

# 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

77 Sarpy

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

|                        |               |                                    |           |
|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Number of Sales        | 5,570         | Median                             | 97        |
| Total Sales Price      | \$924,333,569 | Mean                               | 97        |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$924,577,569 | Wgt. Mean                          | 97        |
| Total Assessed Value   | \$893,954,576 | Average Assessed Value of the Base | \$147,599 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price  | \$165,992     | Avg. Assessed Value                | \$160,495 |

---

### Confidence Interval - Current

|                   |                |
|-------------------|----------------|
| 95% Median C.I    | 96.67 to 96.94 |
| 95% Mean C.I      | 97.12 to 97.47 |
| 95% Wgt. Mean C.I | 96.50 to 96.88 |

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| % of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 73.56 |
| % of Records Sold in the Study Period                            | 10.42 |
| % of Value Sold in the Study Period                              | 11.33 |

---

### Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
|------|-----------------|-----|--------|
| 2009 | 6,577           | 96  | 96     |
| 2008 | 7,907           | 98  | 98     |
| 2007 | 9,017           | 98  | 98     |
| 2006 | 7,416           | 97  | 97     |

## 2010 Commission Summary

77 Sarpy

---

### Commercial Real Property - Current

|                        |               |                                    |           |
|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Number of Sales        | 271           | Median                             | 97        |
| Total Sales Price      | \$267,068,267 | Mean                               | 95        |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$269,570,472 | Wgt. Mean                          | 91        |
| Total Assessed Value   | \$245,715,223 | Average Assessed Value of the Base | \$888,149 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price  | \$994,725     | Avg. Assessed Value                | \$906,698 |

---

### Confidence Interval - Current

|                   |                |
|-------------------|----------------|
| 95% Median C.I    | 95.60 to 98.00 |
| 95% Mean C.I      | 93.46 to 95.97 |
| 95% Wgt. Mean C.I | 88.59 to 93.71 |

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| % of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 23.12 |
| % of Records Sold in the Study Period                            | 9.71  |
| % of Value Sold in the Study Period                              | 9.91  |

---

### Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
|------|-----------------|-----|--------|
| 2009 | 345             | 96  | 96     |
| 2008 | 359             | 97  | 97     |
| 2007 | 318             | 96  | 96     |
| 2006 | 266             | 98  | 98     |



## 2010 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Sarpy 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 Sarpy County is 97% of market value. The quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Sarpy 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 Sarpy County is 97% of market value. The quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Sarpy 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 Sarpy County is 71%. The quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation in Sarpy 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 Sarpy County**

### **taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Residential**

Sarpy County's residential appraisers are assigned particular areas of the county for the review and inspection. The appraisers are responsible for conducting sales review and verification, physical inspections, data collection of new building permits, and the overall analysis of subdivisions and other valuation groupings.

Inspections and other in-depth reviews for 2010 were conducted in certain areas by these appraisers based on the cyclical schedule developed by the county, or as market indication suggested certain areas lacked uniformity and proportionality. Following the data gathering or verification process, the county implemented the most current Marshall and Swift cost tables. New depreciation tables were analyzed and developed using local market information provided by the sales.

The appraisers also conducted analysis of vacant lot sales to determine land values for the various neighborhoods and market areas. The county also updated their standard operating procedure regarding the valuation of vacant residential subdivisions to assign value uniformly using the proportioned methodology or the discounted cash flow methodology. In addition to the analysis of land values in general, rural residential site values and farm home site values were analyzed by five geographic areas. The resulting valuation of parcels was established using comparable sales with similar amenities to the subject parcels.

One of the few exceptions to the utilization of the cost approach is an area of privately owned military housing in the town of Bellevue. In this area income information was capitalized to arrive at estimates of value.

The aforementioned assessment actions resulted in value changes for 97 percent of the residential properties in Sarpy County. Analysis of median assessed values by general areas of the county indicates slight reductions, which is consistent with the information in the statistical reports.

## 2010 Assessment Survey for Sarpy County

### Residential Appraisal Information

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | <b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>   |  |
|    | Staff appraisers.   |  |
| 2. | <b>List the valuation groupings used by the County:</b>   |  |
|    | <b>Valuation Grouping</b>   | <b>Assessor Location(s)/Neighborhood(s) included</b> |
|    | 01  | Bellevue Area  |
|    | 02  | Gretna Area  |
|    | 03  | Lavista Area   |
|    | 04  | Mobile Home Parks                                    |
|    | 05  | Millard Area   |
|    | 06  | Omaha Area   |
|    | 07  | Papillion Area                                       |
|    | 08  | Recreational/Lake Area                               |
|    | 09  | Rural Sarpy  |
|    | 10  | Springfield Area                                     |
| a. | <b>Describe the specific characteristics of the valuation groupings that make them unique.</b>  |  |
|    | Specific characteristics for each area are based on factors such as market appeal, age, style, and quality.   |  |
| 3. | <b>What approach(es) to value is/are used for this class to estimate the market value of properties? List or describe.</b>                                    |  |
|    | Cost approach to value with market transactions used to adjust depreciation tables.   |  |
| 4  | <b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>   |  |
|    | The last lot value study was completed in 2009 for tax year 2010  |  |
| a. | <b>What methodology was used to determine the residential lot values?</b>   |  |
|    | Market transactions of similar vacant lots were used to determine lot values.   |  |
| 5. | <b>Is the same costing year for the cost approach being used for the entire valuation grouping? If not, identify and explain the differences?</b>             |  |
|    | Yes, the county uses the most current costing available for the entire county. For 2010 the June 2009 cost tables are used.                                   |  |
| 6. | <b>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?</b> |  |
|    | Depreciation tables are based on local market information.  |  |
| a. | <b>How often does the County update depreciation tables?</b>  |  |
|    | Annually.   |  |
| 7. | <b>Pickup work:</b>   |  |
| a. | <b>Is pickup work done annually and is it completed by March 19<sup>th</sup>?</b>   |  |
|    | Yes   |  |
| b. | <b>By Whom?</b>   |  |
|    | Staff appraisers.   |  |

|    |  |
|----|--|
| c. | <b>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?</b> |
|    | Yes.   |
| 8. | <b>What is the County's progress with the 6 year inspection and review requirement? (Statute 77-1311.03)</b>   |
|    | Progress is made each year toward the standard of a six years inspection.  |
| a. | <b>Does the County maintain a tracking process? If yes describe.</b>   |
|    | Yes. The county notes the date of physical inspection on the property record card and photos are marked with a date stamp.   |
| b. | <b>How are the results of the portion of the properties inspected and reviewed applied to the balance of the county?</b>   |

The results from the sales analysis are applied to each market area in its entirety.

**PAD 2010 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 02/15/2010

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

|                        |             |                |           |                  |        |                     |                |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|--------|---------------------|----------------|
| NUMBER of Sales:       | 5570        | <b>MEDIAN:</b> | <b>97</b> | COV:             | 6.92   | 95% Median C.I.:    | 96.67 to 96.94 |
| TOTAL Sales Price:     | 924,333,569 | WGT. MEAN:     | 97        | STD:             | 6.73   | 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 96.50 to 96.88 |
| TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | 924,577,569 | MEAN:          | 97        | AVG.ABS.DEV:     | 4.50   | 95% Mean C.I.:      | 97.12 to 97.47 |
| TOTAL Assessed Value:  | 893,954,576 |                |           |                  |        |                     |                |
| AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 165,992     | COD:           | 4.65      | MAX Sales Ratio: | 203.30 |                     |                |
| AVG. Assessed Value:   | 160,494     | PRD:           | 100.63    | MIN Sales Ratio: | 52.21  |                     |                |

Printed: 03/19/2010 14:29:38

| 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 | 985   | 95.78  | 95.76 | 95.41     | 4.09 | 100.36 | 52.21 | 121.14 | 95.40 to 96.06  | 171,775              | 163,896       |
| 10/01/07 TO 12/31/07 | 685   | 96.98  | 97.13 | 96.62     | 4.22 | 100.53 | 75.91 | 120.63 | 96.52 to 97.28  | 164,768              | 159,195       |
| 01/01/08 TO 03/31/08 | 537   | 97.29  | 97.71 | 97.51     | 4.20 | 100.21 | 76.43 | 121.21 | 96.92 to 97.80  | 165,567              | 161,439       |
| 04/01/08 TO 06/30/08 | 842   | 96.80  | 97.03 | 96.56     | 4.41 | 100.48 | 61.03 | 133.33 | 96.45 to 97.13  | 170,216              | 164,366       |
| 07/01/08 TO 09/30/08 | 737   | 96.62  | 97.63 | 96.87     | 5.15 | 100.78 | 63.76 | 203.30 | 96.30 to 96.98  | 166,582              | 161,371       |
| 10/01/08 TO 12/31/08 | 513   | 97.85  | 98.66 | 97.87     | 5.19 | 100.81 | 64.78 | 135.71 | 97.23 to 98.46  | 164,543              | 161,034       |
| 01/01/09 TO 03/31/09 | 427   | 97.96  | 98.63 | 97.87     | 4.83 | 100.78 | 80.15 | 133.49 | 97.27 to 98.49  | 167,786              | 164,215       |
| 04/01/09 TO 06/30/09 | 844   | 96.72  | 97.43 | 96.40     | 5.05 | 101.07 | 69.69 | 144.68 | 96.38 to 96.98  | 155,751              | 150,138       |
| <u>Study Years</u>   |       |        |       |           |      |        |       |        |                 |                      |               |
| 07/01/07 TO 06/30/08 | 3049  | 96.58  | 96.76 | 96.36     | 4.27 | 100.41 | 52.21 | 133.33 | 96.43 to 96.78  | 168,677              | 162,537       |
| 07/01/08 TO 06/30/09 | 2521  | 97.03  | 97.94 | 97.10     | 5.11 | 100.87 | 63.76 | 203.30 | 96.87 to 97.23  | 162,745              | 158,023       |
| <u>Calendar Yrs</u>  |       |        |       |           |      |        |       |        |                 |                      |               |
| 01/01/08 TO 12/31/08 | 2629  | 97.03  | 97.65 | 97.09     | 4.75 | 100.58 | 61.03 | 203.30 | 96.84 to 97.23  | 167,141              | 162,279       |
| <u>ALL</u>           |       |        |       |           |      |        |       |        |                 |                      |               |
|                      | 5570  | 96.81  | 97.29 | 96.69     | 4.65 | 100.63 | 52.21 | 203.30 | 96.67 to 96.94  | 165,992              | 160,494       |

| VALUATION GROUP | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN  | WGT. MEAN | COD   | PRD    | MIN   | MAX    | 95% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |
|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|-----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------|
| 01              | 1156  | 96.66  | 97.29 | 96.92     | 4.29  | 100.38 | 69.69 | 196.63 | 96.39 to 96.85  | 156,040              | 151,234       |
| 02              | 576   | 97.10  | 97.65 | 96.71     | 4.66  | 100.97 | 69.14 | 130.43 | 96.80 to 97.66  | 184,090              | 178,024       |
| 03              | 556   | 96.67  | 97.84 | 96.82     | 5.69  | 101.05 | 79.54 | 147.85 | 96.32 to 97.36  | 159,667              | 154,587       |
| 04              | 11    | 93.85  | 98.46 | 108.17    | 14.81 | 91.02  | 74.10 | 126.83 | 74.95 to 118.43 | 5,472                | 5,920         |
| 05              | 1345  | 96.94  | 97.59 | 96.98     | 4.42  | 100.63 | 78.90 | 144.68 | 96.60 to 97.21  | 155,137              | 150,447       |
| 06              | 300   | 96.52  | 96.87 | 96.78     | 4.32  | 100.10 | 77.02 | 119.74 | 95.96 to 97.11  | 131,835              | 127,584       |
| 07              | 1479  | 96.89  | 96.94 | 96.37     | 4.38  | 100.60 | 69.84 | 125.81 | 96.55 to 97.10  | 185,775              | 179,025       |
| 08              | 66    | 95.57  | 94.90 | 94.77     | 11.92 | 100.14 | 52.21 | 203.30 | 93.04 to 97.68  | 158,043              | 149,770       |
| 09              | 24    | 95.19  | 92.48 | 94.83     | 7.06  | 97.52  | 64.77 | 109.11 | 91.68 to 98.00  | 290,315              | 275,301       |
| 10              | 57    | 96.87  | 97.50 | 96.84     | 4.30  | 100.67 | 83.58 | 133.49 | 95.30 to 98.00  | 157,082              | 152,125       |
| <u>ALL</u>      |       |        |       |           |       |        |       |        |                 |                      |               |
|                 | 5570  | 96.81  | 97.29 | 96.69     | 4.65  | 100.63 | 52.21 | 203.30 | 96.67 to 96.94  | 165,992              | 160,494       |

| 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                                   | 4887  | 96.58  | 96.99 | 96.65     | 4.33  | 100.35 | 64.78 | 196.63 | 96.46 to 96.74  | 183,239              | 177,099       |
| 2                                   | 633   | 100.00 | 99.84 | 98.44     | 5.51  | 101.43 | 64.77 | 144.68 | 99.38 to 100.00 | 42,572               | 41,908        |
| 3                                   | 50    | 93.88  | 94.59 | 90.83     | 15.71 | 104.14 | 52.21 | 203.30 | 87.54 to 98.08  | 42,726               | 38,807        |
| <u>ALL</u>                          |       |        |       |           |       |        |       |        |                 |                      |               |
|                                     | 5570  | 96.81  | 97.29 | 96.69     | 4.65  | 100.63 | 52.21 | 203.30 | 96.67 to 96.94  | 165,992              | 160,494       |

**PAD 2010 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 02/15/2010

(!: AVTot=0)  
(!: Derived)

|                        |             |                |           |                  |        |                     |                |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|--------|---------------------|----------------|
| NUMBER of Sales:       | 5570        | <b>MEDIAN:</b> | <b>97</b> | COV:             | 6.92   | 95% Median C.I.:    | 96.67 to 96.94 |
| TOTAL Sales Price:     | 924,333,569 | WGT. MEAN:     | 97        | STD:             | 6.73   | 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 96.50 to 96.88 |
| TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | 924,577,569 | MEAN:          | 97        | AVG.ABS.DEV:     | 4.50   | 95% Mean C.I.:      | 97.12 to 97.47 |
| TOTAL Assessed Value:  | 893,954,576 |                |           |                  |        |                     |                |
| AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 165,992     | COD:           | 4.65      | MAX Sales Ratio: | 203.30 |                     |                |
| AVG. Assessed Value:   | 160,494     | PRD:           | 100.63    | MIN Sales Ratio: | 52.21  |                     |                |

Printed: 03/19/2010 14:29:40

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

| RANGE      | COUNT       | MEDIAN       | MEAN         | WGT. MEAN    | COD         | PRD           | MIN          | MAX           | 95% Median C.I.       | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val  |
|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 01         | 5528        | 96.81        | 97.32        | 96.70        | 4.55        | 100.64        | 64.77        | 196.63        | 96.68 to 96.95        | 167,024              | 161,516        |
| 06         | 26          | 93.48        | 94.24        | 85.71        | 19.53       | 109.95        | 60.31        | 203.30        | 79.81 to 101.09       | 36,696               | 31,451         |
| 07         | 16          | 94.66        | 94.16        | 87.10        | 16.42       | 108.11        | 52.21        | 126.83        | 74.95 to 115.59       | 19,482               | 16,968         |
| <u>ALL</u> | <u>5570</u> | <u>96.81</u> | <u>97.29</u> | <u>96.69</u> | <u>4.65</u> | <u>100.63</u> | <u>52.21</u> | <u>203.30</u> | <u>96.67 to 96.94</u> | <u>165,992</u>       | <u>160,494</u> |

**SALE PRICE \***

| RANGE            | COUNT       | MEDIAN       | MEAN         | WGT. MEAN    | COD         | PRD           | MIN          | MAX           | 95% Median C.I.       | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val  |
|------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| <u>Low \$</u>    |             |              |              |              |             |               |              |               |                       |                      |                |
| 1 TO 4999        | 10          | 95.44        | 96.74        | 95.36        | 9.78        | 101.45        | 74.10        | 126.83        | 86.80 to 106.20       | 2,070                | 1,974          |
| 5000 TO 9999     | 2           | 139.13       | 139.13       | 144.06       | 46.13       | 96.57         | 74.95        | 203.30        | N/A                   | 6,500                | 9,364          |
| <u>Total \$</u>  |             |              |              |              |             |               |              |               |                       |                      |                |
| 1 TO 9999        | 12          | 95.44        | 103.81       | 114.15       | 19.36       | 90.94         | 74.10        | 203.30        | 86.80 to 106.20       | 2,808                | 3,205          |
| 10000 TO 29999   | 164         | 100.17       | 102.28       | 102.36       | 7.67        | 99.92         | 52.21        | 144.68        | 100.00 to 101.69      | 24,870               | 25,456         |
| 30000 TO 59999   | 447         | 99.48        | 99.22        | 98.91        | 5.35        | 100.31        | 60.31        | 147.85        | 98.73 to 100.00       | 40,834               | 40,391         |
| 60000 TO 99999   | 256         | 97.99        | 99.06        | 98.91        | 6.59        | 100.15        | 64.78        | 196.63        | 97.06 to 99.76        | 85,482               | 84,546         |
| 100000 TO 149999 | 1743        | 96.69        | 97.18        | 97.16        | 4.05        | 100.03        | 64.77        | 132.02        | 96.50 to 96.92        | 130,257              | 126,552        |
| 150000 TO 249999 | 2216        | 96.53        | 96.86        | 96.84        | 4.14        | 100.03        | 69.14        | 151.17        | 96.37 to 96.75        | 188,905              | 182,928        |
| 250000 TO 499999 | 708         | 95.99        | 96.00        | 95.83        | 4.88        | 100.18        | 75.91        | 133.35        | 95.41 to 96.52        | 309,013              | 296,125        |
| 500000 +         | 24          | 93.66        | 91.52        | 90.82        | 5.10        | 100.77        | 70.39        | 99.44         | 90.77 to 95.98        | 662,203              | 601,422        |
| <u>ALL</u>       | <u>5570</u> | <u>96.81</u> | <u>97.29</u> | <u>96.69</u> | <u>4.65</u> | <u>100.63</u> | <u>52.21</u> | <u>203.30</u> | <u>96.67 to 96.94</u> | <u>165,992</u>       | <u>160,494</u> |



**2010 Correlation Section  
for Sarpy County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

The level of value for the residential real property in Sarpy County, as determined by the PTA is 97%. The mathematically calculated median is 97%.

RESIDENTIAL:As noted in the Assessment Actions piece of the Survey, Sarpy County conducts a complete reappraisal every year. The statistical results presented in this report display the results of their efforts. The measures of central are all within the acceptable range, and the quality statistics indicate uniform and proportionate valuation has been achieved. The coefficient of dispersion is rather low in the residential class indicating that on average, selling prices of properties are within a small percentage of the assessed values. Given the fact that a complete residential reappraisal was completed for 2010, it is justifiable to see the COD relatively tightly clustered around the median. The process of updating cost tables annually and calculating new depreciation schedules annually assures the sold properties are valued in the same relation as the unsold properties.

Sarpy County uses approximately 242 neighborhoods to monitor variations in sales activity. On a broader scale, the county monitors regions of the county in 10 value groupings. Those groupings are reported in the statistical analysis and demonstrate that each grouping is valued appropriately.

A general overview of the statistics along with the assessment practices demonstrated by the county both indicate that the level of value is within the acceptable range and the valuation groupings in the county bear a consistent relationship to market value.

**2010 Correlation Section  
for Sarpy 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 residential appraisers are responsible for the qualification of sales for the area in which they are assigned. Typically, the appraisers will verify parcel data against the data displayed in the Multiple Listing Service, or using data contained on the various real estate websites. If significant differences exist, the appraisers will flag the parcel for further review. Information contained on the real estate transfer statement is verified with either the buyer or seller if questions arise regarding the sale price, personal property adjustments, or other adjustments for non-real property.

Currently, Sarpy County avoids using foreclosures in the residential analysis, although numbers of such properties are on the rise. However, if a particular neighborhood is experiencing foreclosure, then the county may consider such sales an indication of market, rather than outlying distressed sales.

In reviewing the process used by the county to qualify and verify sales, the methodology appears to ensure all arms length sales are included for development of the state sales file statistics. A review of the reasons for disqualification also suggests that no bias exists in the sales qualification, assuring that the measurement of the residential class was done with all available sales.

**2010 Correlation Section  
for Sarpy 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.

|                           | <b>Median</b> | <b>Wgt. Mean</b> | <b>Mean</b> |
|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------|
| <b>R&amp;O Statistics</b> | <b>97</b>     | <b>97</b>        | <b>97</b>   |

**2010 Correlation Section  
for Sarpy 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 Sarpy 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 Sarpy County, which are considered as one part of the analysis of the County's assessment practices.

|                           | <b>COD</b>  | <b>PRD</b>    |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>R&amp;O Statistics</b> | <b>4.65</b> | <b>100.63</b> |

RESIDENTIAL:Both of the quality statistics are well within the acceptable range suggesting uniformity and proportionality exist in the residential assessments. The coefficient of dispersion is rather low in the residential class indicating that on average, selling prices of properties are within a small percentage of the assessed values.



## **2010 Assessment Actions for Sarpy County**

### **taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Commercial**

For tax year 2010, Sarpy County conducted a market analysis of the commercial class of property. Occupancy codes that were sufficiently represented by sales with indicated levels of value outside the acceptable range were reviewed and adjusted appropriately.

The county also reviewed and inspected properties based on the county's cyclical review schedule. Particular areas include convenience stores, mortuaries, bars and taverns.

Sarpy County's commercial appraisers are responsible for conducting sales review and verification, physical inspections, data collection of new building permits, and the overall analysis of subclass values. The county also updated their standard operating procedure regarding the valuation of vacant commercial subdivisions to assign value uniformly using the proportioned methodology or the discounted cash flow methodology.

Completion of the assessment actions resulted in value changes for 16 percent of the commercial properties in Sarpy County.

## 2010 Assessment Survey for Sarpy County

### Commercial / Industrial Appraisal Information

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | <b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>  |
|    | Staff  |
| 2. | <b>List the valuation groupings used by the County:</b>  |
|    | Valuation groupings are determined by the Marshall & Swift occupancy codes.  |
| a. | <b>Describe the specific characteristics of the valuation groupings that make them unique.</b>   |
|    | Specifics are detailed in the Marshall & Swift occupancy code. For example: regional shopping center, service garage, storage warehouses, etc.                                 |
| 3. | <b>What approach(es) to value is/are used for this class to estimate the market value of properties? List or describe.</b>   |
|    | The cost approach, sales approach, and income approach are all used. Greater weight is put on the income approach to value.  |
| 4  | <b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>  |
|    | The last lot value study was completed in 2009 for tax year 2010   |
| a. | <b>What methodology was used to determine the commercial lot values?</b>   |
|    | Sales comparison approach of vacant lot sales.   |
| 5. | <b>Is the same costing year for the cost approach being used for entire valuation grouping? If not, identify and explain the differences?</b>                                  |
|    | Yes, the county uses the most current costing for the entire county. For 2010 the June 2009 cost tables are used.  |
| 6. | <b>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?</b>                  |
|    | The local market provides the information necessary for depreciation studies.  |
| a. | <b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>   |
|    | Annually   |
| 7. | <b>Pickup work:</b>  |
| a. | <b>Is pickup work done annually and is it completed by March 19<sup>th</sup>?</b>  |
|    | Yes  |
| b. | <b>By Whom?</b>  |
|    | Staff appraisers.  |
| c. | <b>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?</b> |
|    | Yes  |
| 8. | <b>What is the Counties progress with the 6 year inspection and review requirement? (Statute 77-1311.03)</b>   |
|    | All reviews are on track for a six year cycle completion.  |
| a. | <b>Does the County maintain a tracking process? If yes describe.</b>   |
|    | Yes. The county documents inspections in the CAMA system with inspection notations on the property record, as well as timestamps on the digital photos.                        |

b. **How are the results of the portion of the properties inspected and reviewed applied to the balance of the county?**

Results of the review generally apply to that particular occupancy code only, but the statistics are studied in non reviewed areas to ensure uniformity is maintained.

**PAD 2010 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 02/15/2010

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

|                        |             |                |           |                  |        |                     |                |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|--------|---------------------|----------------|
| NUMBER of Sales:       | 271         | <b>MEDIAN:</b> | <b>97</b> | COV:             | 11.16  | 95% Median C.I.:    | 95.60 to 98.00 |
| TOTAL Sales Price:     | 267,068,267 | WGT. MEAN:     | 91        | STD:             | 10.57  | 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 88.59 to 93.71 |
| TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | 269,570,472 | MEAN:          | 95        | AVG.ABS.DEV:     | 7.43   | 95% Mean C.I.:      | 93.46 to 95.97 |
| TOTAL Assessed Value:  | 245,715,223 |                |           |                  |        |                     |                |
| AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 994,724     | COD:           | 7.67      | MAX Sales Ratio: | 128.85 |                     |                |
| AVG. Assessed Value:   | 906,698     | PRD:           | 103.91    | MIN Sales Ratio: | 53.36  |                     |                |

Printed: 03/19/2010 14:30:29

| 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 | 30    | 97.35  | 96.31 | 95.04     | 6.70  | 101.34 | 59.72 | 115.28 | 95.24 to 100.06 | 1,036,925            | 985,504       |
| 10/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 36    | 99.76  | 98.35 | 94.69     | 5.76  | 103.86 | 73.73 | 119.35 | 96.05 to 101.91 | 433,552              | 410,541       |
| 01/01/07 TO 03/31/07 | 28    | 97.06  | 94.48 | 92.93     | 7.24  | 101.66 | 65.56 | 111.11 | 93.30 to 99.80  | 735,361              | 683,389       |
| 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 | 28    | 97.04  | 94.20 | 92.77     | 7.41  | 101.54 | 72.55 | 115.38 | 91.35 to 99.94  | 886,405              | 822,340       |
| 07/01/07 TO 09/30/07 | 26    | 95.77  | 94.41 | 92.06     | 7.37  | 102.55 | 68.57 | 117.33 | 92.99 to 99.89  | 768,157              | 707,184       |
| 10/01/07 TO 12/31/07 | 24    | 94.15  | 93.49 | 94.19     | 6.59  | 99.25  | 71.24 | 103.52 | 89.08 to 100.00 | 1,059,611            | 998,067       |
| 01/01/08 TO 03/31/08 | 27    | 97.20  | 92.91 | 95.76     | 8.87  | 97.02  | 64.62 | 106.17 | 84.79 to 100.00 | 464,415              | 444,740       |
| 04/01/08 TO 06/30/08 | 18    | 95.46  | 93.05 | 89.22     | 7.03  | 104.29 | 76.60 | 107.23 | 87.30 to 98.24  | 3,369,549            | 3,006,347     |
| 07/01/08 TO 09/30/08 | 20    | 96.46  | 93.61 | 85.80     | 9.61  | 109.11 | 63.22 | 120.53 | 89.35 to 99.99  | 1,530,253            | 1,312,883     |
| 10/01/08 TO 12/31/08 | 22    | 95.52  | 95.01 | 85.57     | 7.67  | 111.03 | 55.32 | 128.85 | 92.00 to 100.00 | 874,652              | 748,482       |
| 01/01/09 TO 03/31/09 | 9     | 99.27  | 92.43 | 87.75     | 14.56 | 105.33 | 53.36 | 111.80 | 78.13 to 111.44 | 840,785              | 737,809       |
| 04/01/09 TO 06/30/09 | 3     | 88.97  | 92.97 | 96.24     | 5.09  | 96.61  | 88.18 | 101.76 | N/A             | 479,000              | 460,972       |
| <u>Study Years</u>   |       |        |       |           |       |        |       |        |                 |                      |               |
| 07/01/06 TO 06/30/07 | 122   | 97.67  | 96.01 | 93.90     | 6.79  | 102.24 | 59.72 | 119.35 | 96.21 to 99.70  | 755,124              | 709,057       |
| 07/01/07 TO 06/30/08 | 95    | 95.68  | 93.49 | 91.46     | 7.59  | 102.23 | 64.62 | 117.33 | 93.00 to 97.73  | 1,248,356            | 1,141,712     |
| 07/01/08 TO 06/30/09 | 54    | 95.52  | 93.95 | 86.23     | 9.71  | 108.95 | 53.36 | 128.85 | 92.39 to 99.27  | 1,089,842            | 939,768       |
| <u>Calendar Yrs</u>  |       |        |       |           |       |        |       |        |                 |                      |               |
| 01/01/07 TO 12/31/07 | 106   | 96.47  | 94.16 | 93.05     | 7.20  | 101.20 | 65.56 | 117.33 | 94.35 to 98.21  | 856,719              | 797,177       |
| 01/01/08 TO 12/31/08 | 87    | 95.68  | 93.63 | 88.47     | 8.43  | 105.84 | 55.32 | 128.85 | 92.86 to 98.40  | 1,414,235            | 1,251,109     |
| <u>ALL</u>           |       |        |       |           |       |        |       |        |                 |                      |               |
|                      | 271   | 96.97  | 94.72 | 91.15     | 7.67  | 103.91 | 53.36 | 128.85 | 95.60 to 98.00  | 994,724              | 906,698       |

| VALUATION GROUP | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN  | WGT. MEAN | COD  | PRD    | MIN   | MAX    | 95% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |
|-----------------|-------|--------|-------|-----------|------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------|
| 01              | 271   | 96.97  | 94.72 | 91.15     | 7.67 | 103.91 | 53.36 | 128.85 | 95.60 to 98.00  | 994,724              | 906,698       |
| <u>ALL</u>      |       |        |       |           |      |        |       |        |                 |                      |               |
|                 | 271   | 96.97  | 94.72 | 91.15     | 7.67 | 103.91 | 53.36 | 128.85 | 95.60 to 98.00  | 994,724              | 906,698       |

| 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                                   | 137   | 95.74  | 93.73 | 89.48     | 8.75 | 104.75 | 55.32 | 128.85 | 93.51 to 97.39  | 1,313,633            | 1,175,403     |
| 2                                   | 134   | 98.04  | 95.72 | 94.51     | 6.45 | 101.28 | 53.36 | 120.53 | 96.48 to 99.89  | 668,677              | 631,977       |
| <u>ALL</u>                          |       |        |       |           |      |        |       |        |                 |                      |               |
|                                     | 271   | 96.97  | 94.72 | 91.15     | 7.67 | 103.91 | 53.36 | 128.85 | 95.60 to 98.00  | 994,724              | 906,698       |

**PAD 2010 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 02/15/2010

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

|                        |             |                |           |                  |        |                     |                |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|--------|---------------------|----------------|
| NUMBER of Sales:       | 271         | <b>MEDIAN:</b> | <b>97</b> | COV:             | 11.16  | 95% Median C.I.:    | 95.60 to 98.00 |
| TOTAL Sales Price:     | 267,068,267 | WGT. MEAN:     | 91        | STD:             | 10.57  | 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 88.59 to 93.71 |
| TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | 269,570,472 | MEAN:          | 95        | AVG.ABS.DEV:     | 7.43   | 95% Mean C.I.:      | 93.46 to 95.97 |
| TOTAL Assessed Value:  | 245,715,223 |                |           |                  |        |                     |                |
| AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 994,724     | COD:           | 7.67      | MAX Sales Ratio: | 128.85 |                     |                |
| AVG. Assessed Value:   | 906,698     | PRD:           | 103.91    | MIN Sales Ratio: | 53.36  |                     |                |

Printed: 03/19/2010 14:30:29

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

| RANGE      | COUNT      | MEDIAN       | MEAN         | WGT. MEAN    | COD         | PRD           | MIN          | MAX           | 95% Median C.I.       | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val  |
|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 02         | 20         | 93.19        | 92.12        | 88.33        | 7.89        | 104.29        | 73.81        | 111.80        | 82.54 to 97.86        | 1,871,239            | 1,652,851      |
| 03         | 137        | 97.14        | 93.98        | 91.25        | 8.19        | 102.99        | 53.36        | 128.85        | 95.54 to 98.26        | 1,179,528            | 1,076,357      |
| 04         | 114        | 97.22        | 96.05        | 92.41        | 6.87        | 103.94        | 64.62        | 119.35        | 95.29 to 99.90        | 618,861              | 571,904        |
| <u>ALL</u> | <u>271</u> | <u>96.97</u> | <u>94.72</u> | <u>91.15</u> | <u>7.67</u> | <u>103.91</u> | <u>53.36</u> | <u>128.85</u> | <u>95.60 to 98.00</u> | <u>994,724</u>       | <u>906,698</u> |

**SALE PRICE \***

| RANGE            | COUNT      | MEDIAN       | MEAN         | WGT. MEAN    | COD         | PRD           | MIN          | MAX           | 95% Median C.I.       | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val  |
|------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| <u>Low \$</u>    |            |              |              |              |             |               |              |               |                       |                      |                |
| 1 TO 4999        | 1          | 100.20       | 100.20       | 100.20       |             |               | 100.20       | 100.20        | N/A                   | 4,035                | 4,043          |
| 5000 TO 9999     | 1          | 100.00       | 100.00       | 100.00       |             |               | 100.00       | 100.00        | N/A                   | 5,200                | 5,200          |
| <u>Total \$</u>  |            |              |              |              |             |               |              |               |                       |                      |                |
| 1 TO 9999        | 2          | 100.10       | 100.10       | 100.09       | 0.10        | 100.01        | 100.00       | 100.20        | N/A                   | 4,617                | 4,621          |
| 10000 TO 29999   | 4          | 100.00       | 99.01        | 99.49        | 0.99        | 99.52         | 96.05        | 100.00        | N/A                   | 19,299               | 19,200         |
| 30000 TO 59999   | 10         | 98.09        | 96.86        | 97.01        | 4.03        | 99.85         | 88.97        | 105.34        | 90.91 to 101.29       | 41,413               | 40,173         |
| 60000 TO 99999   | 14         | 96.72        | 94.86        | 94.77        | 13.40       | 100.09        | 59.72        | 128.85        | 76.53 to 111.11       | 80,227               | 76,034         |
| 100000 TO 149999 | 17         | 94.48        | 95.50        | 95.43        | 6.93        | 100.08        | 77.91        | 115.38        | 89.29 to 100.00       | 121,541              | 115,982        |
| 150000 TO 249999 | 36         | 98.06        | 97.78        | 97.40        | 6.81        | 100.39        | 79.13        | 119.35        | 93.94 to 102.27       | 183,835              | 179,064        |
| 250000 TO 499999 | 63         | 96.97        | 94.81        | 94.55        | 8.02        | 100.28        | 64.62        | 120.53        | 93.51 to 99.82        | 350,275              | 331,184        |
| 500000 +         | 125        | 96.21        | 93.26        | 90.59        | 7.73        | 102.95        | 53.36        | 112.31        | 94.74 to 98.00        | 1,897,560            | 1,719,042      |
| <u>ALL</u>       | <u>271</u> | <u>96.97</u> | <u>94.72</u> | <u>91.15</u> | <u>7.67</u> | <u>103.91</u> | <u>53.36</u> | <u>128.85</u> | <u>95.60 to 98.00</u> | <u>994,724</u>       | <u>906,698</u> |

**PAD 2010 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2009 Posted Before: 02/15/2010

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

|                        |             |                |           |                  |        |                     |                |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|--------|---------------------|----------------|
| NUMBER of Sales:       | 271         | <b>MEDIAN:</b> | <b>97</b> | COV:             | 11.16  | 95% Median C.I.:    | 95.60 to 98.00 |
| TOTAL Sales Price:     | 267,068,267 | WGT. MEAN:     | 91        | STD:             | 10.57  | 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 88.59 to 93.71 |
| TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: | 269,570,472 | MEAN:          | 95        | AVG.ABS.DEV:     | 7.43   | 95% Mean C.I.:      | 93.46 to 95.97 |
| TOTAL Assessed Value:  | 245,715,223 |                |           |                  |        |                     |                |
| AVG. Adj. Sales Price: | 994,724     | COD:           | 7.67      | MAX Sales Ratio: | 128.85 |                     |                |
| AVG. Assessed Value:   | 906,698     | PRD:           | 103.91    | MIN Sales Ratio: | 53.36  |                     |                |

Printed: 03/19/2010 14:30:29

| OCCUPANCY CODE | COUNT      | MEDIAN       | MEAN         | WGT. MEAN    | COD         | PRD           | MIN          | MAX           | 95% Median C.I.       | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val  |
|----------------|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| (blank)        | 140        | 98.04        | 95.57        | 92.83        | 6.54        | 102.95        | 53.36        | 120.53        | 96.05 to 99.89        | 812,812              | 754,567        |
| 304            | 1          | 65.96        | 65.96        | 65.96        |             |               | 65.96        | 65.96         | N/A                   | 1,175,000            | 775,000        |
| 306            | 1          | 100.49       | 100.49       | 100.49       |             |               | 100.49       | 100.49        | N/A                   | 607,000              | 610,000        |
| 319            | 1          | 87.30        | 87.30        | 87.30        |             |               | 87.30        | 87.30         | N/A                   | 25,500,000           | 22,261,935     |
| 326            | 1          | 98.79        | 98.79        | 98.79        |             |               | 98.79        | 98.79         | N/A                   | 165,000              | 163,000        |
| 341            | 1          | 107.81       | 107.81       | 107.81       |             |               | 107.81       | 107.81        | N/A                   | 2,689,998            | 2,900,000      |
| 343            | 1          | 103.52       | 103.52       | 103.52       |             |               | 103.52       | 103.52        | N/A                   | 1,110,900            | 1,150,000      |
| 344            | 18         | 96.32        | 97.99        | 99.46        | 7.43        | 98.52         | 76.53        | 128.85        | 95.60 to 101.46       | 753,562              | 749,516        |
| 349            | 2          | 91.18        | 91.18        | 72.82        | 21.86       | 125.20        | 71.24        | 111.11        | N/A                   | 906,577              | 660,188        |
| 350            | 1          | 92.86        | 92.86        | 92.86        |             |               | 92.86        | 92.86         | N/A                   | 350,000              | 325,000        |
| 352            | 15         | 92.00        | 89.25        | 86.13        | 7.50        | 103.63        | 73.81        | 103.53        | 80.99 to 95.43        | 1,776,623            | 1,530,133      |
| 353            | 13         | 97.89        | 92.01        | 96.38        | 8.86        | 95.47         | 59.72        | 104.06        | 88.24 to 100.00       | 192,459              | 185,492        |
| 380            | 1          | 98.24        | 98.24        | 98.24        |             |               | 98.24        | 98.24         | N/A                   | 10,200,000           | 10,020,000     |
| 384            | 1          | 99.27        | 99.27        | 99.27        |             |               | 99.27        | 99.27         | N/A                   | 68,500               | 68,000         |
| 386            | 1          | 100.00       | 100.00       | 100.00       |             |               | 100.00       | 100.00        | N/A                   | 500,000              | 500,000        |
| 392            | 2          | 101.26       | 101.26       | 99.76        | 5.90        | 101.50        | 95.29        | 107.23        | N/A                   | 313,750              | 313,000        |
| 406            | 17         | 96.97        | 94.15        | 95.60        | 6.43        | 98.49         | 81.25        | 102.86        | 85.56 to 101.76       | 552,941              | 528,588        |
| 407            | 1          | 99.09        | 99.09        | 99.09        |             |               | 99.09        | 99.09         | N/A                   | 1,423,000            | 1,410,000      |
| 410            | 2          | 87.59        | 87.59        | 77.89        | 21.71       | 112.46        | 68.57        | 106.61        | N/A                   | 2,317,500            | 1,805,000      |
| 412            | 5          | 88.58        | 86.33        | 84.78        | 6.12        | 101.83        | 74.77        | 95.74         | N/A                   | 2,178,550            | 1,847,000      |
| 413            | 1          | 96.21        | 96.21        | 96.21        |             |               | 96.21        | 96.21         | N/A                   | 3,850,000            | 3,704,069      |
| 426            | 1          | 88.18        | 88.18        | 88.18        |             |               | 88.18        | 88.18         | N/A                   | 550,000              | 485,000        |
| 442            | 1          | 97.60        | 97.60        | 97.60        |             |               | 97.60        | 97.60         | N/A                   | 62,500               | 61,000         |
| 453            | 8          | 95.16        | 98.00        | 91.54        | 8.61        | 107.06        | 80.77        | 119.35        | 80.77 to 119.35       | 415,125              | 380,000        |
| 470            | 5          | 90.00        | 93.31        | 90.12        | 8.61        | 103.54        | 78.91        | 104.53        | N/A                   | 279,400              | 251,800        |
| 494            | 5          | 95.48        | 97.73        | 96.52        | 7.22        | 101.25        | 87.65        | 108.11        | N/A                   | 1,253,600            | 1,210,000      |
| 528            | 15         | 93.75        | 94.26        | 93.16        | 8.11        | 101.17        | 64.62        | 115.38        | 91.35 to 102.67       | 704,333              | 656,181        |
| 531            | 8          | 99.34        | 94.07        | 90.30        | 9.30        | 104.17        | 72.73        | 111.44        | 72.73 to 111.44       | 1,260,000            | 1,137,750      |
| 534            | 1          | 100.62       | 100.62       | 100.62       |             |               | 100.62       | 100.62        | N/A                   | 1,110,000            | 1,116,915      |
| 594            | 1          | 55.32        | 55.32        | 55.32        |             |               | 55.32        | 55.32         | N/A                   | 4,700,000            | 2,600,000      |
| <u>ALL</u>     | <u>271</u> | <u>96.97</u> | <u>94.72</u> | <u>91.15</u> | <u>7.67</u> | <u>103.91</u> | <u>53.36</u> | <u>128.85</u> | <u>95.60 to 98.00</u> | <u>994,724</u>       | <u>906,698</u> |



**2010 Correlation Section  
for Sarpy County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

The level of value for the commercial real property in Sarpy County, as determined by the PTA is 97%. The mathematically calculated median is 97%.

COMMERCIAL:A general overview of the statistics indicates the level of value for commercial property is within the acceptable range. Sarpy County analyzes the commercial property in the context of occupancy code comparability rather than by specific geographical locations. The county annually analyzes the grouping of commercial properties and reappraisals are completed based on market indication and by cyclical schedules to revalue. A review of the statistics suggests all occupancy code groups sufficiently represented by sales are within the acceptable range. That coupled with the assessment actions completed by the county, both support a level of value within the acceptable range.

**2010 Correlation Section  
for Sarpy 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 commercial group appraisers are responsible for the qualification of sales in Sarpy County. Typically, the appraisers will verify sale information against the data displayed in the Multiple Listing Service, the various real estate websites, or by visiting with fee appraisers involved with the transaction. In cases where significant differences exist, the appraisers will flag the parcel for further review. Information contained on the real estate transfer statement is verified with either the buyer or seller if questions arise regarding the sale price, personal property adjustments, or blue sky adjustments for intangible property.

Sarpy County generally avoids using foreclosures in their commercial analysis. However, if a particular occupancy code is experiencing frequent foreclosures, the county may consider such sales an indication of the commercial market.

In reviewing the process used by the county to qualify and verify sales, the methodology appears to ensure all arms length sales are included for development of the state sales file statistics. A review of the reasons for disqualification also suggests that no bias exists in the sales qualification, assuring that the measurement of the commercial class was done with all available sales.

**2010 Correlation Section  
for Sarpy 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.

|                           | <b>Median</b> | <b>Wgt. Mean</b> | <b>Mean</b> |
|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|-------------|
| <b>R&amp;O Statistics</b> | <b>97</b>     | <b>91</b>        | <b>95</b>   |

**2010 Correlation Section  
for Sarpy 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 Sarpy 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 Sarpy County, which are considered as one part of the analysis of the County's assessment practices.

|                           | <b>COD</b>  | <b>PRD</b>    |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>R&amp;O Statistics</b> | <b>7.67</b> | <b>103.91</b> |

COMMERCIAL:In the commercial class of property, the commercial statistics suggest uniformity has been achieved based the results of the coefficient of dispersion. The price related differential is slightly above the preferred range, typically suggesting higher priced properties are assessed at a lower portion of market value than lower priced properties. In the case of the commercial properties, one rather large sale price can have a damaging effect on the PRD calculation. In the case of Sarpy County, one sale of 25.5 million dollars had the outlying effect on this PRD calculation in a sample of sales that have less than one million dollar average. Based on the commercial assessment practices of Sarpy County, the class of property is considered to be valued uniformly and proportionately.

**Agricultural or Special  
Valuation Reports**

## **2010 Assessment Actions for Sarpy County**

### **taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Agricultural**

The Sarpy County Assessor's Office conducted a market analysis of the home site value on agricultural parcels for tax year 2010. The county analyzed sales within geographic areas of the county to draw comparisons. Base values for the home site and additional acres were established from the comparable sales and adjustments were applied for factors evident in the market place, such as location and existing amenities.

The county also continued to verify land use in the county while implementing the latest soils survey from the United States Department of Agriculture. While the primary result of the implementation was an alpha to numeric conversion of soil identifiers, the combination of similar soils across county lines resulted in new Land Capability Groupings for various parcels in the county. As the county assigns value by LCG, various changes to the overall valuation of certain parcels resulted.

## 2010 Assessment Survey for Sarpy County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | <b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>  |
|    | Staff appraisers   |
| 2. | <b>Does the County maintain more than one market area / valuation grouping in the agricultural property class?</b>   |
|    | One agricultural market area exists in Sarpy County  |
| a. | <b>What is the process used to determine and monitor market areas / valuation groupings? (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1363) List or describe.</b> 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. |
|    | Sales analysis and cash rent studies provided by the State are helpful in monitoring valuation groupings.  |
| b. | <b>Describe the specific characteristics of the market area / valuation groupings that make them unique?</b>   |
|    | There is no uniqueness in the agricultural land market as it is entirely influenced by non-agricultural factors.   |
| 3. | <b>Agricultural Land</b>   |
| a. | <b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>  |
|    | As defined in Section 77-1359  |
| b. | <b>When is it agricultural land, when is it residential, when is it recreational?</b>  |
|    | Use of the land determines how the assessor will classify the land for valuation.  |
| c. | <b>Are these definitions in writing?</b>   |
|    | Yes  |
| d. | <b>What are the recognized differences?</b>  |
|    | The county adheres to the statutory definition as much as possible, but the use of the parcel is the recognized difference.  |
| e. | <b>How are rural home sites valued?</b>  |
|    | Rural home sites are valued by reviewing the sales of similar sites.   |
| f. | <b>Are rural home sites valued the same as rural residential home sites?</b>   |
|    | Yes. Rural farm home sites and rural residential home sites are valued the same but, only to the degree that their marketability is similar. Often residential home sites in suburban areas will have additional amenities external to the subject property, such as, paved roads, street lights, etc.   |
| g. | <b>Are all rural home sites valued the same or are market differences recognized?</b>  |
|    | Market differences are recognized. Five market areas have been established monitoring the sales in each. Areas with different market values according to sales information are adjusted accordingly.   |
| h. | <b>What are the recognized differences?</b>  |
|    | Amenities external to the subject property and proximity to cities or development corridors.   |
| 4. | <b>What is the status of the soil conversion from the alpha to numeric notation?</b>   |
|    | Implemented for 2010   |

|    |  |
|----|--|
| a. | <b>Are land capability groupings (LCG) used to determine assessed value?</b>   |
|    | Yes.   |
| b. | <b>What other land characteristics or analysis are/is used to determine assessed values?</b>   |
|    | Land use.  |
| 5. | <b>Is land use updated annually?</b>   |
|    | Updated are made as land use changes are discovered.   |
| a. | <b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>   |
|    | Physical inspection, FSA maps, aerial photos, interviews with the landowner.   |
| 6. | <b>Is there agricultural land in the County that has a non-agricultural influence?</b>   |
|    | All land in Sarpy County is under a non-agricultural influence.  |
| a. | <b>How is the County developing the value for non-agricultural influences?</b>   |
|    | All land in Sarpy County is under a non-agricultural influence. Therefore, Agricultural and Horticultural Special Valuation is applied throughout the county.  |
| b. | <b>Has the County received applications for special valuation?</b>   |
|    | Yes  |
| c. | <b>Describe special value methodology</b>  |
|    | Land must fit the statutory definition of agricultural land and agricultural use to be considered for special valuation. Title 350, Chapter 11 regulations are implemented to guide the special valuation process.         |
| 7  | <b>Pickup work:</b>  |
| a. | <b>Is pickup work done annually and is it completed by March 19<sup>th</sup>?</b>  |
|    | Yes  |
| b. | <b>By Whom?</b>  |
|    | Staff Appraisers   |
| c. | <b>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?</b> |
|    | Yes  |
| d. | <b>Is the pickup work schedule the same for the land as for the improvements?</b>  |
|    | Land value can be reviewed during pick-up work. Generally, land values require a separate study.   |
| 8. | <b>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)</b>   |
|    | The work load is divided to accomplish at least 1/6 <sup>th</sup> of the rural review each year. The process is on schedule.   |
| a. | <b>Does the County maintain a tracking process?</b>  |
|    | Yes. The inspection dates are recorded in the CAMA files, and photos are timestamped.  |
| b. | <b>How are the results of the portion of the properties inspected and reviewed applied to the balance of the county?</b>   |

The results are typically applied to the particular market area under inspection, only.

## Sarpy 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 |
|-------------|----------|--------------|-------------|----------|--------------|-------------|------------|----------------|---------------|
| Nemaha      | 8.09%    | 1,021,464    | 2.27%       | 5.15%    | 20,386,904   | 75.73%      | 4.28%      | 2,000,573      | 20.18%        |
| Johnson     | 8.45%    | 3,694,758    | 7.09%       | 6.52%    | 10,876,944   | 43.59%      | 3.63%      | 4,426,122      | 48.23%        |
| Richardson  | 10.72%   | 351,125      | 0.47%       | 4.50%    | 24,547,764   | 70.67%      | 4.08%      | 3,234,688      | 23.12%        |
|             |          |              |             |          |              |             |            |                |               |
|             |          |              |             |          |              |             |            |                |               |
|             |          |              |             |          |              |             |            |                |               |
|             |          |              |             |          |              |             |            |                |               |

  

|           | RATE Correlated | 2010 EST Rent | % ACRES |        | 2010 ABST. Value | Indicated LOV | EST Value   |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|---------|--------|------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Irrigated | 8.25%           | 1,376,953     | 6.91%   |        | 12,163,083       | 72.87%        | 16,690,337  |
| Dry       | 5.40%           | 9,150,882     | 74.62%  |        | 120,454,355      | 71.08%        | 169,460,783 |
| Grass     | 4.20%           | 384,917       | 8.03%   |        | 6,601,210        | 72.03%        | 9,164,692   |
|           |                 | 10,912,752    | 89.56%  | TOTALS | 139,218,745      | 71.28%        | 195,315,812 |

## **STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE – SARPY COUNTY ASSESSOR**

Date: 02/17/2010

### **SPECIAL VALUATION METHODOLOGY**

**OBJECTIVE:** To establish the policy and method of valuing improved and unimproved farm land.

**REFERENCE:** NEBRASKA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TITLE 350  
CHAPTER 11 (01/03/2007)  
CHAPTER 14 (01/03/2007)

**POLICY:** Sarpy County is influenced by market forces outside of the typical agricultural market. The influences are residential, commercial and recreational in nature. Therefore, the total of Sarpy County is covered under the Agricultural and Horticultural Special Valuation program.

**MARKET AREAS:** There is one agricultural market area within Sarpy County.

**METHODOLOGY:** Each farm parcel is to have a periodic inspection with all site improvements documented on the property record file. The land portion of the property record file is to be inventoried based upon its actual use and soil classification. As documented in Title 350 Chapter 14 of the Nebraska Administrative Code. The identified uses need to be classified as an agricultural purpose or other land uses.

**VALUATION:**

**AGRICULTURAL LAND VALUATION:** Sarpy County has no sales that are purely for an agricultural purpose. Therefore, Sarpy County relies on sales and income information received from the Property Assessment Division of the Nebraska Department of Revenue. For 2010, the PAD selected four comparable counties from which to draw land sales. In addition, the PAD developed an income approach estimated value for Sarpy County and created a conversion rate for income to value. The conversion rates were correlated into a rate for market influenced counties, such as Sarpy County.

**OTHER LAND USE VALUATION:** The uses that are not agricultural or horticultural land are to be valued at 100% market value. The uses are identified, most typically as residential, commercial or recreational. Once identified, the area values will be arrived at by applying the same policies and practices that are used in valuing their counter parts that are not enrolled in the Special Valuation Program.

**Agricultural or Special  
Valuation Correlation**

## **2010 Correlation Section**

### **For Sarpy County**

---

#### **Special Value for Agricultural Land**

##### **I. Correlation**

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

Based on this analysis it is the opinion of the Division that the level of value of Agricultural Special Value in Sarpy County is 71%.



|  |                         |                               |                           |                                   |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Total Real Property</b><br>Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30 | <b>Records : 58,096</b> | <b>Value : 10,723,613,775</b> | <b>Growth 247,301,426</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>       | 734     | 10,770,933    | 3,444    | 64,579,256    | 1,686   | 37,666,344    | 5,864   | 113,016,533    |             |
| <b>02. Res Improve Land</b>     | 25,647  | 598,369,979   | 10,876   | 356,520,655   | 9,905   | 367,230,075   | 46,428  | 1,322,120,709  |             |
| <b>03. Res Improvements</b>     | 26,212  | 3,084,128,153 | 10,926   | 1,814,888,080 | 9,964   | 1,536,489,327 | 47,102  | 6,435,505,560  |             |
| <b>04. Res Total</b>            | 26,946  | 3,693,269,065 | 14,370   | 2,235,987,991 | 11,650  | 1,941,385,746 | 52,966  | 7,870,642,802  | 178,277,097 |
| <b>% of Res Total</b>           | 50.87   | 46.92         | 27.13    | 28.41         | 22.00   | 24.67         | 91.17   | 73.40          | 72.09       |
| <b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>       | 279     | 54,062,177    | 215      | 45,729,111    | 72      | 15,126,746    | 566     | 114,918,034    |             |
| <b>06. Com Improve Land</b>     | 1,046   | 248,228,134   | 143      | 66,635,695    | 116     | 47,550,349    | 1,305   | 362,414,178    |             |
| <b>07. Com Improvements</b>     | 1,063   | 924,363,305   | 150      | 258,851,098   | 123     | 113,961,051   | 1,336   | 1,297,175,454  |             |
| <b>08. Com Total</b>            | 1,342   | 1,226,653,616 | 365      | 371,215,904   | 195     | 176,638,146   | 1,902   | 1,774,507,666  | 57,256,484  |
| <b>% of Com Total</b>           | 70.56   | 69.13         | 19.19    | 20.92         | 10.25   | 9.95          | 3.27    | 16.55          | 23.15       |
| <b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>       | 65      | 6,759,456     | 76       | 8,835,551     | 124     | 16,442,346    | 265     | 32,037,353     |             |
| <b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>     | 186     | 29,400,680    | 134      | 34,795,682    | 302     | 100,507,179   | 622     | 164,703,541    |             |
| <b>11. Ind Improvements</b>     | 187     | 92,134,744    | 134      | 101,878,484   | 304     | 314,450,560   | 625     | 508,463,788    |             |
| <b>12. Ind Total</b>            | 252     | 128,294,880   | 210      | 145,509,717   | 428     | 431,400,085   | 890     | 705,204,682    | 7,729,427   |
| <b>% of Ind Total</b>           | 28.31   | 18.19         | 23.60    | 20.63         | 48.09   | 61.17         | 1.53    | 6.58           | 3.13        |
| <b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>       | 0       | 0             | 3        | 195,198       | 99      | 6,106,092     | 102     | 6,301,290      |             |
| <b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>     | 0       | 0             | 13       | 656,600       | 37      | 1,861,954     | 50      | 2,518,554      |             |
| <b>15. Rec Improvements</b>     | 0       | 0             | 13       | 614,163       | 361     | 7,927,856     | 374     | 8,542,019      |             |
| <b>16. Rec Total</b>            | 0       | 0             | 16       | 1,465,961     | 460     | 15,895,902    | 476     | 17,361,863     | 0           |
| <b>% of Rec Total</b>           | 0.00    | 0.00          | 3.36     | 8.44          | 96.64   | 91.56         | 0.82    | 0.16           | 0.00        |
| <b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>      | 26,946  | 3,693,269,065 | 14,386   | 2,237,453,952 | 12,110  | 1,957,281,648 | 53,442  | 7,888,004,665  | 178,277,097 |
| <b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b> | 50.42   | 46.82         | 26.92    | 28.37         | 22.66   | 24.81         | 91.99   | 73.56          | 72.09       |
| <b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>      | 1,594   | 1,354,948,496 | 575      | 516,725,621   | 623     | 608,038,231   | 2,792   | 2,479,712,348  | 64,985,911  |
| <b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b> | 57.09   | 54.64         | 20.59    | 20.84         | 22.31   | 24.52         | 4.81    | 23.12          | 26.28       |
| <b>17. Taxable Total</b>        | 28,540  | 5,048,217,561 | 14,961   | 2,754,179,573 | 12,733  | 2,565,319,879 | 56,234  | 10,367,717,013 | 243,263,008 |
| <b>% of Taxable Total</b>       | 50.75   | 48.69         | 26.60    | 26.56         | 22.64   | 24.74         | 96.79   | 96.68          | 98.37       |

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

|                  | Urban   |            |              | SubUrban |            |              |
|------------------|---------|------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------------|
|                  | Records | Value Base | Value Excess | Records  | Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential  | 10      | 68,467     | 1,878,704    | 0        | 0          | 0            |
| 19. Commercial   | 11      | 1,367,462  | 13,496,170   | 0        | 0          | 0            |
| 20. Industrial   | 2       | 58,642     | 1,381,358    | 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            | 10       | 68,467     | 1,878,704    |
| 19. Commercial   | 0       | 0          | 0            | 11       | 1,367,462  | 13,496,170   |
| 20. Industrial   | 0       | 0          | 0            | 2        | 58,642     | 1,381,358    |
| 21. Other        | 0       | 0          | 0            | 0        | 0          | 0            |
| 22. Total Sch II |         |            |              | 23       | 1,494,571  | 16,756,232   |

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. Producing | 872           | 620              | 632           | 2,124         |

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

|                      | Urban   |        | SubUrban |            | Rural   |             | Total   |             |
|----------------------|---------|--------|----------|------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|
|                      | Records | Value  | Records  | Value      | Records | Value       | Records | Value       |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land   | 2       | 21,094 | 283      | 17,899,293 | 725     | 65,345,002  | 1,010   | 83,265,389  |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 0       | 0      | 166      | 26,242,199 | 671     | 97,548,388  | 837     | 123,790,587 |
| 29. Ag Improvements  | 0       | 0      | 167      | 25,078,122 | 685     | 123,762,664 | 852     | 148,840,786 |
| 30. Ag Total         |         |        |          |            |         |             | 1,862   | 355,896,762 |

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           | 135      | 0.00     | 21,983,579  |           |
| 34. HomeSite Total        |         |          |             |          |          |             |           |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land   | 1       | 0.05     | 3,100       | 25       | 42.70    | 930,748     |           |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land  | 0       | 0.00     | 0           | 162      | 527.51   | 12,247,910  |           |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 0       | 0.00     | 0           | 114      | 0.00     | 3,094,543   |           |
| 38. FarmSite Total        |         |          |             |          |          |             |           |
| 39. Road & Ditches        | 0       | 0.00     | 0           | 0        | 1.53     | 0           |           |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use     | 0       | 0.00     | 0           | 0        | 1.11     | 89          |           |
|                           | Records | Acres    | Value       | Records  | Acres    | Value       | Growth    |
| 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 | 584     | 0.00     | 108,425,178 | 719      | 0.00     | 130,408,757 | 4,038,418 |
| 34. HomeSite Total        |         |          |             | 719      | 0.00     | 130,408,757 |           |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land   | 99      | 424.43   | 3,458,153   | 125      | 467.18   | 4,392,001   |           |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land  | 645     | 2,085.05 | 48,913,741  | 807      | 2,612.56 | 61,161,651  |           |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 486     | 0.00     | 15,337,486  | 600      | 0.00     | 18,432,029  | 0         |
| 38. FarmSite Total        |         |          |             | 725      | 3,079.74 | 83,985,681  |           |
| 39. Road & Ditches        | 0       | 0.01     | 0           | 0        | 1.54     | 0           |           |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use     | 0       | 4.60     | 368         | 0        | 5.71     | 457         |           |
| 41. Total Section VI      |         |          |             | 1,444    | 3,086.99 | 214,394,895 | 4,038,418 |

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 | 1       | 1.40  | 38,200 | 1        | 1.40  | 38,200 |

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

|                         | Urban   |           |             | SubUrban |           |             |
|-------------------------|---------|-----------|-------------|----------|-----------|-------------|
|                         | Records | Acres     | Value       | Records  | Acres     | Value       |
| 43. Special Value       | 2       | 20.05     | 17,994      | 425      | 18,487.17 | 30,788,312  |
| 44. Recapture Value N/A | 2       | 20.05     | 300,750     | 425      | 18,487.17 | 205,369,565 |
|                         | Rural   |           |             | Total    |           |             |
|                         | Records | Acres     | Value       | Records  | Acres     | Value       |
| 43. Special Value       | 1,393   | 71,088.73 | 110,521,496 | 1,820    | 89,595.95 | 141,327,802 |
| 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                  | 803.34    | 12.96%      | 1,928,016   | 15.85%      | 2,400.00                |
| 46. 1A                   | 487.11    | 7.86%       | 1,130,096   | 9.29%       | 2,320.00                |
| 47. 2A1                  | 583.80    | 9.42%       | 1,210,801   | 9.95%       | 2,074.00                |
| 48. 2A                   | 3,025.23  | 48.81%      | 5,829,616   | 47.93%      | 1,927.00                |
| 49. 3A1                  | 791.62    | 12.77%      | 1,348,129   | 11.08%      | 1,703.00                |
| 50. 3A                   | 257.86    | 4.16%       | 415,412     | 3.42%       | 1,611.00                |
| 51. 4A1                  | 149.57    | 2.41%       | 191,301     | 1.57%       | 1,279.01                |
| 52. 4A                   | 100.01    | 1.61%       | 109,712     | 0.90%       | 1,097.01                |
| 53. Total                | 6,198.54  | 100.00%     | 12,163,083  | 100.00%     | 1,962.25                |
| <b>Dry</b>               |           |             |             |             |                         |
| 54. 1D1                  | 2,753.15  | 4.11%       | 6,332,245   | 5.26%       | 2,300.00                |
| 55. 1D                   | 19,513.13 | 29.16%      | 43,319,143  | 35.96%      | 2,220.00                |
| 56. 2D1                  | 1,309.25  | 1.96%       | 2,608,026   | 2.17%       | 1,992.00                |
| 57. 2D                   | 5,837.51  | 8.72%       | 10,933,663  | 9.08%       | 1,873.00                |
| 58. 3D1                  | 28,932.86 | 43.24%      | 48,086,448  | 39.92%      | 1,662.00                |
| 59. 3D                   | 439.41    | 0.66%       | 670,978     | 0.56%       | 1,527.00                |
| 60. 4D1                  | 7,207.43  | 10.77%      | 7,668,703   | 6.37%       | 1,064.00                |
| 61. 4D                   | 921.81    | 1.38%       | 835,149     | 0.69%       | 905.99                  |
| 62. Total                | 66,914.55 | 100.00%     | 120,454,355 | 100.00%     | 1,800.12                |
| <b>Grass</b>             |           |             |             |             |                         |
| 63. 1G1                  | 267.50    | 0.00%       | 321,532     | 4.87%       | 1,201.99                |
| 64. 1G                   | 1,380.07  | 19.17%      | 1,597,716   | 24.20%      | 1,157.71                |
| 65. 2G1                  | 104.63    | 1.45%       | 110,386     | 1.67%       | 1,055.01                |
| 66. 2G                   | 337.18    | 4.68%       | 325,046     | 4.92%       | 964.01                  |
| 67. 3G1                  | 2,287.20  | 31.77%      | 2,124,813   | 32.19%      | 929.00                  |
| 68. 3G                   | 176.29    | 2.45%       | 148,081     | 2.24%       | 839.99                  |
| 69. 4G1                  | 1,884.52  | 26.17%      | 1,449,526   | 21.96%      | 769.18                  |
| 70. 4G                   | 762.89    | 10.60%      | 524,110     | 7.94%       | 687.01                  |
| 71. Total                | 7,200.28  | 100.00%     | 6,601,210   | 100.00%     | 916.80                  |
| <b>Irrigated Total</b>   |           |             |             |             |                         |
| Irrigated Total          | 6,198.54  | 6.91%       | 12,163,083  | 8.60%       | 1,962.25                |
| <b>Dry Total</b>         |           |             |             |             |                         |
| Dry Total                | 66,914.55 | 74.62%      | 120,454,355 | 85.13%      | 1,800.12                |
| <b>Grass Total</b>       |           |             |             |             |                         |
| Grass Total              | 7,200.28  | 8.03%       | 6,601,210   | 4.67%       | 916.80                  |
| <b>Waste</b>             |           |             |             |             |                         |
| Waste                    | 2,692.72  | 3.00%       | 215,420     | 0.15%       | 80.00                   |
| <b>Other</b>             |           |             |             |             |                         |
| Other                    | 6,666.08  | 7.43%       | 2,067,799   | 1.46%       | 310.20                  |
| <b>Exempt</b>            |           |             |             |             |                         |
| Exempt                   | 145.62    | 0.16%       | 0           | 0.00%       | 0.00                    |
| <b>Market Area Total</b> |           |             |             |             |                         |
| Market Area Total        | 89,672.17 | 100.00%     | 141,501,867 | 100.00%     | 1,577.99                |

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             | 350.74           | 696,548           | 5,847.80         | 11,466,535         | 6,198.54         | 12,163,083         |
| <b>77. Dry Land</b>  | 0.00         | 0             | 15,797.59        | 28,723,093        | 51,116.96        | 91,731,262         | 66,914.55        | 120,454,355        |
| <b>78. Grass</b>     | 18.66        | 17,883        | 1,273.56         | 1,308,534         | 5,908.06         | 5,274,793          | 7,200.28         | 6,601,210          |
| <b>79. Waste</b>     | 1.39         | 111           | 526.97           | 42,161            | 2,164.36         | 173,148            | 2,692.72         | 215,420            |
| <b>80. Other</b>     | 0.00         | 0             | 619.14           | 192,409           | 6,046.94         | 1,875,390          | 6,666.08         | 2,067,799          |
| <b>81. Exempt</b>    | 0.00         | 0             | 0.00             | 0                 | 145.62           | 0                  | 145.62           | 0                  |
| <b>82. Total</b>     | <b>20.05</b> | <b>17,994</b> | <b>18,568.00</b> | <b>30,962,745</b> | <b>71,084.12</b> | <b>110,521,128</b> | <b>89,672.17</b> | <b>141,501,867</b> |

|                  | Acres            | % of Acres*    | Value              | % of Value*    | Average Assessed Value* |
|------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Irrigated</b> | 6,198.54         | 6.91%          | 12,163,083         | 8.60%          | 1,962.25                |
| <b>Dry Land</b>  | 66,914.55        | 74.62%         | 120,454,355        | 85.13%         | 1,800.12                |
| <b>Grass</b>     | 7,200.28         | 8.03%          | 6,601,210          | 4.67%          | 916.80                  |
| <b>Waste</b>     | 2,692.72         | 3.00%          | 215,420            | 0.15%          | 80.00                   |
| <b>Other</b>     | 6,666.08         | 7.43%          | 2,067,799          | 1.46%          | 310.20                  |
| <b>Exempt</b>    | 145.62           | 0.16%          | 0                  | 0.00%          | 0.00                    |
| <b>Total</b>     | <b>89,672.17</b> | <b>100.00%</b> | <b>141,501,867</b> | <b>100.00%</b> | <b>1,577.99</b>         |

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

77 Sarpy

|   | 2009 CTL<br>County Total | 2010 Form 45<br>County Total | Value Difference<br>(2010 form 45 - 2009 CTL) | Percent<br>Change | 2010 Growth<br>(New Construction Value) | Percent Change<br>excl. Growth |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|---|-------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 01. Residential   | 7,771,157,308            | 7,870,642,802                | 99,485,494                                    | 1.28%             | 178,277,097                             | -1.01%                         |
| 02. Recreational  | 16,182,251               | 17,361,863                   | 1,179,612                                     | 7.29%             | 0                                       | 7.29%                          |
| 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling                             | 132,244,864              | 130,408,757                  | -1,836,107                                    | -1.39%            | 4,038,418                               | -4.44%                         |
| <b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>                      | <b>7,919,584,423</b>     | <b>8,018,413,422</b>         | <b>98,828,999</b>                             | <b>1.25%</b>      | <b>182,315,515</b>                      | <b>-1.05%</b>                  |
| 05. Commercial  | 1,748,454,381            | 1,774,507,666                | 26,053,285                                    | 1.49%             | 57,256,484                              | -1.78%                         |
| 06. Industrial  | 710,623,686              | 705,204,682                  | -5,419,004                                    | -0.76%            | 7,729,427                               | -1.85%                         |
| 07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings                                | 66,062,266               | 83,985,681                   | 17,923,415                                    | 27.13%            | 0                                       | 27.13%                         |
| 08. Minerals  | 0                        | 0                            | 0   |                   | 0                                       |                                |
| <b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>                       | <b>2,525,140,333</b>     | <b>2,563,698,029</b>         | <b>38,557,696</b>                             | <b>1.53%</b>      | <b>64,985,911</b>                       | <b>-1.05%</b>                  |
| <b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>                         | <b>10,444,724,756</b>    | <b>10,582,111,908</b>        | <b>137,387,152</b>                            | <b>1.32%</b>      | <b>247,301,426</b>                      | <b>-1.05%</b>                  |
| 11. Irrigated   | 11,260,246               | 12,163,083                   | 902,837                                       | 8.02%             |   |                                |
| 12. Dryland   | 122,383,340              | 120,454,355                  | -1,928,985                                    | -1.58%            |   |                                |
| 13. Grassland   | 5,394,831                | 6,601,210                    | 1,206,379                                     | 22.36%            |   |                                |
| 14. Wasteland   | 429,767                  | 215,420                      | -214,347                                      | -49.88%           |   |                                |
| 15. Other Agland  | 931                      | 2,067,799                    | 2,066,868                                     | 222,005.16%       |   |                                |
| <b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>                                | <b>139,469,115</b>       | <b>141,501,867</b>           | <b>2,032,752</b>                              | <b>1.46%</b>      |   |                                |
| <b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b><br>(Locally Assessed) | <b>10,584,193,871</b>    | <b>10,723,613,775</b>        | <b>139,419,904</b>                            | <b>1.32%</b>      | <b>247,301,426</b>                      | <b>-1.02%</b>                  |

## **Three Year Plan of Assessment for Sarpy County**

**Introduction:** Pursuant to NEB. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15<sup>th</sup> each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31<sup>st</sup> of each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor shall amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31<sup>st</sup> of each year.

**Duties of the county assessor:** The duties of the county assessor are stated in the Nebraska State Statutes, 77-1311. Along with the general supervision and the direction of the assessment of all taxable property in the county, the assessor is responsible for the following:

- Annually revise the real property assessments for the correction of errors and equitably portion valuations.
- Obey all rules and regulations made under Chapter 77 and the instructions and orders sent by the Property Tax Administrator and the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.
- Examine records from the offices of the register of deeds, county clerk, county judge, and the clerk of the district court for proper ownership of property.
- Prepare the assessment roll.
- Provide public access to records.
- Submit a plan of assessment to the county board and the division of property assessment.

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 75% of actual value for agricultural and horticultural land; and 75% of actual value. (LB968)
  
- 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 75% if its recapture value

as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

**General Description of Real Property in Sarpy County:**

|              | <u>Parcels</u> | <u>% of total parcels</u> |
|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Residential  | 53,033         | 91                        |
| Commercial   | 1,843          | 3                         |
| Industrial   | 886            | 2                         |
| Recreational | 507            | 1                         |
| Agricultural | 1,730          | 3                         |

Sarpy County is predominantly a residential county with 92% of the parcels coded as residential property. Commercial/Industrial parcels make up 4.5% while agricultural has shrunk to 2.5%. In 2006/2007, building permits in Sarpy County were issued as follows:

|              | <u>Permits</u> | Numbers reflect permits issued from |
|--------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Residential  | 2,453          | 1/01/07 to 9/12/08                  |
| Commercial   | 118            |                                     |
| Industrial   | 69             |                                     |
| Agricultural | 42             |                                     |

**Current Resources:** The Sarpy County Assessor’s office is currently staffed as follows:  
 (1) Elected County Assessor  
 (1) Chief Deputy Assessor  
 (9) Real Estate Appraisers  
 (8) Administrative Staff

**Cadastral Mapping** Cadastral mapping is accomplished through our Geographic Information System. We have in-house technical support from our Information Services Department and have two people on the assessor’s staff who work well with the maps. Maps are provided to the public through both departments with some maps accessible through the internet. The I.A.A.O. recommends keeping printed quarter sheets on hand. Our quarter sheets are kept in the office of the register of deeds and are available for public viewing.

**Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal (CAMA)** Automated Systems, Inc provides the Terra Scan Software Package along with updates to Terra Scan and the Marshall-Swift Cost Data. The sketching section of Terra Scan is not adequate for our needs and is replaced by a separate software program named Apex. Unfortunately, these two software systems do not interface. CAMA data is used to supply appraisal information to the county website.

**Geographic Information System** While the GIS system is controlled by our Information Services Department we have the use of ArcViewer and ArcReader. This allows the

appraiser tools for plotting sales, permits, identify areas for reappraisal, etc. The maps generated are helpful for explaining assessment practices to property owners and county board members.

**Internet Access to County Information** Much of the contents from assessment records are on the internet in the form of free public information and premium services. It is the policy of the Information Systems Department to charge a fee for some assessment information and for the generation of custom reports. The public use of the Sarpy County Parcel Look-up Website has increased each year and has proved to be a helpful tool to property owners. The parcel look-up section of the county website does not provide a “search by name” capability because of privacy concerns.

**Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property** The population of Sarpy County continues to grow rapidly and the construction of new homes, apartments, and commercial buildings is steady. Agricultural land is being platted for residential development with a complimenting number of commercial plattings to support the population growth throughout the county. The number of deeds filed with the register of deeds is down from last year which indicates a bit of a slow down in real estate transfers. All sales of real property are noted and submitted to an extensive sales verification process before they are considered a good, arms-length transaction. Poor sales verification can cause considerable problems when sales/assessment ratios and other statistical studies are performed on this data. Copies of building permits are submitted to our office with the major permits (new construction, building additions, etc.) receiving prompt attention. The minor building permits (decks, sheds, patios, etc.) are generally addressed when we re-inspect the sub-division or market area. We are always collecting income and expense data for one or more classes of commercial properties to be appraised. Frequent sweeps through the rural areas helps us pick up newly constructed pole buildings that do not require a permit to be issued.

**Review of Assessment Sales Ratio Studies before Assessment Actions** Ratio studies are performed during the year to determine the quality of our assessments in individual market areas. This serves as an indicator of possible inspection and re-valuation needs in a specific area. While statistical studies are performed in house; we work from the preliminary statistics issued by the Property Assessment Division.

**Approaches to Value** Residential assessed values are determined by using annually updated construction cost information from Marshall and Swift. The market transactions of comparable properties are used to adjust the physical depreciation tables. Our office uses two years worth of good sales as the market data for our statistical analysis and measurement. We rely on the local real estate market and national real estate publications to assist us with the income approach to value on commercial properties. Agricultural land may receive a special valuation by enrolling in an Agricultural Special Valuation Program (greenbelt). There are specific requirements for receiving this greatly reduced value and the assessor must closely look at the predominant use of each parcel requesting special tax treatment as the tax burden is shifted away from these properties and carried by others. The assessor’s office made a thorough inspection and offered

recommendations to the Sarpy County Board of Equalization regarding all parcels applying for agricultural special valuation. The recommendations were largely disregarded by the board and special valuation treatment was granted to many parcels that did not meet the State's standards to receive such special valuation. The assessor's office has appealed three of these decisions to the Nebraska Tax Equalization and Review Commission for further review and we await their hearing and orders.

**Reconciliation of Final Value and Documentation** Three approaches to value are generally accepted in the performance of mass appraisal. We apply two of the three to every improved parcel, as appropriate, to determine fair market value.

**Review Assessment Sales Ratio Studies after Assessment** Staff appraisers review their own statistics before and after assessment actions. The statistics are discussed between the appraiser and chief deputy assessor to determine possible actions to be taken by the appraiser.

**Notices and Public Relations** Several notices or documents are sent to the property owners with regard to the taxable status of their property:

- Change in Valuation Notices are mailed at the end of May. Supplemental information is often enclosed regarding valuation concerns.
- Permissive Exemptions are mailed on November 1<sup>st</sup> to previous filers.
- Personal Property Tax Schedules are mailed at the end of January.
- Homestead Exemptions are mailed at the end of January.

Public notification is often published in a newspaper of general circulation and in the Sarpy County website. The website has an assessor's area where frequently asked questions are answered and access to the assessor's email is provided. Comments and questions via email continue to increase every year and prompt attention is mandatory. Our office promotes taxpayer viewing of the Department of Assessment website as it contains a wealth of information of interest to taxpayers.

**Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for Assessment Year 2007**

| <b><u>Property class</u></b> | <b><u>Median</u></b> | <b><u>COD</u></b> | <b><u>PRD</u></b> |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Commercial                   | 97.00                | 9.53              | 101.47            |
| Agricultural (recap)         | 74                   | 14.13             | 105.23            |
| Residential                  | 98.00                | 4.61              | 100.71            |

The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

- Commercial, a COD of 20 or less
- Agricultural, a COD of 20 or less
- Residential, a COD of 15 or less. Newer and fairly homogeneous areas, a COD of 10 or less.

The PRD should range between 98 and 103.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009**

**Residential** – Sarpy County has over 53,000 residential parcels and the majority of our appraisal assets go toward the valuation of this particular property group. Adding newly constructed homes will remain our highest priority along with working the high value building permits which consist of building additions and major remodeling. Development of a team approach to updating property records in various market areas has been a success. We are re-inspecting more properties and improving the quality of our assessment data. In order to continue and to increase our progress in the area we are in need of one more staff appraiser. We have experienced some set-backs due to health concerns with an appraiser and need to plan for his eventual job change or retirement along with the increased appraiser workload. The county board was not receptive to funding another appraiser although they commend our office on the job we do. We will continue to request additional appraisal staff in our next budget. Some changing of the duties of the clerical side of the office has provided increased support for the appraisal effort. We have increased our use of the Omaha Area Board of Realtors Multiple Listing Service along with several “For Sale by Owner” websites to assist us in discovering improvements to real property that may be missing from our records. The discovery of finished basement areas has been substantial.

### **Commercial and Industrial**

The construction of two hotels continues in Sarpy County and will present a new valuation challenge for our office. Our staff appraisers are preparing for the first valuations in 2008. The number of commercial valuations that are appealed to the board of equalization and on to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission is increasing. Preparation for each case is increasingly difficult as we see tax payers being represented by attorneys. Interrogatories are often issued and must be completed by our staff appraisers with the assistance of an attorney. Many out-of-state tax representatives are now representing local property owners and request a large amount of information and consume a lot of our time. The commercial appraisal staff has been very successful at defending their assessed values. We anticipate continuing to re-appraise several occupancy types of commercial property each year.

### **Agricultural**

In 2007 we made a thorough inspection of the use of the land enrolled in the agricultural special valuation. We took into consideration the changes made to the state law regarding land use. Our attempts at removing parcels of land from special valuation and preventing some new applicants from obtaining special valuation largely failed with the lack of support from the board of equalization. While the majority of the BOE decisions should have been appealed to the TERC by the assessor; time and money had to be considered. The assessor’s office has appealed three of the BOE’s greenbelt decisions and they are yet to be heard. The GIS maps have been helpful with the rural valuation process and a new aerial map should be available this year. We will look at special valuation cases again this year to determine eligibility for special valuation. Repeated visual sweeps of the rural areas will continue to produce improvements that are constructed without a building permit. Our agricultural records are improving in the quality of their content each year.

### **General**

The CAMA system update is slow in coming, but we look forward to it. The money for improved field data collection technology is hard to come by and the new CAMA software will help drive decisions in the purchase of hardware. We are in need of more appraisers and are always looking for ways to stretch our human resources. We will continue to re-value residential property every year as the sales direct.

### **Assessment Action Plans for 2010**

**Residential** – Sarpy County will still be the fastest growing county in the state. We may have a sufficient population count to merit an additional deputy assessor. The electronic record will take over as our primary working record for residential properties. We will keep the paper records in their file cabinets and send them to the archives when the new archive facility is completed. We are hopeful to have more assessment and mapping information out on the internet. Our pencil drawings should all be converted to digital drawings and be on the internet. We will request an additional staff appraiser in our new budget.

### **Commercial/Industrial**

New appraisal challenges will present themselves with hotels appearing in our tax base. Additional formal training may be required to properly value hotel concerns. We anticipate an even greater load of TERC cases that will consume a large amount of the appraiser's time. The appraisers will select certain occupancy codes to be revalued as they do each year. This should be the year when we make some changes to the commercial appraisal staff with retirements or shuffling responsibilities.

### **Agricultural**

We will continue to look closely at the parcels receiving or requesting special valuation. The county board of equalization will likely not be very helpful in supporting our efforts to administer this program. Hopefully, we will have won some greenbelt TERC appeals that will give us some clout with the BOE. We will continue to look for new construction in the rural areas that do not require a building permit. Agricultural land values will be adjusted as the land sales direct. We should have a new soil map by now.

### **General**

The statistical measurements of the quality of assessment will continue to drive our decision making on which areas of the county need to be re-inspected. The sales we processed into our sales file will drive our re-appraisal decisions. We hope to have further improved our data collection tools by providing each appraiser with a hardened computer to take to the field.

### **Assessment Actions for 2011**

**Residential** – Reappraisal and re-inspection will continue as usual. We hope to be working with new data collection technology by now. We should have a staff of 21 or 22 with the addition of appraisers and a field deputy.

### **Commercial/Industrial**

The building of commercial buildings will likely to have slowed with the rapid building that has taken place in the last few years. We will likely be defending many values at the TERC against fee appraisers and attorney's as we are experiencing an increase of same this year. National publications of rents, vacancies, and capitalization rates will be of greater use as we start to see larger commercial/industrial concerns locate in Sarpy County.

**Agricultural**

With greenbelt recapture no longer a factor we may see more land rezoned and be aggressively marketed. Our agricultural tax base decreases every year, but still represents a substantial amount of value. Recalculating soils should be a project that we are involved in to correct our records.

**General**

It is hard to know the concerns that might arise between now and 2011. It will be an election year which can add some distraction from the mission. I have a concern over the TERC cases and the time they consume. I don't see the situation improving anytime soon. If we do not get additional staff the quality and quantity of our data collection will slip. Efforts will be made to persuade the county board to be interested in our endeavors.

## 2010 Assessment Survey for Sarpy County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 1.  | <b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>  |
|     | one  |
| 2.  | <b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>   |
|     | nine   |
| 3.  | <b>Other full-time employees</b>                                     |
|     | eight  |
| 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>           |
|     | \$1,458,147.00   |
| 7.  | <b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>     |
|     | \$1,125,804.00   |
| 8.  | <b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>       |
|     | \$1,125,804.00   |
| 9.  | <b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b> |
|     | \$1,125,804.00   |
| 10. | <b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>   |
|     | \$45,000.00  |
| 11. | <b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>  |
|     | \$4,500.00   |
| 12. | <b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>                                     |
|     | none   |
| 13. | <b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>                       |
|     | no   |

#### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

|    |   |
|----|---|
| 1. | <b>Administrative software</b>                        |
|    | Terra-Scan  |
| 2. | <b>CAMA software</b>                                  |
|    | Terra-Scan  |
| 3. | <b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b> |
|    | Digital maps are provided through the GIS.            |
| 4. | <b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>              |
|    | Assessor/GIS  |

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 5. | <b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>        |
|    | Yes  |
| 6. | <b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>  |
|    | Information Systems Department within the County |
| 7. | <b>Personal Property software:</b>               |
|    | 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>              |
|    | Papillion, La Vista, Bellevue, Gretna, Springfield, Sarpy County |
| 4. | <b>When was zoning implemented?</b>                              |
|    | N/A  |

### **D. Contracted Services**

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | <b>Appraisal Services</b>                                |
|    | None   |
| 2. | <b>Other services</b>                                    |
|    | Printing of valuation change notices and tax statements. |



# 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 Sarpy 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