

# 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 Cedar County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	155	Median	96.20
Total Sales Price	\$8,690,752	Mean	95.49
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$8,740,752	Wgt. Mean	90.15
Total Assessed Value	\$7,879,820	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$54,467
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$56,392	Avg. Assessed Value	\$50,838

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.80 to 99.05
95% Mean C.I	86.27 to 94.03
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.68 to 100.30
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	14.23
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.74
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.43

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	185	97	97
2009	212	94	94
2008	239	93	93
2007	256	93	93

## 2011 Commission Summary for Cedar County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	23	Median	94.86
Total Sales Price	\$2,904,450	Mean	93.27
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,604,450	Wgt. Mean	71.86
Total Assessed Value	\$1,871,540	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$60,006
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$113,237	Avg. Assessed Value	\$81,371

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	86.12 to 101.54
95% Mean C.I	80.21 to 106.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	24.68 to 119.04
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.05
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.62
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.91

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	29	97	97
2009	41	96	96
2008	51	96	96
2007	47	95	95



## 2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Cedar 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>	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	95	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	73	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 Cedar County**

To develop a sales review notebook to be used as a guide to develop the depreciation table for the CAMA. Cedar County will continue implementing new costing, reviewing and developing a depreciation table for all residential properties. The city of Hartington has been completed, and we are working on Laurel, and possibly Coleridge for the 2011 year. A drive by review and new photos will be taken to establish that the physical characteristics of the property are currently reflected on the property record card.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Cedar County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and 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>
	1	Hartington
	5	Laurel
	10	Randolph
	15	Coleridge
	20	Beldin, Fordyce, Magnet, Obert, St. Helena and Wynot
	30	Rural, Bud Becker Sub, Bow Valley
	40	Brooky Bottom Recreational
	50	West River Recreational
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Sales comparison and cost approach	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	Doing as completing reviews of towns, Hartington in 2010 and Laurel in 2011	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	Sales comparison	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	12/2008	
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>	
	Developed own	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes, economic differences	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	In the process of completing with the completion of the residential review	
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>	
	Considered if square footage or major physical changes were done after the date of sale.	
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>	

	Follow the statutes and regulations as provided by the Department.
--	--

**14 Cedar  
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 : 155  
 Total Sales Price : 8,690,752  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,740,752  
 Total Assessed Value : 7,879,820  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,392  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 50,838

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 90  
 MEAN : 95  
 COD : 20.05  
 PRD : 105.92

COV : 32.00  
 STD : 30.56  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.29  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 231.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 10.71

95% Median C.I. : 93.80 to 99.05  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.27 to 94.03  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.68 to 100.30

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:37PM

**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-08 To 30-SEP-08	29	88.26	85.40	86.51	18.77	98.72	32.82	109.33	78.78 to 100.24	66,521	57,544
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	18	96.26	95.64	90.59	17.73	105.57	10.71	154.73	93.80 to 105.80	45,931	41,608
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	99.41	99.26	103.01	04.48	96.36	90.77	107.65	N/A	74,200	76,436
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	30	97.46	100.56	91.61	21.20	109.77	33.00	231.50	93.75 to 102.22	42,040	38,514
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	22	94.73	90.35	89.57	18.46	100.87	51.61	132.85	74.73 to 100.10	68,930	61,739
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	14	98.88	103.48	85.18	27.96	121.48	53.63	218.70	69.60 to 116.57	59,036	50,287
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	12	99.03	98.74	96.98	15.58	101.81	63.96	135.63	87.83 to 109.84	56,988	55,269
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	25	93.74	98.75	90.43	24.54	109.20	47.62	213.74	82.43 to 105.98	53,036	47,960
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	82	96.59	94.04	90.14	18.25	104.33	10.71	231.50	94.02 to 99.34	53,513	48,235
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	73	96.03	97.12	90.16	22.01	107.72	47.62	218.70	91.57 to 100.00	59,626	53,760
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	71	96.55	97.88	90.56	20.79	108.08	33.00	231.50	93.75 to 99.78	55,988	50,703
<u>ALL</u>	155	96.20	95.49	90.15	20.05	105.92	10.71	231.50	93.80 to 99.05	56,392	50,838

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	30	99.55	99.66	98.76	03.48	100.91	82.43	118.77	99.03 to 100.24	82,050	81,033
05	27	95.54	96.12	93.56	07.73	102.74	74.12	126.82	92.29 to 100.06	51,774	48,439
10	27	93.07	106.00	88.50	29.95	119.77	56.58	231.50	84.05 to 109.10	55,915	49,484
15	20	98.46	101.11	86.32	22.31	117.13	52.43	165.00	82.33 to 108.19	34,210	29,532
20	19	93.45	81.24	76.94	19.98	105.59	10.71	106.04	63.96 to 98.71	30,913	23,784
30	21	96.03	98.40	90.37	30.43	108.89	40.00	213.74	76.66 to 111.24	79,957	72,256
40	8	60.58	70.46	59.65	52.48	118.12	32.82	125.00	32.82 to 125.00	44,500	26,545
50	3	51.73	52.78	50.22	11.39	105.10	44.47	62.13	N/A	21,667	10,882
<u>ALL</u>	155	96.20	95.49	90.15	20.05	105.92	10.71	231.50	93.80 to 99.05	56,392	50,838

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	147	96.63	96.85	91.45	18.78	105.90	10.71	231.50	94.32 to 99.28	57,039	52,160
06	8	60.58	70.46	59.65	52.48	118.12	32.82	125.00	32.82 to 125.00	44,500	26,545
07											
<u>ALL</u>	155	96.20	95.49	90.15	20.05	105.92	10.71	231.50	93.80 to 99.05	56,392	50,838

**14 Cedar  
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 : 155  
 Total Sales Price : 8,690,752  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 8,740,752  
 Total Assessed Value : 7,879,820  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,392  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 50,838

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 90  
 MEAN : 95  
 COD : 20.05  
 PRD : 105.92

COV : 32.00  
 STD : 30.56  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.29  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 231.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 10.71

95% Median C.I. : 93.80 to 99.05  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.27 to 94.03  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.68 to 100.30

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:37PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	7	102.22	113.15	103.67	27.49	109.14	51.61	231.50	51.61 to 231.50	2,836	2,940	
5000 TO 9999	7	109.33	97.67	99.87	36.66	97.80	10.71	165.00	10.71 to 165.00	6,529	6,520	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	14	103.66	105.41	101.02	33.38	104.35	10.71	231.50	51.61 to 135.63	4,682	4,730	
10000 TO 29999	43	98.61	106.28	105.03	20.06	101.19	47.62	218.70	95.42 to 106.04	16,974	17,828	
30000 TO 59999	32	98.61	96.15	96.95	20.12	99.17	33.00	213.74	84.05 to 103.63	46,708	45,281	
60000 TO 99999	38	93.20	88.42	88.51	13.89	99.90	32.82	118.77	86.19 to 96.86	73,672	65,205	
100000 TO 149999	17	95.27	85.90	85.98	14.52	99.91	52.43	101.75	64.77 to 100.24	120,329	103,458	
150000 TO 249999	9	87.12	84.69	86.02	16.38	98.45	56.58	107.65	59.76 to 100.26	172,833	148,677	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	155	96.20	95.49	90.15	20.05	105.92	10.71	231.50	93.80 to 99.05	56,392	50,838	



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Cedar County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

The residential statistical sample for Cedar County includes 155 qualified sales. The sample is considered reliable for the measurement of the county. The relationship between the median and mean are all within the acceptable level of 92-100 percent. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are slightly outside the acceptable level and is the result of a few outlier sales.

The sales verification is primarily handled by the personal knowledge of the assessor and staff. If there is a concern in the validity of a sale, the county will contact persons involved in the transaction including the realtor, buyer or seller.

The assessor reported that a review of the residential properties has been completed during the recent year for town of Laurel. New photos were taken and comparison of the current information on the property record card was reviewed.

Based on the consideration of all the available information, the level of value is determined to be 96% of market value for the residential class of real property, and all subclasses with sufficient sales are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar County**

Review sales activity and update any necessary areas if needed.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Cedar County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and 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>
	1	Hartington
	5	Laurel
	10	Randolph
	15	Coleridge
	20	Beldin, Fordyce, Magnet, Obert, St. Helena and Wynot
	30	Rural, Bud Becker Sub., Bow Valley
	40	Brooky Bottom Recreational
	50 West	West River Rec
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Sales and cost	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	Unknown	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Sales comparison	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Unknown	
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>	
	Use own tables	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
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>	
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>	
	Considered if square footage or major physical changes were done after the date of sale.	
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>	

	Follow the statutes and regulations as provided by the Department.
--	--

**14 Cedar**  
**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 : 23  
Total Sales Price : 2,904,450  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,604,450  
Total Assessed Value : 1,871,540  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 113,237  
Avg. Assessed Value : 81,371

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 72  
MEAN : 93  
COD : 21.55  
PRD : 129.79

COV : 32.37  
STD : 30.19  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.44  
MAX Sales Ratio : 160.22  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.39

95% Median C.I. : 86.12 to 101.54  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 24.68 to 119.04  
95% Mean C.I. : 80.21 to 106.33

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:39PM

**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>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	92.00	92.00	86.96	06.35	105.80	86.16	97.83	N/A	145,000	126,095
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	97.70	91.95	74.22	14.82	123.89	47.65	115.68	N/A	29,070	21,577
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	94.86	97.81	95.93	03.18	101.96	94.76	103.81	N/A	56,750	54,438
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	92.92	92.92	92.92	00.00	100.00	92.92	92.92	N/A	34,900	32,430
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	66.94	66.94	79.99	29.74	83.69	47.03	86.84	N/A	120,800	96,623
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	73.02	73.02	73.02	00.00	100.00	73.02	73.02	N/A	45,000	32,860
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	107.66	107.66	107.66	00.00	100.00	107.66	107.66	N/A	25,000	26,915
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	74.83	66.21	26.15	35.20	253.19	22.39	101.40	N/A	357,283	93,433
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	109.14	109.14	119.60	21.09	91.25	86.12	132.16	N/A	68,750	82,228
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	152.64	152.64	145.39	04.97	104.99	145.05	160.22	N/A	202,000	293,683
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	78.41	78.41	78.41	00.00	100.00	78.41	78.41	N/A	39,000	30,580
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	11	97.18	93.64	86.78	09.37	107.91	47.65	115.68	86.16 to 103.81	58,227	50,529
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	79.93	78.64	81.20	23.28	96.85	47.03	107.66	N/A	77,900	63,255
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	8	93.76	100.07	64.31	36.95	155.61	22.39	160.22	22.39 to 160.22	206,544	132,838
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	6	93.84	86.70	87.07	11.84	99.58	47.03	103.81	47.03 to 103.81	74,458	64,832
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	86.12	85.37	39.44	28.37	216.46	22.39	132.16	22.39 to 132.16	182,764	72,076
<u>ALL</u>	23	94.86	93.27	71.86	21.55	129.79	22.39	160.22	86.12 to 101.54	113,237	81,371

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	95.38	96.22	117.95	21.63	81.58	47.03	145.05	47.03 to 145.05	119,417	140,850
05	5	97.18	97.24	105.65	14.55	92.04	73.02	132.16	N/A	47,500	50,184
10	3	78.41	104.49	83.10	36.30	125.74	74.83	160.22	N/A	36,617	30,428
15	3	101.54	88.29	60.08	22.34	146.95	47.65	115.68	N/A	30,117	18,093
20	4	98.13	98.71	96.23	03.97	102.58	94.76	103.81	N/A	45,063	43,364
30	2	54.28	54.28	35.94	58.75	151.03	22.39	86.16	N/A	635,000	228,250
<u>ALL</u>	23	94.86	93.27	71.86	21.55	129.79	22.39	160.22	86.12 to 101.54	113,237	81,371

**14 Cedar  
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 : 23  
 Total Sales Price : 2,904,450  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,604,450  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,871,540  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 113,237  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 81,371

MEDIAN : 95  
 WGT. MEAN : 72  
 MEAN : 93  
 COD : 21.55  
 PRD : 129.79

COV : 32.37  
 STD : 30.19  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.44  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 160.22  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 22.39

95% Median C.I. : 86.12 to 101.54  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 24.68 to 119.04  
 95% Mean C.I. : 80.21 to 106.33

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:39PM

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	23	94.86	93.27	71.86	21.55	129.79	22.39	160.22	86.12 to 101.54	113,237	81,371
04											
<u>ALL</u>	23	94.86	93.27	71.86	21.55	129.79	22.39	160.22	86.12 to 101.54	113,237	81,371

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$</u>											
1 TO 4999	1	115.68	115.68	115.68	00.00	100.00	115.68	115.68	N/A	1,850	2,140
5000 TO 9999	1	160.22	160.22	160.22	00.00	100.00	160.22	160.22	N/A	9,000	14,420
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	2	137.95	137.95	152.63	16.14	90.38	115.68	160.22	N/A	5,425	8,280
10000 TO 29999	6	101.47	101.57	101.67	02.73	99.90	97.18	107.66	97.18 to 107.66	19,917	20,250
30000 TO 59999	6	82.27	79.20	77.65	15.86	102.00	47.03	97.70	47.03 to 97.70	38,000	29,507
60000 TO 99999	4	84.80	78.03	78.67	19.80	99.19	47.65	94.86	N/A	70,275	55,289
100000 TO 149999	1	132.16	132.16	132.16	00.00	100.00	132.16	132.16	N/A	100,000	132,160
150000 TO 249999	1	86.84	86.84	86.84	00.00	100.00	86.84	86.84	N/A	200,000	173,680
250000 TO 499999	2	115.61	115.61	121.14	25.47	95.44	86.16	145.05	N/A	332,500	402,785
500000 +	1	22.39	22.39	22.39	00.00	100.00	22.39	22.39	N/A	1,000,000	223,875
<u>ALL</u>	23	94.86	93.27	71.86	21.55	129.79	22.39	160.22	86.12 to 101.54	113,237	81,371

**14 Cedar**  
**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 : 23  
Total Sales Price : 2,904,450  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,604,450  
Total Assessed Value : 1,871,540  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 113,237  
Avg. Assessed Value : 81,371

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 72  
MEAN : 93  
COD : 21.55  
PRD : 129.79

COV : 32.37  
STD : 30.19  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.44  
MAX Sales Ratio : 160.22  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.39

95% Median C.I. : 86.12 to 101.54  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 24.68 to 119.04  
95% Mean C.I. : 80.21 to 106.33

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:39PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	2	109.14	109.14	119.60	21.09	91.25	86.12	132.16	N/A	68,750	82,228
300	2	94.35	94.35	74.71	22.61	126.29	73.02	115.68	N/A	23,425	17,500
318	1	92.92	92.92	92.92	00.00	100.00	92.92	92.92	N/A	34,900	32,430
326	1	78.41	78.41	78.41	00.00	100.00	78.41	78.41	N/A	39,000	30,580
340	1	160.22	160.22	160.22	00.00	100.00	160.22	160.22	N/A	9,000	14,420
344	2	94.81	94.81	94.82	00.05	99.99	94.76	94.86	N/A	74,625	70,758
350	2	86.50	86.50	86.45	00.39	100.06	86.16	86.84	N/A	235,000	203,153
353	2	97.51	97.51	97.47	00.34	100.04	97.18	97.83	N/A	22,500	21,930
381	1	101.54	101.54	101.54	00.00	100.00	101.54	101.54	N/A	18,500	18,785
384	1	97.70	97.70	97.70	00.00	100.00	97.70	97.70	N/A	30,000	29,310
389	1	47.65	47.65	47.65	00.00	100.00	47.65	47.65	N/A	70,000	33,355
408	1	103.81	103.81	103.81	00.00	100.00	103.81	103.81	N/A	21,000	21,800
424	1	145.05	145.05	145.05	00.00	100.00	145.05	145.05	N/A	395,000	572,945
442	3	101.40	94.63	86.05	10.79	109.97	74.83	107.66	N/A	32,283	27,780
446	1	47.03	47.03	47.03	00.00	100.00	47.03	47.03	N/A	41,600	19,565
528	1	22.39	22.39	22.39	00.00	100.00	22.39	22.39	N/A	1,000,000	223,875
<u>ALL</u>	23	94.86	93.27	71.86	21.55	129.79	22.39	160.22	86.12 to 101.54	113,237	81,371



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Cedar County**

---

**A. Commerical Real Property**

The commercial statistical sample for Cedar County includes 23 qualified sales. Of this sample the median and mean measures are within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion is near the acceptable level and the price related differential is outside the acceptable ranges.

The sales verification is primarily handled by the personal knowledge of the assessor and staff. If there is a concern in the validity of a sale, the county will contact persons involved in the transaction including the realtor, buyer or seller.

The county reported that there was minimal change commercial class.

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar County**

Complete a market analysis and review the market boundaries. Continue to implement the GIS system. The office is currently about 50% complete with the land use layer; parcel ID layer has been completed. We will have to do the soils layer after land use has been done.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Cedar County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and 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	The northern portion of the county, consisting of smaller fields and hilly parcels
	2	The southern portion of the county and has more irrigation potential and larger crop fields
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Complete a market analysis and review the market boundaries	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
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>	
	Yes	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	Land capability groupings, land use, location	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
9.	<b>Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
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>	
	Consider if land use is drastically converted to a different use, example, grass to dry, dry to irrigated	
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the</b>	

	<b>agricultural class of property.</b>
	Follow the statutes and regulations as provided by the Department

**14 Cedar**  
**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 : 59  
Total Sales Price : 21,002,279  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,874,279  
Total Assessed Value : 14,202,225  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 353,801  
Avg. Assessed Value : 240,716

MEDIAN : 71  
WGT. MEAN : 68  
MEAN : 72  
COD : 19.53  
PRD : 105.13

COV : 23.96  
STD : 17.14  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.85  
MAX Sales Ratio : 110.31  
MIN Sales Ratio : 42.24

95% Median C.I. : 62.15 to 77.45  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.95 to 72.12  
95% Mean C.I. : 67.16 to 75.90

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:42PM

**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	3	90.75	92.63	90.90	10.06	101.90	79.88	107.26	N/A	238,333	216,642
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	82.45	78.66	76.98	14.69	102.18	54.76	94.97	N/A	268,315	206,556
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	79.56	88.90	79.14	13.51	112.33	77.45	109.69	N/A	398,490	315,363
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	4	98.42	91.70	97.75	14.13	93.81	59.64	110.31	N/A	196,742	192,310
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	6	71.47	72.23	69.57	09.23	103.82	57.00	90.31	57.00 to 90.31	445,579	309,983
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	57.16	60.93	55.12	21.33	110.54	45.44	78.10	45.44 to 78.10	433,813	239,112
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	60.60	64.91	67.35	15.81	96.38	51.20	91.44	53.69 to 76.45	334,053	224,984
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	70.68	69.75	70.76	16.62	98.57	42.24	89.64	42.24 to 89.64	227,265	160,802
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	70.35	76.06	68.12	15.58	111.66	58.81	99.00	N/A	241,130	164,266
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	64.59	65.48	64.07	16.52	102.20	51.39	84.12	51.39 to 84.12	622,126	398,594
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	56.58	56.58	56.58	00.00	100.00	56.58	56.58	N/A	136,000	76,950
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	50.98	50.98	53.97	07.77	94.46	47.02	54.94	N/A	382,750	206,583
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	14	88.66	87.57	84.64	15.60	103.46	54.76	110.31	77.45 to 107.26	269,336	227,963
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	30	68.87	66.57	64.93	16.19	102.53	42.24	91.44	58.17 to 72.04	354,718	230,305
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	15	64.59	66.48	63.47	18.45	104.74	47.02	99.00	54.38 to 77.62	430,802	273,440
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	20	73.09	74.67	68.23	20.18	109.44	45.44	110.31	59.64 to 79.56	384,630	262,451
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	29	68.75	68.14	66.59	16.47	102.33	42.24	99.00	58.81 to 73.61	361,790	240,929
<u>ALL</u>	59	70.92	71.53	68.04	19.53	105.13	42.24	110.31	62.15 to 77.45	353,801	240,716

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	45	70.92	72.22	66.62	21.77	108.41	42.24	110.31	59.64 to 78.10	243,274	162,076
2	14	71.35	69.32	69.60	12.28	99.60	51.20	91.44	54.94 to 78.34	709,067	493,485
<u>ALL</u>	59	70.92	71.53	68.04	19.53	105.13	42.24	110.31	62.15 to 77.45	353,801	240,716

**14 Cedar**  
**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 : 59  
 Total Sales Price : 21,002,279  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,874,279  
 Total Assessed Value : 14,202,225  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 353,801  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 240,716

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 68  
 MEAN : 72  
 COD : 19.53  
 PRD : 105.13

COV : 23.96  
 STD : 17.14  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.85  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 110.31  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.24

95% Median C.I. : 62.15 to 77.45  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.95 to 72.12  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.16 to 75.90

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:42PM

**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>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	18	71.18	71.88	68.60	15.89	104.78	51.39	100.91	58.17 to 78.10	362,590	248,726
1	13	71.44	72.62	67.52	16.35	107.55	51.39	100.91	57.16 to 84.12	286,267	193,276
2	5	70.68	69.94	70.03	14.45	99.87	54.94	91.44	N/A	561,028	392,896
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	10	63.47	69.03	71.19	26.39	96.97	42.24	110.31	53.69 to 89.64	121,113	86,224
1	10	63.47	69.03	71.19	26.39	96.97	42.24	110.31	53.69 to 89.64	121,113	86,224
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>70.92</b>	<b>71.53</b>	<b>68.04</b>	<b>19.53</b>	<b>105.13</b>	<b>42.24</b>	<b>110.31</b>	<b>62.15 to 77.45</b>	<b>353,801</b>	<b>240,716</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	7	76.45	72.44	66.60	15.81	108.77	45.44	95.93	45.44 to 95.93	441,386	293,966
1	5	76.45	72.00	61.51	19.63	117.05	45.44	95.93	N/A	352,810	217,005
2	2	73.55	73.55	73.38	06.53	100.23	68.75	78.34	N/A	662,826	486,368
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	28	71.73	73.26	70.40	16.09	104.06	51.39	107.26	62.15 to 77.62	358,719	252,548
1	20	71.18	73.89	69.16	18.40	106.84	51.39	107.26	59.64 to 84.12	265,211	183,424
2	8	72.82	71.67	71.79	10.30	99.83	54.94	91.44	54.94 to 91.44	592,490	425,358
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	11	70.35	70.97	73.12	24.22	97.06	42.24	110.31	53.69 to 90.31	122,466	89,551
1	11	70.35	70.97	73.12	24.22	97.06	42.24	110.31	53.69 to 90.31	122,466	89,551
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>70.92</b>	<b>71.53</b>	<b>68.04</b>	<b>19.53</b>	<b>105.13</b>	<b>42.24</b>	<b>110.31</b>	<b>62.15 to 77.45</b>	<b>353,801</b>	<b>240,716</b>

**14 Cedar**  
**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 : 76  
 Total Sales Price : 25,662,329  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 25,497,779  
 Total Assessed Value : 18,187,804  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 335,497  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 239,313

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 71  
 MEAN : 76  
 COD : 21.70  
 PRD : 106.93

COV : 26.80  
 STD : 20.44  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.89  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 151.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.24

95% Median C.I. : 69.39 to 79.56  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.36 to 75.31  
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.67 to 80.87

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:45PM

**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-07 To 30-SEP-07	3	90.75	92.63	90.90	10.06	101.90	79.88	107.26	N/A	238,333	216,642
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	7	90.61	85.74	83.54	11.08	102.63	54.76	97.61	54.76 to 97.61	235,180	196,471
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	7	79.56	85.94	82.87	13.54	103.70	71.21	109.69	71.21 to 109.69	369,879	306,529
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	7	95.93	97.56	88.00	20.63	110.86	59.64	151.53	59.64 to 151.53	302,138	265,876
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	6	71.47	72.23	69.57	09.23	103.82	57.00	90.31	57.00 to 90.31	445,579	309,983
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	57.16	60.93	55.12	21.33	110.54	45.44	78.10	45.44 to 78.10	433,813	239,112
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	60.60	64.91	67.35	15.81	96.38	51.20	91.44	53.69 to 76.45	334,053	224,984
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	70.68	69.75	70.76	16.62	98.57	42.24	89.64	42.24 to 89.64	227,265	160,802
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	70.35	76.06	68.12	15.58	111.66	58.81	99.00	N/A	241,130	164,266
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	68.53	75.22	66.32	28.00	113.42	51.39	124.20	53.78 to 113.65	480,428	318,606
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	74.60	74.60	81.06	24.16	92.03	56.58	92.62	N/A	212,000	171,843
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	69.39	70.97	66.00	23.50	107.53	47.02	100.75	N/A	271,384	179,106
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	24	90.68	90.11	85.37	15.71	105.55	54.76	151.53	78.34 to 97.61	294,391	251,336
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	30	68.87	66.57	64.93	16.19	102.53	42.24	91.44	58.17 to 72.04	354,718	230,305
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	22	69.87	74.39	67.34	23.76	110.47	47.02	124.20	56.01 to 84.12	354,130	238,482
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	27	74.63	79.42	72.41	21.59	109.68	45.44	151.53	70.92 to 90.31	385,714	279,278
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	32	68.76	70.93	67.48	20.07	105.11	42.24	124.20	58.81 to 76.45	341,916	230,714
<u>ALL</u>	76	73.22	76.27	71.33	21.70	106.93	42.24	151.53	69.39 to 79.56	335,497	239,313

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	57	72.47	77.14	71.27	24.66	108.24	42.24	151.53	68.77 to 86.56	235,787	168,035
2	19	73.61	73.65	71.40	13.45	103.15	51.20	113.65	64.59 to 79.56	634,629	453,147
<u>ALL</u>	76	73.22	76.27	71.33	21.70	106.93	42.24	151.53	69.39 to 79.56	335,497	239,313

**14 Cedar**  
**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 : 76  
 Total Sales Price : 25,662,329  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 25,497,779  
 Total Assessed Value : 18,187,804  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 335,497  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 239,313

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 71  
 MEAN : 76  
 COD : 21.70  
 PRD : 106.93

COV : 26.80  
 STD : 20.44  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.89  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 151.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.24

95% Median C.I. : 69.39 to 79.56  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.36 to 75.31  
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.67 to 80.87

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:45PM

**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>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	23	73.61	77.39	71.89	19.40	107.65	51.39	113.65	68.96 to 91.44	321,897	231,401
1	16	75.05	77.12	70.47	18.76	109.44	51.39	100.91	58.17 to 97.35	259,281	182,722
2	7	73.61	78.02	73.69	20.02	105.88	54.94	113.65	54.94 to 113.65	465,020	342,666
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	11	69.39	69.06	70.92	21.95	97.38	42.24	110.31	53.69 to 89.64	129,957	92,162
1	11	69.39	69.06	70.92	21.95	97.38	42.24	110.31	53.69 to 89.64	129,957	92,162
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>73.22</b>	<b>76.27</b>	<b>71.33</b>	<b>21.70</b>	<b>106.93</b>	<b>42.24</b>	<b>151.53</b>	<b>69.39 to 79.56</b>	<b>335,497</b>	<b>239,313</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	10	75.54	73.94	69.69	13.04	106.10	45.44	95.93	58.81 to 84.86	477,070	332,458
1	5	76.45	72.00	61.51	19.63	117.05	45.44	95.93	N/A	352,810	217,005
2	5	74.63	75.88	74.49	05.79	101.87	68.75	84.86	N/A	601,330	447,911
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	36	75.80	79.22	73.81	19.76	107.33	51.39	124.20	70.68 to 90.75	320,543	236,584
1	26	77.86	80.08	73.70	20.91	108.66	51.39	124.20	68.77 to 92.62	244,217	179,999
2	10	73.88	76.97	73.93	14.77	104.11	54.94	113.65	59.05 to 91.44	518,992	383,705
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	12	69.87	70.84	72.60	22.47	97.58	42.24	110.31	54.38 to 89.64	130,461	94,717
1	12	69.87	70.84	72.60	22.47	97.58	42.24	110.31	54.38 to 89.64	130,461	94,717
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>73.22</b>	<b>76.27</b>	<b>71.33</b>	<b>21.70</b>	<b>106.93</b>	<b>42.24</b>	<b>151.53</b>	<b>69.39 to 79.56</b>	<b>335,497</b>	<b>239,313</b>

**14 Cedar**  
**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 : 79  
 Total Sales Price : 26,590,273  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,425,723  
 Total Assessed Value : 19,388,561  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 334,503  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 245,425

MEDIAN : 74  
 WGT. MEAN : 73  
 MEAN : 77  
 COD : 23.69  
 PRD : 105.51

COV : 28.63  
 STD : 22.16  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.44  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 151.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.23

95% Median C.I. : 70.35 to 79.88  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 69.18 to 77.56  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.52 to 82.30

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:47PM

**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	4	99.01	100.55	95.53	15.39	105.25	79.88	124.32	N/A	207,500	198,223
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	7	93.13	89.93	89.77	14.88	100.18	54.76	124.12	54.76 to 124.12	260,323	233,694
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	7	84.86	90.99	91.39	16.10	99.56	71.21	110.02	71.21 to 110.02	449,942	411,191
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	7	95.93	97.52	87.87	20.66	110.98	59.64	151.53	59.64 to 151.53	302,138	265,497
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	6	71.47	72.23	69.57	09.23	103.82	57.00	90.31	57.00 to 90.31	445,579	309,983
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	57.16	60.93	55.12	21.33	110.54	45.44	78.10	45.44 to 78.10	433,813	239,112
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	60.60	64.91	67.35	15.81	96.38	51.20	91.44	53.69 to 76.45	334,053	224,984
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	71.36	72.59	71.67	18.23	101.28	42.24	92.53	42.24 to 92.53	207,607	148,798
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	70.35	76.06	68.12	15.58	111.66	58.81	99.00	N/A	241,130	164,266
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	68.53	75.22	66.32	28.00	113.42	51.39	124.20	53.78 to 113.65	480,428	318,606
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	74.60	74.60	81.06	24.16	92.03	56.58	92.62	N/A	212,000	171,843
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	62.17	65.51	65.86	30.21	99.47	38.23	100.75	38.23 to 100.75	227,237	149,669
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	25	93.13	94.05	90.51	17.33	103.91	54.76	151.53	79.88 to 104.15	316,673	286,622
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	31	68.96	67.41	65.11	16.75	103.53	42.24	92.53	58.17 to 73.61	345,534	224,965
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	23	69.39	72.82	67.32	24.85	108.17	38.23	124.20	56.01 to 83.38	339,015	228,221
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	27	77.45	80.72	75.36	22.38	107.11	45.44	151.53	70.92 to 91.78	406,471	306,315
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	33	68.77	71.59	67.64	20.50	105.84	42.24	124.20	59.05 to 76.45	333,676	225,685
<u>ALL</u>	79	73.61	77.41	73.37	23.69	105.51	38.23	151.53	70.35 to 79.88	334,503	245,425

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	57	72.47	77.66	71.47	25.38	108.66	42.24	151.53	68.77 to 86.56	235,278	168,147
2	22	73.88	76.79	75.33	20.21	101.94	38.23	124.12	64.59 to 84.86	591,586	445,646
<u>ALL</u>	79	73.61	77.41	73.37	23.69	105.51	38.23	151.53	70.35 to 79.88	334,503	245,425

**14 Cedar**  
**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 : 79  
 Total Sales Price : 26,590,273  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,425,723  
 Total Assessed Value : 19,388,561  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 334,503  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 245,425

MEDIAN : 74  
 WGT. MEAN : 73  
 MEAN : 77  
 COD : 23.69  
 PRD : 105.51

COV : 28.63  
 STD : 22.16  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.44  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 151.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.23

95% Median C.I. : 70.35 to 79.88  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 69.18 to 77.56  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.52 to 82.30

Printed:3/28/2011 5:36:47PM

**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>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	23	73.61	78.57	72.21	21.00	108.81	51.39	124.32	68.96 to 91.44	320,636	231,522
1	16	75.05	78.81	71.04	21.01	110.94	51.39	124.32	58.17 to 99.00	257,468	182,897
2	7	73.61	78.02	73.69	20.02	105.88	54.94	113.65	54.94 to 113.65	465,020	342,666
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	12	62.99	66.50	70.77	26.27	93.97	38.23	110.31	53.69 to 86.56	119,669	84,689
1	11	69.39	69.06	70.92	21.95	97.38	42.24	110.31	53.69 to 89.64	129,957	92,162
2	1	38.23	38.23	38.23	00.00	100.00	38.23	38.23	N/A	6,500	2,485
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>73.61</b>	<b>77.41</b>	<b>73.37</b>	<b>23.69</b>	<b>105.51</b>	<b>38.23</b>	<b>151.53</b>	<b>70.35 to 79.88</b>	<b>334,503</b>	<b>245,425</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	10	77.40	77.46	76.05	16.86	101.85	45.44	110.02	58.81 to 95.93	533,115	405,456
1	5	76.45	72.00	61.51	19.63	117.05	45.44	95.93	N/A	352,810	217,005
2	5	78.34	82.91	83.25	13.67	99.59	68.75	110.02	N/A	713,419	593,907
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	37	77.45	81.16	75.37	21.39	107.68	51.39	124.32	70.92 to 90.75	319,745	241,000
1	26	77.86	81.12	74.09	22.23	109.49	51.39	124.32	68.77 to 92.62	243,102	180,106
2	11	74.15	81.26	76.85	19.50	105.74	54.94	124.12	59.05 to 113.65	500,902	384,930
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	13	69.39	68.33	72.46	24.34	94.30	38.23	110.31	53.69 to 89.64	120,925	87,622
1	12	69.87	70.84	72.60	22.47	97.58	42.24	110.31	54.38 to 89.64	130,461	94,717
2	1	38.23	38.23	38.23	00.00	100.00	38.23	38.23	N/A	6,500	2,485
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>73.61</b>	<b>77.41</b>	<b>73.37</b>	<b>23.69</b>	<b>105.51</b>	<b>38.23</b>	<b>151.53</b>	<b>70.35 to 79.88</b>	<b>334,503</b>	<b>245,425</b>



## 2011 Correlation Section for Cedar County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Cedar County is divided into two market areas. Area 1 is the north portion of the county. The land use in area one consists of approximately 17% irrigated, 52% dry land, 30% grass and 1% classified as other. This area is bordered on the north by the Missouri River. The second market area is classified with 37% irrigated, 57% dry land, 5% grass and the remaining 1% as other. The surrounding counties are comparable in topography and have similar soil classifications.

The analyses of the base statistics reveal that the county is out of proportion in the distribution of time. The dry land use in area 2 is overrepresented in the sales. The remainder of the land use in the county meets the minimum threshold difference between the sales file and the base of the county.

The base statistic was expanded to include comparable sales from common market areas adjoining Cedar County to proportionately represent the time frame and land use. All thresholds were met when expanding the sample. In the random inclusion 17 sales were added to the sample and 20 were added to the random exclusion to achieve the thresholds.

Cedar County analyzed the sales within the county and determined increases ranging from 10 to 15 % necessary for irrigated ground in both market areas and 8 to 18% increase to dry land. Grass was also increased in both areas.

Based on the analysis of all available information, the level of value of the agricultural land in Burt County has been determined to be 73%.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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 Cedar 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.



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 7,993</b>	<b>Value : 1,250,215,452</b>	<b>Growth 8,035,450</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	308	1,224,800	0	0	73	396,835	381	1,621,635	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,065	13,984,765	0	0	524	8,057,695	2,589	22,042,460	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,078	108,333,400	0	0	578	41,666,237	2,656	149,999,637	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,386	123,542,965	0	0	651	50,120,767	3,037	173,663,732	2,091,040
<b>% of Res Total</b>	78.56	71.14	0.00	0.00	21.44	28.86	38.00	13.89	26.02
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	65	218,300	0	0	19	136,405	84	354,705	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	441	1,668,765	0	0	84	1,580,895	525	3,249,660	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	452	22,165,215	0	0	94	10,305,880	546	32,471,095	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	517	24,052,280	0	0	113	12,023,180	630	36,075,460	1,418,235
<b>% of Com Total</b>	82.06	66.67	0.00	0.00	17.94	33.33	7.88	2.89	17.65
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	2	13,700	2	13,700	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	3	59,155	3	59,155	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	3	1,955,180	3	1,955,180	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	5	2,028,035	5	2,028,035	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.06	0.16	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	36	500,740	36	500,740	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	84	1,228,755	84	1,228,755	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	194	2,550,975	194	2,550,975	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	230	4,280,470	230	4,280,470	149,045
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	2.88	0.34	1.85
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,386	123,542,965	0	0	881	54,401,237	3,267	177,944,202	2,240,085
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	73.03	69.43	0.00	0.00	26.97	30.57	40.87	14.23	27.88
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	517	24,052,280	0	0	118	14,051,215	635	38,103,495	1,418,235
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	81.42	63.12	0.00	0.00	18.58	36.88	7.94	3.05	17.65
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,903	147,595,245	0	0	999	68,452,452	3,902	216,047,697	3,658,320
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	74.40	68.32	0.00	0.00	25.60	31.68	48.82	17.28	45.53

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	244	0	110	354

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	2,426	482,498,675	2,426	482,498,675
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	1,952	448,293,125	1,952	448,293,125
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,665	103,375,955	1,665	103,375,955
30. Ag Total							4,091	1,034,167,755

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,067	1,081.12	14,595,120	1,067	1,081.12	14,595,120	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,055	0.00	68,107,285	1,055	0.00	68,107,285	1,571,715
34. HomeSite Total				<b>1,055</b>	<b>1,081.12</b>	<b>82,702,405</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	81	200.54	299,790	81	200.54	299,790	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,719	8,927.74	12,102,320	1,719	8,927.74	12,102,320	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,575	0.00	35,268,670	1,575	0.00	35,268,670	2,805,415
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,656</b>	<b>9,128.28</b>	<b>47,670,780</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	8,965.43	0	0	8,965.43	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>2,711</b>	<b>19,174.83</b>	<b>130,373,185</b>	<b>4,377,130</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	4	379.60	148,450	4	379.60	148,450

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	5,378.84	9.29%	16,351,675	10.49%	3,040.00
46. 1A	7,248.06	12.51%	22,029,035	14.14%	3,039.30
47. 2A1	5,790.00	10.00%	17,362,015	11.14%	2,998.62
48. 2A	5,584.39	9.64%	16,719,995	10.73%	2,994.06
49. 3A1	8,753.33	15.11%	23,141,065	14.85%	2,643.69
50. 3A	7,173.45	12.38%	18,827,995	12.08%	2,624.68
51. 4A1	15,472.63	26.71%	35,587,055	22.84%	2,300.00
52. 4A	2,527.72	4.36%	5,813,750	3.73%	2,300.00
53. Total	57,928.42	100.00%	155,832,585	100.00%	2,690.09
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	10,206.82	6.46%	22,446,220	7.23%	2,199.14
55. 1D	22,802.04	14.44%	50,131,425	16.15%	2,198.55
56. 2D1	10,168.63	6.44%	22,112,875	7.12%	2,174.62
57. 2D	14,754.81	9.34%	32,025,535	10.32%	2,170.51
58. 3D1	22,451.64	14.21%	47,886,675	15.43%	2,132.88
59. 3D	19,841.86	12.56%	42,086,610	13.56%	2,121.10
60. 4D1	47,894.85	30.32%	77,775,555	25.05%	1,623.88
61. 4D	9,827.02	6.22%	15,965,945	5.14%	1,624.70
62. Total	157,947.67	100.00%	310,430,840	100.00%	1,965.40
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	1,310.33	1.43%	1,286,715	1.70%	981.98
64. 1G	6,810.20	7.43%	7,529,170	9.93%	1,105.57
65. 2G1	2,766.85	3.02%	2,532,310	3.34%	915.23
66. 2G	6,129.60	6.69%	6,260,675	8.26%	1,021.38
67. 3G1	6,472.99	7.06%	5,816,910	7.67%	898.64
68. 3G	6,671.49	7.28%	6,302,515	8.31%	944.69
69. 4G1	28,001.41	30.56%	22,781,400	30.05%	813.58
70. 4G	33,469.81	36.53%	23,306,495	30.74%	696.34
71. Total	91,632.68	100.00%	75,816,190	100.00%	827.39
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	57,928.42	18.58%	155,832,585	28.66%	2,690.09
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	157,947.67	50.67%	310,430,840	57.10%	1,965.40
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	91,632.68	29.40%	75,816,190	13.95%	827.39
72. Waste	4,192.05	1.34%	1,598,265	0.29%	381.26
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	1.65	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	311,700.82	100.00%	543,677,880	100.00%	1,744.23

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,508.69	3.05%	5,203,855	3.36%	3,449.25
46. 1A	6,208.92	12.55%	21,413,350	13.81%	3,448.80
47. 2A1	4,574.49	9.25%	15,209,800	9.81%	3,324.92
48. 2A	1,091.27	2.21%	3,628,030	2.34%	3,324.59
49. 3A1	8,306.01	16.79%	27,140,435	17.50%	3,267.57
50. 3A	14,443.82	29.20%	47,145,285	30.40%	3,264.05
51. 4A1	13,104.26	26.49%	34,726,325	22.39%	2,650.00
52. 4A	230.40	0.47%	610,560	0.39%	2,650.00
53. Total	49,467.86	100.00%	155,077,640	100.00%	3,134.92
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	1,763.09	2.45%	5,375,825	2.70%	3,049.09
55. 1D	9,303.50	12.92%	28,362,935	14.25%	3,048.63
56. 2D1	8,021.28	11.14%	23,661,720	11.89%	2,949.87
57. 2D	2,711.16	3.77%	7,997,490	4.02%	2,949.84
58. 3D1	13,681.65	19.00%	39,234,820	19.72%	2,867.70
59. 3D	19,815.06	27.52%	56,784,360	28.54%	2,865.72
60. 4D1	16,445.52	22.84%	37,002,550	18.59%	2,250.01
61. 4D	254.76	0.35%	573,215	0.29%	2,250.02
62. Total	71,996.02	100.00%	198,992,915	100.00%	2,763.94
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	73.87	1.24%	75,805	1.33%	1,026.19
64. 1G	639.96	10.77%	732,415	12.89%	1,144.47
65. 2G1	953.74	16.05%	976,050	17.18%	1,023.39
66. 2G	572.15	9.63%	600,755	10.57%	1,050.00
67. 3G1	649.30	10.92%	604,100	10.63%	930.39
68. 3G	1,182.06	19.89%	1,109,745	19.53%	938.82
69. 4G1	1,505.92	25.33%	1,273,610	22.41%	845.74
70. 4G	367.08	6.18%	310,180	5.46%	844.99
71. Total	5,944.08	100.00%	5,682,660	100.00%	956.02
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	49,467.86	38.53%	155,077,640	43.06%	3,134.92
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	71,996.02	56.08%	198,992,915	55.26%	2,763.94
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	5,944.08	4.63%	5,682,660	1.58%	956.02
72. Waste	976.17	0.76%	367,525	0.10%	376.50
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	128,384.13	100.00%	360,120,740	100.00%	2,805.03

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	0.00	0	107,396.28	310,910,225	107,396.28	310,910,225
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	229,943.69	509,423,755	229,943.69	509,423,755
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	97,576.76	81,498,850	97,576.76	81,498,850
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,168.22	1,965,790	5,168.22	1,965,790
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	1.65	0	1.65	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>440,084.95</b>	<b>903,798,620</b>	<b>440,084.95</b>	<b>903,798,620</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	107,396.28	24.40%	310,910,225	34.40%	2,894.98
<b>Dry Land</b>	229,943.69	52.25%	509,423,755	56.36%	2,215.43
<b>Grass</b>	97,576.76	22.17%	81,498,850	9.02%	835.23
<b>Waste</b>	5,168.22	1.17%	1,965,790	0.22%	380.36
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	1.65	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>440,084.95</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>903,798,620</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,053.69</b>

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

### 14 Cedar

	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	170,727,185	173,663,732	2,936,547	1.72%	2,091,040	0.50%
02. Recreational	4,220,045	4,280,470	60,425	1.43%	149,045	-2.10%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	80,953,935	82,702,405	1,748,470	2.16%	1,571,715	0.22%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>255,901,165</b>	<b>260,646,607</b>	<b>4,745,442</b>	<b>1.85%</b>	<b>3,811,800</b>	<b>0.36%</b>
05. Commercial	34,425,530	36,075,460	1,649,930	4.79%	1,418,235	0.67%
06. Industrial	2,020,135	2,028,035	7,900	0.39%	0	0.39%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	44,680,575	47,670,780	2,990,205	6.69%	2,805,415	0.41%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>81,126,240</b>	<b>85,774,275</b>	<b>4,648,035</b>	<b>5.73%</b>	<b>4,223,650</b>	<b>0.52%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>337,027,405</b>	<b>346,420,882</b>	<b>9,393,477</b>	<b>2.79%</b>	<b>8,035,450</b>	<b>0.40%</b>
11. Irrigated	271,281,440	310,910,225	39,628,785	14.61%		
12. Dryland	453,842,735	509,423,755	55,581,020	12.25%		
13. Grassland	69,538,645	81,498,850	11,960,205	17.20%		
14. Wasteland	1,707,285	1,965,790	258,505	15.14%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>796,370,105</b>	<b>903,798,620</b>	<b>107,428,515</b>	<b>13.49%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,133,397,510</b>	<b>1,250,215,452</b>	<b>116,817,942</b>	<b>10.31%</b>	<b>8,035,450</b>	<b>9.60%</b>

**2010 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
FOR  
CEDAR COUNTY  
By Don Hoelsing, Assessor**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2009).

General Description of Real Property in Cedar County: Per the 2010 County Abstract, Cedar County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	3020	37.81%	15.13%
Commercial	632	7.91%	3.06%
Recreational	234	2.93%	.36%
Agricultural	4097	51.35%	81.45%

Game & Parks                      4                                      .05%                                      .01%

Agricultural land - taxable acres 442,427.94

Other pertinent facts: 79.99% of Cedar County value comes from agricultural parcels. 22.87% of the agricultural acres are in irrigated farming, 53.50% is dry land and 23.63% is in grasslands and wastelands. The county consists of 3 smaller cities and 8 villages. The commercial properties are typical for small city and villages. They consist of the banks, grocery stores, mini marts, bars. The smaller villages have fewer operating commercial properties.

New Property: For assessment year 2010, an estimated 175 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2010 Reports & Opinion, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training

1 Assessor, 1 Deputy Assessor, 3 full time clerks and one part time employee responsible for the measuring and listing of the “pickup work” for the year.

The total budget for Cedar County for 2010/2011 is \$209,500. Included in the total is \$19,500 dedicated to the GIS Workshop, MIPS/CAMA is part of the county general budget. There is no specific amount designated for appraisal work due to the fact that all appraisal work is done in house. \$2,000 is for continuing education.

The assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years. The assessor has met all the educational hours required. The assessor also attends other workshops and meetings to further his knowledge of the assessment field.

B. Cadastral Maps

The Cedar County cadastral maps are up-dated on a continual basis once the proper information is filed and delivered to the county assessor. The assessment staff maintains the maps. All new subdivisions and parcel splits are kept up to date, as well as ownership transfers.

C. Property Record Cards

The property record cards in Cedar County are in reasonable shape. County Assessment Office is not on-line at this time.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

The provider for our CAMA and assessment administration is provided by MIPS. Currently, Cedar County is implementing the GIS Workshop system.

E. Web based – property record information access

Property record cards are not available online.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property.

Step 1-Building permits are gathered from the zoning administrator for the rural properties and all cities and villages forward permits to the county assessor. They are separated into separate categories (rural, towns, etc), and put into a three ring binder, a plan of action is developed based on the number and location of each permit.

Step 2-A complete review of the readily accessible areas of the improvement is conducted. Measurements and photos are taken; and physical characteristics are noted at the time of inspection.

Step 3-Inspection data is entered into the CAMA system, using Marshall and Swift cost tables; and market data; a value is generated for each property inspected.

Step 4-The value generated for each property is compared to similar properties in the area, for equalization purposes.

Step 5-When all permit information is noted on the file, the new value generated will be applied for the current assessment year.

B. Data Collection.

All arm's length transactions are analyzed and sorted into valuation groupings. The current preliminary statistical information will be reviewed. A market and depreciation study will reveal where the greatest area of concern will be for the next assessment cycle. Currently, based on the information, the city of Hartington has been repriced and a new depreciation study developed to achieve uniform and proportionate valuation. The towns of Randolph and Laurel will be next for this same process.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.

As part of market analysis and data collection, all market areas are reviewed on a yearly basis.

1) Approaches to Value;

All three approaches are considered when determining market values. The extent each approach is used depends upon the property type and market data available. The cost approach is most heavily relied upon in the initial evaluation process for residential and commercial. All arm's length sales are gathered, and analyzed to develop a market generated depreciation table. The market approach is used to support the value generated by the cost approach. Commercial

properties are valued in a manner similar to residential properties. The income approach is used as a check when comparing agricultural properties. Limited or no data is available for the residential or commercial class of properties to utilize the income approach.

Market Approach; sales comparisons, see above.

- 2) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study,

New costing manuals and software, dated 2008 for residential and 2009 for commercial have been purchased to begin implementing for the 2010 assessment year.

- 3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market,

See above

- 4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land

All arm's length sales are gathered and analyzed to determine if the current market areas are reflective of what the sales information has provided.

Special value generation: Currently Cedar County does not have any special value.

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2010:**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	97	19.28	102.25
Commercial	97	65.61	163.10
Agricultural Land	71	21.61	105.19

\*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.  
For more information regarding statistical measures see 2010 Reports & Opinions.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:**

- Residential:
- 1. Continue using the new costing 2008 software.
  - 2. Develop assessment ratios for all valuation groupings
  - 3. Develop a sales review notebook with all current sales pictures to utilize in developing models and depreciation spread sheet.

4. The city of Hartington has been completed.
5. The towns of Randolph and Laurel will be analyzed and completed, with the remainder of the residential properties to follow as time allows.

Commercial: Analysis will be completed based on the preliminary statistics to determine if there is any action necessary

Agricultural Land: This will be the 2nd year that the GIS Workshop will be utilized to inventory the land classification groupings. Market analysis will be completed to determine if the current market area boundaries are sufficient.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:**

Residential: The same process will follow as for 2011 with the remainder of the city and village parcels within the determined valuation groupings.

Commercial: Analysis will be completed based on the preliminary statistics to determine if there is any action necessary.

Agricultural Land: This will be the 3rd year that the GIS Workshop will be utilized to inventory the land classification groupings. Market analysis will be completed to determine if the current market area boundaries are sufficient.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:**

Residential: The intent is to have all the recosted information and depreciation analysis completed for the residential class.

Commercial: Analysis will be completed based on the preliminary statistics to determine if there is any action necessary.

Agricultural Land: This will be the 4th year that the GIS Workshop will be utilized to inventory the land classification groupings. Market analysis will be completed to determine if the current market area boundaries are sufficient.

**Conclusion:**

The new and revised three year plan for 2011 has been submitted to the Cedar County Board of Equalization and will be submitted to the Property Tax Administrator on or before October 31, 2010.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Cedar County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	Assessor is a Certified General Appraiser
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	3
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$209,500
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$209,500
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$0
9.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	\$0
10.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$4,000
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$2,000
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	\$19,500 for 2 <sup>nd</sup> payment for GIS (included in budget)
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	\$6,007.00

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	County Solutions
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Just in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> year of implementing GIS

6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Staff
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS

### 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>
	Beldin, Bow Valley, Coleridge, Fordyce, Hartington, Laurel, Magnet, Obert, Randolph, St. Helena and Wynot
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2002

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	None
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None



## 2011 Certification for Cedar 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 Cedar County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



