

Table of Contents

2011 Commission Summary

2011 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 Base Analysis Statistics
- Agricultural Random Inclusion Analysis Statistics
- Agricultural Random Exclusion Analysis Statistics

Special Valuation Statistics

- Special Valuation Methodology
- Special Valuation Base Analysis Statistics
- Special Valuation Random Inclusion Analysis Statistics
- Special Valuation Random Exclusion Analysis Statistics

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

- 2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2011 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2011 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

2011 Commission Summary for Arthur County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	5	Median	75.37
Total Sales Price	\$283,500	Mean	98.58
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$283,500	Wgt. Mean	55.12
Total Assessed Value	\$156,277	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$31,439
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$56,700	Avg. Assessed Value	\$31,255

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	19.06 to 178.10
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.17
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.10
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.07

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	2	100	126
2009	1	100	100
2008	6	100	105
2007	10	98	98

2011 Commission Summary for Arthur County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	1	Median	47.27
Total Sales Price	\$5,500	Mean	47.27
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,500	Wgt. Mean	47.27
Total Assessed Value	\$2,600	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$126,914
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$5,500	Avg. Assessed Value	\$2,600

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	N/A
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.78
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.78
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.06

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	1	100	47
2009	1	100	47
2008	1	100	128
2007	3	93	93

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Arthur 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.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	74	The qualitative measures calculated in the random include sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Arthur County

There were no changes to the residential class of real property, other than the routine pickup work, for assessment year 2011.

Plans are being made to work with Stanard Appraisal Service this summer to review the residential properties, hopefully implement new costing tables and update the depreciation tables.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Arthur County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and part-time lister.	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	There are no unique definable characteristics that would warrant the use of more than one valuation grouping.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	The cost approach, sales will be utilized in the development of a depreciation table. Since there are few residential sales in this county other approaches to value would not be meaningful.	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2002	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	A per square foot cost was developed from the few sales and information the contracted appraiser provided in the analysis.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2001 – will update for 2011	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Depreciation is set when the contracted appraisal company builds the costing models for the county.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	Only if the models are re-calibrated or new costing is applied.	

10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that will significantly affect the value, such as: a new home, garage, outbuildings, or additions, remodeling or renovations.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

**03 Arthur
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 5
 Total Sales Price : 283,500
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 283,500
 Total Assessed Value : 156,277
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,700
 Avg. Assessed Value : 31,255

MEDIAN : 75
 WGT. MEAN : 55
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 64.56
 PRD : 178.85

COV : 64.97
 STD : 64.05
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 48.66
 MAX Sales Ratio : 186.81
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.12

95% Median C.I. : N/A
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
 95% Mean C.I. : 19.06 to 178.10

Printed:3/16/2011 12:51:08PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	186.81	186.81	186.81	00.00	100.00	186.81	186.81	N/A	8,000	14,945
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	43.56	43.56	42.19	03.31	103.25	42.12	45.00	N/A	102,500	43,246
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	109.49	109.49	77.79	31.16	140.75	75.37	143.60	N/A	35,250	27,420
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	1	186.81	186.81	186.81	00.00	100.00	186.81	186.81	N/A	8,000	14,945
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	4	60.19	76.52	51.30	54.76	149.16	42.12	143.60	N/A	68,875	35,333
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	45.00	91.31	47.62	107.18	191.75	42.12	186.81	N/A	71,000	33,812
<u>ALL</u>	5	75.37	98.58	55.12	64.56	178.85	42.12	186.81	N/A	56,700	31,255

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	5	75.37	98.58	55.12	64.56	178.85	42.12	186.81	N/A	56,700	31,255
<u>ALL</u>	5	75.37	98.58	55.12	64.56	178.85	42.12	186.81	N/A	56,700	31,255

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	3	75.37	102.39	84.50	62.72	121.17	45.00	186.81	N/A	27,000	22,815
06											
07	2	92.86	92.86	43.37	54.64	214.11	42.12	143.60	N/A	101,250	43,916
<u>ALL</u>	5	75.37	98.58	55.12	64.56	178.85	42.12	186.81	N/A	56,700	31,255

**03 Arthur
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 5
 Total Sales Price : 283,500
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 283,500
 Total Assessed Value : 156,277
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,700
 Avg. Assessed Value : 31,255

MEDIAN : 75
 WGT. MEAN : 55
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 64.56
 PRD : 178.85

COV : 64.97
 STD : 64.05
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 48.66
 MAX Sales Ratio : 186.81
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.12

95% Median C.I. : N/A
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
 95% Mean C.I. : 19.06 to 178.10

Printed:3/16/2011 12:51:08PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	1	143.60	143.60	143.60	00.00	100.00	143.60	143.60	N/A	2,500	3,590	
5000 TO 9999	2	115.91	115.91	132.27	61.18	87.63	45.00	186.81	N/A	6,500	8,598	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	3	143.60	125.14	134.10	32.92	93.32	45.00	186.81	N/A	5,167	6,928	
10000 TO 29999												
30000 TO 59999												
60000 TO 99999	1	75.37	75.37	75.37	00.00	100.00	75.37	75.37	N/A	68,000	51,250	
100000 TO 149999												
150000 TO 249999	1	42.12	42.12	42.12	00.00	100.00	42.12	42.12	N/A	200,000	84,242	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	5	75.37	98.58	55.12	64.56	178.85	42.12	186.81	N/A	56,700	31,255	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

A. Residential Real Property

The calculated median from the statistical sampling of 5 residential sales will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Arthur County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

The sample is not representative of the population as a whole even though the assessor, with the assistance of the contracted appraisal company (Stanard Appraisal Services), has tried to utilize as many sales as possible without bias in the analysis of the residential class. A residential market in Arthur County is almost non-existent. The Arthur County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner. She has held this position for 30 years. Because of these job responsibilities and the length of time in office the assessor is in a unique position to verify sales.

Stanard Appraisal Service is being called upon this year to assist the assessor in reviewing the residential and commercial classes of property.

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

B. 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.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness 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.

2011 Correlation Section for Arthur County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

July, 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.

2011 Commercial Assessment Actions for Arthur County

There were no changes to the commercial class of real property, other than the routine pickup work, for assessment year 2011.

Plans are being made to work with Stanard Appraisal Service this summer to review the commercial properties, hopefully implement new costing tables and update the depreciation tables.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Arthur County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and part-time lister.	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	There are no unique definable characteristics that would warrant the use of more than one valuation grouping.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Primarily the cost approach, there are not enough sales to utilize a sales comparison approach and meaningful income and expense information is not available.	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2002	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Vacant lot sales are rare, primarily relied on experience and information provided by the contracted appraiser in valuing similar lots in counties similar to Arthur County. A per square foot cost is utilized.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2001 – will update for 2011	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Local market and experience and information provided by the contracted appraiser.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	When new costing is applied.	

10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that will significantly affect the value, such as: a new commercial building, additions, remodeling or renovations.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

**03 Arthur
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 1
 Total Sales Price : 5,500
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,500
 Total Assessed Value : 2,600
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 5,500
 Avg. Assessed Value : 2,600

MEDIAN : 47
 WGT. MEAN : 47
 MEAN : 47
 COD : 00.00
 PRD : 100.00

COV : 00.00
 STD : 00.00
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 00.00
 MAX Sales Ratio : 47.27
 MIN Sales Ratio : 47.27

95% Median C.I. : N/A
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
 95% Mean C.I. : N/A

Printed:3/16/2011 12:51:12PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08											
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10											
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09											
<u>ALL</u>	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600
<u>ALL</u>	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
02											
03	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600
04											
<u>ALL</u>	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600

**03 Arthur
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 1
 Total Sales Price : 5,500
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,500
 Total Assessed Value : 2,600
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 5,500
 Avg. Assessed Value : 2,600

MEDIAN : 47
 WGT. MEAN : 47
 MEAN : 47
 COD : 00.00
 PRD : 100.00

COV : 00.00
 STD : 00.00
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 00.00
 MAX Sales Ratio : 47.27
 MIN Sales Ratio : 47.27

95% Median C.I. : N/A
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A
 95% Mean C.I. : N/A

Printed:3/16/2011 12:51:12PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999												
5000 TO 9999	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600	
10000 TO 29999												
30000 TO 59999												
60000 TO 99999												
100000 TO 149999												
150000 TO 249999												
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600	
<u>ALL</u>	1	47.27	47.27	47.27	00.00	100.00	47.27	47.27	N/A	5,500	2,600	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

A. Commerical Real Property

The calculated median from the statistical sampling of 1 commercial sale will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Arthur County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

The sample is not representative of the population as a whole even though the assessor, with the assistance of the contracted appraisal company (Stanard Appraisal Services), has tried to utilize as many sales as possible without bias in the analysis of the commercial class, there is just not a commercial market in Arthur County. The Arthur County clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner, which is beneficial in the sales review process, and the contracted appraisal company will assist if needed.

Stanard Appraisal Service is being called upon this year to assist the assessor in reviewing the residential and commercial classes of property.

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

B. 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.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness 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.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

July, 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.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Arthur County

Arthur County has implemented a new GIS system provided by Dale Hanna, GIS Western Resources, out of North Platte.

An analysis of the agricultural land market was done along with a review and search for comparable sales in the surrounding counties of Grant, Hooker, McPherson, Keith and Garden. By all indication the grass land values appeared to be slightly above the statutory range of sixty nine to seventy five percent. A downward adjustment of eight percent was made in anticipation of meeting the acceptable range.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Arthur County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and part-time lister.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	0	Arthur County is very homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately ninety-seven percent grass land. The small remaining percentage is a mixture of irrigated and waste acres.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	N/A	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	This area is primarily ranch land. Small acreages that are not adjoining or part of a larger ranch holding, or would not substantiate an economically feasible ranching operation are considered rural residential. Non-agricultural influences have not been identified that would cause a parcel to be considered recreational.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	The value is the same, market differences cannot be recognized from the market.	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	Arthur County is approximately 97% grass and is part of a large expanse of sand-dune area known as the Nebraska Sand Hills which is the primary recharge area for the Ogallala aquifer which underlies this region. Few Irrigated parcels exist but good range management is imperative to protect the fragile soils.	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	A GIS system will be in place for assessment year 2011, will also continue to use FSA and NRD maps, do physical inspections, and review personal property schedules for added irrigation systems.	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	N/A	

9.	Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.
	No
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?
	Yes
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that will significantly affect the value such as a change in land use, along with such things as: a new home, garage, outbuildings, or additions, remodeling or renovations.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

03 Arthur
AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 14
 Total Sales Price : 8,783,101
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,736,601
 Total Assessed Value : 5,673,190
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 624,043
 Avg. Assessed Value : 405,228

MEDIAN : 63
 WGT. MEAN : 65
 MEAN : 66

COD : 17.13
 PRD : 101.69

COV : 18.87
 STD : 12.46
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.82

MAX Sales Ratio : 85.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.59

95% Median C.I. : 52.65 to 80.91
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.91 to 73.96
 95% Mean C.I. : 58.85 to 73.23

Printed:3/16/2011 12:51:15PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	1	74.25	74.25	74.25	00.00	100.00	74.25	74.25	N/A	193,301	143,532
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	2	53.99	53.99	56.15	06.30	96.15	50.59	57.39	N/A	895,000	502,561
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	58.56	58.56	58.56	00.00	100.00	58.56	58.56	N/A	388,500	227,489
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	58.21	58.21	56.71	05.02	102.65	55.29	61.12	N/A	1,266,250	718,053
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	51.78	51.78	52.02	01.70	99.54	50.90	52.65	N/A	50,000	26,009
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	76.88	76.88	74.81	05.24	102.77	72.85	80.91	N/A	1,440,000	1,077,295
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	79.92	77.50	76.77	08.17	100.95	65.17	85.00	N/A	213,075	163,584
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	4	57.98	60.20	58.02	10.71	103.76	50.59	74.25	N/A	592,950	344,036
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	53.97	54.99	56.53	05.97	97.28	50.90	61.12	N/A	658,125	372,031
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	6	78.84	77.29	75.26	07.23	102.70	65.17	85.00	65.17 to 85.00	622,050	468,154
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	57.39	56.59	56.65	04.81	99.89	50.59	61.12	N/A	942,200	533,743
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	62.75	64.33	74.05	20.00	86.87	50.90	80.91	N/A	745,000	551,652
<u>ALL</u>	14	63.15	66.04	64.94	17.13	101.69	50.59	85.00	52.65 to 80.91	624,043	405,228

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	14	63.15	66.04	64.94	17.13	101.69	50.59	85.00	52.65 to 80.91	624,043	405,228
<u>ALL</u>	14	63.15	66.04	64.94	17.13	101.69	50.59	85.00	52.65 to 80.91	624,043	405,228

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Grass</u>											
County	9	74.25	71.28	74.63	12.59	95.51	50.90	85.00	52.65 to 83.06	447,289	333,831
Blank	9	74.25	71.28	74.63	12.59	95.51	50.90	85.00	52.65 to 83.06	447,289	333,831
<u>ALL</u>	14	63.15	66.04	64.94	17.13	101.69	50.59	85.00	52.65 to 80.91	624,043	405,228

03 Arthur
AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 14
 Total Sales Price : 8,783,101
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,736,601
 Total Assessed Value : 5,673,190
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 624,043
 Avg. Assessed Value : 405,228

MEDIAN : 63
 WGT. MEAN : 65
 MEAN : 66
 COD : 17.13
 PRD : 101.69

COV : 18.87
 STD : 12.46
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.82
 MAX Sales Ratio : 85.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.59

95% Median C.I. : 52.65 to 80.91
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 55.91 to 73.96
 95% Mean C.I. : 58.85 to 73.23

Printed: 3/16/2011 12:51:15PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
____ Grass ____											
County	13	65.17	66.61	65.23	17.11	102.12	50.59	85.00	52.65 to 80.91	642,162	418,900
Blank	13	65.17	66.61	65.23	17.11	102.12	50.59	85.00	52.65 to 80.91	642,162	418,900
____ ALL ____	14	63.15	66.04	64.94	17.13	101.69	50.59	85.00	52.65 to 80.91	624,043	405,228

03 Arthur
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 16
 Total Sales Price : 9,514,601
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,468,101
 Total Assessed Value : 6,234,514
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 591,756
 Avg. Assessed Value : 389,657

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 67
 COD : 15.49
 PRD : 101.90

COV : 17.87
 STD : 11.99
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.64
 MAX Sales Ratio : 85.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.59

95% Median C.I. : 55.29 to 76.91
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.49 to 74.21
 95% Mean C.I. : 60.71 to 73.49

Printed:3/16/2011 12:51:19PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	1	74.25	74.25	74.25	00.00	100.00	74.25	74.25	N/A	193,301	143,532
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	57.39	61.63	62.01	15.28	99.39	50.59	76.91	N/A	831,333	515,532
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	58.56	58.56	58.56	00.00	100.00	58.56	58.56	N/A	388,500	227,489
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	61.12	62.86	56.87	09.21	110.53	55.29	72.18	N/A	853,333	485,318
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	51.78	51.78	52.02	01.70	99.54	50.90	52.65	N/A	50,000	26,009
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	76.88	76.88	74.81	05.24	102.77	72.85	80.91	N/A	1,440,000	1,077,295
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	79.92	77.50	76.77	08.17	100.95	65.17	85.00	N/A	213,075	163,584
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	5	58.56	63.54	62.35	14.75	101.91	50.59	76.91	N/A	615,160	383,523
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	5	55.29	58.43	56.69	10.76	103.07	50.90	72.18	N/A	532,000	301,595
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	6	78.84	77.29	75.26	07.23	102.70	65.17	85.00	65.17 to 85.00	622,050	468,154
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	58.56	61.72	59.35	11.46	103.99	50.59	76.91	50.59 to 76.91	777,500	461,434
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	62.75	64.33	74.05	20.00	86.87	50.90	80.91	N/A	745,000	551,652
<u>ALL</u>	16	68.68	67.10	65.85	15.49	101.90	50.59	85.00	55.29 to 76.91	591,756	389,657

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	16	68.68	67.10	65.85	15.49	101.90	50.59	85.00	55.29 to 76.91	591,756	389,657
<u>ALL</u>	16	68.68	67.10	65.85	15.49	101.90	50.59	85.00	55.29 to 76.91	591,756	389,657

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Grass</u>											
County	11	74.25	71.88	74.96	10.88	95.89	50.90	85.00	52.65 to 83.06	432,464	324,164
Blank	11	74.25	71.88	74.96	10.88	95.89	50.90	85.00	52.65 to 83.06	432,464	324,164
<u>ALL</u>	16	68.68	67.10	65.85	15.49	101.90	50.59	85.00	55.29 to 76.91	591,756	389,657

03 Arthur
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 16
 Total Sales Price : 9,514,601
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 9,468,101
 Total Assessed Value : 6,234,514
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 591,756
 Avg. Assessed Value : 389,657

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 67
 COD : 15.49
 PRD : 101.90

COV : 17.87
 STD : 11.99
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.64
 MAX Sales Ratio : 85.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.59

95% Median C.I. : 55.29 to 76.91
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.49 to 74.21
 95% Mean C.I. : 60.71 to 73.49

Printed: 3/16/2011 12:51:19PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
____ Grass ____											
County	15	72.18	67.67	66.16	14.46	102.28	50.59	85.00	55.29 to 76.91	605,307	400,468
Blank	15	72.18	67.67	66.16	14.46	102.28	50.59	85.00	55.29 to 76.91	605,307	400,468
____ ALL ____	16	68.68	67.10	65.85	15.49	101.90	50.59	85.00	55.29 to 76.91	591,756	389,657

03 Arthur
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 40
 Total Sales Price : 20,311,326
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,165,806
 Total Assessed Value : 13,278,730
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 504,145
 Avg. Assessed Value : 331,968

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 66
 COD : 15.80
 PRD : 100.52

COV : 24.13
 STD : 15.97
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.37
 MAX Sales Ratio : 94.11
 MIN Sales Ratio : 05.38

95% Median C.I. : 61.64 to 74.60
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.51 to 71.19
 95% Mean C.I. : 61.24 to 71.14

Printed:3/16/2011 12:51:22PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	74.43	75.72	75.06	01.98	100.88	74.25	79.77	N/A	472,151	354,381
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	4	53.99	47.57	58.88	36.27	80.79	05.38	76.91	N/A	659,995	388,612
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	7	75.00	73.01	71.43	06.20	102.21	58.56	81.17	58.56 to 81.17	284,421	203,161
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	94.11	94.11	94.11	00.00	100.00	94.11	94.11	N/A	182,000	171,283
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	61.12	59.69	58.28	11.47	102.42	45.84	72.18	N/A	863,000	502,940
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	54.67	54.67	54.67	00.00	100.00	54.67	54.67	N/A	262,400	143,444
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	52.65	54.06	58.36	04.88	92.63	50.90	58.62	N/A	833,333	486,308
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	76.88	76.88	74.81	05.24	102.77	72.85	80.91	N/A	1,440,000	1,077,295
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	63.87	58.53	66.27	16.49	88.32	29.39	74.98	29.39 to 74.98	373,200	247,323
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	71.70	71.70	71.70	00.00	100.00	71.70	71.70	N/A	150,000	107,552
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	75.42	76.20	76.07	07.19	100.17	65.17	85.00	65.17 to 85.00	186,279	141,700
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	15	74.60	66.95	67.40	13.62	99.33	05.38	81.17	58.56 to 76.91	434,635	292,940
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	10	56.96	60.94	59.07	15.92	103.17	45.84	94.11	50.90 to 72.18	725,940	428,835
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	15	72.85	68.92	71.96	12.34	95.78	29.39	85.00	65.17 to 76.77	425,792	306,419
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	17	68.21	64.35	62.04	19.78	103.72	05.38	94.11	55.29 to 76.91	536,937	333,092
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	60.13	60.15	66.50	17.10	90.45	29.39	80.91	52.65 to 72.85	656,800	436,741
<u>ALL</u>	40	71.94	66.19	65.85	15.80	100.52	05.38	94.11	61.64 to 74.60	504,145	331,968

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	40	71.94	66.19	65.85	15.80	100.52	05.38	94.11	61.64 to 74.60	504,145	331,968
<u>ALL</u>	40	71.94	66.19	65.85	15.80	100.52	05.38	94.11	61.64 to 74.60	504,145	331,968

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	1	94.11	94.11	94.11	00.00	100.00	94.11	94.11	N/A	182,000	171,283
Blank	1	94.11	94.11	94.11	00.00	100.00	94.11	94.11	N/A	182,000	171,283
<u>Grass</u>											
County	31	72.85	68.32	68.87	12.60	99.20	29.39	85.00	65.17 to 75.00	479,402	330,162
Blank	31	72.85	68.32	68.87	12.60	99.20	29.39	85.00	65.17 to 75.00	479,402	330,162
<u>ALL</u>	40	71.94	66.19	65.85	15.80	100.52	05.38	94.11	61.64 to 74.60	504,145	331,968

03 Arthur
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 40
 Total Sales Price : 20,311,326
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,165,806
 Total Assessed Value : 13,278,730
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 504,145
 Avg. Assessed Value : 331,968

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 66
 COD : 15.80
 PRD : 100.52

COV : 24.13
 STD : 15.97
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.37
 MAX Sales Ratio : 94.11
 MIN Sales Ratio : 05.38

95% Median C.I. : 61.64 to 74.60
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.51 to 71.19
 95% Mean C.I. : 61.24 to 71.14

Printed: 3/16/2011 12:51:22PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	2	49.75	49.75	54.62	89.19	91.08	05.38	94.11	N/A	163,990	89,568
Blank	2	49.75	49.75	54.62	89.19	91.08	05.38	94.11	N/A	163,990	89,568
_____Grass_____											
County	36	71.94	67.09	66.10	13.54	101.50	29.39	85.00	61.64 to 74.98	534,901	353,590
Blank	36	71.94	67.09	66.10	13.54	101.50	29.39	85.00	61.64 to 74.98	534,901	353,590
_____ALL_____	40	71.94	66.19	65.85	15.80	100.52	05.38	94.11	61.64 to 74.60	504,145	331,968

2011 Correlation Section for Arthur County

A. Agricultural Land

Arthur County is part of a large expanse of sand-dune area known as the Nebraska Sand Hills which is the primary recharge area for the Ogallala aquifer that underlies this region. This county consists primarily of large ranches, range management is crucial to support livestock. There are a few irrigated parcels but good conservation practices are imperative to protect the fragile soils, when left with no vegetation blowing and eroding of the land will occur. Arthur County is included in the Twin Platte Natural Resource District. As of February 24, 2006 the Twin Platte Natural Resource District established a stay on the issuance of high capacity water well construction permits for the entire District. Primary routes for the shipment of livestock are highway 61 which goes north to south and highway 92 which runs into highway 62 east of the town of Arthur; which is the only town in the county.

To determine the qualification of a sale, the various responsibilities of an ex officio assessor are useful. The Arthur County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner and has been in the office for approximately thirty years. There is opportunity to visit with professionals (abstractors, realtors, mortgage lenders) doing deed research or filing legal documents, and to visit with taxpayers. Occasionally on-site reviews will be done while doing pickup work.

Since the county is very homogenous in makeup, no market areas have been created. A review of the agricultural sales over the three year study period indicate 4 sales occurred from 7/1/07 to 6/30/08, 4 occurred from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09 and 6 occurred from 7/1/09 to 6/30/10. The way the sales are distributed over the study period may cause Arthur County to be compared to a different time standard than others as the first and second years of the study period are slightly under-represented in comparison to the third year. The number of agricultural sales in this county is limited; the shortage of supply causes an erratic market. Over the years sales prices in this area are not linear, other things are affecting the sale amount. My analysis was more about the most probable selling price. Forces of motivation are at play on individual sales that go beyond the production capability of the soil; and these motivations may not be the same on each sale.

In determining the level of value and the quality of assessment within and across county lines three measurement tests were reviewed: the first, being the base statistical profile which is an analysis of only the sales within Arthur County; the second is an analysis of the sales in Arthur County with the random inclusion of sales from surrounding counties with similar soils, land use makeup, and topography. Most of Arthur County would be subject to the same market as other sand hill counties if the supply of land were available. Therefore, the search was extended to within twelve miles of Arthur County to take away the time bias in the first and second years of the study period. From a pool of thirty two sales two were brought in, one sale in the first year and one in the second year, thus meeting the minimum sale threshold as set in policy that allows a variance of 10% of the total sales in the analysis to the sales between study years.

The third test was to bring in as many sales from the pool as possible to maintain a proportionate and representative sample and to meet the 10% threshold between study years.

2011 Correlation Section for Arthur County

In this instance 11 sales were brought into the first year, 6 in the second, and 9 in the third year. The sales file was not distorted with the inclusion of the sales, there is a proportionate distribution of sales among each year of the study period, the sample is considered adequate to be statistically reliable, and there continues to be a reasonable representation of the land use in Arthur County.

There is a close correlation of all three tests, the subclass Majority Land Use (MLU) greater than 95% strata grass will be considered in determining the level of value as Arthur County is predominantly 97% grass. Sales that would not be included in the 95% MLU would have irrigated acres mixed in the sale. There are so few irrigated sales that it is difficult to make an independent analysis of this land use.

From the assessors analysis of the agricultural land market it was apparent that the grass land values were causing the level of value for the agricultural land class to be above the acceptable statutory range. Therefore the assessor, like those in McPherson and Thomas, decreased values just enough to be within the statutory range and mitigate the effects of drastic decreases in value. In regards to all data in the analysis the grassland values were lowered approximately eight percent and the new value did not cause an equalization issue across county lines.

Based on the consideration of all available information and the assessors concerns of only decreasing by a minimal amount, the level of value is determined to be 74% of market value for the agricultural land class of property. Arthur County has a consistent method of assigning and implementing agricultural land values, it is believed that the assessments are uniform and proportionate.

There will be no non binding recommendations made for the agricultural class of property.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

B. 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.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness 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.

2011 Correlation Section for Arthur County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Arthur County**

July, 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.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 1,084

Value : 120,955,617

Growth 45,900

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	19	51,460	1	1,812	2	4,230	22	57,502	
02. Res Improve Land	74	298,080	20	164,421	5	20,700	99	483,201	
03. Res Improvements	76	2,109,365	20	938,555	4	246,900	100	3,294,820	
04. Res Total	95	2,458,905	21	1,104,788	6	271,830	122	3,835,523	37,970
% of Res Total	77.87	64.11	17.21	28.80	4.92	7.09	11.25	3.17	82.72
05. Com UnImp Land	9	17,800	1	3,000	1	4,472	11	25,272	
06. Com Improve Land	22	71,513	3	7,456	0	0	25	78,969	
07. Com Improvements	22	4,358,480	3	106,185	0	0	25	4,464,665	
08. Com Total	31	4,447,793	4	116,641	1	4,472	36	4,568,906	0
% of Com Total	86.11	97.35	11.11	2.55	2.78	0.10	3.32	3.78	0.00
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	95	2,458,905	21	1,104,788	6	271,830	122	3,835,523	37,970
% of Res & Rec Total	77.87	64.11	17.21	28.80	4.92	7.09	11.25	3.17	82.72
Com & Ind Total	31	4,447,793	4	116,641	1	4,472	36	4,568,906	0
% of Com & Ind Total	86.11	97.35	11.11	2.55	2.78	0.10	3.32	3.78	0.00
17. Taxable Total	126	6,906,698	25	1,221,429	7	276,302	158	8,404,429	37,970
% of Taxable Total	79.75	82.18	15.82	14.53	4.43	3.29	14.58	6.95	82.72

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	1	0	0	1

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	1	35,980	811	91,743,811	812	91,779,791
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	1	33,824	113	15,011,703	114	15,045,527
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	1	46,880	113	5,678,990	114	5,725,870
30. Ag Total							926	112,551,188

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	1	1.00	2,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	43,875	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	4.00	900	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	3,005	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	1	4.01	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	8	8.00	16,000	8	8.00	16,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	93	94.00	188,000	94	95.00	190,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	95	0.00	3,993,745	96	0.00	4,037,620	5,965
34. HomeSite Total				104	103.00	4,243,620	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	8	26.00	5,850	8	26.00	5,850	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	102	399.00	89,775	103	403.00	90,675	
37. FarmSite Improvements	109	0.00	1,685,245	110	0.00	1,688,250	1,965
38. FarmSite Total				118	429.00	1,784,775	
39. Road & Ditches	335	1,926.88	0	336	1,930.89	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				222	2,462.89	6,028,395	7,930

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	21.85	0.19%	14,313	0.19%	655.06
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	549.25	4.83%	359,758	4.83%	655.00
50. 3A	2,520.12	22.15%	1,650,683	22.15%	655.00
51. 4A1	3,300.21	29.00%	2,161,641	29.00%	655.00
52. 4A	4,988.53	43.84%	3,267,492	43.84%	655.00
53. Total	11,379.96	100.00%	7,453,887	100.00%	655.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	308.18	0.07%	69,343	0.07%	225.01
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	777.85	0.18%	175,019	0.18%	225.00
68. 3G	16,914.66	3.84%	3,805,875	3.84%	225.00
69. 4G1	37,486.86	8.52%	8,434,698	8.52%	225.00
70. 4G	384,642.68	87.39%	86,544,850	87.39%	225.00
71. Total	440,130.23	100.00%	99,029,785	100.00%	225.00
Irrigated Total	11,379.96	2.50%	7,453,887	7.00%	655.00
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total	440,130.23	96.64%	99,029,785	92.97%	225.00
72. Waste	3,911.00	0.86%	39,121	0.04%	10.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	455,421.19	100.00%	106,522,793	100.00%	233.90

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	11,379.96	7,453,887	11,379.96	7,453,887
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
78. Grass	0.00	0	297.35	66,904	439,832.88	98,962,881	440,130.23	99,029,785
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,911.00	39,121	3,911.00	39,121
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	297.35	66,904	455,123.84	106,455,889	455,421.19	106,522,793

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	11,379.96	2.50%	7,453,887	7.00%	655.00
Dry Land	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass	440,130.23	96.64%	99,029,785	92.97%	225.00
Waste	3,911.00	0.86%	39,121	0.04%	10.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	455,421.19	100.00%	106,522,793	100.00%	233.90

2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2010 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

03 Arthur

	2010 CTL County Total	2011 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2011 form 45 - 2010 CTL)	Percent Change	2011 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	3,736,924	3,835,523	98,599	2.64%	37,970	1.62%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	4,259,365	4,243,620	-15,745	-0.37%	5,965	-0.51%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	7,996,289	8,079,143	82,854	1.04%	43,935	0.49%
05. Commercial	4,570,106	4,568,906	-1,200	-0.03%	0	-0.03%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	1,797,175	1,784,775	-12,400	-0.69%	1,965	-0.80%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	6,367,281	6,353,681	-13,600	-0.21%	1,965	-0.24%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	14,363,570	14,432,824	69,254	0.48%	45,900	0.16%
11. Irrigated	7,431,630	7,453,887	22,257	0.30%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	108,255,975	99,029,785	-9,226,190	-8.52%		
14. Wasteland	41,410	39,121	-2,289	-5.53%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	115,729,015	106,522,793	-9,206,222	-7.95%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	130,092,585	120,955,617	-9,136,968	-7.02%	45,900	-7.06%

2010 Plan of Assessment for Arthur County
Assessment Years 2011, 2012 and 2013
June 15, 2010

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9, on or before June 15 of 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 assessment plan shall indicate classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 of each year, the assessor may amend the assessment 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 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1. 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2. 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 80% of 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 Arthur County

Per the 2010 County Abstract, Arthur County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	122	11%	4.0%
Commercial	35	3%	.5%
Agricultural	921	86%	95.5%

Agricultural land - taxable acres 457,416 vacant acres

Other pertinent facts: Of the 457,416 agricultural acres, only a little over 3% is irrigated.

New Property: For assessment year 2010, an estimated 2 building permits will be filed for new construction and additions. Historically, Arthur County does not have much growth.

Current Resources

A. The 2010-2011 budget has not been prepared. Since the time line for filing the assessment plan has changed, I do not know what the budget amount for assessing will be. The county commissioners are trying to run the county as conservative as possible. So I am assuming the budget will remain about the same as 2010-2011 which is approximately \$7000. I do all the administrative reports and valuing the properties myself. I have a CAMA software programs provided by MIPS, Inc. I hire a local person to help with the pick-up work.

B. I am required to get 60 hours of continuing education as set out in REG.71-00602A. Most of the hours are obtained at workshops and meetings. The budget allowance for the county assessor is not large enough for any IAAO Courses.

C. At this time, the county cannot afford new cadastral maps. The old ones are kept current. I don't see the county purchasing new aeriels or cadastrals within the next three years. I am working with Dale Hanna, GIS Western Resources, Inc. to extract parcel, section and land use boundaries. He will provide me with maps for each parcel to be part of the record cards.

D. New property record cards for all classes were put into use in 2004.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

A. Discover, List & Inventory: I am also county clerk. I handle the real estate transfer statements that are filed with the deeds. The ownership is changed on the cadastrals and record cards once the deed is recorded. Building permits are reviewed as well as phone calls made to the buyers or sellers. I also visit with the real estate agent or abstracter about some of the sales.

B. Data Collection: I sometimes make inspections of property that has sold. More often I visit with the buyer to find the condition and quality of the property they purchased.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions: I consistently work with the field liaison on the analysis of the assessment sales ratio studies. I review preliminary statistics to help me determine what the values should be.

D. Approaches to value: The cost approach to value is the only approach that seems feasible to use in Arthur County.

Notice of value changes were sent out by the 1st of June 2010. I try to let taxpayers know why there is a major change in value. I publish in the local paper when homestead exemption and personal property schedules are due. I follow up with a reminder by phone.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2009:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	126.00	27.41	94.05
Commercial	47.00		99.99
Agricultural	69.00	13.30	102.83

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011

Residential: The sales will be reviewed. Inspections of properties that have sold. Will implement the new cost tables provided by MIPS. Make sure property record cards are updated. Do a review for residential properties located in Range 36 and 37. Do pick-up work for residential properties. Work with Stanard Appraisal Services in reviewing lot values and acreage land values. Maintain record cards. Due to the bad weather last winter, the review of residential properties will be the same.

Commercials: There is very little commercial properties in Arthur County.. Do pick-up work for commercial properties. Maintain record cards. Review lot values.

Agricultural Land: Sales will be reviewed. I will review the irrigated subclass. I will work with surrounding counties to expand the sales base for Arthur County and try to keep values somewhat consistent with surrounding counties. Do pick-up work on outbuildings. Inspect land in Range 36 & 37; Townships 17,18,19 and 20. Maintain record cards and cadastrals. Compare acres irrigated on my records to the map submitted to me by Twin Platte NRD. GIS Western Resources has been hired by Arthur County to help with the completion of the soil conversion and mapping. With the maps that are used by GIS Western Resources and the map provided by the Twin Platte NRD, the irrigation systems should be easy to identify as will all other land uses. Due to the bad weather last year, the schedule for reviewing ag land will remain the same.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011

Residential: Sales will be reviewed and subject properties inspected. Review residential properties in Ranges 39 and 40; Townships 17,18,19 and 20 Maintain record cards. Complete pick-up work with the help of a local lister.

Commercial: Do the pick-up work for any commercial properties that may be constructed. Maintain record cards. Review lot values.

Agricultural Land. Review sales. Work with surrounding counties to expand sales base and try to keep values somewhat consistent with the surrounding counties. Look for changes in use such as from grass to irrigated. With the GIS project being completed, it will be easier to track land uses with more current maps. Copies of the maps will be kept in each record card folder. Do pick-up work on outbuildings. Look for changes in Ranges 39 & 40; Townships 17,18,19 and 20. Maintain record cards and cadastrals.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

Residential: Sales will be reviewed and inspected. Review residential properties in Range 38; Townships 17,18,19 and 20. This review will also include the Village of Arthur. Maintain record cards .Complete the pick-up work with the help of a local lister.

Commercial: Do the pick-up work for any commercials that may be constructed or updated. Maintain record cards and cadastrals.

Agricultural Land: Work with the surrounding counties to expand the sales files. Look for changes in Range 38; Townships 17,18,19 and 20. Maintain record cards and cadastrals.

Other functions performed by the assessor's office:

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates and ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file the administrative reports required by law/regulation
 - a. Abstracts (Real and Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters and annual assessed value update with abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to political subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Educational Lands and Funds
 - i. Report all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 111 personal property schedules.
4. Permissive Exemptions; administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to the county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property-annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.

6. Homestead Exemptions; administer 17 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed-review of valuations as certified by PA&T for public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates-management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
9. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property and centrally assessed.
10. Tax List Corrections-prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
11. County Board of Equalization-attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests;assemble and provide information.
12. TERC Appeals-prepare information and attend appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
13. Education: attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain certification.

Conclusion

Arthur County's financial situation is not the most secure. There will not be a substantial increase in the assessor's budget this year. We have to make do with what we have. Hopefully I will be able to do the functions of the assessor's office with what I have to work with and will be able to maintain the records and physically inspect the county as stated in the assessment plan.

Respectfully submitted:

Becky Swanson
Arthur Co. Assessor
06-15-2010

2011 Assessment Survey for Arthur County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	0
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	1 part-time employee is shared with the Treasurer
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$20,100
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$15,000
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	n/a
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$3,500
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$700
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$900
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	Approximately \$454

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Have always used aerials.
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes – GIS Western Resources, Inc.
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Western Resources, Inc.
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	No
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	None
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1999, with the exception of the village of Arthur

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Stanard Appraisal Service is hired on an as needed basis.
2.	Other services:
	GIS Western Resources, Inc.

2011 Certification for Arthur County

This is to certify that the 2011 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

One copy by electronic transmission to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

One copy by electronic transmission to the Arthur County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

