

# 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 Clay County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	90	Median	97.84
Total Sales Price	\$6,408,651	Mean	109.35
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,412,651	Wgt. Mean	97.14
Total Assessed Value	\$6,229,265	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$49,567
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$71,252	Avg. Assessed Value	\$69,214

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.81 to 98.82
95% Mean C.I	93.73 to 100.55
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	101.16 to 117.54
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	15.73
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.65
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.70

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	103	98	98
2009	152	98	98
2008	194	97	97
2007	195	96	96

## 2011 Commission Summary for Clay County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	15	Median	99.93
Total Sales Price	\$641,807	Mean	104.23
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$633,807	Wgt. Mean	110.84
Total Assessed Value	\$702,495	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$96,972
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$42,254	Avg. Assessed Value	\$46,833

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.02 to 113.00
95% Mean C.I	91.65 to 116.81
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.81 to 132.86
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	6.45
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.11
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.02

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	19	98	98
2009	27	97	97
2008	28	94	94
2007	43	99	99



## 2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Clay County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within this Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>98</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>73</b>	The qualitative measures calculated in the random include sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## **2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Clay County**

The Clay County staff physically reviewed the towns of Sutton and Deweese. The staff's physical review consisted of visiting each property with a copy of the record card, physically inspecting all property from the outside and taking pictures of each improvement. Updates of the condition were made to all improvements, measurements of additions were made and deletions noted according to the on-site review. Owners were interviewed at the time of the review, if possible. If the owner was not available, the Clay County staff left a questionnaire with the changes to the property assessment and noted if any additional information was needed from the owner. The number of urban parcels physically reviewed was 675.

As each town was reviewed, new property cards were made for each parcel. All information pertinent to the property was updated. A sketch of the house was put in the parcel folder along with a photo page if the property consisted of the house with outbuildings. The picture of the house was printed on the parcel card. Lots values were priced by square foot vs. front foot as determined by the Assessor. The six year rotation review has been completed and with that all residential cards are new with all updated materials. New cards should not have to be made for at least ten years.

The Clay County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending a questionnaire to the buyer and seller. If there was no response, a follow-up call was made to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A spreadsheet analysis of all sales with the study period was completed. The Clay County Assessor and staff did all permit and pickup work. All was completed in a timely manner.

### **STAFF CHANGES:**

Clay County hired a new deputy as of December 2010. A full time replacement has not been hired as they have tried to accomplish their goals with knowledgeable part time staff. The county is under a budget crunch and the assessor has tried to help the situation out by using part time help when they can.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Clay 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	Clay Center –town, county seat, no school, on highway, no economic growth
	2	Deweese – off the highway, no school, limited businesses
	3	Edgar – off the highway, no school, large candle business & some economic activity
	4	Fairfield – off highway, no school, limited economic activity
	5	Glenvil – off highway, no school, limited economic activity, bedroom community close to Hastings
	6	Harvard – increasing population, school, north of highway
	7	Harvard Courts – unique former barracks north of Harvard
	8	NAD B-1, B-2 (industrial only) Along highway former federal ground
	9	NAD Glenvil majority a/com/res; NAD Lynn majority ag; NAD Inland is comm. And ag/res former federal land
	10	Ong: very small, no school, coop
	11	Saronville has post office, very small off highway, no school
	12	Sutton largest town, school, on highway, some economic growth
	13	Trumbull north, school combined with Doniphan, bedroom community for Grand Island and Hastings, coop, new homes
	14	Rural Res all parcels outside of towns 25 acres or less unless they provide evidence of only residential use
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Cost approach and sales comparison	
4	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	2004	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	Currently on square foot, previously was front foot	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2005	
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>	
	County develops their own	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	

	No
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>
	Develop with new costing and then update/review annually
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>
	Each case is reviewed individually, there is no general rule of thumb, buildings removed, additions, new windows, siding, roof would likely be considered to be substantially changed.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>
	See attached resolution from the Clay County board

**18 Clay**  
**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 : 90  
Total Sales Price : 6,408,651  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 6,412,651  
Total Assessed Value : 6,229,265  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 71,252  
Avg. Assessed Value : 69,214

MEDIAN : 98  
WGT. MEAN : 97  
MEAN : 109  
COD : 19.45  
PRD : 112.57

COV : 36.25  
STD : 39.64  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.03  
MAX Sales Ratio : 294.25  
MIN Sales Ratio : 75.14

95% Median C.I. : 95.81 to 98.82  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.73 to 100.55  
95% Mean C.I. : 101.16 to 117.54

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:03PM

**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	18	97.84	100.98	95.02	11.77	106.27	75.14	174.33	91.78 to 100.40	76,194	72,398
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	106.20	106.20	98.70	09.89	107.60	95.70	116.70	N/A	70,000	69,088
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	98.82	123.65	97.36	31.37	127.00	89.56	182.56	N/A	79,333	77,235
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	95.81	96.11	94.68	05.50	101.51	87.12	112.81	87.12 to 112.81	82,571	78,177
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	14	98.71	115.39	96.19	24.79	119.96	77.23	249.00	90.70 to 138.92	44,350	42,660
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	13	98.50	115.13	101.52	20.26	113.41	91.12	294.25	95.21 to 106.47	59,885	60,793
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	13	98.32	102.96	102.66	16.40	100.29	76.00	159.81	81.71 to 106.12	83,365	85,583
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	20	96.46	115.87	94.18	27.51	123.03	80.32	287.60	89.96 to 114.29	80,100	75,442
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	30	96.82	102.46	95.39	12.56	107.41	75.14	182.56	92.68 to 98.75	77,583	74,010
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	60	98.41	112.80	98.14	22.80	114.94	76.00	294.25	95.21 to 100.48	68,086	66,816
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	37	98.12	112.32	97.79	20.40	114.86	77.23	294.25	95.74 to 100.48	59,876	58,554
<u>ALL</u>	90	97.84	109.35	97.14	19.45	112.57	75.14	294.25	95.81 to 98.82	71,252	69,214

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	12	99.57	99.75	97.47	09.10	102.34	78.41	114.29	91.78 to 112.81	70,896	69,100
02	1	98.68	98.68	98.68	00.00	100.00	98.68	98.68	N/A	30,000	29,605
03	7	98.02	153.22	97.67	65.47	156.88	81.71	294.25	81.71 to 294.25	37,457	36,585
04	10	98.55	111.58	102.20	20.72	109.18	76.00	182.56	89.56 to 161.42	48,900	49,978
05	3	90.33	88.78	87.51	03.14	101.45	83.75	92.26	N/A	67,833	59,358
06	9	99.23	124.25	99.91	30.57	124.36	88.17	249.00	90.65 to 174.33	62,167	62,109
07	4	100.48	130.02	112.69	33.26	115.38	92.73	226.40	N/A	12,250	13,805
10	1	93.33	93.33	93.33	00.00	100.00	93.33	93.33	N/A	300	280
11	2	90.37	90.37	90.23	00.38	100.16	90.03	90.70	N/A	49,950	45,070
12	21	97.66	105.05	97.69	12.14	107.53	89.23	155.89	92.68 to 104.82	80,226	78,376
13	7	96.88	97.31	97.05	09.17	100.27	75.14	116.70	75.14 to 116.70	65,393	63,462
14	13	95.21	99.35	95.12	13.20	104.45	77.23	159.81	87.12 to 101.30	132,769	126,289
<u>ALL</u>	90	97.84	109.35	97.14	19.45	112.57	75.14	294.25	95.81 to 98.82	71,252	69,214

**18 Clay  
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 : 90	MEDIAN : 98	COV : 36.25	95% Median C.I. : 95.81 to 98.82
Total Sales Price : 6,408,651	WGT. MEAN : 97	STD : 39.64	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.73 to 100.55
Total Adj. Sales Price : 6,412,651	MEAN : 109	Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.03	95% Mean C.I. : 101.16 to 117.54
Total Assessed Value : 6,229,265			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 71,252	COD : 19.45	MAX Sales Ratio : 294.25	
Avg. Assessed Value : 69,214	PRD : 112.57	MIN Sales Ratio : 75.14	

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:03PM

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	87	96.88	107.80	96.96	18.28	111.18	75.14	294.25	95.70 to 98.75	73,266	71,036
06											
07	3	174.33	154.45	127.57	14.55	121.07	106.47	182.56	N/A	12,833	16,372
<u>ALL</u>	90	97.84	109.35	97.14	19.45	112.57	75.14	294.25	95.81 to 98.82	71,252	69,214

**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	6	133.83	163.27	175.56	56.73	93.00	76.00	294.25	76.00 to 294.25	2,800	4,916
5000 TO 9999	6	167.48	175.68	161.39	33.74	108.85	75.14	287.60	75.14 to 287.60	6,875	11,096
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	12	163.37	169.48	165.49	40.53	102.41	75.14	294.25	92.73 to 249.00	4,838	8,006
10000 TO 29999	11	100.48	111.36	112.52	16.74	98.97	80.87	161.42	90.70 to 155.89	22,377	25,180
30000 TO 59999	18	101.07	105.32	104.58	11.30	100.71	88.17	138.92	92.37 to 114.60	46,247	48,366
60000 TO 99999	22	95.92	96.23	96.07	04.75	100.17	81.71	113.82	91.76 to 98.50	75,023	72,077
100000 TO 149999	21	95.70	97.59	97.24	07.76	100.36	83.75	159.81	89.79 to 98.82	115,262	112,085
150000 TO 249999	5	89.85	88.10	88.74	08.77	99.28	77.23	98.18	N/A	186,000	165,052
250000 TO 499999	1	80.32	80.32	80.32	00.00	100.00	80.32	80.32	N/A	275,000	220,890
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	90	97.84	109.35	97.14	19.45	112.57	75.14	294.25	95.81 to 98.82	71,252	69,214



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Clay County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

Clay County is located in south central Nebraska. The largest town is Sutton. The county has three high schools; one in Sutton, one in Harvard and one consolidated high school, Sandy Creek. Most of the county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline.

The statistical sampling of 90 qualified residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Clay County. The measures of central tendency calculate the median at 98% and the weighted mean at 97%. The mean being influenced by twelve low dollar sales calculates higher at 109%. The qualitative statistics are above the recommended range but again are showing influence from the low dollar sales. All but two valuation groupings are within the acceptable range, the two valuation groupings that are just slightly low represent the assessor locations of Glenvil and Saronville but a reliable statistical inference would be difficult with the small number of sales in these two villages. It is possible the county should look toward combining some of the valuation groupings for 2012.

Clay County has a very structured procedure with their sales verification. Questionnaires are sent to all buyers and sellers to verify the price, any personal property or other circumstances that are relevant to the sale. The county estimates their response to be approximately 90% of all the questionnaires sent out. If there is no response or additional information is needed, the assessor may contact a knowledgeable third party either by phone or in person interview. Additionally, any remaining issue may be resolved with an inspection of the parcel.

Clay County has long had excellent cyclical physical inspection. They are diligent in annually physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. The Assessor has done a wonderful job in cross training her staff to be able to handle all facets of the job. Clay County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have continued to develop their GIS system, transfer sales electronically, complete spreadsheet analyses and have online personal property schedules. They should be commended for their diligence, their willingness to move forward technologically, and their solid assessment practices.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 98% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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 Clay 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 Clay 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 Clay 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 Clay County**

The Clay County staff physically reviewed the towns of Sutton and Deweese. The staff's physical review consisted of visiting each property with a copy of the record card, physically inspecting all property from the outside, taking pictures of all improvements. New additions were measured and other improvements no longer there were deleted. Owners were interviewed at the time of the inspection if possible. If the owner was not available, a follow up phone call or letter was sent to gather the needed information. New property cards with the current pictures and information were made and put in folders. 117 commercial parcels were reviewed in Sutton and Deweese.

NAD Inland, NAD Lynn, Area B-1 and Area B-2 consisting of 131 parcels were reviewed by Stanard Appraisals. New 2010 costing was used to determine the values. All parcels reviewed received new property cards with current pictures, sketches and updated information. All Clay County commercial parcels now have new cards and information and should not need to be replaced for about 10 years.

The Clay County Assessor reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the grantor and grantee. If there was no response, a follow-up phone call was made to gather as much information about the sale as possible. This information was shared with the contract appraiser. If needed, a physical review was made to further process the sale information. Maintenance work was done by the contract appraiser consisting of reviewing sales and neighborhoods as well as spreadsheet analysis and adjustments to valuation according to the market.

Assessment of all new commercial construction and most pickup work was made by the contract appraiser. Some pickup work was done by the assessor and staff with all work reviewed by the contract appraiser. All statutory duties were completed in a timely manner.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Clay County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor, staff and contract appraiser	
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	Clay Center –town, county seat, no school, on highway, no economic growth
	2	Deweese – off the highway, no school, limited businesses
	3	Edgar – off the highway, no school, large candle business & some economic activity
	4	Fairfield – off highway, no school, limited economic activity
	5	Glenvil – off highway, no school, limited economic activity, bedroom community close to Hastings
	6	Harvard – increasing population, school, north of highway
	7	Harvard Courts – unique former barracks north of Harvard
	8	NAD B-1, B-2 (industrial only) Along highway, former federal ground
	9	NAD Glenvil majority a/com/res; NAD Lynn majority ag; NAD Inland is comm. And ag/res former federal land
	10	Ong: very small, no school, coop
	11	Saronville has post office, very small off highway, no school
	12	Sutton largest town, school, on highway, some economic growth
	13	Trumbull north, school combined with Doniphan, bedroom community for Grand Island and Hastings, coop, new homes
	14	Rural Res all parcels outside of towns 25 acres or less unless they provide evidence of only residential use
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Income, cost approach, sales comparison	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	2005	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Currently have converted to square foot, previously was front foot.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	October 2009	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The contract appraiser develops	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	

	Yes
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>
	Develop them with new costing then update and review annually
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>
	No rule of thumb, each case is considered individually, complete remodeling would be an example of a substantial change
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>

**18 Clay**  
**COMMERCIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 15  
Total Sales Price : 641,807  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 633,807  
Total Assessed Value : 702,495  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,254  
Avg. Assessed Value : 46,833

MEDIAN : 100  
WGT. MEAN : 111  
MEAN : 104  
COD : 13.33  
PRD : 94.04

COV : 21.79  
STD : 22.71  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.32  
MAX Sales Ratio : 168.65  
MIN Sales Ratio : 61.42

95% Median C.I. : 97.02 to 113.00  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.81 to 132.86  
95% Mean C.I. : 91.65 to 116.81

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:06PM

**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	2	105.36	105.36	105.06	07.25	100.29	97.72	113.00	N/A	62,500	65,660
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	93.49	93.49	92.69	07.08	100.86	86.87	100.11	N/A	50,875	47,158
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	2	111.01	111.01	122.10	12.17	90.92	97.50	124.52	N/A	20,129	24,578
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	96.64	96.64	96.79	03.40	99.85	93.35	99.93	N/A	65,000	62,915
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	100.32	100.32	101.36	02.31	98.97	98.00	102.64	N/A	18,150	18,398
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	132.84	132.84	140.43	26.96	94.60	97.02	168.65	N/A	82,500	115,855
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	113.78	113.78	113.78	00.00	100.00	113.78	113.78	N/A	18,000	20,480
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	61.42	61.42	61.42	00.00	100.00	61.42	61.42	N/A	13,000	7,985
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	109.00	109.00	109.00	00.00	100.00	109.00	109.00	N/A	4,500	4,905
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	8	98.83	101.63	100.91	07.86	100.71	86.87	124.52	86.87 to 124.52	49,626	50,078
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	100.32	116.58	133.39	19.01	87.40	97.02	168.65	N/A	50,325	67,126
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	3	109.00	94.73	94.00	16.01	100.78	61.42	113.78	N/A	11,833	11,123
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	98.72	103.83	102.78	08.51	101.02	93.35	124.52	N/A	42,564	43,746
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	102.64	116.02	131.78	17.03	88.04	97.02	168.65	N/A	43,860	57,797
<u>ALL</u>	15	99.93	104.23	110.84	13.33	94.04	61.42	168.65	97.02 to 113.00	42,254	46,833

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	1	113.78	113.78	113.78	00.00	100.00	113.78	113.78	N/A	18,000	20,480
02	1	98.00	98.00	98.00	00.00	100.00	98.00	98.00	N/A	10,000	9,800
03	1	124.52	124.52	124.52	00.00	100.00	124.52	124.52	N/A	36,657	45,645
04	1	109.00	109.00	109.00	00.00	100.00	109.00	109.00	N/A	4,500	4,905
05	2	98.72	98.72	99.81	01.24	98.91	97.50	99.93	N/A	35,800	35,733
06	1	61.42	61.42	61.42	00.00	100.00	61.42	61.42	N/A	13,000	7,985
08	4	98.92	99.43	99.51	07.21	99.92	86.87	113.00	N/A	56,688	56,409
12	4	99.83	115.42	124.98	20.26	92.35	93.35	168.65	N/A	63,325	79,145
<u>ALL</u>	15	99.93	104.23	110.84	13.33	94.04	61.42	168.65	97.02 to 113.00	42,254	46,833

**18 Clay  
COMMERCIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 15  
 Total Sales Price : 641,807  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 633,807  
 Total Assessed Value : 702,495  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,254  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 46,833

MEDIAN : 100  
 WGT. MEAN : 111  
 MEAN : 104  
 COD : 13.33  
 PRD : 94.04

COV : 21.79  
 STD : 22.71  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.32  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 168.65  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 61.42

95% Median C.I. : 97.02 to 113.00  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.81 to 132.86  
 95% Mean C.I. : 91.65 to 116.81

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:06PM

**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	11	99.93	105.98	117.15	15.58	90.47	61.42	168.65	93.35 to 124.52	37,005	43,351
04	4	98.92	99.43	99.51	07.21	99.92	86.87	113.00	N/A	56,688	56,409
<u>ALL</u>	15	99.93	104.23	110.84	13.33	94.04	61.42	168.65	97.02 to 113.00	42,254	46,833

**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	2	103.25	103.25	103.89	05.57	99.38	97.50	109.00	N/A	4,050	4,208
5000 TO 9999											
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	2	103.25	103.25	103.89	05.57	99.38	97.50	109.00	N/A	4,050	4,208
10000 TO 29999	4	100.32	93.96	96.97	14.20	96.90	61.42	113.78	N/A	16,825	16,315
30000 TO 59999	3	100.11	103.83	101.12	12.54	102.68	86.87	124.52	N/A	46,136	46,653
60000 TO 99999	5	97.72	100.20	100.07	04.62	100.13	93.35	113.00	N/A	64,000	64,042
100000 TO 149999	1	168.65	168.65	168.65	00.00	100.00	168.65	168.65	N/A	100,000	168,650
150000 TO 249999											
250000 TO 499999											
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	15	99.93	104.23	110.84	13.33	94.04	61.42	168.65	97.02 to 113.00	42,254	46,833

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
306	1	124.52	124.52	124.52	00.00	100.00	124.52	124.52	N/A	36,657	45,645
334	1	168.65	168.65	168.65	00.00	100.00	168.65	168.65	N/A	100,000	168,650
344	1	102.64	102.64	102.64	00.00	100.00	102.64	102.64	N/A	26,300	26,995
352	1	99.93	99.93	99.93	00.00	100.00	99.93	99.93	N/A	68,000	67,955
353	2	95.19	95.19	95.22	01.93	99.97	93.35	97.02	N/A	63,500	60,468
406	6	97.86	98.87	99.42	04.95	99.45	86.87	113.00	86.87 to 113.00	40,058	39,824
50	1	113.78	113.78	113.78	00.00	100.00	113.78	113.78	N/A	18,000	20,480
514	1	61.42	61.42	61.42	00.00	100.00	61.42	61.42	N/A	13,000	7,985
98	1	109.00	109.00	109.00	00.00	100.00	109.00	109.00	N/A	4,500	4,905
<u>ALL</u>	15	99.93	104.23	110.84	13.33	94.04	61.42	168.65	97.02 to 113.00	42,254	46,833



## 2011 Correlation Section for Clay County

---

### A. Commerical Real Property

Clay County is located in south central Nebraska. The largest town is Sutton. The county has three high schools; one in Sutton, one in Harvard and one consolidated high school, Sandy Creek. Commercial sales have declined significantly over the past three years. Most of the county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline.

A review of the statistical analysis reveals only 15 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate the level of value is within the acceptable range, there are not a sufficient number of sales to have confidence in the calculated statistics. The calculated median is 99.93%. It will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Clay County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

The sample is not representative of the population as a whole even though the assessor, with the assistance of the contracted appraisal company (Stanard Appraisal Services), has tried to utilize as many sales as possible without bias in the analysis of the commercial class; there is just not an active commercial market in Clay County. Two valuation groupings had 4 sales each, Sutton and Navy Ammunition Depot (NAD).

Clay County contracts with Stanard Appraisal for the valuation of all new commercial construction and most of their commercial pickup work. All commercial valuation is reviewed by the contract appraiser giving confidence that the best effort is being made to assess this class of property uniformly. All new 2010 commercial costing was implemented for the 2011 assessment year.

Clay County has a very structured procedure with their sales verification. Questionnaires are sent to all buyers and sellers to verify the price, any personal property or other circumstances that are relevant to the sale. The county estimates their response to be approximately 90% of all the questionnaires sent out. If there is no response or additional information is needed, the assessor may contact a knowledgeable third party either by phone or in person interview. Additionally, any remaining issue may be resolved with an inspection of the parcel.

Clay County has long had excellent cyclical physical inspection. They are diligent in annually physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. The Assessor has done a wonderful job in cross training her staff to be able to handle all facets of the job. Clay County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have continued to develop their GIS system, transfer of sales electronically, complete spreadsheet analyses and online personal property schedules. They should be commended for their diligence, their willingness to move forward technologically, and their solid assessment practices.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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 Clay 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 Clay 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 Clay 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 Clay County**

Clay County did not physically review any townships for this assessment year as it is at the end of their rotation schedule and all townships have been reviewed. Instead they have concentrated on reviewing their land use and GIS acres. All agricultural parcels now have new cards and updated information and Clay County should not have to make new cards for ten years.

All parcels with new well permits received letters requiring their FSA certification and maps to update the irrigated acres. All other FSA certifications and maps brought to the office were updated for the current assessment year.

All sales were reviewed by sending a questionnaire to the buyer and seller. If there was no response, a follow-up call was made to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A spreadsheet analysis of all usable sales within the study period was completed, analyzing existing and potential market areas. It was decided that Clay County would combine Market Area 1 and Market Area 2 as the market has indicated this change for the past two years. The assessor also plotted agricultural sales within the study period for a visual analysis. The visual aid is available on a map for public viewing in the front office. All ag land within city limits was also updated to current values.

All pickup work was completed in a timely manner.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Clay County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and her staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	The majority of the county, for the 2011 assessment year market areas 1 & 2 were combined
	3	The small southwest corner of the county with the border defined by soils and topography
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Annually sales are plotted, NRD restrictions are reviewed, sales are reviewed.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	Sales verification, no identified areas, review the sales and check the real estate listings	
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>	
	No, there have been determined to be differences based on the proximity to amenities, size and physical inspection, Clay County starts with the acre size of a rural home site then reviews for location and use.	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	Land usage, soils and topography	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	Cyclical inspection, GIS, review well permits and certifications	
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Annually review recreational land, wetlands, no urban influences have been identified	
9.	<b>Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	No	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?</b>	
	Yes	
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>	
	A substantial change would involve land usage changes or changes to improvements	
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>	

**18 Clay**  
**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 : 48  
Total Sales Price : 22,140,812  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,019,912  
Total Assessed Value : 17,014,330  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 458,748  
Avg. Assessed Value : 354,465

MEDIAN : 75  
WGT. MEAN : 77  
MEAN : 83  
COD : 20.57  
PRD : 106.95

COV : 28.70  
STD : 23.72  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.40  
MAX Sales Ratio : 163.27  
MIN Sales Ratio : 50.77

95% Median C.I. : 70.83 to 83.37  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 71.72 to 82.81  
95% Mean C.I. : 75.93 to 89.35

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:09PM

**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	127.12	131.00	126.27	18.40	103.75	106.47	163.27	N/A	186,777	235,838
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	98.24	94.19	87.47	10.04	107.68	72.61	106.72	N/A	459,900	402,266
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	9	75.56	77.20	76.85	10.32	100.46	65.47	96.35	66.75 to 84.27	549,256	422,076
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	69.54	97.84	93.21	48.68	104.97	61.21	162.76	N/A	471,983	439,917
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	6	67.13	66.43	65.66	07.21	101.17	58.88	72.18	58.88 to 72.18	547,727	359,613
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	72.31	74.38	72.36	10.54	102.79	62.24	91.47	66.68 to 86.39	480,478	347,674
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	75.29	78.70	78.67	09.38	100.04	71.46	92.78	N/A	406,313	319,650
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	77.24	74.45	66.60	20.27	111.79	50.77	92.56	N/A	511,540	340,700
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	79.08	76.16	78.15	05.21	97.45	68.52	80.87	N/A	283,833	221,802
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	18	86.69	93.87	84.52	22.27	111.06	65.47	163.27	72.61 to 106.47	443,884	375,187
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	23	71.46	76.11	73.95	14.67	102.92	58.88	162.76	66.94 to 75.74	484,015	357,946
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	79.08	75.18	69.99	13.54	107.42	50.77	92.56	50.77 to 92.56	413,951	289,744
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	18	71.14	77.05	75.43	16.42	102.15	58.88	162.76	65.47 to 80.72	535,867	404,228
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	14	72.99	75.61	73.96	10.22	102.23	62.24	92.78	66.94 to 86.39	459,288	339,667
<u>ALL</u>	48	74.85	82.64	77.27	20.57	106.95	50.77	163.27	70.83 to 83.37	458,748	354,465

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	46	74.85	82.96	77.31	21.14	107.31	50.77	163.27	70.83 to 84.27	471,543	364,549
3	2	75.21	75.21	74.50	07.54	100.95	69.54	80.87	N/A	164,475	122,530
<u>ALL</u>	48	74.85	82.64	77.27	20.57	106.95	50.77	163.27	70.83 to 83.37	458,748	354,465

**18 Clay**  
**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 : 48  
 Total Sales Price : 22,140,812  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,019,912  
 Total Assessed Value : 17,014,330  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 458,748  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 354,465

MEDIAN : 75  
 WGT. MEAN : 77  
 MEAN : 83  
 COD : 20.57  
 PRD : 106.95

COV : 28.70  
 STD : 23.72  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.40  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 163.27  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.77

95% Median C.I. : 70.83 to 83.37  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 71.72 to 82.81  
 95% Mean C.I. : 75.93 to 89.35

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:09PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	16	70.97	83.22	79.04	24.73	105.29	61.21	162.76	66.68 to 84.27	558,613	441,528
1	16	70.97	83.22	79.04	24.73	105.29	61.21	162.76	66.68 to 84.27	558,613	441,528
<b>Dry</b>											
County	3	71.45	100.06	71.28	45.63	140.38	65.47	163.27	N/A	297,167	211,823
1	3	71.45	100.06	71.28	45.63	140.38	65.47	163.27	N/A	297,167	211,823
<b>Grass</b>											
County	1	68.52	68.52	68.52	00.00	100.00	68.52	68.52	N/A	100,000	68,520
1	1	68.52	68.52	68.52	00.00	100.00	68.52	68.52	N/A	100,000	68,520
<b>ALL</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>74.85</b>	<b>82.64</b>	<b>77.27</b>	<b>20.57</b>	<b>106.95</b>	<b>50.77</b>	<b>163.27</b>	<b>70.83 to 83.37</b>	<b>458,748</b>	<b>354,465</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	35	74.14	80.85	77.44	18.80	104.40	50.77	162.76	70.48 to 82.22	532,267	412,182
1	35	74.14	80.85	77.44	18.80	104.40	50.77	162.76	70.48 to 82.22	532,267	412,182
<b>Dry</b>											
County	5	71.45	86.19	65.51	31.01	131.57	58.88	163.27	N/A	364,573	238,847
1	5	71.45	86.19	65.51	31.01	131.57	58.88	163.27	N/A	364,573	238,847
<b>Grass</b>											
County	1	68.52	68.52	68.52	00.00	100.00	68.52	68.52	N/A	100,000	68,520
1	1	68.52	68.52	68.52	00.00	100.00	68.52	68.52	N/A	100,000	68,520
<b>ALL</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>74.85</b>	<b>82.64</b>	<b>77.27</b>	<b>20.57</b>	<b>106.95</b>	<b>50.77</b>	<b>163.27</b>	<b>70.83 to 83.37</b>	<b>458,748</b>	<b>354,465</b>

**18 Clay**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

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

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 3/12/2011

Number of Sales : 60  
 Total Sales Price : 26,793,328  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,632,428  
 Total Assessed Value : 20,063,660  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 443,874  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 334,394

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 75  
 MEAN : 81  
 COD : 21.55  
 PRD : 107.54

COV : 31.40  
 STD : 25.44  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.71  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 169.65  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 45.89

95% Median C.I. : 70.48 to 79.56  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 69.87 to 80.80  
 95% Mean C.I. : 74.58 to 87.46

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:11PM

**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	4	127.12	131.00	126.27	18.40	103.75	106.47	163.27	N/A	186,777	235,838
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	6	93.68	89.27	85.61	14.74	104.28	64.66	106.72	64.66 to 106.72	417,250	357,207
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	9	75.56	77.20	76.85	10.32	100.46	65.47	96.35	66.75 to 84.27	549,256	422,076
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	69.54	97.84	93.21	48.68	104.97	61.21	162.76	N/A	471,983	439,917
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	6	67.13	66.43	65.66	07.21	101.17	58.88	72.18	58.88 to 72.18	547,727	359,613
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	72.31	74.38	72.36	10.54	102.79	62.24	91.47	66.68 to 86.39	480,478	347,674
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	75.29	78.70	78.67	09.38	100.04	71.46	92.78	N/A	406,313	319,650
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	56.97	56.97	56.97	00.00	100.00	56.97	56.97	N/A	736,000	419,315
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	71.12	67.68	58.19	10.52	116.31	45.89	77.96	N/A	370,013	215,311
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	70.02	70.34	65.46	18.42	107.45	50.69	92.56	50.69 to 92.56	453,326	296,725
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	79.98	99.53	98.40	32.17	101.15	68.52	169.65	N/A	273,375	268,989
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	19	84.27	92.34	84.03	22.94	109.89	64.66	163.27	71.45 to 106.47	431,258	362,383
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	23	71.46	76.11	73.95	14.67	102.92	58.88	162.76	66.94 to 75.74	484,015	357,946
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	18	72.17	75.35	67.69	21.06	111.32	45.89	169.65	61.48 to 79.56	405,899	274,757
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	18	71.14	77.05	75.43	16.42	102.15	58.88	162.76	65.47 to 80.72	535,867	404,228
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	20	71.65	72.70	69.33	10.98	104.86	45.89	92.78	67.45 to 77.96	450,805	312,560
<u>ALL</u>	60	72.91	81.02	75.34	21.55	107.54	45.89	169.65	70.48 to 79.56	443,874	334,394

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	56	73.38	81.66	75.45	22.44	108.23	45.89	169.65	70.83 to 79.56	462,634	349,038
3	4	71.38	72.07	71.39	06.96	100.95	64.66	80.87	N/A	181,238	129,382
<u>ALL</u>	60	72.91	81.02	75.34	21.55	107.54	45.89	169.65	70.48 to 79.56	443,874	334,394

**18 Clay**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

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

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 3/12/2011

Number of Sales : 60  
 Total Sales Price : 26,793,328  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,632,428  
 Total Assessed Value : 20,063,660  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 443,874  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 334,394

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 75  
 MEAN : 81  
 COD : 21.55  
 PRD : 107.54

COV : 31.40  
 STD : 25.44  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.71  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 169.65  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 45.89

95% Median C.I. : 70.48 to 79.56  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 69.87 to 80.80  
 95% Mean C.I. : 74.58 to 87.46

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:11PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	21	69.76	78.11	73.98	23.42	105.58	45.89	162.76	64.49 to 79.56	548,968	406,115
1	21	69.76	78.11	73.98	23.42	105.58	45.89	162.76	64.49 to 79.56	548,968	406,115
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	4	70.25	92.31	71.02	35.66	129.98	65.47	163.27	N/A	252,875	179,581
1	4	70.25	92.31	71.02	35.66	129.98	65.47	163.27	N/A	252,875	179,581
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	2	70.87	70.87	71.60	03.32	98.98	68.52	73.21	N/A	146,000	104,538
1	1	68.52	68.52	68.52	00.00	100.00	68.52	68.52	N/A	100,000	68,520
3	1	73.21	73.21	73.21	00.00	100.00	73.21	73.21	N/A	192,000	140,555
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>72.91</b>	<b>81.02</b>	<b>75.34</b>	<b>21.55</b>	<b>107.54</b>	<b>45.89</b>	<b>169.65</b>	<b>70.48 to 79.56</b>	<b>443,874</b>	<b>334,394</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	42	72.40	77.86	74.29	18.91	104.81	45.89	162.76	69.76 to 79.08	530,378	393,992
1	42	72.40	77.86	74.29	18.91	104.81	45.89	162.76	69.76 to 79.08	530,378	393,992
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	6	70.25	83.33	65.73	26.86	126.78	58.88	163.27	58.88 to 163.27	323,811	212,848
1	6	70.25	83.33	65.73	26.86	126.78	58.88	163.27	58.88 to 163.27	323,811	212,848
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	2	70.87	70.87	71.60	03.32	98.98	68.52	73.21	N/A	146,000	104,538
1	1	68.52	68.52	68.52	00.00	100.00	68.52	68.52	N/A	100,000	68,520
3	1	73.21	73.21	73.21	00.00	100.00	73.21	73.21	N/A	192,000	140,555
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>72.91</b>	<b>81.02</b>	<b>75.34</b>	<b>21.55</b>	<b>107.54</b>	<b>45.89</b>	<b>169.65</b>	<b>70.48 to 79.56</b>	<b>443,874</b>	<b>334,394</b>

**18 Clay**  
**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 : 93  
 Total Sales Price : 38,385,085  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 38,189,349  
 Total Assessed Value : 28,912,631  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 410,638  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 310,889

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 76  
 MEAN : 81  
 COD : 22.34  
 PRD : 107.04

COV : 29.76  
 STD : 24.12  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.27  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 169.65  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.23

95% Median C.I. : 71.12 to 79.56  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 76.14 to 85.94

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:14PM

**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	8	107.61	115.02	114.52	15.62	100.44	85.63	163.27	85.63 to 163.27	194,632	222,886
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	10	96.42	92.85	87.24	15.85	106.43	64.66	130.48	66.86 to 106.72	385,845	336,602
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	16	73.89	78.70	72.88	17.95	107.99	51.79	137.87	66.75 to 84.93	549,993	400,820
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	69.54	97.84	93.21	48.68	104.97	61.21	162.76	N/A	471,983	439,917
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	9	68.87	69.33	68.81	09.00	100.76	58.88	91.64	61.39 to 72.18	502,961	346,102
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	14	72.89	76.59	74.81	11.73	102.38	62.24	102.50	66.94 to 86.39	424,142	317,301
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	72.33	78.03	76.80	11.36	101.60	64.36	100.64	64.36 to 100.64	360,656	276,974
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	62.26	70.38	66.74	18.70	105.45	56.97	91.90	N/A	434,833	290,214
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	67.42	61.67	57.38	16.98	107.48	40.23	77.96	40.23 to 77.96	324,258	186,050
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	9	70.65	70.38	65.74	16.23	107.06	50.69	92.56	50.77 to 87.65	426,068	280,084
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	79.17	95.46	93.42	25.99	102.18	68.52	169.65	N/A	294,990	275,589
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	34	87.37	91.41	81.34	22.34	112.38	51.79	163.27	72.61 to 100.74	418,100	340,065
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	34	71.60	76.88	75.12	14.46	102.34	58.88	162.76	68.87 to 75.74	434,289	326,255
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	25	70.65	72.61	67.96	20.93	106.84	40.23	169.65	62.26 to 79.08	368,325	250,310
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	28	71.14	77.74	73.58	19.02	105.65	51.79	162.76	66.75 to 80.72	526,518	387,421
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	33	71.57	72.76	70.88	13.89	102.65	40.23	102.50	67.45 to 75.74	385,509	273,244
<u>ALL</u>	93	72.83	81.04	75.71	22.34	107.04	40.23	169.65	71.12 to 79.56	410,638	310,889

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	89	72.83	81.44	75.79	23.04	107.45	40.23	169.65	71.12 to 80.72	420,948	319,046
3	4	71.38	72.07	71.39	06.96	100.95	64.66	80.87	N/A	181,238	129,382
<u>ALL</u>	93	72.83	81.04	75.71	22.34	107.04	40.23	169.65	71.12 to 79.56	410,638	310,889

**18 Clay**  
**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 : 93  
 Total Sales Price : 38,385,085  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 38,189,349  
 Total Assessed Value : 28,912,631  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 410,638  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 310,889

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 76  
 MEAN : 81  
 COD : 22.34  
 PRD : 107.04

COV : 29.76  
 STD : 24.12  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.27  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 169.65  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.23

95% Median C.I. : 71.12 to 79.56  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 76.14 to 85.94

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:14PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	34	71.38	79.26	74.19	22.63	106.83	45.89	162.76	66.75 to 83.53	477,428	354,216
1	34	71.38	79.26	74.19	22.63	106.83	45.89	162.76	66.75 to 83.53	477,428	354,216
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	5	71.45	88.16	71.11	28.09	123.98	65.47	163.27	N/A	242,300	172,292
1	5	71.45	88.16	71.11	28.09	123.98	65.47	163.27	N/A	242,300	172,292
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	2	70.87	70.87	71.60	03.32	98.98	68.52	73.21	N/A	146,000	104,538
1	1	68.52	68.52	68.52	00.00	100.00	68.52	68.52	N/A	100,000	68,520
3	1	73.21	73.21	73.21	00.00	100.00	73.21	73.21	N/A	192,000	140,555
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>72.83</b>	<b>81.04</b>	<b>75.71</b>	<b>22.34</b>	<b>107.04</b>	<b>40.23</b>	<b>169.65</b>	<b>71.12 to 79.56</b>	<b>410,638</b>	<b>310,889</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	61	72.61	78.83	74.74	20.44	105.47	45.89	162.76	69.76 to 79.56	473,789	354,095
1	61	72.61	78.83	74.74	20.44	105.47	45.89	162.76	69.76 to 79.56	473,789	354,095
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	9	71.57	83.41	71.33	23.21	116.94	58.88	163.27	65.47 to 100.00	310,807	221,685
1	9	71.57	83.41	71.33	23.21	116.94	58.88	163.27	65.47 to 100.00	310,807	221,685
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	2	70.87	70.87	71.60	03.32	98.98	68.52	73.21	N/A	146,000	104,538
1	1	68.52	68.52	68.52	00.00	100.00	68.52	68.52	N/A	100,000	68,520
3	1	73.21	73.21	73.21	00.00	100.00	73.21	73.21	N/A	192,000	140,555
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>72.83</b>	<b>81.04</b>	<b>75.71</b>	<b>22.34</b>	<b>107.04</b>	<b>40.23</b>	<b>169.65</b>	<b>71.12 to 79.56</b>	<b>410,638</b>	<b>310,889</b>



## 2011 Correlation Section for Clay County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Clay County is comprised of approximately 71% irrigated land, 20% dry crop land and 8% grass/pasture land. The county has over 36,000 acres of governmentally owned land located in the Naval Ammunition Depot used for meat animal research. Also, over 6,500 acres are owned by US Fish and Wildlife. In previous years, Clay County was divided into three market areas. For 2011, based on a review of the plotted sales and as indicated by the market, Clay County eliminated Market Area Two. Market Area One is the majority of the county and Market Area Three is the small southwestern corner identifiable by topography and soils comprised of only approximately 12,000 acres.

Clay County has 48 agricultural sales in the three year study period, 46 of these are located in Market Area One and 2 are in Market Area Three. The sales are not proportionately spread across the years, in Market Area One there are 18 sales in the oldest year, 22 sales in the middle year and only 6 sales in the newest year. For Market Area Three, the two newest years each have one sale in them.

The sales in Market Area One appear to be representative of the area, which is made up of approximately 74% irrigated, 19% dry and 7% grass, with the sales file containing sales that are approximately 77% irrigated, 18% dry and 5% grass. Market Area Three is made up of land that is approximately 18% irrigated, 47% dry and 35% grass, the two sales contain land that is approximately 71% dry and 29% grass.

The Base statistics show the calculated median to be 75%. The qualitative statistics are above the acceptable range, but not extremely high. Both market areas calculate to within the range and all majority land uses, both 95% and 80% calculate or round to within the acceptable range for Market Area One. Market Area Two contains no sales with at least an 80% majority land usage.

The second test, random inclusion, added ten sales to Market Area One all in the newest year and two sales to Market Area Three; one in the oldest year and one in the newest year. In Market Area One comparable sales were randomly selected from the neighboring counties of Fillmore, Hall, Hamilton and Nuckolls. For Market Area Three, only two sales were available from comparable areas in the neighboring counties of Adams and Webster, both were brought in for the expanded analysis. The random inclusion statistics show the calculated county median to be 73%. The qualitative statistics are again above the acceptable range, but not extremely high. Both market areas calculate to within the range and all majority land uses, both 95% and 80% calculate or round to within the acceptable range.

The third test, random exclusion, was to bring in as many sales from a six mile radius as possible to maintain a proportionate and representative sample and to meet the 10% threshold between study years. Countywide 45 sales were deemed comparable and brought in to the analysis. For Market Area One 43 sales were included; fifteen in the oldest year, eleven in the middle year and seventeen in the newest year. For Market Area 3, the expanded analysis mirrors the random inclusion as only two sales were comparable. The area surrounding Market Area 3 was expanded up to a 12-mile radius, but only two comparable sales were found. The

## **2011 Correlation Section for Clay County**

---

sales file was not distorted with the inclusion of the sales, there is a proportionate distribution of sales among each year of the study period, the sample is considered adequate to be statistically reliable, and there continues to be a reasonable representation of the land use in Clay County. The random exclusion statistics show the calculated median to be 73% with the weighted mean 76% and mean coming in at 81%. The qualitative statistics are again above the acceptable range, but not extremely high. Both market areas calculate to within the range and all majority land uses, both 95% and 80% calculate or round to within the acceptable range.

A review of the neighboring counties shows that the 2011 values in Clay County appear to blend sufficiently with Fillmore and Adams. Clay County reviewed their LCGs and the difference between the top and bottom LCGs and compared these to the market. As a result, irrigated values were increased 3% to 16%, dry values were increased 25% to 31%, and grass values were increased 3% to 35%. All indications support that Clay County has achieved both inter- and intra-county equalization.

There is a close correlation of all three tests, because the second and third analyses have a more proportionate distribution of sales, the calculated median for these two approaches will be used for the determination of the level of value.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Clay 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 Clay 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 Clay 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 Clay 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 : 7,271</b>	<b>Value : 1,070,522,900</b>	<b>Growth 2,954,173</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>	547	2,427,870	0	0	128	336,815	675	2,764,685	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,226	7,630,395	0	0	474	11,152,855	2,700	18,783,250	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,237	104,476,025	0	0	472	42,100,665	2,709	146,576,690	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,784	114,534,290	0	0	600	53,590,335	3,384	168,124,625	659,528
<b>% of Res Total</b>	82.27	68.12	0.00	0.00	17.73	31.88	46.54	15.70	22.33
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	138	814,275	0	0	17	799,680	155	1,613,955	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	396	1,117,540	0	0	67	3,456,980	463	4,574,520	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	396	37,913,740	0	0	68	10,944,640	464	48,858,380	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	534	39,845,555	0	0	85	15,201,300	619	55,046,855	431,845
<b>% of Com Total</b>	86.27	72.38	0.00	0.00	13.73	27.62	8.51	5.14	14.62
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	16	278,900	16	278,900	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	78	751,515	78	751,515	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	77	12,966,595	77	12,966,595	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	93	13,997,010	93	13,997,010	40,400
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	1.28	1.31	1.37
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	13	219,615	13	219,615	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	2	36,095	2	36,095	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	13	255,710	13	255,710	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.18	0.02	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,784	114,534,290	0	0	613	53,846,045	3,397	168,380,335	659,528
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	81.95	68.02	0.00	0.00	18.05	31.98	46.72	15.73	22.33
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	534	39,845,555	0	0	178	29,198,310	712	69,043,865	472,245
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	75.00	57.71	0.00	0.00	25.00	42.29	9.79	6.45	15.99
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	3,318	154,379,845	0	0	791	83,044,355	4,109	237,424,200	1,131,773
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	80.75	65.02	0.00	0.00	19.25	34.98	56.51	22.18	38.31

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	3	510,670	462,405	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	3	510,670	462,405
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				3	510,670	462,405

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	345	0	143	488

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	2,468	607,586,885	2,468	607,586,885
28. Ag-Improved Land	2	0	0	0	692	177,281,580	694	177,281,580
29. Ag Improvements	2	68,545	0	0	692	48,161,690	694	48,230,235
30. Ag Total							3,162	833,098,700

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	2	0.00	68,545	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	18	19.00	152,000	18	19.00	152,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	300	315.99	2,527,920	300	315.99	2,527,920	
33. HomeSite Improvements	313	0.00	23,719,485	313	0.00	23,719,485	342,775
34. HomeSite Total				<b>331</b>	<b>334.99</b>	<b>26,399,405</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	22	26.11	52,220	22	26.11	52,220	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	577	1,519.02	3,038,040	577	1,519.02	3,038,040	
37. FarmSite Improvements	684	0.00	24,442,205	686	0.00	24,510,750	1,479,625
38. FarmSite Total				<b>708</b>	<b>1,545.13</b>	<b>27,601,010</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	2,871	8,009.40	0	2,871	8,009.40	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,039</b>	<b>9,889.52</b>	<b>54,000,415</b>	<b>1,822,400</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	25	1,476.78	2,479,055	25	1,476.78	2,479,055

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	56,999.46	27.02%	188,098,250	29.00%	3,300.00
46. 1A	93,444.09	44.30%	303,697,925	46.82%	3,250.05
47. 2A1	21,809.74	10.34%	66,520,175	10.25%	3,050.02
48. 2A	1,720.25	0.82%	4,988,730	0.77%	2,900.00
49. 3A1	21,473.41	10.18%	52,073,270	8.03%	2,425.01
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	10,204.16	4.84%	22,960,790	3.54%	2,250.14
52. 4A	5,301.45	2.51%	10,338,120	1.59%	1,950.06
53. Total	210,952.56	100.00%	648,677,260	100.00%	3,074.99
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	8,793.05	16.34%	19,344,630	19.53%	2,199.99
55. 1D	23,418.21	43.51%	46,836,420	47.28%	2,000.00
56. 2D1	6,622.58	12.30%	11,920,670	12.03%	1,800.00
57. 2D	976.64	1.81%	1,562,645	1.58%	1,600.02
58. 3D1	8,083.48	15.02%	12,529,645	12.65%	1,550.03
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	4,310.66	8.01%	5,172,815	5.22%	1,200.01
61. 4D	1,617.07	3.00%	1,698,060	1.71%	1,050.08
62. Total	53,821.69	100.00%	99,064,885	100.00%	1,840.61
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	1,062.38	5.07%	1,062,380	6.77%	1,000.00
64. 1G	2,820.40	13.46%	2,750,040	17.54%	975.05
65. 2G1	1,506.10	7.19%	1,204,870	7.68%	799.99
66. 2G	848.69	4.05%	657,785	4.19%	775.06
67. 3G1	1,710.66	8.17%	1,231,695	7.85%	720.01
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	3,177.10	15.17%	2,144,545	13.67%	675.00
70. 4G	9,824.26	46.89%	6,631,465	42.29%	675.01
71. Total	20,949.59	100.00%	15,682,780	100.00%	748.60
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	210,952.56	73.48%	648,677,260	84.84%	3,074.99
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	53,821.69	18.75%	99,064,885	12.96%	1,840.61
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	20,949.59	7.30%	15,682,780	2.05%	748.60
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	1,379.53	0.48%	1,172,135	0.15%	849.66
74. Exempt	7,546.11	2.63%	3,650	0.00%	0.48
75. Market Area Total	287,103.37	100.00%	764,597,060	100.00%	2,663.14

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	456.57	20.66%	1,303,510	24.36%	2,855.01
46. 1A	1,005.77	45.50%	2,856,385	53.39%	2,840.00
47. 2A1	89.53	4.05%	174,590	3.26%	1,950.07
48. 2A	269.84	12.21%	446,590	8.35%	1,655.02
49. 3A1	79.38	3.59%	128,995	2.41%	1,625.03
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	177.76	8.04%	258,640	4.83%	1,455.00
52. 4A	131.52	5.95%	181,485	3.39%	1,379.90
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>2,210.37</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>5,350,195</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,420.50</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,215.92	38.82%	3,213,105	48.27%	1,450.01
55. 1D	1,367.75	23.96%	1,716,550	25.79%	1,255.02
56. 2D1	163.54	2.86%	199,515	3.00%	1,219.98
57. 2D	550.41	9.64%	500,855	7.52%	909.97
58. 3D1	577.73	10.12%	493,970	7.42%	855.02
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	438.52	7.68%	295,985	4.45%	674.96
61. 4D	395.04	6.92%	237,005	3.56%	599.95
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>5,708.91</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>6,656,985</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,166.07</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	143.60	3.34%	137,855	5.53%	959.99
64. 1G	288.94	6.72%	234,065	9.39%	810.08
65. 2G1	507.06	11.78%	360,005	14.44%	709.99
66. 2G	461.33	10.72%	279,105	11.19%	605.00
67. 3G1	232.88	5.41%	135,065	5.42%	579.98
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	235.60	5.48%	130,740	5.24%	554.92
70. 4G	2,433.39	56.55%	1,216,695	48.79%	500.00
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>4,302.80</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,493,530</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>579.51</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>2,210.37</b>	<b>18.08%</b>	<b>5,350,195</b>	<b>36.89%</b>	<b>2,420.50</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>5,708.91</b>	<b>46.70%</b>	<b>6,656,985</b>	<b>45.91%</b>	<b>1,166.07</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>4,302.80</b>	<b>35.20%</b>	<b>2,493,530</b>	<b>17.20%</b>	<b>579.51</b>
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	1.47	0.01%	515	0.00%	350.34
74. Exempt	39.40	0.32%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>12,223.55</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>14,501,225</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,186.33</b>

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	213,162.93	654,027,455	213,162.93	654,027,455
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	59,530.60	105,721,870	59,530.60	105,721,870
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	25,252.39	18,176,310	25,252.39	18,176,310
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,381.00	1,172,650	1,381.00	1,172,650
<b>81. Exempt</b>	2.40	3,650	0.00	0	7,583.11	0	7,585.51	3,650
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>299,326.92</b>	<b>779,098,285</b>	<b>299,326.92</b>	<b>779,098,285</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	213,162.93	71.21%	654,027,455	83.95%	3,068.20
<b>Dry Land</b>	59,530.60	19.89%	105,721,870	13.57%	1,775.92
<b>Grass</b>	25,252.39	8.44%	18,176,310	2.33%	719.79
<b>Waste</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Other</b>	1,381.00	0.46%	1,172,650	0.15%	849.13
<b>Exempt</b>	7,585.51	2.53%	3,650	0.00%	0.48
<b>Total</b>	<b>299,326.92</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>779,098,285</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,602.83</b>

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

18 Clay

	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	162,757,725	168,124,625	5,366,900	3.30%	659,528	2.89%
02. Recreational	34,340	255,710	221,370	644.64%	0	644.64%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	26,242,605	26,399,405	156,800	0.60%	342,775	-0.71%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>189,034,670</b>	<b>194,779,740</b>	<b>5,745,070</b>	<b>3.04%</b>	<b>1,002,303</b>	<b>2.51%</b>
05. Commercial	49,285,850	55,046,855	5,761,005	11.69%	431,845	10.81%
06. Industrial	11,664,585	13,997,010	2,332,425	20.00%	40,400	19.65%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	26,335,305	27,601,010	1,265,705	4.81%	1,479,625	-0.81%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>87,285,740</b>	<b>96,644,875</b>	<b>9,359,135</b>	<b>10.72%</b>	<b>1,951,870</b>	<b>8.49%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>276,320,410</b>	<b>291,424,615</b>	<b>15,104,205</b>	<b>5.47%</b>	<b>2,954,173</b>	<b>4.40%</b>
11. Irrigated	586,685,695	654,027,455	67,341,760	11.48%		
12. Dryland	83,011,380	105,721,870	22,710,490	27.36%		
13. Grassland	16,507,995	18,176,310	1,668,315	10.11%		
14. Wasteland	0	0	0			
15. Other Agland	1,705,745	1,172,650	-533,095	-31.25%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>687,910,815</b>	<b>779,098,285</b>	<b>91,187,470</b>	<b>13.26%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>964,231,225</b>	<b>1,070,522,900</b>	<b>106,291,675</b>	<b>11.02%</b>	<b>2,954,173</b>	<b>10.72%</b>

**CLAY COUNTY**  
**3-YEAR PLAN OF ASSESSMENT**  
**AS FOLLOWS FOR THE TAX YEAR:**

**For Tax Year 2011**

**Residential**-the following residential properties will be up for review in our rotation of residential properties:

Clay Center-525 parcels-Market Area 1

Glenvil-191 parcels-Market 1

The same information will be gathered and applied as with previous years without the making of new property cards. This will be the year we update our CAMA pricing since our last pricing update was year 2000. A new depreciation schedule will be made and implemented.

**Rural residential and Agricultural land**—the following townships will be up for review in our rotation of rural properties:

Sheridan-223 parcels-Market Area 1

Marshall-227 parcels-Market Area 1

Lonetree-157 parcels-Market Area 1

Glenvil-160 parcels-Market Area 1

We have a contract with Stanard Appraisal to review the improved parcels in these townships. We then will use the newest CAMA costing for the new assessment. A new depreciation schedule will be made and implemented. Pickup work will be done by the assessor and staff.

**Commercial**-Stanard Appraisal will be contracted to do any new construction and for maintenance and the assessor and staff will do the pickup work for the commercial. All commercial properties will be on new costing and Stanard Appraisal will be consulted with new assessments. All commercials in the 2012 rotation will be reviewed and updated with the CAMA 2009 pricing. A new depreciation table will be implemented.

**For Tax Year 2012**

**Residential**-the following residential properties will be up for review in our rotation of residential properties:

Fairfield-353 parcels-Market Area 1

Trumbull-171 parcels-Market Area 2

Inland Village-42 parcels-Market Area 2

Spring Ranch Village-41 parcels-Market Area 1

**Rural residential and Agricultural land**-the following townships will be up for review in our rotation of rural properties:

- Spring Ranch Twp-255 parcels-Market Area 1
- Fairfield Twp-309 parcels-Market Area 1
- Edgar Twp-253 parcels-Market Area 1
- Logan Twp-235 parcels-Market Area 1

**Commercial**-Stanard Appraisal will be contracted to do any new construction and for maintenance and the assessor and staff will do the pickup work for the above areas. All commercial properties will be on new costing and Stanard Appraisal will be consulted with new assessments.

**For Tax Year 2013**

**Residential-Rural Residential and Agricultural and Commercial**-The following properties will be up for review:

- Harvard-641 parcels-Market Area 2
- Ong -157 parcels-Market Area 1
- Verona Village-39 parcels-Market Area 2
- Sutton Twp-261 parcels-Market Area 2
- Lewis Twp-286 parcels-Market Area 2
- Lynn Twp-163 parcels-Market Area 2
- Inland Twp-81 parcels-Market Area 2

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Clay County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	1 presently, normally 2
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1 presently, 2 employed through summer for review work
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$228,947
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	Same
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$44,740, Stanard Appraisal contracted for NAD commercial and 4 townships review
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>
	\$34,300
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,200
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	0
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	0

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	County Solutions
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>
	Assessor and staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes

6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Deputy and other staff
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	County Solutions

### 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>
	All towns except Ong. Sutton has their own zoning separate from the county's.
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1975 with updates periodically

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	GIS Workshop, Radwen, Inc for online personal property schedules



## 2011 Certification for Clay 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 Clay 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



