

# 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 Box Butte County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	205	Median	95.73
Total Sales Price	\$19,092,978	Mean	99.99
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$19,082,478	Wgt. Mean	94.01
Total Assessed Value	\$17,940,363	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$65,455
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$93,085	Avg. Assessed Value	\$87,514

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.68 to 98.97
95% Mean C.I	91.69 to 96.34
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	95.66 to 104.32
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	38.84
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.57
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.11

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	305	97	97
2009	385	99	99
2008	434	99	99
2007	402	97	97

## 2011 Commission Summary for Box Butte County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	15	Median	92.57
Total Sales Price	\$2,240,245	Mean	96.34
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,240,245	Wgt. Mean	99.73
Total Assessed Value	\$2,234,115	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$126,952
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$149,350	Avg. Assessed Value	\$148,941

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	80.28 to 100.00
95% Mean C.I	81.46 to 111.22
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	77.58 to 121.87
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	13.53
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.86
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.18

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	48	95	95
2009	48	95	95
2008	60	97	97
2007	58	98	98



## 2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Box Butte 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
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>96</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>93</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>70</b>	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 Box Butte County**

For assessment year 2011, the only assessment actions taken to address the residential property class were: the completion of residential pick-up work, and lot values in Homestead Addition (southeast Alliance) were reviewed and equalized with the market.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and her staff.	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	10	Alliance—residential properties within the city of Alliance and what would technically be classified as suburban (since there is no separate suburban market within the County).
	20	Hemingford—residential properties within the town of Hemingford and its environs.
	81	Rural Res 1—all rural residential properties that are close in proximity and have ready access to the paved roads within the County (Hwy 385, Hwy 2, Hwy 87, Hwy 71, 10 <sup>th</sup> Street West, and County Road 70).
	82	Rural Res 2—rural residential properties that do not meet the criteria of Area 1, nor are in any of the Rainbow Acres subdivisions.
	83	Rainbow Acres—only those rural residential properties that are within the Rainbow subdivisions.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	The replacement cost new approach, minus depreciation.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	For Alliance residential it is currently in process; for Hemingford, 2009; for Rural residential, 2008.	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	The market approach is used, and the lots are valued by the square foot method.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	For Alliance it is 2010; for Hemingford 2009, and for Rural residential it is 2008. The cost year is based on the cyclical re-appraisal date.	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The County currently uses the depreciation tables provided by the vendor.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes.	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	After the re-appraisal of the valuation grouping.	
10.	<b>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?</b>	

	Yes.
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	A parcel is considered substantially changed only when new improvements are added to vacant lots, or when major additions are made to existing improvements.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>
	There are no County-specific policies or procedures. The Assessor follows statutes, regulations and PAD directives.

**07 Box Butte**

**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 : 205  
 Total Sales Price : 19,092,978  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 19,082,478  
 Total Assessed Value : 17,940,363  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 93,085  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 87,514

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 94  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 18.52  
 PRD : 106.36

COV : 31.62  
 STD : 31.62  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.73  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 399.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.33

95% Median C.I. : 92.68 to 98.97  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.69 to 96.34  
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.66 to 104.32

Printed:3/27/2011 5:44:00PM

**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>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	42	87.23	91.78	88.62	15.92	103.57	62.92	150.84	83.60 to 95.17	93,820	83,144
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	26	99.24	106.02	97.67	19.87	108.55	65.99	224.35	88.14 to 104.67	94,212	92,016
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	28	96.13	96.26	93.79	17.77	102.63	54.33	135.59	81.51 to 106.18	85,068	79,788
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	25	95.07	97.23	92.79	11.89	104.78	73.60	139.17	89.52 to 98.97	101,923	94,572
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	22	97.13	98.68	95.03	11.79	103.84	76.20	159.58	88.00 to 100.76	85,477	81,232
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	95.53	112.81	91.70	35.17	123.02	57.32	399.00	81.96 to 105.53	100,259	91,933
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	17	108.30	103.97	102.07	16.53	101.86	55.24	166.52	85.41 to 116.55	71,294	72,768
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	27	100.79	103.41	96.97	17.27	106.64	74.48	174.25	86.28 to 112.45	106,126	102,912
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	121	94.47	97.00	92.60	16.89	104.75	54.33	224.35	90.06 to 98.59	93,553	86,635
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	84	99.51	104.30	96.07	19.87	108.57	55.24	399.00	94.05 to 101.64	92,411	88,781
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	93	95.52	100.29	93.33	18.24	107.46	54.33	399.00	92.26 to 98.82	92,636	86,454
<u>ALL</u>	205	95.73	99.99	94.01	18.52	106.36	54.33	399.00	92.68 to 98.97	93,085	87,514

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
10	174	94.87	97.36	93.59	17.08	104.03	54.33	224.35	89.54 to 98.95	92,032	86,136
20	12	99.42	140.38	102.67	46.23	136.73	76.40	399.00	98.53 to 174.25	50,192	51,532
81	3	92.26	87.79	84.26	07.35	104.19	75.38	95.73	N/A	206,522	174,018
82	13	99.19	98.43	97.38	12.26	101.08	55.24	145.47	89.11 to 105.61	119,277	116,156
83	3	104.67	110.16	101.92	10.46	108.08	96.47	129.33	N/A	98,833	100,731
<u>ALL</u>	205	95.73	99.99	94.01	18.52	106.36	54.33	399.00	92.68 to 98.97	93,085	87,514

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	202	95.43	99.79	93.88	18.57	106.30	54.33	399.00	92.26 to 98.96	93,238	87,528
06											
07	3	99.37	113.77	104.58	16.43	108.79	96.47	145.47	N/A	82,800	86,596
<u>ALL</u>	205	95.73	99.99	94.01	18.52	106.36	54.33	399.00	92.68 to 98.97	93,085	87,514

**07 Box Butte  
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 : 205  
 Total Sales Price : 19,092,978  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 19,082,478  
 Total Assessed Value : 17,940,363  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 93,085  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 87,514

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 94  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 18.52  
 PRD : 106.36

COV : 31.62  
 STD : 31.62  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.73  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 399.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.33

95% Median C.I. : 92.68 to 98.97  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.69 to 96.34  
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.66 to 104.32

Printed:3/27/2011 5:44:00PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	4	151.79	200.58	183.37	56.69	109.39	99.73	399.00	N/A	2,500	4,584	
5000 TO 9999	2	100.23	100.23	99.90	01.42	100.33	98.81	101.64	N/A	6,500	6,494	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	6	115.49	167.13	136.19	58.07	122.72	98.81	399.00	98.81 to 399.00	3,833	5,221	
10000 TO 29999	11	133.37	134.55	138.47	23.80	97.17	69.98	224.35	83.60 to 188.60	21,427	29,671	
30000 TO 59999	36	102.74	109.08	106.17	25.78	102.74	55.24	166.52	85.98 to 128.51	44,074	46,794	
60000 TO 99999	79	95.86	93.98	94.07	12.58	99.90	55.04	134.10	88.25 to 99.10	79,227	74,528	
100000 TO 149999	45	90.61	91.18	91.07	11.61	100.12	54.33	116.55	86.51 to 96.47	120,213	109,478	
150000 TO 249999	23	94.47	91.42	91.45	10.11	99.97	62.92	109.30	85.79 to 100.10	178,304	163,062	
250000 TO 499999	5	91.99	91.55	90.86	09.88	100.76	75.38	105.61	N/A	293,513	266,685	
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	205	95.73	99.99	94.01	18.52	106.36	54.33	399.00	92.68 to 98.97	93,085	87,514	



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Box Butte County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

As shown in the 2011 residential statistical profile, there were 205 qualified residential sales that occurred during the two-year timeframe of the sales study period. All three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range, and any could be used to serve as the point estimate for the overall residential level of value (LOV). Both qualitative statistical measures are at least three points above their respective acceptable level. The higher overall COD and PRD may be skewed by the twelve sales that occurred within valuation grouping 20 (Hemingford) that exhibit a COD of 46.23 and a PRD of 136.73. No valuation grouping with significant numbers of sales exhibits a median outside of the prescribed range for level of value.

Sales verification and qualification within Box Butte County consists of a mailed questionnaire sent to both the buyer and seller of all sales transactions for all three property classes (excepting only those that current IAAO standards recommend for possible exclusion). The response rate is estimated at approximately one-half. Non-respondents are sent a second document and this appears to raise the response rate to about seventy-five percent. If no response occurs, the Assessor's policy is to automatically qualify these, with the note that if in the future, it is discovered that the sale is not truly arms-length, it then is disqualified. Copies of returned questionnaires are attached to the Assessor's copy of the Real Estate Transfer document (F521), and kept in notebooks by year.

Assessment actions taken to address the residential property class for 2011 included the completion of all pick-up work and lot values in Homestead Addition (southeast Alliance) were reviewed and equalized with the market.

Considering all of the above information, the residential level of value is determined to be 96%. Both qualitative statistics are slightly outside of their respective ranges, and these are skewed by the high COD and PRD of valuation grouping 20. The bulk of the sales in valuation grouping 10 (Alliance) are also slightly outside of range for the COD and PRD (by two points or less). However, the known assessment practices of the County in the conduct of sales verification, and review are consistent, therefore the residential property class overall is believed to be treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte County**

For 2011, the only assessment action taken to address the commercial property class was the completion of commercial pick-up work.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Stanard Appraisal	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	10	Alliance—commercial properties within the city of Alliance and what would technically be classified as suburban (since there is no separate suburban commercial market within the County).
	20	Hemingford—commercial properties within the town of Hemingford and environ.
	80	Rural Comm—All rural commercial properties.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Hemingford and Rural residential were re-valued using the replacement cost new minus depreciation approach. The last time Alliance commercial was revalued, the cost, market and income approaches were all used to establish value.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	Alliance in 2005; Hemingford in 2009 and Rural residential in 2008.	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	The market approach is used, and the lots are valued by the square foot method.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Alliance cost index is dated 2005, the Hemingford cost index is 2009 and the Rural residential cost index is dated 2008.	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The county currently uses the depreciation tables provided by the CAMA vendor.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	When the valuation groupings are re-valued.	
10.	<b>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?</b>	
	Yes	
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>	
	Only is substantial new improvements are made, or if the building is converted to a new occupancy code due to extensive remodeling.	
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the</b>	

	<b>commercial class of property.</b>
	By following statutes, regulations and directives, the County has not developed commercial specific policies or procedures for the commercial property class.

**07 Box Butte  
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 : 15  
 Total Sales Price : 2,240,245  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,240,245  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,234,115  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 149,350  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 148,941

MEDIAN : 93  
 WGT. MEAN : 100  
 MEAN : 96  
 COD : 18.99  
 PRD : 96.60

COV : 27.88  
 STD : 26.86  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.58  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 167.77  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 65.00

95% Median C.I. : 80.28 to 100.00  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 77.58 to 121.87  
 95% Mean C.I. : 81.46 to 111.22

Printed:3/27/2011 5:44:02PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Qtrts</b>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	3	95.83	110.11	135.13	14.90	81.48	95.83	138.68	N/A	185,333	250,444
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	16,245	16,245
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	65.00	65.00	65.00	00.00	100.00	65.00	65.00	N/A	20,000	13,000
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	111.17	111.17	111.17	00.00	100.00	111.17	111.17	N/A	30,000	33,350
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	88.33	88.33	88.33	00.00	100.00	88.33	88.33	N/A	60,000	52,995
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	167.77	167.77	167.77	00.00	100.00	167.77	167.77	N/A	36,000	60,398
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	92.57	87.17	86.86	10.36	100.36	70.08	98.85	N/A	278,333	241,774
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	78.26	78.26	86.49	11.36	90.48	69.37	87.15	N/A	193,500	167,355
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	80.28	80.28	80.28	00.00	100.00	80.28	80.28	N/A	150,000	120,423
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	84.23	84.23	84.23	00.00	100.00	84.23	84.23	N/A	150,000	126,340
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
<b>Study Yrs</b>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	5	95.83	99.07	131.80	16.25	75.17	65.00	138.68	N/A	118,449	156,115
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	6	95.71	104.80	90.75	22.09	115.48	70.08	167.77	70.08 to 167.77	160,167	145,344
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	4	82.26	80.26	84.64	06.60	94.83	69.37	87.15	N/A	171,750	145,368
<b>Calendar Yrs</b>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	94.17	91.13	91.56	15.36	99.53	65.00	111.17	N/A	31,561	28,898
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	87.15	95.15	88.13	22.86	107.97	69.37	167.77	69.37 to 167.77	201,143	177,265
<b>ALL</b>	15	92.57	96.34	99.73	18.99	96.60	65.00	167.77	80.28 to 100.00	149,350	148,941

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
10	13	92.57	96.77	100.08	21.03	96.69	65.00	167.77	70.08 to 111.17	162,711	162,836
20	2	93.59	93.59	93.80	05.62	99.78	88.33	98.85	N/A	62,500	58,625
<b>ALL</b>	15	92.57	96.34	99.73	18.99	96.60	65.00	167.77	80.28 to 100.00	149,350	148,941

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	2	118.93	118.93	83.30	41.07	142.77	70.08	167.77	N/A	133,000	110,792
03	13	92.57	92.87	101.94	13.79	91.10	65.00	138.68	80.28 to 100.00	151,865	154,810
04											
<b>ALL</b>	15	92.57	96.34	99.73	18.99	96.60	65.00	167.77	80.28 to 100.00	149,350	148,941

**07 Box Butte  
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 : 15  
 Total Sales Price : 2,240,245  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,240,245  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,234,115  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 149,350  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 148,941

MEDIAN : 93  
 WGT. MEAN : 100  
 MEAN : 96  
 COD : 18.99  
 PRD : 96.60

COV : 27.88  
 STD : 26.86  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.58  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 167.77  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 65.00

95% Median C.I. : 80.28 to 100.00  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 77.58 to 121.87  
 95% Mean C.I. : 81.46 to 111.22

Printed:3/27/2011 5:44:02PM

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
_____ Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999											
5000 TO 9999											
_____ Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999											
10000 TO 29999	5	95.83	85.21	86.19	12.82	98.86	65.00	100.00	N/A	19,349	16,677
30000 TO 59999	2	139.47	139.47	142.04	20.29	98.19	111.17	167.77	N/A	33,000	46,874
60000 TO 99999	2	93.59	93.59	93.80	05.62	99.78	88.33	98.85	N/A	62,500	58,625
100000 TO 149999											
150000 TO 249999	3	80.28	78.20	76.97	05.88	101.60	70.08	84.23	N/A	176,667	135,983
250000 TO 499999	1	87.15	87.15	87.15	00.00	100.00	87.15	87.15	N/A	372,500	324,652
500000 +	2	115.63	115.63	114.96	19.94	100.58	92.57	138.68	N/A	525,000	603,565
_____ ALL _____	15	92.57	96.34	99.73	18.99	96.60	65.00	167.77	80.28 to 100.00	149,350	148,941

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
Blank	7	95.83	89.97	92.48	11.94	97.29	65.00	111.17	65.00 to 111.17	95,249	88,088
303	1	84.23	84.23	84.23	00.00	100.00	84.23	84.23	N/A	150,000	126,340
326	1	167.77	167.77	167.77	00.00	100.00	167.77	167.77	N/A	36,000	60,398
344	1	80.28	80.28	80.28	00.00	100.00	80.28	80.28	N/A	150,000	120,423
352	1	70.08	70.08	70.08	00.00	100.00	70.08	70.08	N/A	230,000	161,186
353	1	88.33	88.33	88.33	00.00	100.00	88.33	88.33	N/A	60,000	52,995
386	1	87.15	87.15	87.15	00.00	100.00	87.15	87.15	N/A	372,500	324,652
494	1	98.85	98.85	98.85	00.00	100.00	98.85	98.85	N/A	65,000	64,255
540	1	138.68	138.68	138.68	00.00	100.00	138.68	138.68	N/A	510,000	707,249
_____ ALL _____	15	92.57	96.34	99.73	18.99	96.60	65.00	167.77	80.28 to 100.00	149,350	148,941



## **2011 Correlation Section for Box Butte County**

---

### **A. Commerical Real Property**

The 2011 commercial statistical profile indicates there were only 15 qualified sales that occurred during the three-year sales study period. Of this small sample, the profile shows that all three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range, and any could realistically be used to represent the overall commercial level of value (LOV). The overall coefficient of dispersion is within its prescribed range, and the price-related differential is about one point below the prescribed minimum figure of 98%.

Box Butte County's sales qualification procedures for commercial property are a reiteration of those described in the residential correlation section: a questionnaire is sent via mail to both the buyer and seller of commercial property (excepting only those that IAAO standards currently recommend for exclusion). If no response occurs after two mailings of the questionnaire, the Assessor's policy is to automatically qualify these, with the note that if in the future, it is discovered that the sale is not truly arms-length, it then is disqualified. Copies of returned questionnaires are attached to the Assessor's copy of the Real Estate Transfer document (F521), and kept in notebooks by year.

For 2011, the only assessment action taken to address the commercial property class was the completion of commercial pick-up work.

Considering all of the aforementioned information, the overall commercial level of value is determined to be 93%. The coefficient of dispersion is within range and the price-related differential is only one percentage point below the prescribed minimum of 98%. This is remarkable with the occupancy code diversity of the sales. However, the known assessment practices of the County in the conduct of sales verification, and review are consistent, therefore the commercial property class overall is believed to be treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte County**

For assessment year 2011, the Assessor reviewed the sales data during the timeframe of the sales study and implemented land use and acre count changes discovered with the use of the County's GIS. Also, the Assessor adjusted any land class that was below acceptable range in all three agricultural market areas. For example, all irrigated land was raised in all three market areas. Two dry LCG's were raised in market area one, all dry LCG's were raised in area two, and three dry LCG's were raised in area three. Grass values remained the same in area one, three LCG grass values were raised in both agricultural market areas two and three.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The Assessor and her staff.	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Consists of land primarily in the southern part of the County that is mostly sandhills and the majority use is for grazing cattle.
	2	This market area has more rolling to steep hill land, and irrigation wells found in this centrally located area are deeper than those in area 3.
	3	This land is in the northern portion of the County and has richer soils and a fairly level to slightly rolling topography.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Basically by sales studies of comparable sales within each market area, with special attention paid to those that border an adjacent market area. Land use is also monitored in each agricultural market area.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	Primary use of the land is the factor utilized to identify rural residential versus recreational land within Box Butte County. Land that has no primary residential purposes would be considered recreational. Recreational use shall be considered when land use is for the preservation of the land for purposes of recreation and hunting.	
5.	<b>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?</b>	
	Farm home sites within each market area are valued the same. There are differences in well-depth that are taken into account when valuing the sites in each of the three market areas.	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	The three primary classes of land—irrigated, dry and grass—used in conjunction with the land capability groups found in all three.	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	GIS, FSA maps from taxpayers, and physical inspection.	
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Any response to the agricultural verification questionnaire that would indicate a non-agricultural influenced use would be noted. At present, the Assessor has found none.	
9.	<b>Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	No.	

10.	<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 was used for the general population of the class?</b>
	Yes.
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	Major improvements added to unimproved land would be an example of substantially changed. Land use change (from one class to another—i.e., dry to irrigated) would not necessarily constitute substantially changed for agricultural land.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>
	The Box Butte Assessor follows statutes, regulations and directives for all three property classes, and therefore has not developed specific policies or procedures.

**07 Box Butte**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

**AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 47  
 Total Sales Price : 20,423,062  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 19,737,562  
 Total Assessed Value : 12,507,054  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 419,948  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 266,108

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 63  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 24.62  
 PRD : 115.92

COV : 31.70  
 STD : 23.29  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.12  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 169.41  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.19

95% Median C.I. : 63.64 to 82.04  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 53.92 to 72.81  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.80 to 80.12

Printed:3/27/2011 5:44:05PM

**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	6	81.83	74.01	76.39	18.16	96.88	46.78	97.00	46.78 to 97.00	108,665	83,005
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	3	89.73	97.13	91.27	11.85	106.42	84.89	116.77	N/A	148,000	135,077
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	6	80.51	79.97	77.43	18.16	103.28	55.89	106.07	55.89 to 106.07	207,683	160,801
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	55.87	55.87	55.87	00.00	100.00	55.87	55.87	N/A	1,210,100	676,044
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	60.14	60.14	58.16	15.65	103.40	50.73	69.54	N/A	279,500	162,565
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	52.43	52.43	52.43	00.00	100.00	52.43	52.43	N/A	6,848,000	3,590,278
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	76.71	73.93	77.48	17.60	95.42	38.19	92.99	38.19 to 92.99	206,575	160,046
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	5	67.06	72.71	79.28	21.40	91.71	45.72	94.18	N/A	159,046	126,085
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	70.29	70.95	58.44	23.06	121.41	46.96	95.59	N/A	200,833	117,376
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	71.95	81.36	70.47	29.90	115.45	40.95	169.41	40.95 to 169.41	603,875	425,537
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	52.72	55.16	52.71	11.27	104.65	47.26	63.64	N/A	241,638	127,362
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	62.35	62.35	62.35	00.00	100.00	62.35	62.35	N/A	102,000	63,600
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	16	84.07	79.44	71.62	18.28	110.92	46.78	116.77	55.89 to 90.61	222,012	159,007
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	14	69.25	69.99	58.32	20.66	120.01	38.19	94.18	50.73 to 90.00	674,406	393,294
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	17	63.64	70.70	66.09	26.51	106.98	40.95	169.41	49.43 to 82.04	396,688	262,167
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	67.89	70.84	56.33	21.52	125.76	50.73	106.07	52.43 to 90.61	986,320	555,626
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	72.22	75.95	71.60	24.19	106.08	38.19	169.41	66.66 to 89.95	339,463	243,051
<u>ALL</u>	47	69.54	73.46	63.37	24.62	115.92	38.19	169.41	63.64 to 82.04	419,948	266,108

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	9	68.95	81.55	56.86	31.52	143.42	52.43	169.41	55.87 to 97.00	1,045,483	594,424
2	24	71.84	70.33	71.44	23.47	98.45	38.19	106.07	50.73 to 83.96	294,084	210,080
3	14	68.84	73.64	64.68	21.14	113.85	40.95	116.77	62.35 to 90.00	233,586	151,094
<u>ALL</u>	47	69.54	73.46	63.37	24.62	115.92	38.19	169.41	63.64 to 82.04	419,948	266,108

**07 Box Butte**

**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 : 47  
 Total Sales Price : 20,423,062  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 19,737,562  
 Total Assessed Value : 12,507,054  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 419,948  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 266,108

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 63  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 24.62  
 PRD : 115.92

COV : 31.70  
 STD : 23.29  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.12  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 169.41  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.19

95% Median C.I. : 63.64 to 82.04  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 53.92 to 72.81  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.80 to 80.12

Printed:3/27/2011 5:44:05PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	3	52.72	69.84	57.31	35.00	121.86	50.73	106.07	N/A	260,720	149,426
2	3	52.72	69.84	57.31	35.00	121.86	50.73	106.07	N/A	260,720	149,426
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	7	76.07	78.43	74.91	19.35	104.70	47.26	116.77	47.26 to 116.77	130,269	97,588
2	1	47.26	47.26	47.26	00.00	100.00	47.26	47.26	N/A	104,380	49,330
3	6	80.48	83.63	78.49	15.38	106.55	67.39	116.77	67.39 to 116.77	134,583	105,631
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	9	89.95	92.64	84.30	18.45	109.89	66.66	169.41	69.54 to 94.18	196,096	165,316
1	3	89.95	111.10	85.47	35.38	129.99	73.94	169.41	N/A	265,533	226,942
2	3	87.07	83.60	79.24	09.43	105.50	69.54	94.18	N/A	128,667	101,957
3	3	90.00	83.22	86.07	09.76	96.69	66.66	92.99	N/A	194,087	167,050
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>69.54</b>	<b>73.46</b>	<b>63.37</b>	<b>24.62</b>	<b>115.92</b>	<b>38.19</b>	<b>169.41</b>	<b>63.64 to 82.04</b>	<b>419,948</b>	<b>266,108</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	9	55.87	68.70	59.84	32.38	114.81	46.96	106.07	49.43 to 97.00	394,307	235,965
1	3	68.95	73.94	60.82	19.88	121.57	55.87	97.00	N/A	516,700	314,243
2	6	51.73	66.09	59.09	32.96	111.85	46.96	106.07	46.96 to 106.07	333,110	196,827
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	9	70.29	75.29	72.57	19.11	103.75	47.26	116.77	62.35 to 86.35	131,764	95,626
2	1	47.26	47.26	47.26	00.00	100.00	47.26	47.26	N/A	104,380	49,330
3	8	73.18	78.79	75.02	16.71	105.03	62.35	116.77	62.35 to 116.77	135,188	101,413
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	9	89.95	92.64	84.30	18.45	109.89	66.66	169.41	69.54 to 94.18	196,096	165,316
1	3	89.95	111.10	85.47	35.38	129.99	73.94	169.41	N/A	265,533	226,942
2	3	87.07	83.60	79.24	09.43	105.50	69.54	94.18	N/A	128,667	101,957
3	3	90.00	83.22	86.07	09.76	96.69	66.66	92.99	N/A	194,087	167,050
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>69.54</b>	<b>73.46</b>	<b>63.37</b>	<b>24.62</b>	<b>115.92</b>	<b>38.19</b>	<b>169.41</b>	<b>63.64 to 82.04</b>	<b>419,948</b>	<b>266,108</b>

**07 Box Butte**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 51  
 Total Sales Price : 22,043,800  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,358,300  
 Total Assessed Value : 13,571,080  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 418,790  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 266,100

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 64  
 MEAN : 75  
 COD : 27.14  
 PRD : 117.88

COV : 36.96  
 STD : 27.68  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.87  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 184.11  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.19

95% Median C.I. : 64.87 to 80.40  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.54 to 72.54  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.30 to 82.50

Printed:3/27/2011 5:44:08PM

**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	6	81.83	74.01	76.39	18.16	96.88	46.78	97.00	46.78 to 97.00	108,665	83,005
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	87.31	82.82	71.05	23.40	116.57	39.89	116.77	N/A	183,000	130,025
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	6	80.51	79.97	77.43	18.16	103.28	55.89	106.07	55.89 to 106.07	207,683	160,801
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	55.87	55.87	55.87	00.00	100.00	55.87	55.87	N/A	1,210,100	676,044
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	69.54	66.16	63.96	13.17	103.44	50.73	78.22	N/A	262,067	167,613
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	118.27	118.27	53.30	55.67	221.89	52.43	184.11	N/A	3,446,769	1,837,059
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	76.71	73.93	77.48	17.60	95.42	38.19	92.99	38.19 to 92.99	206,575	160,046
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	66.86	71.41	71.04	18.43	100.52	45.72	94.18	45.72 to 94.18	309,205	219,672
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	70.29	70.95	58.44	23.06	121.41	46.96	95.59	N/A	200,833	117,376
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	71.95	81.36	70.47	29.90	115.45	40.95	169.41	40.95 to 169.41	603,875	425,537
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	52.72	55.16	52.71	11.27	104.65	47.26	63.64	N/A	241,638	127,362
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	62.35	62.35	62.35	00.00	100.00	62.35	62.35	N/A	102,000	63,600
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	17	83.25	77.12	69.24	20.43	111.38	39.89	116.77	55.87 to 90.61	225,894	156,411
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	17	69.54	76.88	59.91	27.77	128.33	38.19	184.11	52.43 to 90.00	633,789	379,721
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	17	63.64	70.70	66.09	26.51	106.98	40.95	169.41	49.43 to 82.04	396,688	262,167
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	71.74	80.89	57.40	31.28	140.92	50.73	184.11	55.87 to 90.61	844,662	484,817
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	23	70.29	75.47	70.76	24.11	106.66	38.19	169.41	66.66 to 83.96	370,791	262,379
<u>ALL</u>	51	69.54	74.90	63.54	27.14	117.88	38.19	184.11	64.87 to 80.40	418,790	266,100

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	9	68.95	81.55	56.86	31.52	143.42	52.43	169.41	55.87 to 97.00	1,045,483	594,424
2	24	71.84	70.33	71.44	23.47	98.45	38.19	106.07	50.73 to 83.96	294,084	210,080
3	18	68.84	77.67	65.00	29.15	119.49	39.89	184.11	63.26 to 86.35	271,719	176,630
<u>ALL</u>	51	69.54	74.90	63.54	27.14	117.88	38.19	184.11	64.87 to 80.40	418,790	266,100

**07 Box Butte**

**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 : 51  
 Total Sales Price : 22,043,800  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,358,300  
 Total Assessed Value : 13,571,080  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 418,790  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 266,100

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 64  
 MEAN : 75  
 COD : 27.14  
 PRD : 117.88

COV : 36.96  
 STD : 27.68  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.87  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 184.11  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.19

95% Median C.I. : 64.87 to 80.40  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.54 to 72.54  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.30 to 82.50

Printed:3/27/2011 5:44:08PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	3	52.72	69.84	57.31	35.00	121.86	50.73	106.07	N/A	260,720	149,426
2	3	52.72	69.84	57.31	35.00	121.86	50.73	106.07	N/A	260,720	149,426
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	7	76.07	78.43	74.91	19.35	104.70	47.26	116.77	47.26 to 116.77	130,269	97,588
2	1	47.26	47.26	47.26	00.00	100.00	47.26	47.26	N/A	104,380	49,330
3	6	80.48	83.63	78.49	15.38	106.55	67.39	116.77	67.39 to 116.77	134,583	105,631
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	10	88.51	87.36	78.07	22.53	111.90	39.89	169.41	66.66 to 94.18	205,286	160,272
1	3	89.95	111.10	85.47	35.38	129.99	73.94	169.41	N/A	265,533	226,942
2	3	87.07	83.60	79.24	09.43	105.50	69.54	94.18	N/A	128,667	101,957
3	4	78.33	72.39	70.79	24.40	102.26	39.89	92.99	N/A	217,565	154,006
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>69.54</b>	<b>74.90</b>	<b>63.54</b>	<b>27.14</b>	<b>117.88</b>	<b>38.19</b>	<b>184.11</b>	<b>64.87 to 80.40</b>	<b>418,790</b>	<b>266,100</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	9	55.87	68.70	59.84	32.38	114.81	46.96	106.07	49.43 to 97.00	394,307	235,965
1	3	68.95	73.94	60.82	19.88	121.57	55.87	97.00	N/A	516,700	314,243
2	6	51.73	66.09	59.09	32.96	111.85	46.96	106.07	46.96 to 106.07	333,110	196,827
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	9	70.29	75.29	72.57	19.11	103.75	47.26	116.77	62.35 to 86.35	131,764	95,626
2	1	47.26	47.26	47.26	00.00	100.00	47.26	47.26	N/A	104,380	49,330
3	8	73.18	78.79	75.02	16.71	105.03	62.35	116.77	62.35 to 116.77	135,188	101,413
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	11	87.07	86.53	78.09	21.74	110.81	39.89	169.41	66.66 to 94.18	207,278	161,857
1	3	89.95	111.10	85.47	35.38	129.99	73.94	169.41	N/A	265,533	226,942
2	3	87.07	83.60	79.24	09.43	105.50	69.54	94.18	N/A	128,667	101,957
3	5	78.22	73.55	72.32	19.55	101.70	39.89	92.99	N/A	219,492	158,746
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>69.54</b>	<b>74.90</b>	<b>63.54</b>	<b>27.14</b>	<b>117.88</b>	<b>38.19</b>	<b>184.11</b>	<b>64.87 to 80.40</b>	<b>418,790</b>	<b>266,100</b>

**07 Box Butte**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 54  
 Total Sales Price : 22,398,368  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,712,868  
 Total Assessed Value : 13,842,066  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 402,090  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 256,335

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 64  
 MEAN : 75  
 COD : 25.86  
 PRD : 117.63

COV : 35.88  
 STD : 26.91  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.18  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 184.11  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.19

95% Median C.I. : 66.23 to 80.40  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.83 to 72.68  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.81 to 82.17

Printed:3/27/2011 5:44:10PM

**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	7	81.19	75.03	76.74	15.69	97.77	46.78	97.00	46.78 to 97.00	100,651	77,244
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	87.31	82.82	71.05	23.40	116.57	39.89	116.77	N/A	183,000	130,025
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	6	80.51	79.97	77.43	18.16	103.28	55.89	106.07	55.89 to 106.07	207,683	160,801
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	55.87	55.87	55.87	00.00	100.00	55.87	55.87	N/A	1,210,100	676,044
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	69.54	66.16	63.96	13.17	103.44	50.73	78.22	N/A	262,067	167,613
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	70.29	102.28	53.55	62.44	191.00	52.43	184.11	N/A	2,331,846	1,248,605
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	76.71	73.93	77.48	17.60	95.42	38.19	92.99	38.19 to 92.99	206,575	160,046
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	66.86	71.41	71.04	18.43	100.52	45.72	94.18	45.72 to 94.18	309,205	219,672
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	70.29	70.95	58.44	23.06	121.41	46.96	95.59	N/A	200,833	117,376
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	76.07	81.02	70.78	25.46	114.47	40.95	169.41	63.26 to 83.96	559,000	395,656
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	52.72	55.16	52.71	11.27	104.65	47.26	63.64	N/A	241,638	127,362
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	62.35	62.35	62.35	00.00	100.00	62.35	62.35	N/A	102,000	63,600
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	18	82.22	77.34	69.40	19.68	111.44	39.89	116.77	55.89 to 89.73	216,264	150,092
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	18	69.92	76.52	60.01	26.14	127.51	38.19	184.11	64.87 to 89.95	604,246	362,609
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	18	65.52	71.12	66.44	25.56	107.04	40.95	169.41	52.72 to 78.30	385,761	256,302
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	13	70.29	80.08	57.53	29.48	139.20	50.73	184.11	55.87 to 90.61	787,534	453,039
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	24	72.22	75.58	70.94	22.94	106.54	38.19	169.41	66.66 to 83.96	363,674	257,972
<u>ALL</u>	54	70.29	74.99	63.75	25.86	117.63	38.19	184.11	66.23 to 80.40	402,090	256,335

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	11	70.29	80.49	57.13	26.87	140.89	52.43	169.41	55.87 to 97.00	869,447	496,745
2	25	74.14	70.65	71.62	22.07	98.65	38.19	106.07	52.72 to 83.25	290,321	207,941
3	18	68.84	77.67	65.00	29.15	119.49	39.89	184.11	63.26 to 86.35	271,719	176,630
<u>ALL</u>	54	70.29	74.99	63.75	25.86	117.63	38.19	184.11	66.23 to 80.40	402,090	256,335

**07 Box Butte**  
**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 : 54	MEDIAN : 70	COV : 35.88	95% Median C.I. : 66.23 to 80.40
Total Sales Price : 22,398,368	WGT. MEAN : 64	STD : 26.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.83 to 72.68
Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,712,868	MEAN : 75	Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.18	95% Mean C.I. : 67.81 to 82.17
Total Assessed Value : 13,842,066			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 402,090	COD : 25.86	MAX Sales Ratio : 184.11	
Avg. Assessed Value : 256,335	PRD : 117.63	MIN Sales Ratio : 38.19	

Printed:3/27/2011 5:44:10PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	3	52.72	69.84	57.31	35.00	121.86	50.73	106.07	N/A	260,720	149,426
2	3	52.72	69.84	57.31	35.00	121.86	50.73	106.07	N/A	260,720	149,426
<b>Dry</b>											
County	9	78.30	78.72	75.78	15.35	103.88	47.26	116.77	67.39 to 86.35	129,383	98,045
1	1	81.19	81.19	81.19	00.00	100.00	81.19	81.19	N/A	52,568	42,680
2	2	62.78	62.78	67.66	24.72	92.79	47.26	78.30	N/A	152,190	102,970
3	6	80.48	83.63	78.49	15.38	106.55	67.39	116.77	67.39 to 116.77	134,583	105,631
<b>Grass</b>											
County	10	88.51	87.36	78.07	22.53	111.90	39.89	169.41	66.66 to 94.18	205,286	160,272
1	3	89.95	111.10	85.47	35.38	129.99	73.94	169.41	N/A	265,533	226,942
2	3	87.07	83.60	79.24	09.43	105.50	69.54	94.18	N/A	128,667	101,957
3	4	78.33	72.39	70.79	24.40	102.26	39.89	92.99	N/A	217,565	154,006
<b>ALL</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>70.29</b>	<b>74.99</b>	<b>63.75</b>	<b>25.86</b>	<b>117.63</b>	<b>38.19</b>	<b>184.11</b>	<b>66.23 to 80.40</b>	<b>402,090</b>	<b>256,335</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	9	55.87	68.70	59.84	32.38	114.81	46.96	106.07	49.43 to 97.00	394,307	235,965
1	3	68.95	73.94	60.82	19.88	121.57	55.87	97.00	N/A	516,700	314,243
2	6	51.73	66.09	59.09	32.96	111.85	46.96	106.07	46.96 to 106.07	333,110	196,827
<b>Dry</b>											
County	11	76.07	76.10	73.68	16.01	103.28	47.26	116.77	62.35 to 86.35	130,768	96,356
1	1	81.19	81.19	81.19	00.00	100.00	81.19	81.19	N/A	52,568	42,680
2	2	62.78	62.78	67.66	24.72	92.79	47.26	78.30	N/A	152,190	102,970
3	8	73.18	78.79	75.02	16.71	105.03	62.35	116.77	62.35 to 116.77	135,188	101,413
<b>Grass</b>											
County	12	82.65	85.18	77.75	22.70	109.56	39.89	169.41	69.54 to 92.99	198,505	154,344
1	4	81.95	100.90	83.74	35.12	120.49	70.29	169.41	N/A	224,650	188,131
2	3	87.07	83.60	79.24	09.43	105.50	69.54	94.18	N/A	128,667	101,957
3	5	78.22	73.55	72.32	19.55	101.70	39.89	92.99	N/A	219,492	158,746
<b>ALL</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>70.29</b>	<b>74.99</b>	<b>63.75</b>	<b>25.86</b>	<b>117.63</b>	<b>38.19</b>	<b>184.11</b>	<b>66.23 to 80.40</b>	<b>402,090</b>	<b>256,335</b>



## 2011 Correlation Section for Box Butte County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

There is a total of 1,078 square miles of land within Box Butte County, and agricultural land consists approximately of 47% grass, 28% dry land and about 23% irrigated. The remaining two percent is classified as waste and other. The County currently has three clearly defined agricultural market areas based on topography, soil type and availability of water. Counties contiguous to Box Butte are Dawes to the north, Sheridan to the east, Morrill to the south (with a small portion of Scotts Bluff on the southwest), and Sioux to the west. Of the neighboring counties, only Sheridan lacks defined agricultural market areas.

Sales verification and qualification within Box Butte County consists of a mailed questionnaire sent to both the buyer and seller of all sales transactions for all three property classes (excepting only those that current IAAO standards recommend for possible exclusion). The response rate is estimated at approximately one-half. Non-respondents are sent a second document and this appears to raise the response rate to about seventy-five percent. If no response occurs, the Assessor's policy is to automatically qualify these, with the note that if in the future, it is discovered that the sale is not truly arms-length, it then is disqualified. Copies of returned questionnaires are attached to the Assessor's copy of the Real Estate Transfer document (F521), and kept in notebooks by year.

Actions taken to address the agricultural land class for assessment year 2011 included the review of the sales data during the timeframe of the sales study and the implementation of land use and acre count changes discovered with the use of the County's GIS. Also, the Assessor adjusted any land class that was below acceptable range in all three agricultural market areas. For example, all irrigated land was raised in all three market areas. Two dry LCG's were raised in market area one, all dry LCG's were raised in area two, and three dry LCG's were raised in area three. Grass values remained the same in area one, three LCG grass values were raised in both agricultural market areas two and three. This produced a 51.90 percent change in irrigated value difference according to the current Form 45 Compared with the 2010 CTL. It should be noted that this dramatic increase can be explained by: first, the implementation of land use change and acre count via the County's GIS discovered approximately 530 new irrigated acres; second, the average assessed value for irrigated land in 2010 was \$689.59. Averaged assessed value for irrigated land in 2011 is \$1,045.45 (comparison of Schedule X of the Box Butte County abstract for both years).

The agricultural Base Stat profile reveals that for the three-year timeframe of the sales study, there were forty-seven sales deemed qualified by the Assessor. Of these, sixteen occurred during July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008, fourteen occurred during the second study year from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009. Seventeen sales occurred during the latest study year from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010. The Base Stat overall distribution of sales is within the minimum threshold of 10% variance of total sales per year as set in Department policy. However, agricultural market area three does not meet this threshold, with five sales in the first year, only three in the second and six in the third. Examination of the sample land use (for the whole County sample, rather than by market area) is roughly 59% grass, 14% dry and 25% irrigated. Comparison of the sample land use to the actual land percentages of the County reveals there is less than 10% difference in the sample irrigated, but grass is overrepresented

## 2011 Correlation Section for Box Butte County

---

by 12% and dry is underrepresented by 14%.

To arrive at the level of value and quality of assessment for agricultural land within Box Butte County, three statistical tests were utilized: the first test (named Base Stat) consists of the statistical profile using only the sales that occurred during the timeframe of the sales study within Box Butte County. Test two (named Random Include) consists of the County sales and a random inclusion of comparable sales (similar soils, use, topography) from contiguous counties to eliminate the time bias in agricultural market area three. There were twenty-three total comparable sales from all of the counties bordering Box Butte, and of these one was randomly drawn for the first year (7.01.07 to 6.30.08) and three were randomly drawn for the third year (7.01.09 to 6.30.10). This produced a total of fifty-one sales with 17 sales occurring each of the three years. Thus, the minimum threshold of 10% variance of total sales per year as set in Department policy was met overall and by market area.

Test three (named Random Exclude) consists of including all comparable sales and then randomly excluding these to obtain a proportionate sample and to eliminate time bias caused by more than 10% variance of total sales per year. The result was a total of fifty-four sales, with 18 in each of the three years.

A review of the statistical data from all three tests reveals medians of 70% (rounded), with coefficients of dispersion that would support these. All three tests indicate that the median measurements for all three agricultural market areas are within acceptable range. A review of Majority Land Use >95% appears to show that dry and grass values are above range. However, it should be noted that the grass sales are scattered within all three market areas (three in each), and the dry sales exist within market areas two and three (with one and six, respectively). With the MLU >95% scattered in the unique market areas, no non-binding recommendation will be made for any agricultural subclass.

Thus, all three tests reveal a median that is within acceptable range, and to a large extent support the level of value measurement of each other. It is my opinion, based on consideration of all the information available to me that the level of value of agricultural land in Box Butte County is 70%. Further, with knowledge of the County's assessment practices it is believed that agricultural land is being assessed uniformly and proportionately.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 Box Butte 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 : 8,098**

**Value : 756,540,822**

**Growth 5,164,416**

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

**Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	293	1,765,913	24	234,805	122	799,820	439	2,800,538	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	3,104	18,537,121	69	1,106,405	387	6,026,085	3,560	25,669,611	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	3,502	223,292,374	81	6,537,913	465	35,502,901	4,048	265,333,188	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	3,795	243,595,408	105	7,879,123	587	42,328,806	4,487	293,803,337	773,922
<b>% of Res Total</b>	84.58	82.91	2.34	2.68	13.08	14.41	55.41	38.84	14.99
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	146	2,308,712	6	507,455	27	234,326	179	3,050,493	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	491	8,649,547	20	642,163	31	684,498	542	9,976,208	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	515	59,790,377	22	8,853,249	84	9,325,788	621	77,969,414	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	661	70,748,636	28	10,002,867	111	10,244,612	800	90,996,115	3,433,855
<b>% of Com Total</b>	82.63	77.75	3.50	10.99	13.88	11.26	9.88	12.03	66.49
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	1	14,622	0	0	1	14,622	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	1	28,986	4	501,980	5	530,966	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	1	3,532,792	4	7,248,903	5	10,781,695	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	2	3,576,400	4	7,750,883	6	11,327,283	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	33.33	31.57	66.67	68.43	0.07	1.50	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1	8,506	1	8,506	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	1	15,275	0	0	0	0	1	15,275	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	1	600	0	0	0	0	1	600	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	1	15,875	0	0	1	8,506	2	24,381	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	50.00	65.11	0.00	0.00	50.00	34.89	0.02	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	3,796	243,611,283	105	7,879,123	588	42,337,312	4,489	293,827,718	773,922
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	84.56	82.91	2.34	2.68	13.10	14.41	55.43	38.84	14.99
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	661	70,748,636	30	13,579,267	115	17,995,495	806	102,323,398	3,433,855
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	82.01	69.14	3.72	13.27	14.27	17.59	9.95	13.53	66.49
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	4,457	314,359,919	135	21,458,390	703	60,332,807	5,295	396,151,116	4,207,777
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	84.17	79.35	2.55	5.42	13.28	15.23	65.39	52.36	81.48

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	4	79,458	528,533	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	4	79,458	528,533
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				4	79,458	528,533

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	381	27	111	519

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	2	19,741	54	7,012,917	2,104	215,305,614	2,160	222,338,272
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	49	8,938,644	551	80,999,907	600	89,938,551
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	51	5,331,830	592	42,781,053	643	48,112,883
30. Ag Total							2,803	360,389,706

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	2,775	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	43	51.00	340,775	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	39	42.00	4,259,245	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	2.00	800	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	44	149.41	320,126	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	48	0.00	1,072,585	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	4.00	0	0	359.42	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	48	51.71	97,754	49	52.71	100,529	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	460	480.01	3,456,356	503	531.01	3,797,131	
33. HomeSite Improvements	361	355.01	29,831,825	400	397.01	34,091,070	956,639
34. HomeSite Total				<b>449</b>	<b>583.72</b>	<b>37,988,730</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	66	127.08	123,602	68	129.08	124,402	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	503	2,380.63	4,231,648	547	2,530.04	4,551,774	
37. FarmSite Improvements	565	0.00	12,949,228	613	0.00	14,021,813	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>681</b>	<b>2,659.12</b>	<b>18,697,989</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,880.98	0	0	6,244.40	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,130</b>	<b>9,487.24</b>	<b>56,686,719</b>	<b>956,639</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	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	5,198.97	14.95%	6,193,178	18.87%	1,191.23
47. 2A1	75.00	0.22%	80,000	0.24%	1,066.67
48. 2A	5,818.78	16.73%	6,290,498	19.16%	1,081.07
49. 3A1	63.77	0.18%	55,480	0.17%	870.00
50. 3A	8,697.23	25.01%	7,546,434	22.99%	867.68
51. 4A1	10,652.66	30.63%	9,030,069	27.51%	847.68
52. 4A	4,273.49	12.29%	3,632,223	11.06%	849.94
53. Total	34,779.90	100.00%	32,827,882	100.00%	943.88
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	2,849.99	28.24%	997,506	36.10%	350.00
56. 2D1	2.00	0.02%	700	0.03%	350.00
57. 2D	3,030.30	30.03%	818,182	29.61%	270.00
58. 3D1	42.99	0.43%	9,673	0.35%	225.01
59. 3D	1,318.89	13.07%	296,752	10.74%	225.00
60. 4D1	2,089.76	20.71%	470,204	17.02%	225.00
61. 4D	756.63	7.50%	170,244	6.16%	225.00
62. Total	10,090.56	100.00%	2,763,261	100.00%	273.85
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	3,797.13	2.98%	1,028,215	3.54%	270.79
65. 2G1	61.81	0.05%	15,143	0.05%	244.99
66. 2G	7,341.99	5.76%	1,850,208	6.37%	252.00
67. 3G1	127.44	0.10%	28,550	0.10%	224.03
68. 3G	16,533.64	12.98%	3,711,736	12.79%	224.50
69. 4G1	59,594.59	46.78%	13,412,453	46.20%	225.06
70. 4G	39,923.30	31.34%	8,984,935	30.95%	225.05
71. Total	127,379.90	100.00%	29,031,240	100.00%	227.91
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	34,779.90	19.89%	32,827,882	50.60%	943.88
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	10,090.56	5.77%	2,763,261	4.26%	273.85
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	127,379.90	72.85%	29,031,240	44.74%	227.91
72. Waste	1,614.56	0.92%	48,439	0.07%	30.00
73. Other	996.25	0.57%	212,213	0.33%	213.01
74. Exempt	5,419.85	3.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	174,861.17	100.00%	64,883,035	100.00%	371.05

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	54,950.76	54.94%	64,583,835	59.31%	1,175.30
47. 2A1	4,142.88	4.14%	4,427,358	4.07%	1,068.67
48. 2A	25,082.77	25.08%	26,635,742	24.46%	1,061.91
49. 3A1	85.85	0.09%	74,690	0.07%	870.01
50. 3A	4,465.61	4.46%	3,821,878	3.51%	855.85
51. 4A1	9,382.57	9.38%	7,757,197	7.12%	826.77
52. 4A	1,914.07	1.91%	1,595,395	1.47%	833.51
53. Total	100,024.51	100.00%	108,896,095	100.00%	1,088.69
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	48,797.27	51.63%	19,518,908	58.05%	400.00
56. 2D1	3,297.68	3.49%	1,154,221	3.43%	350.01
57. 2D	26,165.37	27.68%	9,158,106	27.24%	350.01
58. 3D1	128.23	0.14%	30,135	0.09%	235.01
59. 3D	2,600.07	2.75%	611,019	1.82%	235.00
60. 4D1	12,346.10	13.06%	2,901,351	8.63%	235.00
61. 4D	1,183.52	1.25%	248,541	0.74%	210.00
62. Total	94,518.24	100.00%	33,622,281	100.00%	355.72
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	12,559.81	14.72%	3,727,919	18.15%	296.81
65. 2G1	459.64	0.54%	120,923	0.59%	263.08
66. 2G	19,115.18	22.40%	4,792,556	23.34%	250.72
67. 3G1	128.40	0.15%	32,101	0.16%	250.01
68. 3G	8,274.35	9.69%	1,857,203	9.04%	224.45
69. 4G1	29,510.47	34.58%	6,568,581	31.98%	222.58
70. 4G	15,301.23	17.93%	3,438,060	16.74%	224.69
71. Total	85,349.08	100.00%	20,537,343	100.00%	240.63
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	100,024.51	34.85%	108,896,095	66.35%	1,088.69
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	94,518.24	32.93%	33,622,281	20.49%	355.72
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	85,349.08	29.74%	20,537,343	12.51%	240.63
72. Waste	1,596.82	0.56%	47,732	0.03%	29.89
73. Other	5,505.09	1.92%	1,025,486	0.62%	186.28
74. Exempt	372.88	0.13%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	286,993.74	100.00%	164,128,937	100.00%	571.89

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	9,682.47	63.12%	10,008,827	65.66%	1,033.71
47. 2A1	26.56	0.17%	29,216	0.19%	1,100.00
48. 2A	4,209.94	27.44%	4,307,498	28.26%	1,023.17
49. 3A1	4.00	0.03%	2,600	0.02%	650.00
50. 3A	431.02	2.81%	270,670	1.78%	627.98
51. 4A1	916.54	5.97%	580,488	3.81%	633.35
52. 4A	69.56	0.45%	44,979	0.30%	646.62
53. Total	15,340.09	100.00%	15,244,278	100.00%	993.75
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	50,272.95	60.76%	23,627,910	67.27%	469.99
56. 2D1	222.67	0.27%	91,295	0.26%	410.00
57. 2D	21,053.15	25.44%	8,631,814	24.57%	410.00
58. 3D1	121.60	0.15%	30,403	0.09%	250.02
59. 3D	3,431.79	4.15%	857,980	2.44%	250.01
60. 4D1	7,022.34	8.49%	1,755,645	5.00%	250.01
61. 4D	621.63	0.75%	130,544	0.37%	210.00
62. Total	82,746.13	100.00%	35,125,591	100.00%	424.50
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	11,077.46	11.69%	3,726,123	15.67%	336.37
65. 2G1	125.22	0.13%	41,660	0.18%	332.69
66. 2G	16,617.63	17.53%	4,955,078	20.84%	298.18
67. 3G1	118.35	0.12%	32,732	0.14%	276.57
68. 3G	9,322.83	9.83%	2,092,124	8.80%	224.41
69. 4G1	21,523.80	22.71%	4,827,165	20.30%	224.27
70. 4G	36,008.57	37.99%	8,098,867	34.07%	224.91
71. Total	94,793.86	100.00%	23,773,749	100.00%	250.79
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	15,340.09	7.78%	15,244,278	20.41%	993.75
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	82,746.13	41.98%	35,125,591	47.03%	424.50
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	94,793.86	48.09%	23,773,749	31.83%	250.79
72. Waste	1,291.85	0.66%	40,007	0.05%	30.97
73. Other	2,958.49	1.50%	507,390	0.68%	171.50
74. Exempt	267.87	0.14%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	197,130.42	100.00%	74,691,015	100.00%	378.89

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	11,921.96	13,012,504	138,222.54	143,955,751	150,144.50	156,968,255
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	39.50	14,743	4,851.28	1,741,663	182,464.15	69,754,727	187,354.93	71,511,133
<b>78. Grass</b>	19.85	4,716	2,186.98	508,923	305,316.01	72,828,693	307,522.84	73,342,332
<b>79. Waste</b>	9.40	282	129.61	3,888	4,364.22	132,008	4,503.23	136,178
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	118.05	20,107	9,341.78	1,724,982	9,459.83	1,745,089
<b>81. Exempt</b>	5.88	0	803.77	0	5,250.95	0	6,060.60	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>68.75</b>	<b>19,741</b>	<b>19,207.88</b>	<b>15,287,085</b>	<b>639,708.70</b>	<b>288,396,161</b>	<b>658,985.33</b>	<b>303,702,987</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	150,144.50	22.78%	156,968,255	51.68%	1,045.45
<b>Dry Land</b>	187,354.93	28.43%	71,511,133	23.55%	381.69
<b>Grass</b>	307,522.84	46.67%	73,342,332	24.15%	238.49
<b>Waste</b>	4,503.23	0.68%	136,178	0.04%	30.24
<b>Other</b>	9,459.83	1.44%	1,745,089	0.57%	184.47
<b>Exempt</b>	6,060.60	0.92%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>658,985.33</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>303,702,987</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>460.86</b>

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

### 07 Box Butte

	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	292,675,333	293,803,337	1,128,004	0.39%	773,922	0.12%
02. Recreational	24,793	24,381	-412	-1.66%	0	-1.66%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	37,889,457	37,988,730	99,273	0.26%	956,639	-2.26%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>330,589,583</b>	<b>331,816,448</b>	<b>1,226,865</b>	<b>0.37%</b>	<b>1,730,561</b>	<b>-0.15%</b>
05. Commercial	84,424,535	90,996,115	6,571,580	7.78%	3,433,855	3.72%
06. Industrial	11,327,283	11,327,283	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	17,923,929	18,697,989	774,060	4.32%	0	4.32%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>113,675,747</b>	<b>121,021,387</b>	<b>7,345,640</b>	<b>6.46%</b>	<b>3,433,855</b>	<b>3.44%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>444,265,330</b>	<b>452,837,835</b>	<b>8,572,505</b>	<b>1.93%</b>	<b>5,164,416</b>	<b>0.77%</b>
11. Irrigated	103,333,181	156,968,255	53,635,074	51.90%		
12. Dryland	63,749,167	71,511,133	7,761,966	12.18%		
13. Grassland	68,484,658	73,342,332	4,857,674	7.09%		
14. Wasteland	148,326	136,178	-12,148	-8.19%		
15. Other Agland	1,010,115	1,745,089	734,974	72.76%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>236,725,447</b>	<b>303,702,987</b>	<b>66,977,540</b>	<b>28.29%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>680,990,777</b>	<b>756,540,822</b>	<b>75,550,045</b>	<b>11.09%</b>	<b>5,164,416</b>	<b>10.34%</b>

**2010  
BOX BUTTE COUNTY  
THREE YEAR PLAN  
OF ASSESSMENT**

Requirement

The assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263 Section 9, on or before June 15 each year. The assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 each year. A copy of the plan and any amendments made shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

General Description of Real Property in Box Butte County

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

	Parcels	% of Total	% of Taxable Value
Residential	4,477	55	42.87
Commercial	806	10	12.53
Industrial	6	<1	1.66
Recreational	2	<1	0
Agricultural	2,800	35	42.94
	-----	-----	-----
Totals	8,091	100	100

Current Resources

- Staff \*
  - Assessor with current certification and hours of continuing education
  - Deputy with current certification and hours of continuing education
  - Two full-time clerical employees
  - Hired appraiser from Stanard Appraisal
    - Our lister is employed by Stanard Appraisal
      - Part-time, local
- Budget
  - Our fiscal year is July 1-June 30 each year
    - The adopted budget for 2009-2010 yr is \$203,340
      - \$65,000 is budgeted for reappraisal
      - \$2,000 is budgeted for pick up work
    - Amended: adopted budget for 2010-2011 is \$209,380
      - \$65,000 budgeted for reappraisal\*
      - \$2,000 budgeted for pick up work

- Equipment
  - Leased CAMA program with Terra Scan
  - Deed plotter (1998 version) software program
  - Microsoft Windows Server 2003
  - Internet access with local provider
  - Four workstations
  - Cadastral books maintained monthly with real estate transfers
  - GIS contracted with GIS Workshop, Inc.

#### Current Assessment Procedures

- Update ownership by receipt of real estate transfers from register of deeds office
- Maintain sales file with monthly qualified sales
  - Conduct sales study
- Receive building permits monthly from the City's Building and Zoning office
  - Review properties as "pick-up" work annually
- Zoning is county wide, however the county does not enforce building permits for rural improvements
  - Our pick-up work for rural is currently by discovery
- Data collection is constant
  - Application for value change from discovery is applied annually between January 1 and March 19 each year
- Approaches to value are used in accordance with IAAO mass appraisal techniques
  - **Income approach** is applied to Alliance commercial properties (due to cycle of reappraisal)
    - Collected income and expense data
    - Analyzed data with market depreciation
  - **Cost approach** is used for all parcels
    - Marshall & Swift pricing system is used
    - Market depreciation applied
  - **Market approach** is used on all properties in regard to market depreciation
- Agricultural land sales are studied and valuations adjusted accordingly in their respective market areas
  - Agricultural land has four market areas
- Change of value notices are sent pursuant state statute 77-1315
- Levels of value are published in local newspapers and delivered to local radio station pursuant state statute 77-1315

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for 2010 Assessment

	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	97%	14.87	105.10
Commercial	95%	20.64	112.13
Agricultural land	72%	27.49	132.11

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011

- Residential
  - Alliance
    - May need to implement new cost index to keep up with current trends
    - Continue reviewing residential properties for the next phase of reappraisal
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly if needed
  - Hemingford
    - Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly if needed
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
  - Rural Residential
    - **Enforce use of Improvement Information Statement in lieu of a building permit**
    - Study sales and adjust values accordingly
  
- Commercial
  - Alliance
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust values accordingly
  - Hemingford
    - Study sales and adjust values accordingly
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
  - Rural
    - **Enforce use of Improvement Information Statement in lieu of a building permit**
    - Study sales and adjust values accordingly

- Agricultural land
  - Study sales and make adjustments if necessary
  - Continue working on GIS making sure land use is correct

#### Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012

- Residential
  - Alliance
    - Anticipating being able to finish Alliance review to be in compliance with the six year review mandated by the state
    - Study sales and adjust subclasses accordingly
  - Hemingford
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust accordingly
  - Rural Residential
    - Inspect properties through Improvement Information Statement and through discovery
    - Study sales and make adjustments if necessary
- Commercial
  - Alliance
    - Anticipate moving on for final phase of six year review mandated by the state
  - Hemingford, and Rural
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust values accordingly
- Agricultural land
  - Study sales and make adjustments if necessary

#### Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013

- Residential
  - Alliance
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary
  - Hemingford
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary

- Rural Residential
  - Inspect properties according to Improvement Information Statement and through discovery
  - Study sales and adjust if necessary
- Commercial
  - Hemingford
    - Inspect properties according to building permits and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary
  - Alliance
    - Anticipate completion of review process to be in compliance with the state's mandated six year review
  - Rural
    - Inspect properties according to Improvement Information Statement and through discovery
    - Study sales and adjust if necessary
- Agricultural land
  - Study sales and make adjustments if necessary

\*Due to budget restraints, Alliance reappraisal may or may not get complete by 2013, the end of the county 6 year review cycle.

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Box Butte County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	One
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	None
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	Two
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	None
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	None
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$422,330 (was to include re-appraisal of Alliance residential)
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$209,380
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$ 67,000
9.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	N/A
10.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	N/A; does not come from the Assessor's budget.
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$ 10,000
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	None
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	None

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Terra Scan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Deputy Assessor
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes

6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Deputy Assessor
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>
	Alliance and Hemingford
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2001

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal—commercial pick-up
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None



# 2011 Certification for Box Butte 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 Box Butte County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



