

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 Deuel County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	42	Median	94.64
Total Sales Price	\$2,421,544	Mean	99.32
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,418,544	Wgt. Mean	98.98
Total Assessed Value	\$2,393,955	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$43,565
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$57,584	Avg. Assessed Value	\$56,999

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.49 to 105.44
95% Mean C.I	93.98 to 103.98
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.07 to 104.57
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	19.95
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.20
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.80

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	41	95	95
2009	52	94	94
2008	58	93	93
2007	44	96	96

2011 Commission Summary for Deuel County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	14	Median	96.69
Total Sales Price	\$423,000	Mean	93.65
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$423,000	Wgt. Mean	93.84
Total Assessed Value	\$396,964	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$135,939
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$30,214	Avg. Assessed Value	\$28,355

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.30 to 99.43
95% Mean C.I	87.14 to 100.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.59 to 98.10
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	11.48
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	9.40
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.96

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	14	100	71
2009	11	100	79
2008	8	92	79
2007	7	100	50

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Deuel County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	95	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	73	The qualitative measures calculated in the base stat 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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Deuel County

The 2011 residential changes were minor in Deuel County this year although new pickup work included 277,655 in growth value. The new construction was monitored through the building permits in the county. The Assessor follows the Three Year Plan and cyclical review pattern of residential property on an annual basis. Deuel County has three market neighborhoods or valuation groupings to monitor; Chappell being the largest, Big Springs and the rural locations. The review and maintenance work in the residential property class ensures the class is equal and proportionate for 2011.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Deuel County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Deputy Assessor and Clerk	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Chappell is the largest town in Deuel Co. with the major differences being size and paved streets. It is located along I-80 and has nearly 3 times the residential base. The school has K-4; 9-12 in Chappell.
	02	Big Springs is located at the I-76 and I-80 junction where the main employer in town is Bosselmans Truck Plaza. This traffic separates the Villages in uniqueness.
	03	The rural areas include all residential properties not located within the Villages of Chappell or Big Springs. They are located on acreages with characteristics of county space living.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Cost Approach	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2010	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	Market or current sales data	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June/2007	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The County uses the tables from the CAMA vendor, MIPS.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No, they are the same countywide	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	The depreciation tables were updated in 2007 for the review of Big Springs and Chappell parcels. The tables will be reviewed for 2011 for rural residential parcels.	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	Through the requirements of building permits, physical inspection by the assessor's office, and self reported changes by the owners.	

12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.
	The policy manual and procedures was reviewed and too large to print. These are kept current in the office and available upon request.

25 Deuel
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 : 42
Total Sales Price : 2,421,544
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,418,544
Total Assessed Value : 2,393,955
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 57,584
Avg. Assessed Value : 56,999

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 99
MEAN : 99
COD : 12.74
PRD : 100.34

COV : 17.47
STD : 17.35
Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.06
MAX Sales Ratio : 171.55
MIN Sales Ratio : 70.97

95% Median C.I. : 91.49 to 105.44
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.98 to 103.98
95% Mean C.I. : 94.07 to 104.57

Printed:3/21/2011 5:07:38PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Qrtrs											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	6	90.89	93.80	92.68	04.64	101.21	87.87	107.91	87.87 to 107.91	41,075	38,067
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	101.46	101.88	98.94	05.03	102.97	92.90	111.28	N/A	67,300	66,586
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	102.59	105.25	105.96	09.96	99.33	91.78	124.03	N/A	61,750	65,430
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	102.50	95.18	82.81	11.68	114.94	73.56	109.47	N/A	30,833	25,532
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	9	92.18	95.71	96.23	07.38	99.46	86.23	119.97	87.11 to 107.28	59,111	56,885
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	93.21	93.47	91.94	10.19	101.66	71.87	108.91	71.87 to 108.91	64,432	59,239
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	87.26	95.55	93.73	11.21	101.94	84.33	123.34	N/A	59,250	55,538
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	118.06	117.69	118.87	19.30	99.01	70.97	171.55	N/A	68,100	80,953
Study Yrs											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	18	98.30	98.82	97.53	08.81	101.32	73.56	124.03	90.91 to 106.90	51,247	49,980
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	24	92.49	99.70	99.88	15.18	99.82	70.97	171.55	87.32 to 107.28	62,337	62,263
Calendar Yrs											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	93.35	96.76	95.84	10.54	100.96	71.87	124.03	89.18 to 106.90	57,186	54,805
ALL	42	94.64	99.32	98.98	12.74	100.34	70.97	171.55	91.49 to 105.44	57,584	56,999

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	29	92.90	99.71	99.55	13.71	100.16	70.97	171.55	90.00 to 107.26	64,702	64,408
02	9	95.31	97.88	96.82	11.44	101.09	73.56	124.03	87.32 to 109.47	43,078	41,710
03	4	98.47	99.77	97.56	08.72	102.27	90.87	111.28	N/A	38,625	37,681
ALL	42	94.64	99.32	98.98	12.74	100.34	70.97	171.55	91.49 to 105.44	57,584	56,999

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	42	94.64	99.32	98.98	12.74	100.34	70.97	171.55	91.49 to 105.44	57,584	56,999
06											
07											
ALL	42	94.64	99.32	98.98	12.74	100.34	70.97	171.55	91.49 to 105.44	57,584	56,999

25 Deuel
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 : 42
Total Sales Price : 2,421,544
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,418,544
Total Assessed Value : 2,393,955
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 57,584
Avg. Assessed Value : 56,999

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 99
MEAN : 99
COD : 12.74
PRD : 100.34

COV : 17.47
STD : 17.35
Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.06
MAX Sales Ratio : 171.55
MIN Sales Ratio : 70.97

95% Median C.I. : 91.49 to 105.44
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.98 to 103.98
95% Mean C.I. : 94.07 to 104.57

Printed:3/21/2011 5:07:38PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	2	92.61	92.61	93.66	02.82	98.88	90.00	95.21	N/A	3,350	3,138	
5000 TO 9999	1	109.47	109.47	109.47	00.00	100.00	109.47	109.47	N/A	8,500	9,305	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	3	95.21	98.23	102.50	06.82	95.83	90.00	109.47	N/A	5,067	5,193	
10000 TO 29999	6	106.17	111.05	112.60	17.03	98.62	70.97	171.55	70.97 to 171.55	22,500	25,334	
30000 TO 59999	17	92.63	97.73	96.53	11.18	101.24	71.87	123.34	87.87 to 107.91	43,261	41,760	
60000 TO 99999	12	90.89	94.07	94.60	09.56	99.44	73.56	124.03	87.11 to 98.27	77,825	73,624	
100000 TO 149999	2	100.68	100.68	100.55	06.57	100.13	94.07	107.28	N/A	137,500	138,262	
150000 TO 249999	2	109.46	109.46	110.01	10.17	99.50	98.33	120.59	N/A	162,000	178,218	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	42	94.64	99.32	98.98	12.74	100.34	70.97	171.55	91.49 to 105.44	57,584	56,999	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

A. Residential Real Property

A review of the calculated statistics and the current assessment actions for residential property in Deuel County determines the level of value is 95 as supported through the acceptable measures of central tendency and qualitative statistics. The residential base in the county is primarily within the valuation groupings 01 and 02, Chappell and Big Springs. The rural areas typically have a very limited amount of sales and are not representative for analysis purposes. Chappell and Big Springs are located along Interstate 80 west of Ogallala and the southeastern county in the Panhandle area.

The sales verification process begins with a questionnaire being sent to the owners. The assessor follows up with further calls and inspections to ensure all available market information is obtained for assessment purposes.

The Deuel County Assessor and Deputy Assessor implemented an updated CAMA and administrative program through MIPS for all valuation processes. This resulted in minor changes in residential value due to the new program implementation. The residential value increased 1.23% in the residential subclasses compared to the 2010 CTL which was a result of the new computer system. The county utilized over 60% of the total residential sales for measurement and review purposes. The assessor continually achieves equalization through the accomplished goals with uniform and proportionate assessment practices as shown through the qualitative statistics.

The statistical sample of 42 qualified residential sales within Deuel County will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of this class of property. All three measures of central tendency are very supportive of each other and are within acceptable thresholds for residential property. Both qualitative measures represent acceptable statistics within the ranges.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 95% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Deuel 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 Deuel 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 Deuel 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 Deuel 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 Deuel County

A contract between Deuel County and Stanard Appraisal Service was entered into agreement in April of 2010 for a complete 2011 commercial reappraisal. This reappraisal was completed and new values assessed for the current assessment year. All of the commercial improved parcels were physically reviewed and inspected. The quality and condition of the improved properties was determined, measurements were taken, and new additions were added and omitted buildings removed from the property record card.

New Marshall & Swift costing index of June, 2007 and new depreciation was determined from the market. Standard Appraisal Service built models and the sales in the local market were used for comparability. From the models built, a cost per square foot (less depreciation, land and outbuildings) was established based on the condition, quality, effective age and occupancy. When possible the income and expense data provided by the owners was used to develop an income approach.

All three approaches were reconciled to determine a 2011 market value. The Assessor and Deputy entered the data information into a new CAMA system used by the MIPS system in Deuel County. Lot values were not changed with the new improvement values. The reappraisal included the feedlots within Deuel County and the large commercial property of Bosselman's in Big Springs. The total value of the commercial class of property increased approximately 8.1 million through the new appraisal. This was a major accomplished goal met by the Deuel County Assessor and it achieved uniform and proportionate treatment in this property class.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Deuel County

	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and staff	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Chappell has a larger commercial base with downtown retail and bowling alley.
	02	Big Springs is smaller but has Bosselman's Truck Plaza along I-80. This market is weaker due to limited amenities.
	03	The rural areas include all commercials not within the Villages of Chappell or Big Springs. They are located in the rural locations.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Cost Approach, Sales Comparison and Income when available	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2010	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Square Foot method	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June/2007	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	In 2011 the assessor used depreciation tables developed by the contract appraiser.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	As the market indicates a reappraisal is needed.	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	Through the requirements of building permits, physical inspection by the assessor's office, and self reported changes by the owners.	
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.	
	The policy manual and procedures was reviewed and too large to print. These are kept current in the office and available upon request.	

25 Deuel
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 : 14
Total Sales Price : 423,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 423,000
Total Assessed Value : 396,964
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 30,214
Avg. Assessed Value : 28,355

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 94
COD : 05.54
PRD : 99.80

COV : 12.03
STD : 11.27
Avg. Abs. Dev : 05.36
MAX Sales Ratio : 100.38
MIN Sales Ratio : 55.92

95% Median C.I. : 92.30 to 99.43
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.59 to 98.10
95% Mean C.I. : 87.14 to 100.16

Printed:3/21/2011 5:07:41PM

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	2	98.37	98.37	98.54	01.09	99.83	97.30	99.43	N/A	28,750	28,331
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	1	91.21	91.21	91.21	00.00	100.00	91.21	91.21	N/A	70,000	63,849
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	99.40	99.40	99.40	00.00	100.00	99.40	99.40	N/A	38,500	38,269
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	92.65	92.65	92.65	00.00	100.00	92.65	92.65	N/A	55,000	50,960
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	76.00	76.00	88.30	26.42	86.07	55.92	96.08	N/A	46,500	41,061
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	92.30	92.30	92.30	00.00	100.00	92.30	92.30	N/A	20,000	18,460
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	99.39	99.39	99.60	00.65	99.79	98.74	100.03	N/A	12,000	11,952
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	95.72	95.72	95.72	00.00	100.00	95.72	95.72	N/A	26,000	24,888
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	95.99	95.99	96.67	01.93	99.30	94.14	97.83	N/A	17,500	16,918
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	100.38	100.38	100.38	00.00	100.00	100.38	100.38	N/A	4,000	4,015
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	5	97.30	96.00	94.90	03.07	101.16	91.21	99.43	N/A	44,200	41,948
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	5	96.08	88.61	90.87	10.52	97.51	55.92	100.03	N/A	27,400	24,897
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	4	96.78	97.02	96.52	02.16	100.52	94.14	100.38	N/A	16,250	15,685
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	92.65	87.27	91.92	10.20	94.94	55.92	99.40	N/A	41,300	37,962
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	98.74	98.16	97.58	01.46	100.59	95.72	100.03	N/A	16,667	16,264
<u>ALL</u>	14	96.69	93.65	93.84	05.54	99.80	55.92	100.38	92.30 to 99.43	30,214	28,355

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	9	97.30	92.65	93.75	06.70	98.83	55.92	100.03	91.21 to 99.43	34,333	32,188
02	4	95.99	96.16	95.44	03.06	100.75	92.30	100.38	N/A	14,750	14,078
03	1	92.65	92.65	92.65	00.00	100.00	92.65	92.65	N/A	55,000	50,960
<u>ALL</u>	14	96.69	93.65	93.84	05.54	99.80	55.92	100.38	92.30 to 99.43	30,214	28,355

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	14	96.69	93.65	93.84	05.54	99.80	55.92	100.38	92.30 to 99.43	30,214	28,355
04											
<u>ALL</u>	14	96.69	93.65	93.84	05.54	99.80	55.92	100.38	92.30 to 99.43	30,214	28,355

25 Deuel
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 : 14
Total Sales Price : 423,000
Total Adj. Sales Price : 423,000
Total Assessed Value : 396,964
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 30,214
Avg. Assessed Value : 28,355

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 94
COD : 05.54
PRD : 99.80

COV : 12.03
STD : 11.27
Avg. Abs. Dev : 05.36
MAX Sales Ratio : 100.38
MIN Sales Ratio : 55.92

95% Median C.I. : 92.30 to 99.43
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.59 to 98.10
95% Mean C.I. : 87.14 to 100.16

Printed:3/21/2011 5:07:41PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	1	100.38	100.38	100.38	00.00	100.00	100.38	100.38	N/A	4,000	4,015	
5000 TO 9999	1	98.74	98.74	98.74	00.00	100.00	98.74	98.74	N/A	8,000	7,899	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	2	99.56	99.56	99.28	00.82	100.28	98.74	100.38	N/A	6,000	5,957	
10000 TO 29999	7	95.72	90.46	91.08	07.88	99.32	55.92	100.03	55.92 to 100.03	19,857	18,086	
30000 TO 59999	3	99.40	97.16	96.49	02.27	100.69	92.65	99.43	N/A	42,333	40,846	
60000 TO 99999	2	93.65	93.65	93.73	02.61	99.91	91.21	96.08	N/A	72,500	67,953	
100000 TO 149999												
150000 TO 249999												
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	14	96.69	93.65	93.84	05.54	99.80	55.92	100.38	92.30 to 99.43	30,214	28,355	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	11	96.08	92.93	94.08	06.12	98.78	55.92	100.03	92.30 to 99.43	29,545	27,795	
326	1	100.38	100.38	100.38	00.00	100.00	100.38	100.38	N/A	4,000	4,015	
350	1	91.21	91.21	91.21	00.00	100.00	91.21	91.21	N/A	70,000	63,849	
352	1	97.30	97.30	97.30	00.00	100.00	97.30	97.30	N/A	24,000	23,352	
<u>ALL</u>	14	96.69	93.65	93.84	05.54	99.80	55.92	100.38	92.30 to 99.43	30,214	28,355	

2011 Correlation Section for Deuel County

A. Commerical Real Property

Deuel County fulfilled a contract for a complete reappraisal with Stanard Appraisal Service for all improved commercial properties within the County. This has been a much needed action countywide since the date of the last commercial appraisal is unknown. The County Assessor has set the land values according to the most recent market data available but the improvement values have not been addressed since the prior assessor.

As the abstract, Form 45 indicates over 8.1 million in commercial value was added this year due to the new assessed values. This assessment work ensures the commercial property is treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

Although the calculated median from 14 sales is 97% and the qualitative measures are reflective of the commercial reappraisal that was completed this year; the sample of sold properties are not in proportionate to the County population of commercial sales. Within the 14 sales, 11 have an unknown occupancy code.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is undetermined for the commercial class of property and there is no non-binding recommendation for Deuel County.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Deuel 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 Deuel 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 Deuel 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 Deuel 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 Deuel County

The Deuel County Assessor reviewed the most current market data for each subclass within the county and surrounding comparable areas. New 2011 agricultural values were set accordingly to meet acceptable market values.

Irrigated subclasses remained the same with not as much change in market activity in the three year study period. Dry land subclasses increased between \$20 to \$60 per acre. This is the largest impact on the county agricultural valuation with the dry land subclasses representing approximately 66% of the county. Grass values raised \$15 per every LCG to bring them the 2011 grass values \$225-\$230 per acre. The local area market is reflecting increases in Deuel County very similar to 2010.

The county is in the process of fully implementing the GIS system through GIS workshop. The soil layers are currently being processed for agricultural land.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Deuel County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	County Assessor and staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	One entire market area county wide; there are no differences identifiable
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	N/A	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	By its actual use of the parcel after inspection and a review of all data is completed.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	Yes	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	Soil types by market data, land use by irrigated, dry or grass.	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	FSA Maps, inspections, GIS data	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	The actual use of the parcel and review work	
9.	Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?	
	Yes	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	Through the questionnaire and inspection; structural changes; land use change; or personal property reporting.	
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.	
	The policy manual and procedures was reviewed and too large to print. These are kept current in the office and available upon request.	

25 Deuel
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 : 30
Total Sales Price : 4,675,030
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,281,199
Total Assessed Value : 3,112,435
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 142,707
Avg. Assessed Value : 103,748

MEDIAN : 73
WGT. MEAN : 73
MEAN : 75
COD : 18.14
PRD : 102.76

COV : 21.03
STD : 15.71
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.21
MAX Sales Ratio : 104.25
MIN Sales Ratio : 52.64

95% Median C.I. : 62.22 to 82.95
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.36 to 78.04
95% Mean C.I. : 68.84 to 80.58

Printed:3/21/2011 5:07:44PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	3	73.49	80.13	76.19	11.65	105.17	70.61	96.29	N/A	228,325	173,957
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	78.61	78.61	63.82	32.62	123.17	52.97	104.25	N/A	75,600	48,250
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	2	68.84	68.84	75.95	23.53	90.64	52.64	85.04	N/A	173,750	131,968
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	4	86.27	83.90	89.06	12.87	94.21	62.22	100.83	N/A	114,500	101,973
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	61.85	75.05	66.88	26.53	112.22	57.18	102.38	N/A	146,279	97,836
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	57.93	61.25	61.21	06.28	100.07	57.44	68.37	N/A	104,933	64,227
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	70.51	70.93	69.15	05.74	102.57	64.93	77.77	N/A	102,100	70,604
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	77.95	75.83	72.37	11.58	104.78	57.10	90.33	N/A	214,500	155,224
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	81.80	74.84	72.51	09.45	103.21	59.77	82.95	N/A	108,977	79,023
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	11	83.38	79.17	78.59	17.85	100.74	52.64	104.25	52.97 to 100.83	149,243	117,290
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	8	60.18	69.87	65.18	20.12	107.20	57.18	102.38	57.18 to 102.38	130,774	85,233
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	11	76.50	73.78	71.57	10.63	103.09	57.10	90.33	59.77 to 82.95	144,848	103,671
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	11	83.38	77.14	75.54	19.67	102.12	52.64	102.38	57.18 to 100.83	139,718	105,546
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	11	68.83	70.07	69.31	11.94	101.10	57.10	90.33	57.44 to 79.40	143,745	99,635
<u>ALL</u>	30	72.84	74.71	72.70	18.14	102.76	52.64	104.25	62.22 to 82.95	142,707	103,748

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	30	72.84	74.71	72.70	18.14	102.76	52.64	104.25	62.22 to 82.95	142,707	103,748
<u>ALL</u>	30	72.84	74.71	72.70	18.14	102.76	52.64	104.25	62.22 to 82.95	142,707	103,748

25 Deuel
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 : 30
 Total Sales Price : 4,675,030
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,281,199
 Total Assessed Value : 3,112,435
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 142,707
 Avg. Assessed Value : 103,748

MEDIAN : 73
 WGT. MEAN : 73
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 18.14
 PRD : 102.76

COV : 21.03
 STD : 15.71
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.21
 MAX Sales Ratio : 104.25
 MIN Sales Ratio : 52.64

95% Median C.I. : 62.22 to 82.95
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.36 to 78.04
 95% Mean C.I. : 68.84 to 80.58

Printed:3/21/2011 5:07:44PM

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
Irrigated											
County	3	77.77	72.25	68.63	10.56	105.27	57.18	81.80	N/A	124,131	85,195
1	3	77.77	72.25	68.63	10.56	105.27	57.18	81.80	N/A	124,131	85,195
Dry											
County	20	74.35	76.77	73.50	20.67	104.45	52.97	104.25	61.85 to 90.33	127,715	93,866
1	20	74.35	76.77	73.50	20.67	104.45	52.97	104.25	61.85 to 90.33	127,715	93,866
Grass											
County	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
1	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
ALL	30	72.84	74.71	72.70	18.14	102.76	52.64	104.25	62.22 to 82.95	142,707	103,748

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	4	75.63	72.56	69.91	09.56	103.79	57.18	81.80	N/A	126,492	88,436
1	4	75.63	72.56	69.91	09.56	103.79	57.18	81.80	N/A	126,492	88,436
Dry											
County	20	74.35	76.77	73.50	20.67	104.45	52.97	104.25	61.85 to 90.33	127,715	93,866
1	20	74.35	76.77	73.50	20.67	104.45	52.97	104.25	61.85 to 90.33	127,715	93,866
Grass											
County	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
1	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
ALL	30	72.84	74.71	72.70	18.14	102.76	52.64	104.25	62.22 to 82.95	142,707	103,748

25 Deuel
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 30
 Total Sales Price : 4,675,030
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,281,199
 Total Assessed Value : 3,112,435
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 142,707
 Avg. Assessed Value : 103,748

MEDIAN : 73
 WGT. MEAN : 73
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 18.14
 PRD : 102.76

COV : 21.03
 STD : 15.71
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.21
 MAX Sales Ratio : 104.25
 MIN Sales Ratio : 52.64

95% Median C.I. : 62.22 to 82.95
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.36 to 78.04
 95% Mean C.I. : 68.84 to 80.58

Printed:3/21/2011 5:07:47PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Qtrrs											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	3	73.49	80.13	76.19	11.65	105.17	70.61	96.29	N/A	228,325	173,957
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	78.61	78.61	63.82	32.62	123.17	52.97	104.25	N/A	75,600	48,250
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	2	68.84	68.84	75.95	23.53	90.64	52.64	85.04	N/A	173,750	131,968
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	4	86.27	83.90	89.06	12.87	94.21	62.22	100.83	N/A	114,500	101,973
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	61.85	75.05	66.88	26.53	112.22	57.18	102.38	N/A	146,279	97,836
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	57.93	61.25	61.21	06.28	100.07	57.44	68.37	N/A	104,933	64,227
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	70.51	70.93	69.15	05.74	102.57	64.93	77.77	N/A	102,100	70,604
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	77.95	75.83	72.37	11.58	104.78	57.10	90.33	N/A	214,500	155,224
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	81.80	74.84	72.51	09.45	103.21	59.77	82.95	N/A	108,977	79,023
Study Yrs											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	11	83.38	79.17	78.59	17.85	100.74	52.64	104.25	52.97 to 100.83	149,243	117,290
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	8	60.18	69.87	65.18	20.12	107.20	57.18	102.38	57.18 to 102.38	130,774	85,233
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	11	76.50	73.78	71.57	10.63	103.09	57.10	90.33	59.77 to 82.95	144,848	103,671
Calendar Yrs											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	11	83.38	77.14	75.54	19.67	102.12	52.64	102.38	57.18 to 100.83	139,718	105,546
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	11	68.83	70.07	69.31	11.94	101.10	57.10	90.33	57.44 to 79.40	143,745	99,635
ALL	30	72.84	74.71	72.70	18.14	102.76	52.64	104.25	62.22 to 82.95	142,707	103,748

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	30	72.84	74.71	72.70	18.14	102.76	52.64	104.25	62.22 to 82.95	142,707	103,748
ALL	30	72.84	74.71	72.70	18.14	102.76	52.64	104.25	62.22 to 82.95	142,707	103,748

25 Deuel
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 30
 Total Sales Price : 4,675,030
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,281,199
 Total Assessed Value : 3,112,435
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 142,707
 Avg. Assessed Value : 103,748

MEDIAN : 73
 WGT. MEAN : 73
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 18.14
 PRD : 102.76

COV : 21.03
 STD : 15.71
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.21
 MAX Sales Ratio : 104.25
 MIN Sales Ratio : 52.64

95% Median C.I. : 62.22 to 82.95
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.36 to 78.04
 95% Mean C.I. : 68.84 to 80.58

Printed:3/21/2011 5:07:47PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	3	77.77	72.25	68.63	10.56	105.27	57.18	81.80	N/A	124,131	85,195
1	3	77.77	72.25	68.63	10.56	105.27	57.18	81.80	N/A	124,131	85,195
Dry											
County	20	74.35	76.77	73.50	20.67	104.45	52.97	104.25	61.85 to 90.33	127,715	93,866
1	20	74.35	76.77	73.50	20.67	104.45	52.97	104.25	61.85 to 90.33	127,715	93,866
Grass											
County	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
1	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
ALL	30	72.84	74.71	72.70	18.14	102.76	52.64	104.25	62.22 to 82.95	142,707	103,748

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	4	75.63	72.56	69.91	09.56	103.79	57.18	81.80	N/A	126,492	88,436
1	4	75.63	72.56	69.91	09.56	103.79	57.18	81.80	N/A	126,492	88,436
Dry											
County	20	74.35	76.77	73.50	20.67	104.45	52.97	104.25	61.85 to 90.33	127,715	93,866
1	20	74.35	76.77	73.50	20.67	104.45	52.97	104.25	61.85 to 90.33	127,715	93,866
Grass											
County	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
1	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
ALL	30	72.84	74.71	72.70	18.14	102.76	52.64	104.25	62.22 to 82.95	142,707	103,748

25 Deuel
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 : 43
 Total Sales Price : 8,304,385
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,916,154
 Total Assessed Value : 5,179,071
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 184,097
 Avg. Assessed Value : 120,444

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 65
 MEAN : 71
 COD : 19.99
 PRD : 108.65

COV : 23.65
 STD : 16.81
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.76
 MAX Sales Ratio : 104.25
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.15

95% Median C.I. : 61.85 to 77.77
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.14 to 69.71
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.06 to 76.10

Printed:3/21/2011 5:07:50PM

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	75.58	79.51	76.46	09.87	103.99	70.61	96.29	N/A	209,994	160,562
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	3	77.16	78.13	72.78	22.15	107.35	52.97	104.25	N/A	153,733	111,895
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	4	58.59	63.72	60.15	17.48	105.94	52.64	85.04	N/A	392,336	235,994
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	6	72.80	72.12	67.68	26.11	106.56	45.92	100.83	45.92 to 100.83	161,333	109,189
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	29.15	29.15	29.15	00.00	100.00	29.15	29.15	N/A	332,000	96,766
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	61.85	75.05	66.88	26.53	112.22	57.18	102.38	N/A	146,279	97,836
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	57.93	61.05	60.00	06.99	101.75	56.42	68.37	56.42 to 68.37	191,147	114,679
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	72.19	72.55	69.89	06.37	103.81	64.93	79.01	N/A	88,256	61,679
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	79.40	79.46	73.55	12.77	108.04	57.10	93.95	N/A	181,600	133,574
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	81.80	74.84	72.51	09.45	103.21	59.77	82.95	N/A	108,977	79,023
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	17	73.49	72.94	67.14	20.89	108.64	45.92	104.25	52.97 to 89.15	225,795	151,591
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	13	58.50	63.98	57.83	18.89	110.63	29.15	102.38	56.69 to 68.37	184,725	106,823
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	13	77.77	75.73	72.39	10.70	104.61	57.10	93.95	64.93 to 82.95	128,939	93,333
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	16	62.04	68.25	60.68	27.24	112.48	29.15	102.38	52.64 to 89.15	225,046	136,566
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	17	68.37	69.84	66.20	13.50	105.50	56.42	93.95	57.44 to 79.01	158,077	104,648
<u>ALL</u>	43	68.83	71.08	65.42	19.99	108.65	29.15	104.25	61.85 to 77.77	184,097	120,444

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	43	68.83	71.08	65.42	19.99	108.65	29.15	104.25	61.85 to 77.77	184,097	120,444
<u>ALL</u>	43	68.83	71.08	65.42	19.99	108.65	29.15	104.25	61.85 to 77.77	184,097	120,444

25 Deuel
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 : 43
 Total Sales Price : 8,304,385
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,916,154
 Total Assessed Value : 5,179,071
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 184,097
 Avg. Assessed Value : 120,444

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 65
 MEAN : 71
 COD : 19.99
 PRD : 108.65

COV : 23.65
 STD : 16.81
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.76
 MAX Sales Ratio : 104.25
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.15

95% Median C.I. : 61.85 to 77.77
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.14 to 69.71
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.06 to 76.10

Printed:3/21/2011 5:07:50PM

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
Irrigated											
County	4	67.48	61.48	50.02	27.13	122.91	29.15	81.80	N/A	176,099	88,088
1	4	67.48	61.48	50.02	27.13	122.91	29.15	81.80	N/A	176,099	88,088
Dry											
County	26	70.51	73.74	69.74	20.71	105.74	51.19	104.25	58.50 to 83.38	153,918	107,345
1	26	70.51	73.74	69.74	20.71	105.74	51.19	104.25	58.50 to 83.38	153,918	107,345
Grass											
County	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
1	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
ALL	43	68.83	71.08	65.42	19.99	108.65	29.15	104.25	61.85 to 77.77	184,097	120,444

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	5	73.49	63.88	53.76	19.93	118.82	29.15	81.80	N/A	167,594	90,102
1	5	73.49	63.88	53.76	19.93	118.82	29.15	81.80	N/A	167,594	90,102
Dry											
County	28	70.51	74.27	70.01	20.52	106.08	51.19	104.25	61.85 to 83.38	147,210	103,060
1	28	70.51	74.27	70.01	20.52	106.08	51.19	104.25	61.85 to 83.38	147,210	103,060
Grass											
County	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
1	4	73.89	73.15	75.83	12.29	96.47	59.77	85.04	N/A	176,483	133,819
ALL	43	68.83	71.08	65.42	19.99	108.65	29.15	104.25	61.85 to 77.77	184,097	120,444

**2011 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

A. Agricultural Land

Deuel County consists of one market area countywide and is primarily dry at 66% of the land use. Grass makes up approximately 26% of the county and the irrigated subclasses only contain 8% of the county. The agricultural market in Deuel County has been increasing between 7 to 20% per year but with a lower number of sales in the market. The assessor achieved equalization in 2011 by increasing dry and grass values in the agricultural property class.

In the base statistic, the analysis includes 30 qualified sales within Deuel County. The distribution of the sales among the three year study period was reviewed and was found adequate, proportionate and representative for reliability. There is a 5% or less spread between the county population and sample for each land use. The sales are distributed with 11 in the oldest and newest years and 8 in the middle study year. The acceptable thresholds were met for the base statistic making these reliable.

The random inclusion statistics are identical to the base statistics since all thresholds were met and no expansion is necessary in the second test.

The random exclusion or third analysis brought in all the comparable sales from the adjoining counties. 13 total sales were borrowed; 6 from Garden, 4 from Cheyenne and 3 from Keith. Colorado borders Deuel County on the south. In the results of the third analysis the median and mean remain in acceptable ranges at 69 and 71 but the other statistics show signs of unreliability. The weighted mean dropped to 65 and the COD rounds mathematically to 20 and the PRD increased by 5.89 points. This may be due partly to the size of adjoining counties which include a much larger base of sales. The values in Deuel County are reasonably similar to the adjoining counties and are much smaller in size whereas Garden County is approximately 71% grass to the dry land in Deuel County. Although Deuel is located in the Panhandle of the state you can see a transitional location where the characteristics of the soils start to change more to the east near Keith County.

Based on the known assessment practices, the sales review completed by the assessor and the assessment actions to increase the dry and grass subclasses in 2011 the base stat is determined to be proportionate, representative and reliable for the 2011 statistical measurements.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 73% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Deuel 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 Deuel 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 Deuel 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 Deuel 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.

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	74	3,655,290	74	3,655,290	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	74	3,655,290	74	3,655,290	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	72	0	40	112

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	1,350	0	0	931	72,909,275	932	72,910,625
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	12,000	0	0	360	28,880,945	361	28,892,945
29. Ag Improvements	1	12,501	0	0	364	15,541,810	365	15,554,311
30. Ag Total							1,297	117,357,881

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	1	0.00	12,000	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	1	0.00	12,501	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	7	12.62	65,425	8	12.62	77,425	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	221	256.49	2,069,775	221	256.49	2,069,775	
33. HomeSite Improvements	226	0.00	10,350,002	226	0.00	10,350,002	0
34. HomeSite Total				234	269.11	12,497,202	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	16	21.92	27,250	16	21.92	27,250	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	127	124.60	310,300	127	124.60	310,300	
37. FarmSite Improvements	344	0.00	5,191,808	345	0.00	5,204,309	499,640
38. FarmSite Total				361	146.52	5,541,859	
39. Road & Ditches	988	3,714.49	0	988	3,714.49	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	2	8.50	23,000	2	8.50	23,000	
41. Total Section VI				595	4,138.62	18,062,061	499,640

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	10,026.81	48.65%	6,868,385	51.32%	685.00
47. 2A1	1,682.98	8.17%	1,144,420	8.55%	680.00
48. 2A	5,499.67	26.68%	3,712,280	27.74%	675.00
49. 3A1	908.55	4.41%	531,505	3.97%	585.00
50. 3A	307.50	1.49%	164,515	1.23%	535.01
51. 4A1	1,259.83	6.11%	592,120	4.42%	470.00
52. 4A	926.50	4.49%	370,600	2.77%	400.00
53. Total	20,611.84	100.00%	13,383,825	100.00%	649.33
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	131,785.90	74.06%	55,350,060	79.20%	420.00
56. 2D1	3,900.88	2.19%	1,326,295	1.90%	340.00
57. 2D	11,713.70	6.58%	3,982,660	5.70%	340.00
58. 3D1	14,701.62	8.26%	4,998,550	7.15%	340.00
59. 3D	832.45	0.47%	249,735	0.36%	300.00
60. 4D1	11,380.84	6.40%	3,015,945	4.32%	265.00
61. 4D	3,637.61	2.04%	963,975	1.38%	265.00
62. Total	177,953.00	100.00%	69,887,220	100.00%	392.73
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	9,427.40	13.28%	2,174,200	13.57%	230.63
65. 2G1	1,590.60	2.24%	362,920	2.27%	228.17
66. 2G	10,075.40	14.19%	2,274,525	14.20%	225.75
67. 3G1	2,967.94	4.18%	667,720	4.17%	224.98
68. 3G	1,062.78	1.50%	238,350	1.49%	224.27
69. 4G1	21,063.47	29.67%	4,728,315	29.51%	224.48
70. 4G	24,804.83	34.94%	5,576,540	34.80%	224.82
71. Total	70,992.42	100.00%	16,022,570	100.00%	225.69
Irrigated Total					
	20,611.84	7.64%	13,383,825	13.48%	649.33
Dry Total					
	177,953.00	65.96%	69,887,220	70.38%	392.73
Grass Total					
	70,992.42	26.32%	16,022,570	16.14%	225.69
72. Waste	220.52	0.08%	2,205	0.00%	10.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	269,777.78	100.00%	99,295,820	100.00%	368.07

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	2.00	1,350	0.00	0	20,609.84	13,382,475	20,611.84	13,383,825
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	177,953.00	69,887,220	177,953.00	69,887,220
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	70,992.42	16,022,570	70,992.42	16,022,570
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	220.52	2,205	220.52	2,205
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	2.00	1,350	0.00	0	269,775.78	99,294,470	269,777.78	99,295,820

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	20,611.84	7.64%	13,383,825	13.48%	649.33
Dry Land	177,953.00	65.96%	69,887,220	70.38%	392.73
Grass	70,992.42	26.32%	16,022,570	16.14%	225.69
Waste	220.52	0.08%	2,205	0.00%	10.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	269,777.78	100.00%	99,295,820	100.00%	368.07

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

25 Deuel

	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	34,797,727	35,200,870	403,143	1.16%	277,655	0.36%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	12,318,697	12,497,202	178,505	1.45%	0	1.45%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	47,116,424	47,698,072	581,648	1.23%	277,655	0.65%
05. Commercial	12,207,730	20,254,931	8,047,201	65.92%	0	65.92%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	5,384,369	5,541,859	157,490	2.92%	499,640	-6.35%
08. Minerals	3,495,610	3,655,290	159,680	4.57	0	4.57
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	21,087,709	29,452,080	8,364,371	39.66%	499,640	37.30%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	68,204,133	77,173,152	8,969,019	13.15%	777,295	12.01%
11. Irrigated	13,370,650	13,383,825	13,175	0.10%		
12. Dryland	62,762,285	69,887,220	7,124,935	11.35%		
13. Grassland	15,013,365	16,022,570	1,009,205	6.72%		
14. Wasteland	2,205	2,205	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	23,000	0	-23,000	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	91,171,505	99,295,820	8,124,315	8.91%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	159,375,638	176,468,972	17,093,334	10.73%	777,295	10.24%

2010 Plan of Assessment for Deuel County Assessor's Office
Assessment Years 2011, 2012 and 2013
Date: October 15, 2010

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the County Board of Equalization and the Assessor may amend the plan, if necessary after the budget is approved by the County Board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 92-100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 68-75% of actual value for agricultural and horticultural land; and
- 3) 68-75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 750% of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when special valuation is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

General Description of Real Property in Deuel County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	818	35.03%	21.84%
Commercial	154	6.60%	7.60%
Agricultural	1281	54.86%	68.37%
Mineral	82	3.51%	2.19%
Total	2335	100.00%	100.00%

Agricultural land taxable acres – 270,126.67

New Property: For assessment year 2010, 20 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county. The total growth was \$157,200.

Current Resources:

- A) The Deuel County Assessor’s office has a staff of 3 that includes Assessor Jean Timm, Deputy Marjorie Radke and clerk Brenda LaVante. This office has an adopted budget for 2010-11 of \$105,310. The cost for required training for the assessor and deputy has been incorporated into the budget. The assessor and the deputy have sufficient hours to date to meet the 60-hour requirement.
- B) The cadastral map was redone in 1997 and is updated monthly by the staff. All rural improved records contain an aerial photo taken in 1987. It is unknown what year the land use overlays were created.
- C) We have signed a contract with GIS Workshop and are working to verify the information in the cadastral books. We plan to have the GIS program in operation by July 1, 2011.
- D) The Property record cards are current and exceed the standards set by the department. Each record contains all required information, an index, current valuation sheet, CAMA worksheet and sketch and color photos of improvements.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

- A) The Assessor processes the Real Estate Transfers. The clerk assists with updating the records and is responsible for maintaining the Sales Reference Book and the Land Sales Map. These steps are followed:
 - 1) Fill out Sales Worksheets

- 2) Send out questionnaires, add returned questionnaires to Sales File
- 3) Update computer records
- 4) Add the sale to the sales spreadsheet to update projected sales ratios
- 5) File updated computer printout in record card
- 6) Update rolodex
- 7) Update record label
- 8) Update the Ag Sales Map
- 9) Update the Sales Reference Book
- 10) Update Cadastral
- 11) Update GIS, if necessary
- 12) Mail 521's to PAT by 15th of the following month
- B) Data collection is completed by of the Deputy and clerk. Improvements are priced by the Deputy using the current CAMA program (Cost Approach). We are currently using a 2007 pricing table.
- C) The Assessor reviews the sales ratios to determine if any assessment action is needed.
- D) The Assessor reviews assessment/sales ratio with the liaison after assessment actions are completed and discusses any area of concern.
- E) The Assessor is responsible for Public Notices.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	95%	11.63	101.28
Commercial	71%	37.80	115.65
Agricultural	71%	18.12	106.36

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

Residential:

We will continue to monitor Chappell and Big Springs Residential property sales. We will address the remaining properties located in township 12, ranges 41-45. The valuations of all properties reviewed by December 31, 10 will be updated by March 19, 2011.

Commercial and Agricultural Land:

We will continue to monitor Commercial/Agricultural land sales. The Commercial reappraisal has been completed by Stanard Appraisal Services, Inc. All commercial property values have been updated on the PC-Admin and CAMA.

We plan to print a report with values, pictures and sketches for each commercial property to be mailed with the Change of Valuation Notices.

We will be working with GIS Workshop complete the mapping and implementation of the program.

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

Residential:

We will continue to monitor Residential properties for changes and sales.

We will continue the review and inspection of rural residences and agricultural improvements within township 13 ranges 41-45. Valuations of all properties reviewed by December 31, 2011 will be updated by March 19, 2012.

Commercial and Agricultural Land:

We will continue to monitor Commercial/Agricultural land sales.

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

Residential:

We will continue to monitor Residential properties for changes and sales.

We will continue the review and inspection of rural residences and agricultural improvements within township 14 ranges 41-45. Valuations of all properties reviewed by December 31, 2012 will be updated by March 19, 2013.

Commercial and Agricultural Land:

We will continue to monitor Commercial/Agricultural land sales.

Other functions performed by the Assessor's office, but not limited to:

1. The Assessor makes all ownership changes. Record maintenance and mapping updates are the responsibility of the entire staff.
2. The Assessor is responsible for the filing of all Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real and Personal)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value Update with Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report

- f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for property owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property – The entire staff administers the annual filings of schedules. The assessor and the deputy prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
 4. Permissive Exemptions – The assessor administers the annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, reviews and makes recommendations to the county board.
 5. Taxable Government Owned Property – the annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose and the sending of notices of intent to tax is the responsibility of the assessor.
 6. Homestead Exemptions – The entire staff assists the taxpayer with the annual filings of applications. The assessor approves or denies each application and sends out taxpayer notifications.
 7. Centrally Assessed – The assessor reviews the valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establishes assessment records and tax billing for the tax list.
 8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates –The assessor prepares the tax lists and certifies it to the County Treasurer for real property, personal property and centrally assessed property,
 9. Tax List Corrections – The assessor prepares and presents the tax list corrections documents for county board approval.
 10. County Board of Equalization – The assessor provides information regarding protests and attends the county board of equalization meetings for these protests.
 11. TERC Appeals – The assessor prepares information and attends taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC. It is the assessor’s duty to defend the valuation established by the assessor’s office.
 12. Education – The Assessor and the Deputy Assessor will attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain the required 60 hours of continuing education to maintain their assessor certification.

Respectfully submitted,

Assessor signature: Jean M. Timm

Date: 10-15-10

2011 Assessment Survey for Deuel County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	0
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$131,000
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$48,500
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	0
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$8,500
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,050
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$3,000
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	\$984.11

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS (PC Admin)
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	The assessor and staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	The county is in the process of implementing a new GIS system and they are

	currently in the process of creating complete records for each parcel
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop/County Assessor and Staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS (PC Admin)

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Big Springs and Chappell
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	The County and Village of Big Springs were zoned in 1975. Chappell was zoned in 2002.

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Pritchard and Abbott is contracted for Mineral Appraisal Valuations
2.	Other services:
	MIPS and GIS Workshop

2011 Certification for Deuel 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 Deuel County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

