

# 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 Fillmore County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	156	Median	99.43
Total Sales Price	\$7,488,300	Mean	108.96
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,488,300	Wgt. Mean	99.91
Total Assessed Value	\$7,481,495	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$55,122
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$48,002	Avg. Assessed Value	\$47,958

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	98.76 to 99.88
95% Mean C.I	97.54 to 102.28
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	101.05 to 116.87
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	12.66
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.12
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.32

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	164	99	99
2009	185	99	99
2008	199	99	99
2007	188	99	99

## 2011 Commission Summary for Fillmore County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	19	Median	100.22
Total Sales Price	\$1,158,940	Mean	124.42
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,158,940	Wgt. Mean	97.87
Total Assessed Value	\$1,134,245	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$92,916
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$60,997	Avg. Assessed Value	\$59,697

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.80 to 158.75
95% Mean C.I	94.10 to 154.74
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.25 to 111.49
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.58
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.47
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.23

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	23	99	99
2009	28	99	99
2008	35	98	98
2007	28	98	98



## 2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Fillmore 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>	99	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	73	The qualitative measures calculated in the random include sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



*Ruth A. Sorensen*

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



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

### **Residential:**

For 2011, Fillmore County reports that they will complete all residential pickup work.

They have verified, reviewed and analyzed the residential sales throughout the county.

Since the inspection and update of all residential was conducted during 2009 and 2010, the county did not schedule or undertake any inspections for 2011.

They have now completed the preparation of new record cards for all of the residential parcels.

They have implemented a new "APEX" sketching program and now completed all of the sketches for all of the urban, rural and agricultural residential records for 2011.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Fillmore County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	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>
	01	Geneva: (Including: Sub Geneva; Rural Geneva) Unique characteristics include: The primary host location for the K-12 school district (Fillmore Central) with part of the system in Fairmont; an active downtown commercial business district; a fairly broad selection of employment in the retail and service sectors; an organized residential market; the only hospital in the county.
	02	Exeter: Unique characteristics include: A shared K-12 school district (Exeter Milligan) with parts of the system in both Exeter, and Milligan; a moderately active downtown commercial business district; a fairly limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
	03	Fairmont: Unique characteristics include: A K-12 school district (Fillmore Central) with most of the system in Geneva and part in Fairmont; Little to no business district or available services;; a very limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
	04	Grafton: Unique characteristics include: No school; minimal business district or available services.
	05	Milligan: Unique characteristics include: A shared K-12 school district (Exeter Milligan) with parts of the system in both Exeter, and Milligan; minimal business district or available services.
	06	Ohiowa: (Including: Sub Ohiowa) Unique characteristics include: Little to no business district or available services; no school, students attend either Fillmore Central, Meridian or Bruning Davenport.
	07	Shickley: (Including: Sub Shickley) Unique characteristics include: A K-12 school district (Shickley) but affiliate with Bruning Davenport for sports activities; a moderately active downtown commercial business district; a fairly limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
	08	Strang: Unique characteristics include: Little to no business district or available services; no school, students attend either Fillmore Central or Bruning Davenport.

	09	Rural: (Including: Rural Res) There are few unique characteristics common to all parcels in this valuation group. The parcels are located in the non-urban areas throughout the county.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	The cost and sales comparison approaches, both rooted in the analysis of the local market.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	1993	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	Sales Comparison (by square foot)	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2008	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The county uses the local market to develop depreciation tables	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes; each valuation group is done separately.	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	Depreciation is developed when a class of property is reviewed and new cost tables are implemented.	
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>	
	Following are some of the circumstances that are considered: -The construction of a new structure on a previously vacant or minimally improved lot. -A major addition or alteration to the structure, usually results in a change in square footage. -A dramatic increase in the depreciation, usually due to something like fire damage, vandalism or demolition of a structure. -Extensive rehabilitation and remodeling (change to the interior finish, mechanical systems or fixtures) of an existing structure causing a significant reduction of depreciation.	
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>	
	The assessor is presently developing policies and procedures for the county. She has sent the ones that are currently in place.	

**30 Fillmore  
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 : 156  
 Total Sales Price : 7,488,300  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,488,300  
 Total Assessed Value : 7,481,495  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 48,002  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 47,958

MEDIAN : 99  
 WGT. MEAN : 100  
 MEAN : 109  
 COD : 16.29  
 PRD : 109.06

COV : 46.26  
 STD : 50.40  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.20  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 547.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.82

95% Median C.I. : 98.76 to 99.88  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 97.54 to 102.28  
 95% Mean C.I. : 101.05 to 116.87

Printed:3/28/2011 3:10:04PM

**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	20	99.48	100.05	98.97	02.98	101.09	93.16	115.77	98.78 to 100.32	49,863	49,347
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	23	100.69	109.32	107.75	10.87	101.46	94.06	237.77	98.24 to 105.79	36,187	38,990
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	12	100.56	130.17	105.44	40.40	123.45	53.17	328.54	95.90 to 105.25	33,546	35,372
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	21	99.00	98.02	98.42	02.93	99.59	86.65	103.75	95.73 to 100.70	45,393	44,675
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	29	99.05	126.33	104.40	29.63	121.01	90.86	547.50	97.95 to 101.00	50,897	53,135
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	16	99.26	99.96	98.83	02.40	101.14	96.12	114.00	97.78 to 100.94	60,719	60,008
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	14	100.21	108.80	101.28	17.59	107.42	59.07	189.59	94.22 to 124.67	40,461	40,980
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	21	90.13	98.82	90.02	25.92	109.78	50.82	284.00	77.50 to 99.88	61,381	55,256
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	76	99.69	107.05	101.91	11.46	105.04	53.17	328.54	98.91 to 100.69	41,913	42,715
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	80	98.78	110.77	98.42	20.95	112.55	50.82	547.50	97.95 to 99.63	53,787	52,939
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	78	99.11	113.89	101.59	18.62	112.11	53.17	547.50	98.27 to 99.78	48,760	49,534
<u>ALL</u>	156	99.43	108.96	99.91	16.29	109.06	50.82	547.50	98.76 to 99.88	48,002	47,958

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	58	99.10	107.96	99.88	16.74	108.09	50.82	328.54	97.91 to 99.89	70,235	70,154
02	14	99.49	111.58	100.03	18.48	111.55	67.85	284.00	95.61 to 105.25	34,143	34,153
03	27	100.12	122.45	101.55	27.49	120.58	70.08	547.50	97.78 to 103.79	31,231	31,714
04	7	100.00	99.81	99.46	00.87	100.35	97.63	101.38	97.63 to 101.38	27,521	27,374
05	7	98.88	93.82	91.65	05.52	102.37	63.20	99.61	63.20 to 99.61	44,143	40,458
06	19	99.78	110.76	110.68	18.76	100.07	59.07	286.36	96.19 to 103.75	13,337	14,762
07	17	98.24	99.45	97.43	05.02	102.07	86.63	114.00	94.22 to 102.75	36,526	35,586
09	7	99.88	102.35	100.07	10.26	102.28	88.13	137.08	88.13 to 137.08	102,486	102,556
<u>ALL</u>	156	99.43	108.96	99.91	16.29	109.06	50.82	547.50	98.76 to 99.88	48,002	47,958

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	154	99.43	109.03	99.94	16.36	109.10	50.82	547.50	98.76 to 99.88	48,362	48,332
06											
07	2	103.71	103.71	94.69	09.92	109.53	93.42	114.00	N/A	20,250	19,175
<u>ALL</u>	156	99.43	108.96	99.91	16.29	109.06	50.82	547.50	98.76 to 99.88	48,002	47,958

**30 Fillmore  
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 : 156  
 Total Sales Price : 7,488,300  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,488,300  
 Total Assessed Value : 7,481,495  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 48,002  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 47,958

MEDIAN : 99  
 WGT. MEAN : 100  
 MEAN : 109  
 COD : 16.29  
 PRD : 109.06

COV : 46.26  
 STD : 50.40  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.20  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 547.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.82

95% Median C.I. : 98.76 to 99.88  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 97.54 to 102.28  
 95% Mean C.I. : 101.05 to 116.87

Printed:3/28/2011 3:10:04PM

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	15	112.57	162.30	124.88	53.78	129.96	93.33	547.50	102.75 to 142.71	1,810	2,260	
5000 TO 9999	13	100.69	101.90	101.09	07.47	100.80	88.17	153.80	94.06 to 101.60	6,196	6,264	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	28	101.91	134.26	107.09	36.28	125.37	88.17	547.50	100.00 to 112.57	3,846	4,119	
10000 TO 29999	49	99.45	109.69	108.64	21.92	100.97	50.82	328.54	98.21 to 101.11	18,266	19,844	
30000 TO 59999	32	98.83	101.54	102.07	05.05	99.48	90.94	166.60	97.42 to 99.89	43,758	44,665	
60000 TO 99999	26	99.54	100.16	100.18	05.98	99.98	63.20	137.08	97.78 to 100.41	74,685	74,816	
100000 TO 149999	9	97.91	94.82	94.97	03.62	99.84	85.87	99.02	86.63 to 98.38	119,500	113,495	
150000 TO 249999	11	99.32	96.04	96.17	04.10	99.86	77.50	101.00	88.13 to 100.58	163,455	157,198	
250000 TO 499999	1	99.50	99.50	99.50	00.00	100.00	99.50	99.50	N/A	270,000	268,655	
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	156	99.43	108.96	99.91	16.29	109.06	50.82	547.50	98.76 to 99.88	48,002	47,958	



## 2011 Correlation Section for Fillmore County

---

### **A. Residential Real Property**

Fillmore County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. Geneva is the largest town and the county seat. Most of the residential properties in the county are in the towns and villages but there are some houses on acreages and houses on agricultural parcels. The county has divided the residential analysis and valuation work into 9 Valuation Groupings, mostly centered on individual towns plus one for rural residential parcels. In the Residential Survey and Residential Assessment Actions section of the R&O, the characteristics of the Valuation Groupings and the assessment process are described in detail. The county believes that each grouping is unique with differing combinations of population, schools, available commercial services, healthcare services and employment outside the agricultural sector. During the past few years there have been no significant economic events that have impacted the value of residential property. Some locations have shown positive residential growth and some have shown decline. In all, the residential class is stable, but values are somewhat flat to slightly increasing. Over the past 10 years, the residential valuations have increased at an average of 3.51%, and had growth of an average of 1.31%. In the 2011 Abstract, the change in valuation to the residential class is 2.37%; and 0.99% excluding growth. The assessment sales ratio study of the 156 qualified sales in the 2 year study period sales is the lowest number in 5 years.

The basic assessment sales ratio study of the 156 qualified sales produced a median ratio of 99%. The analysis of the assessment process in the county goes beyond the statistics that are produced from the sales that have occurred in the current study period. The actions taken during the assessment process are of considerable importance when determining the quality of assessment. The assessor annually reports their assessment intentions in their 3 Year Plan; they verify their accomplishments during the interview for the Assessment Actions section of the R&O; and explain many of the other details and valuation procedures or policies during the preparation of the Survey. The discussion of their 6 Year Inspection process further reveals steps in any inspection, review or revaluation process and supports the thoroughness and the consistency of their actions.

It is not certain that the county has achieved equalization in the residential class of property by simply reviewing the R&O Statistics. The Department does not depend solely on the assessment statistics to evaluate equalization in the county. The best basis to evaluate intra-county equalization is to determine that the valuation process is current accurate and applied consistently. The assessment actions narratives prepared this year and in prior years describe a process that likely to produce equalized results.

The Department believes that the quality of assessment of residential property in the county is good. There are numerous reasons, but the most relevant are the Departments ongoing interaction with the assessor, and the annual reporting of their actions with regard to residential property. The county has built thorough, high quality and current records by the regular inspection of all parcels. They keep the values up dated and current by paying constant attention to the verification and review of sales. While perfect valuation of residential property is unlikely, the county has done a consistent and uniform job of valuation. They verify all sales, are in regular contact with many property owners and apply their valuation processes even handedly. The costs used are universal across the county and the land values and depreciation are consistent within each valuation group.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Fillmore County**

---

The Department is confident that Fillmore County has conducted a high quality assessment process for residential property. They are thorough and timely in their work, and consistent in the application of the results of the analysis variables that they work with. There is some confidence that the current R&O Statistics are meaningful to measure the entire class partly because the sample is adequate and partly because the assessment actions are good. The measurement of any subclass of residential property is considered less reliable in most cases. For 2011, the median ratio is 99% for the residential property. The median confidence interval indicates a level of value within the range of 92 to 100% even though the PRD and COD are not. Considering all of the factors, the level of value is 99%. There are no recommendations for the adjustment of the class or for any subclasses of the residential class. The quality of assessment based on the assessment actions of the assessor for the residential class is acceptable.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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 Fillmore County**

### **Commercial:**

For 2011, Fillmore County reports that they will complete all commercial pickup work.

They have verified, reviewed and analyzed the commercial sales throughout the county.

Since the inspection and update of all commercial was conducted during 2009 and 2010, the county did not schedule or undertake any additional inspections for 2011.

They have now completed the preparation of new record cards for all of the commercial parcels.

They have implemented a new "APEX" sketching program and now completed all of the sketches on all of the commercial records for 2011.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Fillmore County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	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>
	01	Geneva: (Including: Sub Geneva; Rural Geneva) Unique characteristics include: The primary host location for the K-12 school district (Fillmore Central) with part of the system in Fairmont; an active downtown commercial business district; a fairly broad selection of employment in the retail and service sectors; an organized residential market; the only hospital in the county.
	02	Exeter: Unique characteristics include: A shared K-12 school district (Exeter Milligan) with parts of the system in both Exeter, and Milligan; a moderately active downtown commercial business district; a fairly limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
	03	Fairmont: Unique characteristics include: A K-12 school district (Fillmore Central) with most of the system in Geneva and part in Fairmont; Little to no business district or available services;; a very limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
	04	Grafton: Unique characteristics include: No school; minimal business district or available services.
	05	Milligan: Unique characteristics include: A shared K-12 school district (Exeter Milligan) with parts of the system in both Exeter, and Milligan; minimal business district or available services.
	06	Ohiowa: (Including: Sub Ohiowa) Unique characteristics include: Little to no business district or available services; no school, students attend either Fillmore Central, Meridian or Bruning Davenport.
	07	Shickley: (Including: Sub Shickley) Unique characteristics include: A K-12 school district (Shickley) but affiliate with Bruning Davenport for sports activities; a moderately active downtown commercial business district; a fairly limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
	08	Strang: Unique characteristics include: Little to no business district or available services; no school, students attend either Fillmore Central or Bruning Davenport.

	09	Rural: (Including: Rural Res) There are few unique characteristics common to all parcels in this valuation group. The parcels are located in the non-urban areas throughout the county.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	The cost and sales comparison approaches.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	1993, but more recently in newer subdivisions.	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Sales Comparison (by square foot)	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	July of 2008	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The county uses the local market to develop depreciation tables	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes; The county develops their depreciation countywide then determines a local multiplier based on the market.	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	Depreciation is developed when a class of property is reviewed or when new cost tables are implemented. The commercial depreciation was developed in 2009.	
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>	
	Following are some of the circumstances that are considered: -The construction of a new structure on a previously vacant or minimally improved lot. -A major addition or alteration to the structure, usually results in a change in square footage. -A dramatic increase in the depreciation, usually due to something like fire damage, vandalism or demolition of a structure. -Extensive rehabilitation and remodeling (change to the interior finish, mechanical systems or fixtures) of an existing structure causing a significant reduction of depreciation.	
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>	
	The assessor is presently developing policies and procedures for the county. She has sent the ones that are currently in place.	

**30 Fillmore  
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 : 19  
 Total Sales Price : 1,158,940  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,158,940  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,134,245  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 60,997  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 59,697

MEDIAN : 100  
 WGT. MEAN : 98  
 MEAN : 124  
 COD : 34.51  
 PRD : 127.13

COV : 50.55  
 STD : 62.90  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 34.59  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 344.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.10

95% Median C.I. : 96.80 to 158.75  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.25 to 111.49  
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.10 to 154.74

Printed:3/28/2011 3:10:07PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	92.14	92.14	98.38	07.75	93.66	85.00	99.27	N/A	16,000	15,740
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08											
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	98.51	98.51	96.96	01.74	101.60	96.80	100.21	N/A	48,720	47,240
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	129.01	129.01	116.26	23.05	110.97	99.27	158.75	N/A	21,000	24,415
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	175.84	204.52	101.07	47.45	202.35	93.71	344.00	N/A	57,833	58,452
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	100.22	86.85	98.41	17.34	88.25	54.10	106.24	N/A	128,667	126,620
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	78.11	78.11	78.11	00.00	100.00	78.11	78.11	N/A	315,000	246,060
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	101.20	126.48	143.14	27.86	88.36	96.83	181.40	N/A	6,167	8,827
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	117.33	131.02	139.37	13.30	94.01	114.45	161.28	N/A	31,500	43,900
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	4	98.04	95.32	97.31	04.51	97.95	85.00	100.21	N/A	32,360	31,490
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	5	158.75	174.31	104.03	41.18	167.56	93.71	344.00	N/A	43,100	44,837
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	10	103.72	111.12	96.33	24.12	115.35	54.10	181.40	78.11 to 161.28	81,400	78,410
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	99.74	113.76	102.78	15.76	110.68	96.80	158.75	N/A	34,860	35,828
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	100.22	136.03	91.63	57.04	148.46	54.10	344.00	54.10 to 344.00	124,929	114,468
<u>ALL</u>	19	100.22	124.42	97.87	34.51	127.13	54.10	344.00	96.80 to 158.75	60,997	59,697

**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	99.75	112.08	96.94	18.13	115.62	78.11	181.40	96.80 to 117.33	91,933	89,120
02	1	100.21	100.21	100.21	00.00	100.00	100.21	100.21	N/A	4,740	4,750
03	1	344.00	344.00	344.00	00.00	100.00	344.00	344.00	N/A	1,000	3,440
04	1	54.10	54.10	54.10	00.00	100.00	54.10	54.10	N/A	21,000	11,360
05	1	101.20	101.20	101.20	00.00	100.00	101.20	101.20	N/A	2,500	2,530
06	1	85.00	85.00	85.00	00.00	100.00	85.00	85.00	N/A	2,000	1,700
07	2	167.30	167.30	167.47	05.11	99.90	158.75	175.84	N/A	12,250	20,515
<u>ALL</u>	19	100.22	124.42	97.87	34.51	127.13	54.10	344.00	96.80 to 158.75	60,997	59,697

**30 Fillmore  
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 : 19  
 Total Sales Price : 1,158,940  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,158,940  
 Total Assessed Value : 1,134,245  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 60,997  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 59,697

MEDIAN : 100  
 WGT. MEAN : 98  
 MEAN : 124  
 COD : 34.51  
 PRD : 127.13

COV : 50.55  
 STD : 62.90  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 34.59  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 344.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.10

95% Median C.I. : 96.80 to 158.75  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.25 to 111.49  
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.10 to 154.74

Printed:3/28/2011 3:10:07PM

**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	19	100.22	124.42	97.87	34.51	127.13	54.10	344.00	96.80 to 158.75	60,997	59,697
04											
<u>ALL</u>	19	100.22	124.42	97.87	34.51	127.13	54.10	344.00	96.80 to 158.75	60,997	59,697

**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	5	101.20	149.55	120.08	54.57	124.54	85.00	344.00	N/A	2,948	3,540
5000 TO 9999	1	96.83	96.83	96.83	00.00	100.00	96.83	96.83	N/A	6,000	5,810
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	6	100.71	140.76	113.36	46.42	124.17	85.00	344.00	85.00 to 344.00	3,457	3,918
10000 TO 29999	4	167.30	142.52	127.08	21.58	112.15	54.10	181.40	N/A	13,875	17,633
30000 TO 59999	5	106.24	116.10	119.89	14.53	96.84	99.27	161.28	N/A	39,000	46,758
60000 TO 99999	1	96.80	96.80	96.80	00.00	100.00	96.80	96.80	N/A	92,700	89,730
100000 TO 149999											
150000 TO 249999	1	93.71	93.71	93.71	00.00	100.00	93.71	93.71	N/A	160,000	149,935
250000 TO 499999	2	89.17	89.17	89.25	12.40	99.91	78.11	100.22	N/A	317,500	283,375
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	19	100.22	124.42	97.87	34.51	127.13	54.10	344.00	96.80 to 158.75	60,997	59,697

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	7	114.45	145.45	129.16	42.63	112.61	85.00	344.00	85.00 to 344.00	19,071	24,633
123	1	106.24	106.24	106.24	00.00	100.00	106.24	106.24	N/A	45,000	47,810
185	1	99.27	99.27	99.27	00.00	100.00	99.27	99.27	N/A	30,000	29,780
25	1	175.84	175.84	175.84	00.00	100.00	175.84	175.84	N/A	12,500	21,980
42	1	78.11	78.11	78.11	00.00	100.00	78.11	78.11	N/A	315,000	246,060
47	2	95.26	95.26	94.84	01.63	100.44	93.71	96.80	N/A	126,350	119,833
49	1	100.22	100.22	100.22	00.00	100.00	100.22	100.22	N/A	320,000	320,690
50	2	129.98	129.98	148.83	22.14	87.33	101.20	158.75	N/A	7,250	10,790
98	3	100.21	111.90	95.83	42.34	116.77	54.10	181.40	N/A	11,913	11,417
<u>ALL</u>	19	100.22	124.42	97.87	34.51	127.13	54.10	344.00	96.80 to 158.75	60,997	59,697



## 2011 Correlation Section for Fillmore County

---

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

Fillmore County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. Most of the commercial properties in the county either directly service or support agriculture or the people involved in agriculture. There are a few commercial activities operating outside of those uses but they are in the minority. During the past year and even the past 5 to 10 years, commercial property has had no real economic fluctuations. Some property uses have prospered and grown and some have declined. Some locations have shown positive commercial activity and some have shown decline. In all, the commercial is stable but somewhat flat in terms of value.

The basic assessment sales ratio study of the 19 qualified sales produced a median ratio of 100%. The analysis of the assessment process in the county goes beyond the statistics that are produced from the sales that have occurred in the current study period. The actions taken during the assessment process are of considerable importance when determining the quality of assessment. The assessor annually reports their assessment intentions in their 3 Year Plan; they verify their accomplishments during the interview for the Assessment Actions section of the R&O; and explain many of the other details and valuation procedures or policies during the preparation of the Survey. The discussion of their 6 Year Inspection process further reveals steps in any inspection, review or revaluation process and supports the thoroughness and the consistency of their actions. There is no way to accurately portray whether the county has achieved equalization in the commercial class of property by simply reviewing the R&O Statistics. The Commission Summary in the 2010 R&O indicated an average assessed value of the assessed base of about \$87,000 and an average assessed value of the sold parcels at just about \$56,500. For 2011 the average value of the 19 sold parcels is just under \$59,700 indicating a lack of representativeness. The lack of sufficient sales and the likelihood that the sales are not representative of the class, leads one to conclude that the actions of the assessor are far more important in evaluating the level of value and likelihood of equalization of the class of commercial property. In the opinion of the Department, Fillmore County has achieved a reasonable degree of equalization based on their assessment practices, not based on the assessment statistics.

The Department believes that the quality of assessment of commercial property in the county is good. There are numerous reasons, but the most relevant are the Departments ongoing interaction with the assessor, and the annual reporting of their actions with regard to commercial property. The COD and the PRD might be a good test of the quality of assessment if there was any assurance that the sample was adequate and represented the population. Every indicator available says that it does not. The county has built thorough, high quality and current records by the regular inspection of all parcels. They keep the values up dated and current by paying constant attention to the verification and review of sales. While perfect valuation of commercial property is unlikely, the county continually works to do a consistent and uniform job of valuation. They verify all sales, are in regular contact with the property owners and apply their valuation processes even handedly. The costs used are universal across the county and the land values and depreciation are consistent within each valuation group. That is the best basis that they can have for intra county equalization.

The Department is confident that Fillmore County has conducted a consistent, uniform and detailed assessment process for commercial property. They are consistent in their verification

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Fillmore County**

---

and analysis of sales and the application of the results of the analysis. Historically, the county assessment process has produced a level of value of about 98 to 99%. The median of the 2011 statistics is 100% which is supported by the historical data. The past measures are statistically similar to the one prepared for 2011, collectively they all suggest that 99% is possibly the level of value of the commercial property. The Department is reluctant to certify a level of value based on the median ratio of a small sample of sales that is not apparently representative of this diverse class of property. There is not sufficient data to determine a level of value for the commercial class. There is not sufficient data to recommend any adjustment of the class or for any subclasses of commercial property. The quality of assessment for the commercial class is acceptable based on the known practices of the assessor.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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 Fillmore County**

For 2011, Fillmore County reports that they will complete all of the pickup work of agricultural improvements.

They have implemented any land use changes that were reported or discovered.

They have verified, reviewed and analyzed the agricultural sales throughout the county. This analysis resulted in significant changes in value to most agricultural land values. There were increases of \$600 per acre to all irrigated land and \$200 per acre to all dry land. There was no indication that grass land needed to be changed for 2011.

The county has continued their 2 year process of inspecting and updating all of the agricultural improvements and houses. For 2011, there will be no changes to improvements or site values, but when the inspection process is completed in 2011, all of the agricultural houses and improvements will be updated.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Fillmore County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	<b>Market Area</b>	<b>Description of unique characteristics</b>
	1	Area #1 differs mainly from Area 2 in that there is ground water available throughout the area and the crops raised and the purchases of land reflect it.
	2	Area #2 is unique because it mostly exists in a location where little or no ground water is available for irrigation. Since there is no potential for future irrigation and the general farming practices vary accordingly. There are only dry crop or grass land options available to the land owner, and the price of land reflects that.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The county verifies sales, monitors wells registrations, and has current information from the NRD. Since the ability to irrigate is reflected in the value of the land, it is the predominant characteristic in the development of the market areas.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	This would be determined by the predominant present use of the parcel. There are presently no parcels classified as recreational.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?</b>	
	Yes; The first acre for the home site at \$7,500, and the next 2 acres at \$2,500 are valued the same. This is the same throughout the county. Zoning requires rural residential parcels to be at least 3 acres. Additional acres may vary since agricultural use may be a factor on predominantly agricultural parcels.	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	One of the major characteristics is the productivity of the soil revealed by the soil survey. Another is the majority land use; irrigated, dry, grass. Within each market area, the predominant use typically drives the values. Market Area 2 having limited irrigation is an example of a characteristic that impacts value. The market areas are designed to reflect any differences in value that are attributed to location within the county.	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	Land use is being kept up to date utilizing self reporting, third party reporting, NRD notifications, FSA maps, individual certifications, and physical inspections.	

8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>
	The county actively verifies all agricultural sales with the buyer or seller. Those verifications, the trend in values, and the ongoing observation of the present use of the parcels are all important to detect non-agricultural characteristics in the market.
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>
	In the case of agricultural land, the land use is a key indicator of substantial change. If the use of a parcel of land changes from dry or grass to irrigated the valuation difference is substantial. If there are only a few acres that change, that may not be viewed as substantial. If the resulting change in value is sufficient to noticeably distort the measurement of the parcel, it is considered substantial. The reasons that pertain to structures may be similar to the residential or commercial reasons, but the threshold for substantial may be greater if the total purchase price for the land is greater.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>
	The assessor is presently developing policies and procedures for the county. She has sent the ones that are currently in place.

**30 Fillmore**  
**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 : 55  
 Total Sales Price : 25,611,690  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 25,611,690  
 Total Assessed Value : 17,878,965  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 465,667  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 325,072

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 76  
 COD : 19.83  
 PRD : 108.42

COV : 23.38  
 STD : 17.70  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.15  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.66  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.56

95% Median C.I. : 65.89 to 82.05  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.97 to 73.64  
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.01 to 80.37

Printed:3/28/2011 3:10:10PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	4	81.65	81.52	83.42	11.06	97.72	64.56	98.21	N/A	194,500	162,248
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	11	88.00	85.51	77.14	15.33	110.85	58.45	128.21	64.93 to 97.67	368,577	284,313
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	6	80.48	83.49	70.66	25.76	118.16	58.49	132.66	58.49 to 132.66	516,571	364,999
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	4	73.21	72.69	73.84	11.73	98.44	62.31	82.05	N/A	390,500	288,354
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	64.69	64.69	64.69	00.00	100.00	64.69	64.69	N/A	704,000	455,405
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	66.88	70.16	70.01	14.23	100.21	50.56	90.34	50.56 to 90.34	595,340	416,805
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	78.39	79.85	78.99	10.58	101.09	66.95	95.65	N/A	501,000	395,754
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	84.48	83.82	82.52	10.77	101.58	69.84	97.14	N/A	280,000	231,053
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	89.02	80.10	72.54	15.14	110.42	55.43	95.86	N/A	467,000	338,783
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	57.95	60.48	58.19	12.36	103.94	52.54	73.47	N/A	645,884	375,850
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	71.35	69.04	64.05	09.15	107.79	58.09	77.69	N/A	411,000	263,265
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	56.47	57.70	56.53	06.99	102.07	50.68	66.34	N/A	637,000	360,073
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	25	82.05	82.34	74.99	17.39	109.80	58.45	132.66	67.33 to 89.70	379,751	284,794
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	15	69.84	75.11	73.22	15.99	102.58	50.56	97.14	64.69 to 87.82	514,359	376,614
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	15	59.55	65.19	60.81	17.11	107.20	50.68	95.86	55.43 to 73.47	560,169	340,661
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	18	67.09	74.86	70.46	19.57	106.24	50.56	132.66	63.64 to 87.82	529,600	373,136
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	14	74.82	75.22	70.23	17.64	107.11	52.54	97.14	55.43 to 95.65	487,753	342,566
<u>ALL</u>	55	71.35	75.69	69.81	19.83	108.42	50.56	132.66	65.89 to 82.05	465,667	325,072

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	47	73.47	76.17	69.80	20.59	109.13	50.56	132.66	65.89 to 82.88	504,608	352,198
2	8	69.32	72.89	69.95	11.71	104.20	62.31	88.00	62.31 to 88.00	236,888	165,708
<u>ALL</u>	55	71.35	75.69	69.81	19.83	108.42	50.56	132.66	65.89 to 82.05	465,667	325,072

**30 Fillmore**  
**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 : 55  
 Total Sales Price : 25,611,690  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 25,611,690  
 Total Assessed Value : 17,878,965  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 465,667  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 325,072

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 76  
 COD : 19.83  
 PRD : 108.42

COV : 23.38  
 STD : 17.70  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.15  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.66  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.56

95% Median C.I. : 65.89 to 82.05  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.97 to 73.64  
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.01 to 80.37

Printed:3/28/2011 3:10:10PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	14	90.02	84.99	79.92	11.05	106.34	56.47	98.21	73.47 to 97.14	368,334	294,368
1	14	90.02	84.99	79.92	11.05	106.34	56.47	98.21	73.47 to 97.14	368,334	294,368
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	4	75.79	72.53	67.65	17.96	107.21	50.56	88.00	N/A	241,275	163,228
1	1	50.56	50.56	50.56	00.00	100.00	50.56	50.56	N/A	290,000	146,635
2	3	84.28	79.86	74.99	08.19	106.49	67.29	88.00	N/A	225,033	168,758
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
2	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>71.35</b>	<b>75.69</b>	<b>69.81</b>	<b>19.83</b>	<b>108.42</b>	<b>50.56</b>	<b>132.66</b>	<b>65.89 to 82.05</b>	<b>465,667</b>	<b>325,072</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	68.59	73.91	68.91	19.54	107.26	50.68	98.21	64.69 to 82.88	527,909	363,797
1	41	69.84	74.13	69.04	19.47	107.37	50.68	98.21	64.62 to 84.48	523,809	361,648
2	1	64.93	64.93	64.93	00.00	100.00	64.93	64.93	N/A	696,000	451,910
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	5	71.35	72.30	68.60	15.26	105.39	50.56	88.00	N/A	259,620	178,103
1	1	50.56	50.56	50.56	00.00	100.00	50.56	50.56	N/A	290,000	146,635
2	4	77.82	77.73	73.79	10.81	105.34	67.29	88.00	N/A	252,025	185,970
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
2	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>71.35</b>	<b>75.69</b>	<b>69.81</b>	<b>19.83</b>	<b>108.42</b>	<b>50.56</b>	<b>132.66</b>	<b>65.89 to 82.05</b>	<b>465,667</b>	<b>325,072</b>

**30 Fillmore**  
**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 : 65  
 Total Sales Price : 27,693,840  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,678,840  
 Total Assessed Value : 19,478,855  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 425,828  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 299,675

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 76  
 COD : 18.50  
 PRD : 107.62

COV : 22.43  
 STD : 16.99  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.59  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.66  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.32

95% Median C.I. : 66.95 to 80.61  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.71 to 74.04  
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.60 to 79.86

Printed:3/28/2011 3:10:13PM

**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	81.65	81.52	83.42	11.06	97.72	64.56	98.21	N/A	194,500	162,248
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	11	88.00	85.51	77.14	15.33	110.85	58.45	128.21	64.93 to 97.67	368,577	284,313
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	6	80.48	83.49	70.66	25.76	118.16	58.49	132.66	58.49 to 132.66	516,571	364,999
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	4	73.21	72.69	73.84	11.73	98.44	62.31	82.05	N/A	390,500	288,354
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	64.69	64.69	64.69	00.00	100.00	64.69	64.69	N/A	704,000	455,405
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	67.09	68.71	69.43	14.17	98.96	50.32	90.34	50.56 to 87.82	461,188	320,216
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	80.61	81.51	80.03	10.10	101.85	66.95	95.65	N/A	452,000	361,756
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	84.97	84.23	83.42	08.32	100.97	69.84	97.14	N/A	303,413	253,119
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	89.02	80.10	72.54	15.14	110.42	55.43	95.86	N/A	467,000	338,783
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	61.99	63.46	59.73	11.79	106.24	52.54	76.67	52.54 to 76.67	495,256	295,792
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	71.35	72.74	68.24	09.40	106.59	58.09	85.26	N/A	341,400	232,973
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	58.01	63.84	58.03	16.62	110.01	50.68	94.56	50.68 to 94.56	552,667	320,706
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	25	82.05	82.34	74.99	17.39	109.80	58.45	132.66	67.33 to 89.70	379,751	284,794
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	20	72.83	74.82	73.71	15.43	101.51	50.32	97.14	66.88 to 85.46	439,477	323,941
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	20	64.25	68.39	62.59	18.30	109.27	50.68	95.86	56.47 to 76.67	469,777	294,010
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	21	67.29	73.50	70.17	18.71	104.75	50.32	132.66	63.64 to 82.05	475,110	333,380
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	76.42	75.86	71.53	16.04	106.05	52.54	97.14	62.16 to 88.19	435,899	311,798
<u>ALL</u>	65	73.47	75.73	70.37	18.50	107.62	50.32	132.66	66.95 to 80.61	425,828	299,675

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	49	73.47	75.82	69.82	20.73	108.59	50.32	132.66	65.89 to 82.88	493,165	344,325
2	16	73.01	75.44	74.19	11.77	101.68	62.16	94.56	64.93 to 85.46	219,609	162,933
<u>ALL</u>	65	73.47	75.73	70.37	18.50	107.62	50.32	132.66	66.95 to 80.61	425,828	299,675

**30 Fillmore**  
**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 : 65  
 Total Sales Price : 27,693,840  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,678,840  
 Total Assessed Value : 19,478,855  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 425,828  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 299,675

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 76  
 COD : 18.50  
 PRD : 107.62

COV : 22.43  
 STD : 16.99  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.59  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.66  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.32

95% Median C.I. : 66.95 to 80.61  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.71 to 74.04  
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.60 to 79.86

Printed:3/28/2011 3:10:13PM

**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	14	90.02	84.99	79.92	11.05	106.34	56.47	98.21	73.47 to 97.14	368,334	294,368
1	14	90.02	84.99	79.92	11.05	106.34	56.47	98.21	73.47 to 97.14	368,334	294,368
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	4	75.79	72.53	67.65	17.96	107.21	50.56	88.00	N/A	241,275	163,228
1	1	50.56	50.56	50.56	00.00	100.00	50.56	50.56	N/A	290,000	146,635
2	3	84.28	79.86	74.99	08.19	106.49	67.29	88.00	N/A	225,033	168,758
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
2	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>73.47</b>	<b>75.73</b>	<b>70.37</b>	<b>18.50</b>	<b>107.62</b>	<b>50.32</b>	<b>132.66</b>	<b>66.95 to 80.61</b>	<b>425,828</b>	<b>299,675</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	43	69.84	74.18	69.11	19.24	107.34	50.68	98.21	64.69 to 84.48	521,818	360,611
1	42	71.66	74.40	69.24	19.05	107.45	50.68	98.21	64.69 to 84.48	517,671	358,437
2	1	64.93	64.93	64.93	00.00	100.00	64.93	64.93	N/A	696,000	451,910
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	8	73.01	75.21	71.38	13.93	105.37	50.56	94.56	50.56 to 94.56	211,388	150,884
1	1	50.56	50.56	50.56	00.00	100.00	50.56	50.56	N/A	290,000	146,635
2	7	74.67	78.73	75.69	10.94	104.02	67.29	94.56	67.29 to 94.56	200,157	151,491
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
2	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>73.47</b>	<b>75.73</b>	<b>70.37</b>	<b>18.50</b>	<b>107.62</b>	<b>50.32</b>	<b>132.66</b>	<b>66.95 to 80.61</b>	<b>425,828</b>	<b>299,675</b>

**30 Fillmore**  
**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 : 100  
 Total Sales Price : 45,573,798  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 45,331,962  
 Total Assessed Value : 30,421,000  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 453,320  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 304,210

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 67  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 19.26  
 PRD : 108.96

COV : 24.11  
 STD : 17.63  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.59  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.66  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.46

95% Median C.I. : 66.34 to 76.67  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.66 to 76.58

Printed:3/28/2011 3:10:16PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	6	90.55	91.04	88.53	16.66	102.84	64.56	110.95	64.56 to 110.95	160,958	142,504
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	12	87.73	85.68	78.31	14.15	109.41	58.45	128.21	67.33 to 94.79	381,196	298,518
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	13	77.14	80.04	72.83	18.05	109.90	58.49	132.66	64.19 to 89.70	476,211	346,818
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	65.98	71.35	72.30	10.41	98.69	62.31	82.05	N/A	388,400	280,828
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	62.05	62.05	61.88	04.27	100.27	59.40	64.69	N/A	752,000	465,300
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	13	67.29	69.03	69.37	13.06	99.51	50.32	90.34	61.86 to 78.25	486,432	337,445
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	12	75.53	76.40	74.25	13.28	102.90	57.23	100.56	64.89 to 88.19	493,258	366,242
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	72.66	73.93	69.01	16.12	107.13	54.19	97.14	54.19 to 97.14	395,744	273,101
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	89.02	80.10	72.54	15.14	110.42	55.43	95.86	N/A	467,000	338,783
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	11	61.81	59.01	55.04	15.06	107.21	30.06	76.67	44.35 to 73.47	457,759	251,931
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	71.29	66.70	61.79	14.63	107.95	50.75	85.26	50.75 to 85.26	392,143	242,289
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	8	57.48	56.81	48.34	17.03	117.52	25.46	82.01	25.46 to 82.01	695,638	336,285
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	36	82.29	82.54	75.70	16.73	109.04	58.45	132.66	69.90 to 89.07	379,801	287,500
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	35	70.11	72.28	70.34	14.75	102.76	50.32	100.56	64.89 to 76.17	483,219	339,917
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	29	61.41	62.44	55.43	19.18	112.65	25.46	95.86	55.43 to 71.29	508,498	281,858
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	33	69.90	73.29	70.36	15.68	104.16	50.32	132.66	64.69 to 78.25	483,648	340,308
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	34	69.15	70.52	66.79	18.26	105.58	30.06	100.56	61.81 to 76.67	456,512	304,920
<u>ALL</u>	100	70.55	73.12	67.11	19.26	108.96	25.46	132.66	66.34 to 76.67	453,320	304,210

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	82	69.87	73.22	66.67	20.95	109.82	25.46	132.66	65.89 to 77.14	505,893	337,270
2	18	71.32	72.69	71.84	11.97	101.18	52.45	88.19	64.56 to 82.01	213,819	153,602
<u>ALL</u>	100	70.55	73.12	67.11	19.26	108.96	25.46	132.66	66.34 to 76.67	453,320	304,210

**30 Fillmore**  
**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 : 100  
 Total Sales Price : 45,573,798  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 45,331,962  
 Total Assessed Value : 30,421,000  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 453,320  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 304,210

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 67  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 19.26  
 PRD : 108.96

COV : 24.11  
 STD : 17.63  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.59  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 132.66  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.46

95% Median C.I. : 66.34 to 76.67  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.66 to 76.58

Printed:3/28/2011 3:10:16PM

**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	27	77.14	76.77	71.24	16.32	107.76	44.35	98.21	65.98 to 89.70	410,228	292,243
1	27	77.14	76.77	71.24	16.32	107.76	44.35	98.21	65.98 to 89.70	410,228	292,243
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	7	67.29	69.43	65.31	19.08	106.31	50.56	88.00	50.56 to 88.00	204,443	133,527
1	1	50.56	50.56	50.56	00.00	100.00	50.56	50.56	N/A	290,000	146,635
2	6	74.65	72.57	69.06	16.33	105.08	52.45	88.00	52.45 to 88.00	190,183	131,342
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
2	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>70.55</b>	<b>73.12</b>	<b>67.11</b>	<b>19.26</b>	<b>108.96</b>	<b>25.46</b>	<b>132.66</b>	<b>66.34 to 76.67</b>	<b>453,320</b>	<b>304,210</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	68	67.55	71.37	65.82	18.62	108.43	25.46	100.56	64.69 to 76.17	544,449	358,357
1	67	67.77	71.47	65.84	18.78	108.55	25.46	100.56	64.62 to 77.14	542,187	356,960
2	1	64.93	64.93	64.93	00.00	100.00	64.93	64.93	N/A	696,000	451,910
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	11	71.35	73.84	69.89	17.27	105.65	50.56	109.20	52.45 to 88.00	196,009	136,994
1	2	79.88	79.88	68.71	36.71	116.26	50.56	109.20	N/A	210,000	144,298
2	9	71.35	72.49	70.18	11.97	103.29	52.45	88.00	61.41 to 84.28	192,900	135,371
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
2	1	62.31	62.31	62.31	00.00	100.00	62.31	62.31	N/A	75,000	46,735
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>70.55</b>	<b>73.12</b>	<b>67.11</b>	<b>19.26</b>	<b>108.96</b>	<b>25.46</b>	<b>132.66</b>	<b>66.34 to 76.67</b>	<b>453,320</b>	<b>304,210</b>



## 2011 Correlation Section for Fillmore County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Fillmore County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. The primary crops are row crops with corn, soybeans, and some grain sorghum. Grass use makes up 8% of the agricultural land and is mostly in Market Area 2 where limited potential for irrigation exists or is spread throughout the county, often along rivers and streams. The agricultural land is valued using two market areas that are more fully described in the survey. The agricultural economy is strong, driven by a very high grain prices for the past few years. The value of crop land has followed the high grain prices with historic increases in value. Grazing land has also experienced very large increases over the past 3 years. The assessed values of agricultural land have likewise increased each year, often at double digit percentages.

The Department has conducted three separate measurement processes for 2011 to determine the level of value of the agricultural land. There are 55 qualified agricultural sales that occurred in the county during the three year study period. 47 sales are located in Market Area 1; and 8 sales are located in Market Area 2. The sales are not distributed proportionately across the study years. The oldest study year has 25 sales, the middle study year has 15 sales and the newest study year has 15 sales.

The Base sample calculates assessment statistics using only the subject county sales. A review of the 55 sales reveals that the sample is not proportional and is not quite representative. The strength of this method is that it uses only the subject county sales. The weakness is that the calculations may not be statistically adequate. In this case the sample is biased in favor of the first study year. To achieve adequacy the sample had ample sales in the first study year, was short 10 sales in the middle study year and 10 sales in the third study year. The median ratio of the Base sample is 71% and both Market Area 1 has a 73% median ratio and Market Area 2 has a 69% median ratio.

The Random Include sample begins with the Base sample and adds enough comparable sales to make the base sample adequate. There were 10 borrowed comparable sales from adjacent counties in order to make the sample adequate for measurement and be considered proportional and representative. The shortage of sales that was mentioned in the Base sample is addressed in this process and the result is considered statistically proportionate and representative. The strength of this method is that it uses the subject county sales and only borrows enough additional sales to make the sample statistically adequate. The median ratio in the Random Include sample is 73%; Market Area 1 has a 73% median ratio and Market Area 2 has a 73% median ratio.

The Random Exclude sample begins with the Base sample and adds all if the available comparable sales within 6 miles of the border of the county. The supplemented file is then trimmed of excess sales in order to make the base sample statistically adequate. In this case, the available sales were trimmed to 45 comparable sales, making the entire sample 100 sales. The sample was then considered proportional and is representative. Of the three methods, the Random Exclude sample relies on a higher number of sales from outside the host county. While the proximity to the host county is one test of comparability, the chance of bias increases as additional sales are introduced. The median ratio in the Random Exclude sample is 71%; Market Area 1 has a 70% median ratio and Market Area 2 has a 71% median ratio.

Based on a review of the schedule of values and a general knowledge of their assessment

## 2011 Correlation Section for Fillmore County

---

practices relating to the valuation of agricultural land the county has achieved intra-county equalization. Schedule X of the Abstracts of Fillmore County and the surrounding counties were compared to test for inter-county equalization. That comparison of the average assessed value for irrigated, dry and grass land uses revealed that the average assessed value for each of the land uses shows a logical progression from county to county. The values tended to be lower in the counties to the west and south and increase as you progress to the east and north, suggesting inter-county equalization.

The COD falls within the desired range and the PRD is well above the desired range in all three statistical studies. This is not surprising given the rapid upward trend of the value of agricultural land. The county increased irrigated values by nearly 26% and dry values by nearly 12%. Given the current market conditions the Department is not overly concerned that there are any quality issues in the valuation of agricultural land. The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification and analysis of agricultural values. They have adequate tools and practices to keep land use up to date and there is no weakness or bias noticed in their assessment practices. The quality of assessment for agricultural land is acceptable.

It is the opinion of the Department that the level of value for agricultural land of value falls among the median ratios of the three samples. The base sample median was 71% but was not adequate based a lack of proportionality of the sales among the study years. The other two methods after supplementation were considered adequate and produced medians of 73% and 71%. All 3 samples produced medians within the range for the entire county and the individual market areas. All were supportive of each other. The quality statistics were not all within the desired range. The Random Include sample was probably the strongest indicator in this case because it made the sample adequate but did not risk the possibility of introduced bias. A review of the majority land uses was generally favorable in the Base sample and the Random Include sample. In general the 95% MLU is not the best indicator for irrigated land since it usually excludes many pivot irrigated sales. The irrigated MLU in the Random Exclude sample gave completely conflicting indications, the 95% MLU was slightly high and the 80% MLU, indicated the irrigated land in Market Area 1 was slightly low. Considering that 31 of the borrowed sales came from 5 counties (Clay, Hamilton, Saline, Seward and York) that tend to have values equal to or higher than Fillmore and 14 of the borrowed sales came from counties (Jefferson, Nuckolls and Thayer) that tend to have values equal to lower than Fillmore, it is possible to have comparable sales but minor bias from the market place. In this case, the apparent level of value is 73% and the quality of the assessment process is acceptable. There are no recommended adjustments to the class or to any subclass of agricultural land.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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 Fillmore 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 : 6,462</b>	<b>Value : 1,110,147,473</b>	<b>Growth 8,658,635</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>	258	457,910	13	253,510	4	104,940	275	816,360	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,006	5,559,470	63	1,065,415	195	3,150,865	2,264	9,775,750	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,016	101,942,620	63	6,892,275	195	21,095,745	2,274	129,930,640	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,274	107,960,000	76	8,211,200	199	24,351,550	2,549	140,522,750	1,887,680
<b>% of Res Total</b>	89.21	76.83	2.98	5.84	7.81	17.33	39.45	12.66	21.80
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	61	227,310	9	136,895	2	16,370	72	380,575	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	405	1,604,890	51	1,006,370	17	366,705	473	2,977,965	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	405	32,429,945	44	4,195,080	13	1,665,805	462	38,290,830	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	466	34,262,145	53	5,338,345	15	2,048,880	534	41,649,370	1,787,200
<b>% of Com Total</b>	87.27	82.26	9.93	12.82	2.81	4.92	8.26	3.75	20.64
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	1	328,000	2	213,530	0	0	3	541,530	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	7,200	8	448,775	1	42,240	10	498,215	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	1	134,675	8	7,682,375	1	318,870	10	8,135,920	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	2	469,875	10	8,344,680	1	361,110	13	9,175,665	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	15.38	5.12	76.92	90.94	7.69	3.94	0.20	0.83	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1	4,425	1	4,425	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	1	34,740	1	34,740	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	1	39,165	1	39,165	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,274	107,960,000	76	8,211,200	200	24,390,715	2,550	140,561,915	1,887,680
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	89.18	76.81	2.98	5.84	7.84	17.35	39.46	12.66	21.80
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	468	34,732,020	63	13,683,025	16	2,409,990	547	50,825,035	1,787,200
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	85.56	68.34	11.52	26.92	2.93	4.74	8.46	4.58	20.64
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,742	142,692,020	139	21,894,225	216	26,800,705	3,097	191,386,950	3,674,880
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	88.54	74.56	4.49	11.44	6.97	14.00	47.93	17.24	42.44

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	1	13,100	2,502,300	0	0	0
20. Industrial	1	328,000	44,548,234	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	1	13,100	2,502,300
20. Industrial	0	0	0	1	328,000	44,548,234
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				2	341,100	47,050,534

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	200	34	80	314

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	49	348,870	290	61,581,505	2,034	538,435,000	2,373	600,365,375
28. Ag-Improved Land	6	67,465	119	27,746,430	870	232,374,745	995	260,188,640
29. Ag Improvements	6	139,515	116	6,814,304	870	51,252,689	992	58,206,508
30. Ag Total							3,365	918,760,523

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	7,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	2	2.00	15,000	52	52.00	390,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2	0.00	55,865	55	0.00	3,403,905	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	2	1.43	3,575	19	33.48	69,275	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	5	5.02	12,550	86	319.03	682,390	
37. FarmSite Improvements	5	0.00	83,650	111	0.00	3,410,399	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	283	679.83	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	21	21.00	157,500	22	22.00	165,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	419	421.02	3,157,650	473	475.02	3,562,650	
33. HomeSite Improvements	438	0.00	25,148,865	495	0.00	28,608,635	692,185
34. HomeSite Total				<b>517</b>	<b>497.02</b>	<b>32,336,285</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	113	262.11	496,420	134	297.02	569,270	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	666	2,315.35	4,939,340	757	2,639.40	5,634,280	
37. FarmSite Improvements	837	0.00	26,103,824	953	0.00	29,597,873	4,291,570
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,087</b>	<b>2,936.42</b>	<b>35,801,423</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	2,615	7,206.43	0	2,898	7,886.26	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	1	10.04	3,010	1	10.04	3,010	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,604</b>	<b>11,329.74</b>	<b>68,140,718</b>	<b>4,983,755</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	2	253.30	214,035
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	3	439.36	542,405	5	692.66	756,440

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	5,677.20	2.65%	18,138,670	2.85%	3,195.00
46. 1A	121,627.59	56.69%	376,437,570	59.06%	3,095.00
47. 2A1	43,152.04	20.11%	128,808,910	20.21%	2,985.00
48. 2A	13,924.60	6.49%	40,172,445	6.30%	2,885.00
49. 3A1	20,868.02	9.73%	53,839,445	8.45%	2,580.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	7,034.38	3.28%	15,370,135	2.41%	2,185.00
52. 4A	2,265.20	1.06%	4,609,690	0.72%	2,035.00
53. Total	214,549.03	100.00%	637,376,865	100.00%	2,970.77
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,185.61	4.34%	4,382,190	4.70%	2,005.02
55. 1D	27,175.52	53.98%	53,399,870	57.23%	1,965.00
56. 2D1	6,924.60	13.76%	12,914,350	13.84%	1,865.00
57. 2D	3,450.52	6.85%	6,262,780	6.71%	1,815.02
58. 3D1	6,873.22	13.65%	11,306,505	12.12%	1,645.01
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	2,615.05	5.19%	3,582,610	3.84%	1,370.00
61. 4D	1,117.65	2.22%	1,458,565	1.56%	1,305.03
62. Total	50,342.17	100.00%	93,306,870	100.00%	1,853.45
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	554.14	3.44%	531,970	4.19%	959.99
64. 1G	2,669.66	16.57%	2,509,575	19.76%	940.04
65. 2G1	1,598.62	9.92%	1,406,765	11.08%	879.99
66. 2G	1,431.50	8.88%	1,173,860	9.24%	820.02
67. 3G1	1,741.59	10.81%	1,393,315	10.97%	800.02
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	2,289.02	14.20%	1,602,285	12.62%	699.99
70. 4G	5,829.66	36.18%	4,080,715	32.14%	699.99
71. Total	16,114.19	100.00%	12,698,485	100.00%	788.03
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	214,549.03	75.55%	637,376,865	85.67%	2,970.77
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	50,342.17	17.73%	93,306,870	12.54%	1,853.45
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	16,114.19	5.67%	12,698,485	1.71%	788.03
72. Waste	2,574.51	0.91%	285,205	0.04%	110.78
73. Other	397.33	0.14%	293,755	0.04%	739.32
74. Exempt	6,406.77	2.26%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	283,977.23	100.00%	743,961,180	100.00%	2,619.79

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,232.98	12.03%	3,939,380	12.98%	3,195.01
46. 1A	5,057.90	49.34%	15,654,235	51.58%	3,095.01
47. 2A1	1,526.37	14.89%	4,556,210	15.01%	2,985.00
48. 2A	748.34	7.30%	2,158,945	7.11%	2,884.98
49. 3A1	994.34	9.70%	2,565,400	8.45%	2,580.00
50. 3A	8.19	0.08%	19,495	0.06%	2,380.34
51. 4A1	425.87	4.15%	930,520	3.07%	2,184.99
52. 4A	256.99	2.51%	522,975	1.72%	2,035.00
53. Total	10,250.98	100.00%	30,347,160	100.00%	2,960.42
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,157.20	5.57%	4,109,480	6.06%	1,905.01
55. 1D	20,326.34	52.50%	37,705,360	55.57%	1,855.00
56. 2D1	5,746.95	14.84%	10,085,900	14.86%	1,755.00
57. 2D	3,378.72	8.73%	5,659,370	8.34%	1,675.00
58. 3D1	4,838.09	12.50%	7,450,685	10.98%	1,540.01
59. 3D	27.86	0.07%	39,010	0.06%	1,400.22
60. 4D1	1,691.65	4.37%	2,139,965	3.15%	1,265.02
61. 4D	550.92	1.42%	663,870	0.98%	1,205.02
62. Total	38,717.73	100.00%	67,853,640	100.00%	1,752.52
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	374.34	3.56%	359,380	4.32%	960.04
64. 1G	1,887.22	17.95%	1,773,980	21.32%	940.00
65. 2G1	850.12	8.09%	748,110	8.99%	880.01
66. 2G	1,138.84	10.83%	933,835	11.22%	819.99
67. 3G1	1,170.69	11.13%	936,550	11.26%	800.00
68. 3G	173.72	1.65%	125,085	1.50%	720.04
69. 4G1	1,475.53	14.03%	1,032,850	12.41%	699.99
70. 4G	3,443.17	32.75%	2,410,235	28.97%	700.00
71. Total	10,513.63	100.00%	8,320,025	100.00%	791.36
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	10,250.98	17.13%	30,347,160	28.45%	2,960.42
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	38,717.73	64.69%	67,853,640	63.62%	1,752.52
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	10,513.63	17.57%	8,320,025	7.80%	791.36
72. Waste	221.80	0.37%	22,185	0.02%	100.02
73. Other	150.62	0.25%	115,615	0.11%	767.59
74. Exempt	927.43	1.55%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	59,854.76	100.00%	106,658,625	100.00%	1,781.96

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	65.50	200,080	22,289.25	66,703,210	202,445.26	600,820,735	224,800.01	667,724,025
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	85.53	165,025	10,780.08	19,469,310	78,194.29	141,526,175	89,059.90	161,160,510
<b>78. Grass</b>	21.77	20,055	2,281.93	1,859,485	24,324.12	19,138,970	26,627.82	21,018,510
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.48	50	216.23	21,610	2,579.60	285,730	2,796.31	307,390
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	177.95	125,155	370.00	284,215	547.95	409,370
<b>81. Exempt</b>	447.17	0	269.48	0	6,617.55	0	7,334.20	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>173.28</b>	<b>385,210</b>	<b>35,745.44</b>	<b>88,178,770</b>	<b>307,913.27</b>	<b>762,055,825</b>	<b>343,831.99</b>	<b>850,619,805</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	224,800.01	65.38%	667,724,025	78.50%	2,970.30
<b>Dry Land</b>	89,059.90	25.90%	161,160,510	18.95%	1,809.57
<b>Grass</b>	26,627.82	7.74%	21,018,510	2.47%	789.34
<b>Waste</b>	2,796.31	0.81%	307,390	0.04%	109.93
<b>Other</b>	547.95	0.16%	409,370	0.05%	747.09
<b>Exempt</b>	7,334.20	2.13%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>343,831.99</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>850,619,805</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,473.94</b>

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

### 30 Fillmore

	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	137,269,975	140,522,750	3,252,775	2.37%	1,887,680	0.99%
02. Recreational	39,165	39,165	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	32,507,570	32,336,285	-171,285	-0.53%	692,185	-2.66%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>169,816,710</b>	<b>172,898,200</b>	<b>3,081,490</b>	<b>1.81%</b>	<b>2,579,865</b>	<b>0.30%</b>
05. Commercial	39,581,455	41,649,370	2,067,915	5.22%	1,787,200	0.71%
06. Industrial	9,105,145	9,175,665	70,520	0.77%	0	0.77%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	32,220,188	35,801,423	3,581,235	11.11%	4,291,570	-2.20%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>80,906,788</b>	<b>86,626,458</b>	<b>5,719,670</b>	<b>7.07%</b>	<b>6,078,770</b>	<b>-0.44%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>250,723,498</b>	<b>259,527,668</b>	<b>8,804,170</b>	<b>3.51%</b>	<b>8,658,635</b>	<b>0.06%</b>
11. Irrigated	531,004,670	667,724,025	136,719,355	25.75%		
12. Dryland	144,365,565	161,160,510	16,794,945	11.63%		
13. Grassland	21,373,885	21,018,510	-355,375	-1.66%		
14. Wasteland	158,195	307,390	149,195	94.31%		
15. Other Agland	483,940	409,370	-74,570	-15.41%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>697,386,255</b>	<b>850,619,805</b>	<b>153,233,550</b>	<b>21.97%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>948,109,753</b>	<b>1,110,147,473</b>	<b>162,037,720</b>	<b>17.09%</b>	<b>8,658,635</b>	<b>16.18%</b>

# FILLMORE COUNTY

## Plan of Assessment – 2010 Update

State law establishes the framework within which the assessor must operate. However, a real property assessment system requires that an operation or procedure be done completely and in a uniform manner each time it is repeated. Accurate and efficient assessment practices represent prudent expenditure of tax monies, establishes taxpayer confidence in local government, and enables the local government to serve its citizens more effectively. The important role the assessment practices play in local government cannot be overstated. Pursuant to Nebraska Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9 the assessor shall submit a Plan of Assessment to the county board of equalization before July 31<sup>st</sup> and the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division on or before October 31<sup>st</sup>. The plan and update shall examine the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the county.

The responsibilities of assessment include record maintenance. Ownership is updated in the cadastrals and on our record cards using 521 RETS (Real Estate Transfer Statements) and the miscellaneous book to check for death certificates, etc. Our mapping procedures include updating the cadastrals and GIS. We use the GIS to draw out any new tracts.

Reports are systematically filed as required by law. Real estate abstract is filed by March 19, personal property abstract is filed by June 15, certification of values for levy setting is mailed to all entities in the county by August 20, and copies of the school valuations are also mailed to the Department of Education. The school district taxable value report is mailed to the state by August 25, tax list of real and personal property is delivered to the treasurer by November 22, and the CTL (Certificate of Taxes Levied ) is filed with the state by December 1. Tax list corrections are made only if necessary. Homestead exemption applications are mailed by February 1 and must be filled out, signed and returned to our office by June 30. Personal property forms are mailed by February 15<sup>th</sup> and must be filled out, signed and returned by May 1. Notices of valuation change are mailed on or before June 1. Exempt property applications are mailed in November and must be filled out, signed and returned by December 31.

The assessor is responsible for valuing at market value all real property in the county except railroads and public service entities as of January 1 of each year. Assessors use professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques, including but not limited to: comparison with sales of property of known or recognized value, taking into account location, zoning, and current functional use; income approach, and cost approach. By statute all real property is assessed at 100% of actual value, except for agricultural land and horticultural land which is assessed at 75% of actual value. Fillmore County currently contracts with Knoche Appraisal & Consulting LLC to assist with the review of sales and do the pick-up work.

Our current aerial photos were taken in 2006 for all rural parcels. This helps identify buildings in the rural area. County-wide zoning was implemented January 1, 2000. Any

new buildings or additions need to be approved prior to construction. This has been very beneficial for our office.

Pick-up work is scheduled based on our permits. We try to schedule pick-up work and sales review in the same area.

After sales are reviewed, we decide whether we need to look at a certain class or sub-class of property. We try to have a systematic review of all property in the county.

The qualification process involves a careful review of the information on the 521 RETS and utilizes the personal knowledge of the assessor and staff to make a decision about the usability of the sales. Some are later modified based on information discovered during the verification and inspection processes. The verification process is primarily accomplished during the on-site inspection, which is done by the contract appraiser. Most of the interviews conducted outside the inspection process are for clarification or when another party to the sale is contacted, and for unimproved parcels that are not inspected. The county attempts to inspect all improved sales in the qualified roster, and many of the others in the total roster that are not obviously non-sales.

The assessor and staff do most of the sale qualification with further verification and inspection contracted to Knoche Appraisal & Consulting LLC. The qualification decisions are sometimes modified after the verification or inspection processes are done. Sale inspection is contracted to Knoche Appraisal & Consulting LLC. Most of the verification process is done during the inspection and most interviews are done at that time. The phone is used for verification with persons who are unavailable during the inspection process or if additional clarification is needed. In Fillmore County the order of preference for verification is buyer, buyer's representative, seller and then real estate agent. The county verifies a larger percentage of the transfers to enhance the input to the county CAMA system that is used to calculate building valuation.

When conducting a physical inspection, the county looks for the same thing we look for when listing property. We check for the accuracy of the listing. We also believe the sale file review serves as a semi-random sampling of the assessed property. The review enables us to plan for reappraisal priorities, and prepare for future changes of classes and sub-classes. The county attempts to inspect all qualified improved sales as well as others that are possibly good sales. We estimate this is 85% of the residential sales, 75% of the commercial sales, 20% of the unimproved agland sales and 60% of the improved agland sales that are in the total roster. Unreported pick-up work and alterations are listed and errors that are discovered are corrected on the records accordingly. Omissions are usually parcels of unreported pick-up work, which are listed, valued and added to the tax rolls. We continue to work with the NRD. Looking at possible regulation in the future, owners want to make sure our records are correct. For 2008 we measured and recorded the land use in the rest of the county in our GIS system and applied the new numeric codes. Our administrative package has a permit tab and all pick-up work is entered on corresponding property records. We are able to run a list of permits out of this system.

The information gathered during the sale review process is kept in the county sales books.

Fillmore County Assessor's office personnel includes the assessor, deputy and clerk. The assessor and deputy have completed their continuing education to keep up their certificates and are certified through 2010. I have included money in the budget for education. Our appraisal work is contracted with Knoche Appraisal & Consulting LLC and Mr. Knoche helps with the sales review and pick-up work.

Fillmore County Assessor's office acquired all new computers and printers (July 2005). Computers were replaced spring 2010.

Fillmore County utilizes the computerized administrative system County Solutions, provided and supported by NACO. The Marshall & Swift costing tables are used for estimating replacement costs for the residential parcels and ag buildings. The county administrative system includes the Microsolve CAMA 2000 package. The assessment records are kept in the hard copy format with updates made in the form of inserts. The valuation history on the face of the hard copy is updated to reflect all valuation changes that are made annually. For 2010 houses were sketched in our new APEX program. This had been done in our old system when we reviewed the whole county; however the sketches wouldn't transfer to our current system.

According to the 2010 abstract, the real property within Fillmore County is comprised of the following: 2,546 residential parcels of which 277 are unimproved, 535 commercial parcels of which 75 are unimproved, 13 industrial parcels, 1 recreational parcels, and 3,367 agricultural parcels of which 2,351 are unimproved. Among the improved agricultural parcels are 526 with residential improvements. The percentage breakdown of the three primary classes of real estate is as follows: residential 39%, commercial/industrial 9%, agricultural 52% and 0.00% comprising any other classes. There are two other groups to mention; the administrative parcels (including Game and Parks and exempt parcels), numbering 319 and there are two parcels that have additional valuation responsibility (TIF Projects). These groups are mentioned because they represent additional assessment responsibility but will not be included in the parcel count in this report. The total number of parcels that are associated with the total real property value from the total records on the front page of the abstract in Fillmore County is estimated at 6,462 and contain no parcels with mineral interests valued. The total including exempt, Game and Parks and TIF parcels is 6,783.

The total valuation as certified on the abstract of assessment for real property 2010 to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division is 897,943,830. The breakdown of valuation is as follows:

	<u>Valuation</u>	<u>Total Parcels</u>
Real Estate	947,583,489	6,462
Personal Property	102,371,208	1,297
Railroad & Public Service Utilities	<u>17,740,739</u>	
(Certified by PA&T in 2009)		
TOTAL	1,067,695,436	

Homestead Exemption applications for 2010 are 297

Charitable exemption applications for 2009 were 36 excluding cemeteries.

Cadastrals are maps showing the boundaries of subdivisions of land usually with the bearings and lengths thereof and the areas of individual tracts for the purpose of describing and recording ownership. Our current set of cadastrals was made in 1989. The ownership names and property lines are routinely updated, and we consider them current.

Our property record cards serve as a reference to and inventory of all portions of the property. It contains a summary of the general data relevant to the parcel it represents. Our most recent record cards (for all classes of property) were prepared in 1993 during our county-wide reappraisal. Our 2010 records are currently up-to-date along with the 2010 values. We also updated all photos for ALL our town/village record cards for 2007. The Geneva and rural photos were updated for 2006. We replaced all our record cards for 2010.

When a parcel of real property in the State of Nebraska transfers and a deed is recorded a Real Estate Transfer Statement, form 521, is required. A copy of Form 521 is provided to the assessor. The assessor is responsible for maintaining the changes of ownership on the property record cards of the county. The assessor completes supplemental worksheets on these sales and submits this information to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division within 45 days or sooner.

Our office has developed a formal manual of office and assessment procedures, which includes a job description. It is our practice to follow all rules, regs, and directives that govern the assessment process.

We qualify all sales, review most of them, prepare in-depth analysis on most property classes or subclasses and identify the projects that need to be done.

Our level of value, quality and uniformity for assessment year 2010:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	99%	10.66	103.22
Commerical	99%	21.07	113.81
Agricultural Land	72%	17.47	109.26

Our three year plan is as follows:

- 2011
- Continue sales review of all classes of property
  - Examine the level, quality and uniformity of assessment in the county
  - Review level of value and make any needed changes by class of property
  - Review agland for any changes in values and land areas
  - Verify land usage with FSA & NRD information (as needed)
  - Add new construction
  - Fillmore County board purchased the GIS for the following offices:
    - Assessor, roads department, clerk’s office and zoning office (8-9-05)
    - 2006 - The staff had the parcel layer in and aerial photos identified.
    - 2008 - Land use layer was completed and the numeric codes applied
  - Continue our systematic review of property –
    - 2006 - reviewed the rural homes and buildings and Geneva
    - 2007 –reviewed all the small towns
    - 2008 –worked on completing the land use layer and converted the land classification codes from the old soil symbols to the new numeric codes
    - 2009- Commercial & Industrial values reviewed including new photos -20% all homes 1939 or older with average or lower condition in Geneva due to statistics
    - 2010- Reviewed Geneva and all towns
      - Made new record cards
      - New APEX sketching program, drew all residential sketches in this program.
    - 2011 Beginning rural residential and building review
- 2012
- Continue sales review for all classes of property
  - Examine the level, quality and uniformity of assessment in the county
  - Review level of value and make any needed changes by class of property
  - Review agland for any changes in land areas and values
  - Verify land usage with FSA & NRD information (as needed)
  - Add new construction
  - Continue our systematic review of property

2013      Continue sales review for all classes of property  
            Examine the level, quality and uniformity of assessment in the county  
            Review level of value and make any needed changes by class of property  
            Review agland for any changes in land areas and values  
            Verify land usage with FSA & NRD information (as needed)  
            Add new construction  
            Continue our systematic review of property

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Fillmore 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
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$165,635
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$165,635
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work :</b>
	\$28,500
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>
	N/A (this is in the county data processing budget)
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops :</b>
	\$1,250
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds :</b>
	\$12,000 is in the surveyor's budget for GIS Workshop & office support; also \$1,500 for aerial photos
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	Yes; about \$2,300

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software :</b>
	County Solutions
2.	<b>CAMA software :</b>
	County Solutions / MicroSolve
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>
	Assessor and Staff and GIS Workshop
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 are zoned except Strang
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2000

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Knoche Consulting LLC
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	County Solutions and GIS Workshop



# 2011 Certification for Fillmore 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 Fillmore County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



