75.07%	473,565,260	86.48%	1,611.98
Grass Total					
Grass Total	57,992.95	14.82%	39,601,221	7.23%	682.86
Waste					
Waste	24,326.60	6.22%	1,831,866	0.33%	75.30
Other					
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt					
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total					
Market Area Total	391,359.89	100.00%	547,587,000	100.00%	1,399.19

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	15,261.56	32,588,653	15,261.56	32,588,653
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	293,778.78	473,565,260	293,778.78	473,565,260
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	57,992.95	39,601,221	57,992.95	39,601,221
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	24,326.60	1,831,866	24,326.60	1,831,866
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	391,359.89	547,587,000	391,359.89	547,587,000

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	15,261.56	3.90%	32,588,653	5.95%	2,135.34
Dry Land	293,778.78	75.07%	473,565,260	86.48%	1,611.98
Grass	57,992.95	14.82%	39,601,221	7.23%	682.86
Waste	24,326.60	6.22%	1,831,866	0.33%	75.30
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	391,359.89	100.00%	547,587,000	100.00%	1,399.19

2010 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2009 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

55 Lancaster

	2009 CTL County Total	2010 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2010 form 45 - 2009 CTL)	Percent Change	2010 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	12,154,404,900	12,283,979,800	129,574,900	1.07%	133,299,809	-0.03%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	379,720,000	386,077,200	6,357,200	1.67%	10,618,977	-1.12%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	12,534,124,900	12,670,057,000	135,932,100	1.08%	143,918,786	-0.06%
05. Commercial	4,574,088,900	4,652,572,500	78,483,600	1.72%	60,095,754	0.40%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	25,277,800	22,331,400	-2,946,400	-11.66%	0	-11.66%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	4,599,366,700	4,674,903,900	75,537,200	1.64%	60,095,754	0.34%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	17,133,491,600	17,348,066,900	214,575,300	1.25%	204,014,540	0.06%
11. Irrigated	32,757,736	32,588,653	-169,083	-0.52%		
12. Dryland	474,781,091	473,565,260	-1,215,831	-0.26%		
13. Grassland	39,294,630	39,601,221	306,591	0.78%		
14. Wasteland	1,830,243	1,831,866	1,623	0.09%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	548,663,700	547,587,000	-1,076,700	-0.20%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	17,682,155,300	17,895,653,900	213,498,600	1.21%	204,014,540	0.05%

Lancaster County's Three Year Assessment Plan

Norman H. Agena, Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds

Introduction

Pursuant to 77-1311.02, the following Three Year Assessment Plan has been prepared by Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds Office.

<u>Assessment/Sales Ratio Statistics for Tax Year 2009</u>			
Class	Ratio	COD*	PRD**
Residential	94	6.19	101.47
Commercial	92	9.17	111.12
Ag-Special	73		

* Coefficient of Dispersion

** Price Related Differential

Tax Year 2010

We anticipate this to be a “clean up” year. In addition to the routine annual work, we will be focusing on properties that may have slipped through the cracks, as well as conduct a close review of the 2009 protests to see if we concur with changes made by the referees. We will continue field inspections of one fifth of the properties in all classes. This review will allow the data collection and review to be at as current a level as possible. By reviewing one fifth of the parcels every year, data will be no older than six years. Pickup work and sales verification will continue annually, but is not considered part of the annual review. Based on our annual review process we should be able to remodel all classes of property every third year, and monitor market and ratio trends for all classes on an annual basis.

Tax Year 2011

A complete reappraisal of all property will be continued this year for application in 2012. We will continue field inspections of one third of the properties in all classes. This review will allow the data collection and review to be at as current a level as possible. By reviewing one fifth of the parcels every year, data will be no older than six years. Pickup work and sales verification will continue annually, but is not considered part of the annual review. Based on our annual review process we should be able to remodel all classes of property every third year, and monitor market and ratio trends for all classes during the intervening years.

Tax Year 2012

A complete reappraisal of all property will be completed for this year. This reappraisal consists of remodeling of all properties utilizing the three approaches to value. It includes an on-site property inspection of all sales and pickup work, and a general site review of more than one fifth of the data base as well as a complete drive by review of all parcels in the county to set final values. We expect the statistical ratios for residential and commercial properties to be in the acceptable market range and the quality stats to be within the acceptable range.

2010 Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	2
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	21
3.	Other full-time employees
	6
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	15
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	3,859,899
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	same
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	The appraisal budget is not a separate line item in the budget.
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	0 The appraisal budget is not a separate line item in the budget.
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	298,982
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	13,000
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
13.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	Yes, a nominal amount

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	Tyler Technologies Orion
2.	CAMA software
	Tyler Technologies Orion
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	NO
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	N/A

5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes/ ArcGIS Server
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor office staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	Tyler Technologies Orion

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All cities and incorporated villages are zoned.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	Over 30 years ago.

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	None
2.	Other services
	Tyler Technologies Orion for computer programming and program support, ArcGIS software and program maintenance.

Certification

This is to certify that the 2010 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

One copy by electronic transmission and one printed copy by hand delivery to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

One copy by electronic transmission to the Lancaster County Assessor.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2010.



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts