

# 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 Franklin County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	120	Median	98.84
Total Sales Price	\$3,640,141	Mean	113.14
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,597,141	Wgt. Mean	100.52
Total Assessed Value	\$3,615,925	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$23,203
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$29,976	Avg. Assessed Value	\$30,133

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	98.49 to 99.34
95% Mean C.I	97.20 to 103.85
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	97.21 to 129.07
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	8.58
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.32
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	9.51

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	122	99	99
2009	121	99	99
2008	144	99	99
2007	133	99	99

## 2011 Commission Summary for Franklin County

---

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	20	Median	95.35
Total Sales Price	\$748,621	Mean	109.41
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$646,121	Wgt. Mean	75.02
Total Assessed Value	\$484,720	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$36,479
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$32,306	Avg. Assessed Value	\$24,236

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	81.03 to 106.00
95% Mean C.I	75.96 to 142.86
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	54.72 to 95.32
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.08
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.35
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.55

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	19	94	94
2009	13	94	94
2008	19	97	97
2007	30	98	98



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

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>99</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>73</b>	The qualitative measures calculated in the random exclude 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 Franklin County**

Franklin County began transferring their 521s electronically.

They continued to audit the files after the conversion to the new MIPS system, making correction to parcel sizes that did not transfer.

All urban residential property received a drive by review of the property. Improvements were checked against the property record cards for any discrepancies. New photos and measurements were taken if needed.

Pick up work was completed and any new improvements were added as reported or discovered.

All depreciation tables were reviewed and updated if necessary. Spreadsheet analysis was completed on the sales.

All houses and improvement have been repriced using the new CAMA system.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Franklin County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor, Contract Appraiser and staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Franklin - Largest town in county, hospital, school, most market activity in the county
	2	Bloomington - Southern part of county, by the river, located on the highway, has Franklin influence, almost bedroom community
	3	Campbell - Northern part of the county, on highway, bedroom city to Hastings influence due to new elevator, new jobs
	4	Hildreth - Northern part of the county, not on highway, bedroom city to Minden and Kearney school combined with Wilcox
	5	Naponee - Southern part of county, by the river, located on the highway, very small, reservoir influence
	6	Riverton - Southern part of county, by the river, located on the highway, small town not much activity, post office and bar/restaurant
	7	Upland - Northern part of the county, not on highway, very small, not much activity, post office, satellite bank, co-op
	10	Rural - All rural residential not located inside of a village boundary
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Sales comparison and cost	
4	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	Late 1990s	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	Square Foot	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2007	
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 and the contract appraiser develop their own depreciation tables based on local market information	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	Annually the depreciation tables are reviewed	
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</b>	

	<b>population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	Each sale is reviewed individually, to be a substantial change there would need to be an addition or removal of a structure to the property or an extensive remodel.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>

**31 Franklin  
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 : 120  
Total Sales Price : 3,640,141  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,597,141  
Total Assessed Value : 3,615,925  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 29,976  
Avg. Assessed Value : 30,133

MEDIAN : 99  
WGT. MEAN : 101  
MEAN : 113  
COD : 20.70  
PRD : 112.55

COV : 78.71  
STD : 89.05  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.46  
MAX Sales Ratio : 965.50  
MIN Sales Ratio : 54.78

95% Median C.I. : 98.49 to 99.34  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 97.20 to 103.85  
95% Mean C.I. : 97.21 to 129.07

Printed:3/21/2011 5:08:15PM

**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	19	98.56	99.23	98.09	03.08	101.16	89.51	112.89	96.84 to 99.43	34,329	33,672
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	99.39	107.88	101.25	14.12	106.55	87.67	178.67	87.67 to 178.67	20,013	20,263
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	21	99.39	107.85	100.61	11.16	107.20	86.17	175.20	98.81 to 100.59	32,748	32,946
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	12	98.32	139.49	113.58	44.27	122.81	92.13	500.00	96.40 to 140.11	30,563	34,713
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	13	99.10	106.04	99.82	08.23	106.23	96.65	180.43	98.00 to 101.40	25,231	25,185
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	98.28	96.07	100.24	07.37	95.84	74.17	114.88	87.00 to 102.58	27,478	27,543
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	18	99.08	153.40	105.24	60.72	145.76	75.46	965.50	96.69 to 102.45	28,725	30,230
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	20	98.66	94.24	91.88	13.63	102.57	54.78	160.54	87.50 to 99.48	31,900	29,310
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	60	98.95	111.45	102.33	15.66	108.91	86.17	500.00	98.39 to 99.43	31,113	31,838
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	60	98.72	114.82	98.57	25.74	116.49	54.78	965.50	98.00 to 99.48	28,839	28,427
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	55	99.10	112.40	103.31	17.08	108.80	74.17	500.00	98.28 to 99.50	29,632	30,613
<u>ALL</u>	120	98.84	113.14	100.52	20.70	112.55	54.78	965.50	98.49 to 99.34	29,976	30,133

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	41	99.17	104.07	97.58	11.97	106.65	54.78	176.38	97.92 to 99.84	30,126	29,397
02	7	96.70	108.79	103.33	15.95	105.28	91.25	178.67	91.25 to 178.67	6,214	6,421
03	26	98.44	98.20	99.22	06.94	98.97	70.00	160.54	96.40 to 99.38	21,377	21,210
04	20	98.93	102.48	99.42	04.09	103.08	97.54	166.67	98.68 to 99.39	60,253	59,902
05	6	99.09	99.37	99.02	01.41	100.35	97.11	101.54	97.11 to 101.54	12,392	12,270
06	5	87.67	105.67	108.76	26.76	97.16	74.17	180.43	N/A	4,680	5,090
07	8	99.41	98.78	99.83	04.59	98.95	84.21	112.00	84.21 to 112.00	18,799	18,766
10	7	140.11	290.05	118.57	138.88	244.62	67.70	965.50	67.70 to 965.50	44,214	52,426
<u>ALL</u>	120	98.84	113.14	100.52	20.70	112.55	54.78	965.50	98.49 to 99.34	29,976	30,133

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	118	98.82	113.30	100.41	20.98	112.84	54.78	965.50	98.39 to 99.33	29,623	29,743
06											
07	2	103.13	103.13	104.55	03.65	98.64	99.37	106.89	N/A	50,800	53,113
<u>ALL</u>	120	98.84	113.14	100.52	20.70	112.55	54.78	965.50	98.49 to 99.34	29,976	30,133

**31 Franklin  
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 : 120  
 Total Sales Price : 3,640,141  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,597,141  
 Total Assessed Value : 3,615,925  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 29,976  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 30,133

MEDIAN : 99  
 WGT. MEAN : 101  
 MEAN : 113  
 COD : 20.70  
 PRD : 112.55

COV : 78.71  
 STD : 89.05  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.46  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 965.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.78

95% Median C.I. : 98.49 to 99.34  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 97.20 to 103.85  
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.21 to 129.07

Printed:3/21/2011 5:08:15PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	21	96.00	167.54	195.98	86.28	85.49	70.00	965.50	87.50 to 166.67	2,064	4,045	
5000 TO 9999	16	99.03	112.38	111.16	16.28	101.10	91.83	175.20	97.11 to 110.56	6,781	7,538	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	37	98.25	143.68	135.37	55.00	106.14	70.00	965.50	96.00 to 107.50	4,104	5,555	
10000 TO 29999	36	98.92	99.26	99.48	06.50	99.78	54.78	160.54	97.60 to 99.43	17,457	17,366	
30000 TO 59999	23	98.96	101.46	101.42	03.74	100.04	96.40	160.63	98.03 to 99.48	38,157	38,697	
60000 TO 99999	20	98.84	97.56	97.20	06.37	100.37	65.33	140.11	98.68 to 99.39	76,463	74,325	
100000 TO 149999	4	99.06	100.43	99.68	02.87	100.75	96.69	106.89	N/A	102,500	102,171	
150000 TO 249999												
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	120	98.84	113.14	100.52	20.70	112.55	54.78	965.50	98.49 to 99.34	29,976	30,133	



## **2011 Correlation Section for Franklin County**

---

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

Franklin County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The county seat and largest town is Franklin. The Republican River runs through the southern portion of the county. The county has two high schools; one in Franklin and a consolidated high school in Hildreth. The county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline.

The statistical sampling of 120 qualified residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Franklin County. The calculated median is 99%. All but two valuation groupings are within the acceptable range, the two valuation groupings that are low represent the assessor locations of Riverton and Rural but a reliable statistical inference would be difficult with the small number of sales in these two groupings. The qualitative measures are above the acceptable range due to the fact that Franklin County includes as many sales as possible causing some extreme outliers to remain in the file. The statistics reflect an influence on the COD and PRD due to low dollar sales. Twenty-one of the 120 sales are under \$5000.

Franklin County does not utilize sales verification questionnaires but instead relies on telephone and personal interviews for the sales verification. Additionally, some sales are physically inspected if there is a perceived discrepancy in the sale.

Franklin County employs a six-year inspection cycle for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Franklin County is moving forward technologically. They have a website with online parcel search, began the transfer of sales electronically in 2010, complete spreadsheet analyses and utilize their GIS system.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 99% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Franklin 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 Franklin 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 Franklin 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 Franklin 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 Franklin County**

Franklin County began transferring their 521s electronically.

They continued to audit the files after the conversion to the new MIPS system, making correction to parcel sizes that did not transfer.

The commercial properties have been reviewed as needed. A drive-by review of some of them has been done to check for occupancy or vacancy. Changes have been done as reported or discovered.

Pick up work was completed and any new improvements were added as reported or discovered.

All depreciation tables were reviewed and updated if necessary. Spreadsheet analysis was completed on the sales.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Franklin County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor, Contract Appraiser and office staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Franklin - Largest town in county, hospital, school, most market activity in the county
	2	Bloomington - Southern part of county, by the river, located on the highway, has Franklin influence, almost bedroom community
	3	Campbell - Northern part of the county, on highway, bedroom city to Hastings influence due to new elevator, new jobs
	4	Hildreth - Northern part of the county, not on highway, bedroom city to Minden and Kearneyschool combined with Wilcox
	5	Naponee - Southern part of county, by the river, located on the highway, very small, reservoir influence
	6	Riverton - Southern part of county, by the river, located on the highway, small town not much activity, post office and bar/restaurant
	7	Upland - Northern part of the county, not on highway, very small, not much activity, post office, satellite bank, co-op
	10	Rural - All rural residential not located inside of a village boundary
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Sales comparison and cost, income when information is available	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	2002	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Square Foot	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2007	
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 develops depreciation tables based on local markets	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	They are reviewed annually and updated if necessary	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>	

	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	Each sale is reviewed individually and a determination is made if a change is substantial, remodeling, additions, removal of structures would be examples of substantial changes.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>

**31 Franklin  
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 : 20  
Total Sales Price : 748,621  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 646,121  
Total Assessed Value : 484,720  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 32,306  
Avg. Assessed Value : 24,236

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 75  
MEAN : 109  
COD : 40.16  
PRD : 145.84

COV : 65.33  
STD : 71.48  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 38.29  
MAX Sales Ratio : 336.00  
MIN Sales Ratio : 19.57

95% Median C.I. : 81.03 to 106.00  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.72 to 95.32  
95% Mean C.I. : 75.96 to 142.86

Printed:3/21/2011 5:08:18PM

**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	1	111.90	111.90	111.90	00.00	100.00	111.90	111.90	N/A	5,000	5,595
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	97.27	97.27	97.27	00.00	100.00	97.27	97.27	N/A	15,000	14,590
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	214.82	214.82	102.29	56.41	210.01	93.63	336.00	N/A	7,000	7,160
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	174.55	174.55	106.13	53.58	164.47	81.03	268.06	N/A	11,550	12,258
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	101.19	106.60	97.52	11.67	109.31	92.52	131.50	N/A	12,313	12,008
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	122.22	122.22	122.22	00.00	100.00	122.22	122.22	N/A	18,000	22,000
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	67.58	68.04	45.41	33.12	149.83	19.57	106.00	19.57 to 106.00	35,583	16,158
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	101.59	101.59	101.59	00.00	100.00	101.59	101.59	N/A	18,270	18,560
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	84.19	84.19	84.19	00.00	100.00	84.19	84.19	N/A	275,000	231,525
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	57.60	57.60	57.60	00.00	100.00	57.60	57.60	N/A	15,000	8,640
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	4	104.59	159.70	101.49	61.43	157.36	93.63	336.00	N/A	8,500	8,626
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	13	92.52	100.46	63.02	37.16	159.41	19.57	268.06	62.37 to 122.22	23,373	14,730
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	3	84.19	81.13	83.93	17.41	96.66	57.60	101.59	N/A	102,757	86,242
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	9	97.27	144.71	100.10	54.45	144.57	81.03	336.00	92.52 to 268.06	11,261	11,273
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	84.19	79.58	70.32	28.04	113.17	19.57	122.22	55.05 to 106.00	58,308	41,003
<u>ALL</u>	20	95.35	109.41	75.02	40.16	145.84	19.57	336.00	81.03 to 106.00	32,306	24,236

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	7	105.32	112.34	73.26	42.25	153.34	19.57	268.06	19.57 to 268.06	60,729	44,489
03	3	97.27	88.92	82.36	18.61	107.97	57.60	111.90	N/A	11,667	9,608
04	4	93.08	148.73	86.06	70.99	172.82	72.78	336.00	N/A	13,813	11,888
05	2	94.77	94.77	95.88	02.43	98.84	92.47	97.06	N/A	16,500	15,820
06	1	62.37	62.37	62.37	00.00	100.00	62.37	62.37	N/A	30,000	18,710
10	3	101.59	96.05	68.73	25.08	139.75	55.05	131.50	N/A	22,590	15,525
<u>ALL</u>	20	95.35	109.41	75.02	40.16	145.84	19.57	336.00	81.03 to 106.00	32,306	24,236

**31 Franklin  
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 : 20  
Total Sales Price : 748,621  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 646,121  
Total Assessed Value : 484,720  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 32,306  
Avg. Assessed Value : 24,236

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 75  
MEAN : 109  
COD : 40.16  
PRD : 145.84

COV : 65.33  
STD : 71.48  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 38.29  
MAX Sales Ratio : 336.00  
MIN Sales Ratio : 19.57

95% Median C.I. : 81.03 to 106.00  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.72 to 95.32  
95% Mean C.I. : 75.96 to 142.86

Printed:3/21/2011 5:08:18PM

**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	20	95.35	109.41	75.02	40.16	145.84	19.57	336.00	81.03 to 106.00	32,306	24,236
04											
<u>ALL</u>	20	95.35	109.41	75.02	40.16	145.84	19.57	336.00	81.03 to 106.00	32,306	24,236

**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	3	268.06	245.19	245.76	25.43	99.77	131.50	336.00	N/A	1,533	3,768
5000 TO 9999	3	106.00	107.74	107.28	02.07	100.43	105.32	111.90	N/A	6,334	6,795
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	6	121.70	176.46	134.27	56.47	131.42	105.32	336.00	105.32 to 336.00	3,934	5,282
10000 TO 29999	10	93.08	90.82	90.51	12.40	100.34	57.60	122.22	72.78 to 101.59	17,402	15,751
30000 TO 59999	2	58.71	58.71	57.85	06.23	101.49	55.05	62.37	N/A	39,250	22,705
60000 TO 99999	1	19.57	19.57	19.57	00.00	100.00	19.57	19.57	N/A	95,000	18,590
100000 TO 149999											
150000 TO 249999											
250000 TO 499999	1	84.19	84.19	84.19	00.00	100.00	84.19	84.19	N/A	275,000	231,525
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	20	95.35	109.41	75.02	40.16	145.84	19.57	336.00	81.03 to 106.00	32,306	24,236

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	1	336.00	336.00	336.00	00.00	100.00	336.00	336.00	N/A	500	1,680
344	1	268.06	268.06	268.06	00.00	100.00	268.06	268.06	N/A	3,100	8,310
350	3	84.19	65.41	68.16	28.86	95.97	19.57	92.47	N/A	126,167	85,992
353	3	106.00	114.27	107.36	08.24	106.44	105.32	131.50	N/A	5,000	5,368
384	1	92.52	92.52	92.52	00.00	100.00	92.52	92.52	N/A	16,250	15,035
406	2	101.63	101.63	100.54	20.27	101.08	81.03	122.22	N/A	19,000	19,103
442	3	72.78	77.40	76.33	15.88	101.40	62.37	97.06	N/A	26,500	20,228
471	1	101.59	101.59	101.59	00.00	100.00	101.59	101.59	N/A	18,270	18,560
478	1	97.27	97.27	97.27	00.00	100.00	97.27	97.27	N/A	15,000	14,590
494	1	55.05	55.05	55.05	00.00	100.00	55.05	55.05	N/A	48,500	26,700
528	2	84.75	84.75	71.18	32.04	119.06	57.60	111.90	N/A	10,000	7,118
<u>ALL</u>	20	95.35	109.41	75.02	40.16	145.84	19.57	336.00	81.03 to 106.00	32,306	24,236



## **2011 Correlation Section for Franklin County**

---

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

Franklin County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The county seat and largest town is Franklin. The Republican River runs through the southern portion of the county. The county has two high schools; one in Franklin and a consolidated high school in Hildreth. The county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline.

A review of the statistical analysis reveals only 20 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate the level of value is within the acceptable range, there are not a sufficient number of sales to have confidence in the calculated statistics. The calculated median is 95%. It will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Franklin County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

The sample is not representative of the population as a whole even though the assessor, with the assistance of the contracted appraisal company (Knoche Appraisal), has tried to utilize as many sales as possible without bias in the analysis of the commercial class, there is just not an active commercial market in Franklin County. The largest number of sales occurred in the valuation grouping representing the town of Franklin.

Franklin County does not employ the usage of sales verification questionnaires but instead relies on telephone and personal interviews for the sales verification. Additionally, some sales are physically inspected if there is a perceived discrepancy in the sale.

Franklin County employs a six-year inspection cycle for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Franklin County is moving forward technologically. They have a website with online parcel search, began the transfer of sales electronically in 2010, complete spreadsheet analyses and utilize their GIS system.

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Franklin 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 Franklin 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 Franklin 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 Franklin 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 Franklin County**

Franklin County began transferring their 521s electronically.

They continued to audit the files after the conversion to the new MIPS system, making correction to parcel sizes that did not transfer.

New farm improvements and new houses and remodeling of farm homes have been added as they have been reported or discovered.

Land use changes have been checked as they are reported or discovered. Market areas were reviewed and evaluated.

One page notices showing land use are mailed with each valuation change notice. Each real estate owner receives one of these notices.

Pick up work was completed and any new improvements were added as reported or discovered. New photos and measurements were taken if needed.

Spreadsheet analysis was completed on the sales.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Franklin County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The Assessor, contract appraiser and office staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	South of the Bostwick Irrigation Ditch, includes the Republican River - The irrigated area south of the Bostwick Irrigation District comes under restrictions when there is not enough water in the Harlan County Reservoir some of this area doesn't get any water for irrigation from the canal, but it still has to be classed and taxed as irrigated. If they have a well they can irrigate each year with restrictions of the number of inches of water that they can pump.
	2	North of the Bostwick Irrigation Ditch - North of the Bostwick Irrigation District has restrictions on the number of inches of water that they can pump from their wells, but they have water every year because they have well irrigation.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Annually sales are plotted, FSA records are reviewed, NRD restrictions are identified, water availability and topography is reviewed, sales are reviewed in a spreadsheet analysis	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	Sales are reviewed for recreational influence, no differences in value have been determined, the Republican River is mainly comprised of farms that have been in families for over 100 years.	
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, no differences have been determined	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	Usage, soils, topography	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	FSA records, GIS analysis	
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Franklin County is mainly an agricultural county, land is reviewed along the river for ag usage, the assessor attends the NRD meetings.	
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>
	If there is a change in land usage, acres split off or combined, improvements added or removed
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>

**31 Franklin**  
**AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 48  
 Total Sales Price : 12,305,917  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 12,172,917  
 Total Assessed Value : 8,731,490  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 253,602  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 181,906

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 72  
 MEAN : 80  
 COD : 25.01  
 PRD : 111.06

COV : 28.94  
 STD : 23.05  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.18  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.95  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.65

95% Median C.I. : 67.99 to 86.03  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.54 to 79.91  
 95% Mean C.I. : 73.14 to 86.18

Printed:3/21/2011 5:08:21PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	3	68.28	71.66	69.34	09.50	103.35	63.61	83.08	N/A	403,667	279,907
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	7	72.61	82.37	74.31	20.18	110.85	57.67	117.31	57.67 to 117.31	203,883	151,503
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	12	91.85	92.88	91.36	21.48	101.66	56.39	128.95	72.79 to 119.56	241,503	220,633
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	65.03	65.03	62.89	06.92	103.40	60.53	69.52	N/A	318,950	200,590
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	77.81	80.14	63.59	29.51	126.03	53.66	111.29	N/A	231,418	147,170
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	61.87	67.23	64.13	13.69	104.83	56.38	95.01	N/A	190,585	122,219
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	90.52	86.62	80.44	24.55	107.68	43.28	122.15	N/A	104,204	83,818
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	74.17	74.17	74.17	00.00	100.00	74.17	74.17	N/A	113,000	83,815
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	70.13	70.13	71.69	03.05	97.82	67.99	72.27	N/A	152,500	109,330
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	68.61	71.84	62.91	20.86	114.19	51.18	98.94	N/A	375,704	236,363
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	63.39	70.66	56.07	37.43	126.02	33.65	122.19	N/A	445,644	249,876
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	24	77.12	84.84	80.16	22.60	105.84	56.39	128.95	69.52 to 97.66	257,255	206,209
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	14	68.73	76.95	67.22	29.08	114.47	43.28	122.15	56.38 to 95.53	172,029	115,633
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	10	67.29	71.02	60.26	23.67	117.86	33.65	122.19	51.18 to 98.94	359,039	216,362
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	23	75.06	82.66	78.47	26.53	105.34	53.66	128.95	61.87 to 97.66	235,414	184,720
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	74.17	80.13	76.39	23.04	104.90	43.28	122.15	43.28 to 122.15	119,259	91,106
<u>ALL</u>	48	72.70	79.66	71.73	25.01	111.06	33.65	128.95	67.99 to 86.03	253,602	181,906

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	11	70.66	75.64	61.24	27.14	123.51	43.28	122.15	51.18 to 111.29	173,255	106,100
2	37	72.79	80.85	73.68	24.48	109.73	33.65	128.95	68.28 to 93.40	277,490	204,443
<u>ALL</u>	48	72.70	79.66	71.73	25.01	111.06	33.65	128.95	67.99 to 86.03	253,602	181,906

**31 Franklin**  
**AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 48  
 Total Sales Price : 12,305,917  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 12,172,917  
 Total Assessed Value : 8,731,490  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 253,602  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 181,906

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 72  
 MEAN : 80  
 COD : 25.01  
 PRD : 111.06

COV : 28.94  
 STD : 23.05  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.18  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.95  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.65

95% Median C.I. : 67.99 to 86.03  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.54 to 79.91  
 95% Mean C.I. : 73.14 to 86.18

Printed:3/21/2011 5:08:21PM

**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	2	88.92	88.92	73.13	31.93	121.59	60.53	117.31	N/A	302,250	221,025
2	2	88.92	88.92	73.13	31.93	121.59	60.53	117.31	N/A	302,250	221,025
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	3	72.27	77.95	73.49	13.12	106.07	66.58	95.01	N/A	205,454	150,985
2	3	72.27	77.95	73.49	13.12	106.07	66.58	95.01	N/A	205,454	150,985
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	15	73.35	77.95	71.64	15.58	108.81	56.39	111.29	67.99 to 92.56	137,107	98,223
1	7	74.17	79.87	71.65	18.27	111.47	56.39	111.29	56.39 to 111.29	101,759	72,911
2	8	72.98	76.27	71.63	12.98	106.48	61.87	95.53	61.87 to 95.53	168,037	120,371
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>72.70</b>	<b>79.66</b>	<b>71.73</b>	<b>25.01</b>	<b>111.06</b>	<b>33.65</b>	<b>128.95</b>	<b>67.99 to 86.03</b>	<b>253,602</b>	<b>181,906</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	9	72.79	75.95	68.04	23.31	111.63	51.18	117.31	53.66 to 106.30	443,336	301,656
1	1	51.18	51.18	51.18	00.00	100.00	51.18	51.18	N/A	855,000	437,630
2	8	73.93	79.04	72.64	22.18	108.81	53.66	117.31	53.66 to 117.31	391,878	284,659
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	3	72.27	77.95	73.49	13.12	106.07	66.58	95.01	N/A	205,454	150,985
2	3	72.27	77.95	73.49	13.12	106.07	66.58	95.01	N/A	205,454	150,985
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	18	72.98	77.68	71.83	16.26	108.14	56.39	111.29	67.99 to 92.56	171,005	122,839
1	7	74.17	79.87	71.65	18.27	111.47	56.39	111.29	56.39 to 111.29	101,759	72,911
2	11	72.61	76.29	71.89	14.68	106.12	57.67	98.94	61.87 to 95.53	215,071	154,610
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>72.70</b>	<b>79.66</b>	<b>71.73</b>	<b>25.01</b>	<b>111.06</b>	<b>33.65</b>	<b>128.95</b>	<b>67.99 to 86.03</b>	<b>253,602</b>	<b>181,906</b>

**31 Franklin**  
**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 : 63  
 Total Sales Price : 21,722,261  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,589,261  
 Total Assessed Value : 14,904,970  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 342,687  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 236,587

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 69  
 MEAN : 79  
 COD : 25.82  
 PRD : 114.01

COV : 29.42  
 STD : 23.16  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.75  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.95  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.65

95% Median C.I. : 67.99 to 84.16  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.99 to 84.43

Printed:3/21/2011 5:08:24PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	3	68.28	71.66	69.34	09.50	103.35	63.61	83.08	N/A	403,667	279,907
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	7	72.61	82.37	74.31	20.18	110.85	57.67	117.31	57.67 to 117.31	203,883	151,503
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	12	91.85	92.88	91.36	21.48	101.66	56.39	128.95	72.79 to 119.56	241,503	220,633
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	65.03	65.03	62.89	06.92	103.40	60.53	69.52	N/A	318,950	200,590
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	77.81	80.14	63.59	29.51	126.03	53.66	111.29	N/A	231,418	147,170
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	63.29	74.81	74.16	23.64	100.88	56.38	108.09	56.38 to 108.09	271,292	201,193
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	95.53	89.57	90.15	19.84	99.36	43.28	122.15	N/A	155,563	140,241
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	93.61	95.06	87.70	16.99	108.39	74.17	118.86	N/A	277,125	243,044
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	61.56	61.56	58.01	10.56	106.12	55.06	68.05	N/A	1,196,000	693,756
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	59.91	60.42	56.90	16.21	106.19	49.61	72.27	N/A	250,500	142,544
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	60.88	64.02	58.71	19.05	109.04	46.11	98.94	46.11 to 98.94	658,193	386,411
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	66.58	74.62	60.48	35.69	123.38	33.65	122.19	N/A	408,915	247,314
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	24	77.12	84.84	80.16	22.60	105.84	56.39	128.95	69.52 to 97.66	257,255	206,209
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	20	84.84	83.61	77.91	23.53	107.32	43.28	122.15	61.87 to 101.37	235,551	183,521
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	19	63.87	65.79	58.72	21.94	112.04	33.65	122.19	51.82 to 72.27	563,375	330,818
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	25	79.17	83.55	79.33	24.82	105.32	53.66	128.95	63.29 to 97.66	254,426	201,832
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	15	74.17	79.53	68.77	27.19	115.65	43.28	122.15	55.06 to 101.37	352,021	242,071
<u>ALL</u>	63	72.61	78.71	69.04	25.82	114.01	33.65	128.95	67.99 to 84.16	342,687	236,587

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	13	67.99	73.30	61.44	25.89	119.30	43.28	122.15	54.50 to 92.56	180,292	110,771
2	50	73.07	80.11	69.96	25.82	114.51	33.65	128.95	68.05 to 90.48	384,909	269,299
<u>ALL</u>	63	72.61	78.71	69.04	25.82	114.01	33.65	128.95	67.99 to 84.16	342,687	236,587

**31 Franklin**  
**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 : 63  
 Total Sales Price : 21,722,261  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,589,261  
 Total Assessed Value : 14,904,970  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 342,687  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 236,587

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 69  
 MEAN : 79  
 COD : 25.82  
 PRD : 114.01

COV : 29.42  
 STD : 23.16  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.75  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.95  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.65

95% Median C.I. : 67.99 to 84.16  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.99 to 84.43

Printed:3/21/2011 5:08:24PM

**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	4	63.42	73.99	66.61	28.10	111.08	51.82	117.31	N/A	288,625	192,263
1	1	66.30	66.30	66.30	00.00	100.00	66.30	66.30	N/A	290,000	192,265
2	3	60.53	76.55	66.72	36.06	114.73	51.82	117.31	N/A	288,167	192,262
<b>Dry</b>											
County	4	83.64	88.18	77.76	22.43	113.40	66.58	118.86	N/A	170,091	132,256
2	4	83.64	88.18	77.76	22.43	113.40	66.58	118.86	N/A	170,091	132,256
<b>Grass</b>											
County	15	73.35	77.95	71.64	15.58	108.81	56.39	111.29	67.99 to 92.56	137,107	98,223
1	7	74.17	79.87	71.65	18.27	111.47	56.39	111.29	56.39 to 111.29	101,759	72,911
2	8	72.98	76.27	71.63	12.98	106.48	61.87	95.53	61.87 to 95.53	168,037	120,371
<b>ALL</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>72.61</b>	<b>78.71</b>	<b>69.04</b>	<b>25.82</b>	<b>114.01</b>	<b>33.65</b>	<b>128.95</b>	<b>67.99 to 84.16</b>	<b>342,687</b>	<b>236,587</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	17	63.61	68.38	62.54	22.86	109.34	46.11	117.31	51.82 to 83.08	675,015	422,165
1	2	58.74	58.74	55.01	12.87	106.78	51.18	66.30	N/A	572,500	314,948
2	15	63.61	69.67	63.38	24.32	109.92	46.11	117.31	53.66 to 83.08	688,683	436,460
<b>Dry</b>											
County	4	83.64	88.18	77.76	22.43	113.40	66.58	118.86	N/A	170,091	132,256
2	4	83.64	88.18	77.76	22.43	113.40	66.58	118.86	N/A	170,091	132,256
<b>Grass</b>											
County	18	72.98	77.68	71.83	16.26	108.14	56.39	111.29	67.99 to 92.56	171,005	122,839
1	7	74.17	79.87	71.65	18.27	111.47	56.39	111.29	56.39 to 111.29	101,759	72,911
2	11	72.61	76.29	71.89	14.68	106.12	57.67	98.94	61.87 to 95.53	215,071	154,610
<b>ALL</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>72.61</b>	<b>78.71</b>	<b>69.04</b>	<b>25.82</b>	<b>114.01</b>	<b>33.65</b>	<b>128.95</b>	<b>67.99 to 84.16</b>	<b>342,687</b>	<b>236,587</b>

**31 Franklin**  
**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 : 85  
 Total Sales Price : 25,186,077  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 25,127,521  
 Total Assessed Value : 17,399,769  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 295,618  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 204,703

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 69  
 MEAN : 78  
 COD : 25.92  
 PRD : 112.49

COV : 31.32  
 STD : 24.40  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.86  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 173.24  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.65

95% Median C.I. : 67.99 to 80.14  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.71 to 83.09

Printed:3/21/2011 5:08:27PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	5	68.28	89.93	75.39	38.44	119.29	61.45	173.24	N/A	293,720	221,425
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	7	72.61	82.37	74.31	20.18	110.85	57.67	117.31	57.67 to 117.31	203,883	151,503
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	16	82.60	87.29	83.81	23.58	104.15	53.09	128.95	69.45 to 106.30	266,827	223,635
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	69.52	77.21	77.57	19.68	99.54	60.53	101.58	N/A	342,633	265,777
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	5	94.90	83.11	67.20	19.38	123.68	53.66	111.29	N/A	209,135	140,538
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	76.80	75.94	75.44	17.20	100.66	56.38	108.09	61.05 to 87.32	225,949	170,465
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	82.45	79.78	78.75	24.61	101.31	43.28	122.15	47.94 to 101.37	150,442	118,473
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	103.06	98.70	96.17	14.46	102.63	74.17	118.86	N/A	109,000	104,827
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	68.05	64.29	58.16	07.20	110.54	55.06	69.75	N/A	808,000	469,944
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	59.91	63.17	57.16	20.73	110.51	49.61	86.51	49.61 to 86.51	202,500	115,744
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	9	57.89	61.78	58.10	20.50	106.33	43.84	98.94	46.11 to 73.35	610,060	354,436
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	63.39	69.78	59.32	36.77	117.63	33.65	122.19	33.65 to 122.19	369,429	219,155
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	31	75.06	85.63	79.86	26.19	107.23	53.09	173.24	69.52 to 93.40	264,288	211,069
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	30	79.78	80.69	76.00	22.45	106.17	43.28	122.15	63.29 to 95.01	186,283	141,583
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	24	62.04	64.44	58.25	23.24	110.63	33.65	122.19	51.18 to 69.75	472,755	275,381
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	36	79.30	82.08	78.68	22.02	104.32	53.09	128.95	69.45 to 94.90	251,506	197,882
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	73.22	75.72	65.87	25.54	114.95	43.28	122.15	51.82 to 95.53	248,656	163,796
<u>ALL</u>	85	72.76	77.90	69.25	25.92	112.49	33.65	173.24	67.99 to 80.14	295,618	204,703

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
1	22	72.42	79.65	70.34	29.61	113.24	43.28	173.24	56.38 to 92.56	171,555	120,672
2	63	72.76	77.29	69.05	24.68	111.93	33.65	128.95	66.58 to 80.14	338,941	234,048
<u>ALL</u>	85	72.76	77.90	69.25	25.92	112.49	33.65	173.24	67.99 to 80.14	295,618	204,703

**31 Franklin**  
**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 : 85  
 Total Sales Price : 25,186,077  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 25,127,521  
 Total Assessed Value : 17,399,769  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 295,618  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 204,703

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 69  
 MEAN : 78  
 COD : 25.92  
 PRD : 112.49

COV : 31.32  
 STD : 24.40  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.86  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 173.24  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.65

95% Median C.I. : 67.99 to 80.14  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.71 to 83.09

Printed:3/21/2011 5:08:27PM

**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	7	66.30	74.14	67.63	21.66	109.63	51.82	117.31	51.82 to 117.31	294,786	199,361
1	2	76.41	76.41	69.01	13.23	110.72	66.30	86.51	N/A	167,500	115,598
2	5	63.73	73.23	67.36	24.38	108.71	51.82	117.31	N/A	345,700	232,867
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	4	83.64	88.18	77.76	22.43	113.40	66.58	118.86	N/A	170,091	132,256
2	4	83.64	88.18	77.76	22.43	113.40	66.58	118.86	N/A	170,091	132,256
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	25	73.35	74.25	69.55	17.38	106.76	45.56	111.29	67.99 to 79.38	147,472	102,571
1	12	72.42	75.12	68.35	18.88	109.90	50.81	111.29	56.39 to 92.48	127,959	87,458
2	13	73.35	73.46	70.41	16.22	104.33	45.56	95.53	61.87 to 94.90	165,485	116,522
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>72.76</b>	<b>77.90</b>	<b>69.25</b>	<b>25.92</b>	<b>112.49</b>	<b>33.65</b>	<b>173.24</b>	<b>67.99 to 80.14</b>	<b>295,618</b>	<b>204,703</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	19	63.73	68.49	61.59	21.37	111.20	46.11	117.31	53.66 to 75.06	610,671	376,083
1	3	66.30	68.00	56.20	17.77	121.00	51.18	86.51	N/A	396,667	222,942
2	16	63.67	68.59	62.20	21.67	110.27	46.11	117.31	53.66 to 75.06	650,797	404,798
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	4	83.64	88.18	77.76	22.43	113.40	66.58	118.86	N/A	170,091	132,256
2	4	83.64	88.18	77.76	22.43	113.40	66.58	118.86	N/A	170,091	132,256
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	31	72.61	73.60	69.77	18.30	105.49	45.56	111.29	63.29 to 79.38	169,526	118,282
1	12	72.42	75.12	68.35	18.88	109.90	50.81	111.29	56.39 to 92.48	127,959	87,458
2	19	72.61	72.64	70.36	17.97	103.24	45.56	98.94	61.05 to 87.32	195,778	137,751
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>72.76</b>	<b>77.90</b>	<b>69.25</b>	<b>25.92</b>	<b>112.49</b>	<b>33.65</b>	<b>173.24</b>	<b>67.99 to 80.14</b>	<b>295,618</b>	<b>204,703</b>



## 2011 Correlation Section for Franklin County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Franklin County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The county seat and largest town is Franklin. The Republican River runs through the southern portion of the county. The county has two high schools; one in Franklin and a consolidated high school in Hildreth. The county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline. Franklin County is comprised of approximately 32% irrigated land, 18% dry crop land and 49% grass/pasture land. Franklin County is divided into two market areas; area one is south of the Bostwick Irrigation Ditch and market area two is north of the ditch.

Franklin County has 48 agricultural sales in the three year study period, 11 of these are located in market area one and 37 are in market area two. The sales are not proportionately spread across the years, in market area one there are 4 sales in the oldest year, 5 sales in the middle year and only 2 sales in the newest year. For market area two, there are 20 sales in the oldest year, 9 sales in the middle year and 8 sales in the newest year.

The sales in market area one appear to be representative of the area, which is made up of approximately 15% irrigated, 15% dry and 67% grass, with the sales file containing sales that are approximately 18% irrigated, 8% dry and 71% grass. Market area two is made up of land that is approximately 40% irrigated, 19% dry and 40% grass; the sales contains land that is approximately 25% irrigated, 18% dry and 56% grass.

The Base statistics show the calculated median to be 73%. The qualitative statistics are above the acceptable range. Both market areas calculate to within the range. A review of the majority land uses for 95% MLU show no irrigated or dry sales in market area one, only two irrigated sales and only three dry sales in market area two. The grass sales look more representative of the county with seven and eight sales in market areas one and two respectively. The 80% MLU statistics show one irrigated sale in area one and eight irrigated sales in area two. Again there are no dry sales in area one and only three in market area two. Both grass statistics are within the range with seven sales in market area one and eleven sales in market area two.

The second test, random inclusion, added two sales to market area one both in the newest year and thirteen sales to market area two; six in the middle year and seven in the newest year. Comparable sales were determined to be in the neighboring counties of Harlan and Webster, with sales that were in the Lower Republican natural resource district and in those county's comparable north-south areas. The overall calculated median is 73%. For market area one, one irrigated sales and one dry/grass mixed sale were borrowed. Although the market areas are now more proportionately distributed and representative, there are very few irrigated or dry sales in the 95% MLU. For the 80% MLU there are more irrigated ales in area two calculating to approximately 64% . Both the 95% MLU and 80% MLU appear to have reliable statistical calculations for the grass sales.

The third test, random exclusion, was to bring in as many sales from a six mile radius as possible to maintain a proportionate and representative sample and to meet the 10% threshold between study years. Thirty-seven Harlan and Webster County sales were deemed comparable

## **2011 Correlation Section for Franklin County**

---

and borrowed for the analysis. For market area one 11 sales were included; four in the oldest year, two in the middle year and five in the newest year. For market area two, the expanded analysis brought in twenty-six sales; three in the oldest year, fourteen in the middle year, and nine in the newest year. With the inclusion of the sales, there appears to be a proportionate distribution of sales among each year of the study period as well as a reasonable representation of the land use in Franklin County. The random exclusion statistics show the calculated median to be 73%. The qualitative statistics are above the acceptable range. Both market areas calculate to within the range and both grass MLU statistics calculate to within the range. As with the first two tests, there are very few irrigated or dry sales in the 95% MLU. The 80% MLU statistics show only three irrigated sales in market area one and sixteen sales in market area two. Both medians calculate below the acceptable range.

As a result of the statistical analyses, in market area one the Franklin County assessor increased her irrigated values 17% to 38%, dry values were increased 13% to 29% and grass values were increased 12% to 16%. In market area two, irrigated increased 18% to 39% dry values were increased 33% to 78% and grass values were slightly decreased 3% to 4%. A review of the neighboring counties shows that the 2011 values in Franklin County are very comparable to both Webster and Harlan counties achieving inter-county equalization. Based on the equalized values, no recommendation for irrigated land will be made. The Assessor has worked at narrowing the difference between her top and bottom LCGs as indicated by the market in Franklin County and has achieved good intra-county equalization.

There is a close correlation of all three tests, because the second and third analyses have a more proportionate distribution of sales, the calculated median for these two approaches will be used for the determination of the level of value. Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 73% of market value for the agricultural class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Franklin 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 Franklin 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 Franklin 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 Franklin 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 : 4,765</b>	<b>Value : 443,334,110</b>	<b>Growth 1,386,105</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>	398	444,115	0	0	0	0	398	444,115	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,225	2,508,950	0	0	0	0	1,225	2,508,950	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,233	34,690,605	0	0	7	216,230	1,240	34,906,835	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,631	37,643,670	0	0	7	216,230	1,638	37,859,900	108,425
<b>% of Res Total</b>	99.57	99.43	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.57	34.38	8.54	7.82
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	99	159,545	0	0	27	92,640	126	252,185	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	211	509,775	0	0	14	68,440	225	578,215	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	225	10,659,735	0	0	15	2,036,115	240	12,695,850	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	324	11,329,055	0	0	42	2,197,195	366	13,526,250	126,915
<b>% of Com Total</b>	88.52	83.76	0.00	0.00	11.48	16.24	7.68	3.05	9.16
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	3	10,630	0	0	0	0	3	10,630	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	5	23,405	0	0	0	0	5	23,405	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	5	82,995	0	0	0	0	5	82,995	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	8	117,030	0	0	0	0	8	117,030	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.17	0.03	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	140,910	1	140,910	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	1	29,095	1	29,095	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	1	170,005	1	170,005	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	0.04	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,631	37,643,670	0	0	8	386,235	1,639	38,029,905	108,425
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	99.51	98.98	0.00	0.00	0.49	1.02	34.40	8.58	7.82
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	332	11,446,085	0	0	42	2,197,195	374	13,643,280	126,915
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	88.77	83.90	0.00	0.00	11.23	16.10	7.85	3.08	9.16
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	1,963	49,089,755	0	0	50	2,583,430	2,013	51,673,185	235,340
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	97.52	95.00	0.00	0.00	2.48	5.00	42.25	11.66	16.98

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	258	0	304	562

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	74	418,180	0	0	1,862	245,459,720	1,936	245,877,900
28. Ag-Improved Land	17	126,255	0	0	751	104,128,935	768	104,255,190
29. Ag Improvements	13	307,585	0	0	803	41,220,250	816	41,527,835
30. Ag Total							2,752	391,660,925

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	2	1.39	3,475	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	12	3.31	33,100	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	10	0.00	256,505	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	4	13.25	12,075	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	12	0.00	51,080	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	4	9.62	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	162	171.55	583,100	164	172.94	586,575	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	488	483.95	4,852,890	500	487.26	4,885,990	
33. HomeSite Improvements	492	0.00	27,857,935	502	0.00	28,114,440	6,290
34. HomeSite Total				<b>666</b>	<b>660.20</b>	<b>33,587,005</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	51	184.11	128,250	51	184.11	128,250	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	573	2,245.91	1,330,765	577	2,259.15	1,342,840	
37. FarmSite Improvements	751	0.00	13,362,315	763	0.00	13,413,395	1,144,475
38. FarmSite Total				<b>814</b>	<b>2,443.26</b>	<b>14,884,485</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	2,066	5,947.22	0	2,070	5,956.84	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	2	9.95	5,875	2	9.95	5,875	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,480</b>	<b>9,070.25</b>	<b>48,477,365</b>	<b>1,150,765</b>

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,932.40	16.98%	5,073,025	19.51%	1,729.99
46. 1A	4,611.22	26.70%	7,977,380	30.67%	1,729.99
47. 2A1	3,856.53	22.33%	5,861,905	22.54%	1,519.99
48. 2A	2,835.79	16.42%	4,026,800	15.48%	1,419.99
49. 3A1	668.26	3.87%	681,615	2.62%	1,019.98
50. 3A	1,109.40	6.42%	1,120,510	4.31%	1,010.01
51. 4A1	548.09	3.17%	553,565	2.13%	1,009.99
52. 4A	706.63	4.09%	713,705	2.74%	1,010.01
53. Total	17,268.32	100.00%	26,008,505	100.00%	1,506.14
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	673.46	3.83%	602,745	4.95%	895.00
55. 1D	6,949.19	39.51%	6,184,800	50.79%	890.00
56. 2D1	1,105.26	6.28%	945,000	7.76%	855.00
57. 2D	1,001.45	5.69%	680,965	5.59%	679.98
58. 3D1	193.71	1.10%	122,045	1.00%	630.04
59. 3D	543.84	3.09%	269,205	2.21%	495.01
60. 4D1	4,196.62	23.86%	2,056,335	16.89%	490.00
61. 4D	2,927.04	16.64%	1,317,300	10.82%	450.05
62. Total	17,590.57	100.00%	12,178,395	100.00%	692.33
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	296.08	0.39%	210,520	0.49%	711.02
64. 1G	4,908.04	6.44%	3,289,715	7.73%	670.27
65. 2G1	992.43	1.30%	625,675	1.47%	630.45
66. 2G	2,748.79	3.61%	1,653,265	3.88%	601.45
67. 3G1	3.97	0.01%	2,340	0.01%	589.42
68. 3G	4,468.93	5.86%	2,521,170	5.92%	564.16
69. 4G1	18,117.13	23.77%	10,145,575	23.83%	560.00
70. 4G	44,679.95	58.62%	24,130,115	56.67%	540.07
71. Total	76,215.32	100.00%	42,578,375	100.00%	558.66
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	17,268.32	15.12%	26,008,505	32.11%	1,506.14
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	17,590.57	15.40%	12,178,395	15.04%	692.33
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	76,215.32	66.74%	42,578,375	52.57%	558.66
72. Waste	3,117.03	2.73%	233,805	0.29%	75.01
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	1.86	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	114,191.24	100.00%	80,999,080	100.00%	709.33

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	817.22	0.87%	1,589,505	0.95%	1,945.01
46. 1A	65,323.91	69.75%	127,055,080	76.14%	1,945.00
47. 2A1	2,363.27	2.52%	4,088,460	2.45%	1,730.00
48. 2A	4,461.77	4.76%	7,540,390	4.52%	1,690.00
49. 3A1	1,059.85	1.13%	1,372,495	0.82%	1,294.99
50. 3A	395.13	0.42%	507,735	0.30%	1,284.98
51. 4A1	7,119.68	7.60%	9,148,875	5.48%	1,285.01
52. 4A	12,119.88	12.94%	15,574,060	9.33%	1,285.00
53. Total	93,660.71	100.00%	166,876,600	100.00%	1,781.71
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	147.54	0.32%	179,260	0.37%	1,214.99
55. 1D	30,089.16	66.11%	36,558,310	75.31%	1,215.00
56. 2D1	1,208.89	2.66%	1,275,370	2.63%	1,054.99
57. 2D	2,987.19	6.56%	2,628,730	5.41%	880.00
58. 3D1	542.81	1.19%	450,555	0.93%	830.04
59. 3D	180.02	0.40%	131,415	0.27%	730.00
60. 4D1	5,031.08	11.05%	3,672,745	7.57%	730.01
61. 4D	5,328.03	11.71%	3,649,685	7.52%	685.00
62. Total	45,514.72	100.00%	48,546,070	100.00%	1,066.60
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	18.77	0.02%	11,630	0.02%	619.61
64. 1G	8,756.62	9.17%	5,290,280	11.35%	604.15
65. 2G1	1,597.80	1.67%	892,135	1.91%	558.35
66. 2G	2,286.83	2.39%	1,218,465	2.61%	532.82
67. 3G1	755.16	0.79%	390,930	0.84%	517.68
68. 3G	5,388.20	5.64%	2,636,185	5.65%	489.25
69. 4G1	15,080.36	15.79%	7,347,110	15.76%	487.20
70. 4G	61,641.01	64.53%	28,841,680	61.85%	467.90
71. Total	95,524.75	100.00%	46,628,415	100.00%	488.13
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	93,660.71	39.61%	166,876,600	63.65%	1,781.71
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	45,514.72	19.25%	48,546,070	18.52%	1,066.60
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	95,524.75	40.39%	46,628,415	17.78%	488.13
72. Waste	1,778.10	0.75%	133,395	0.05%	75.02
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.51	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	236,478.27	100.00%	262,184,480	100.00%	1,108.70

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	148.70	270,670	0.00	0	110,780.33	192,614,435	110,929.03	192,885,105
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	174.49	152,355	0.00	0	62,930.79	60,572,110	63,105.29	60,724,465
<b>78. Grass</b>	124.26	71,995	0.00	0	171,615.81	89,134,795	171,740.06	89,206,790
<b>79. Waste</b>	10.15	765	0.00	0	4,884.98	366,435	4,895.13	367,200
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	2.37	0	2.37	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>457.60</b>	<b>495,785</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>350,211.91</b>	<b>342,687,775</b>	<b>350,669.51</b>	<b>343,183,560</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	110,929.03	31.63%	192,885,105	56.20%	1,738.82
<b>Dry Land</b>	63,105.29	18.00%	60,724,465	17.69%	962.27
<b>Grass</b>	171,740.06	48.97%	89,206,790	25.99%	519.43
<b>Waste</b>	4,895.13	1.40%	367,200	0.11%	75.01
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	2.37	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>350,669.51</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>343,183,560</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>978.65</b>

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

### 31 Franklin

	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	37,100,400	37,859,900	759,500	2.05%	108,425	1.75%
02. Recreational	170,005	170,005	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	32,797,750	33,587,005	789,255	2.41%	6,290	2.39%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>70,068,155</b>	<b>71,616,910</b>	<b>1,548,755</b>	<b>2.21%</b>	<b>114,715</b>	<b>2.05%</b>
05. Commercial	13,392,280	13,526,250	133,970	1.00%	126,915	0.05%
06. Industrial	112,280	117,030	4,750	4.23%	0	4.23%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	14,045,890	14,884,485	838,595	5.97%	1,144,475	-2.18%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>27,550,450</b>	<b>28,527,765</b>	<b>977,315</b>	<b>3.55%</b>	<b>1,271,390</b>	<b>-1.07%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>97,618,605</b>	<b>100,150,550</b>	<b>2,531,945</b>	<b>2.59%</b>	<b>1,386,105</b>	<b>1.17%</b>
11. Irrigated	159,078,600	192,885,105	33,806,505	21.25%		
12. Dryland	45,186,195	60,724,465	15,538,270	34.39%		
13. Grassland	85,399,885	89,206,790	3,806,905	4.46%		
14. Wasteland	244,885	367,200	122,315	49.95%		
15. Other Agland	3,375	0	-3,375	-100.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>289,912,940</b>	<b>343,183,560</b>	<b>53,270,620</b>	<b>18.37%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>387,531,545</b>	<b>443,334,110</b>	<b>55,802,565</b>	<b>14.40%</b>	<b>1,386,105</b>	<b>14.04%</b>

**2010 Plan of Assessment for Franklin County**  
**Assessment Years 2011, 2012, and 2013**  
**Date: June 15, 2010**

**Plan of Assessment Requirements:**

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

**Real Property Assessment Requirements:**

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-201 (R.S. Supp 2007)

**General Description of Real Property in Franklin County:**

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

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Value Base</u>
Residential	1,642	35%	10%
Commercial	363	8%	3%
Industrial	8		0.5%
Recreational	1		0.5%
Agricultural	2,734	57%	86%
Special Value			

Agricultural land – taxable acres 350,752

Other pertinent facts: 86% of Franklin County is agricultural and of that 31% Irrigated, 18% Dry, 49% Pasture, 1% Waste, 12% Residential, 3% Commercial, Industrial, and Recreational, 1% Exempt.

New Property: For assessment year 2010, an estimated **95** building permits and /or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

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

**Current Resources:**

- A. Staffing consists of a Deputy and a Clerk. The Assessor and Deputy, and Clerk take the training that is necessary to keep their certificates current. The budget for 2009-2010 was \$93,225.
- B. A new set of cadastral maps were printed in 2008. Ownership and splits are kept current. In 2000 we purchased a GIS program for the all property in the county. In 2007, a CD was purchased from the FSA office to check the land usage on the GIS program,
- C. The property record cards are color coded for Agricultural, Residential, Commercial, Improvements on Leased Land and Exempt. The cards that have Residential, Commercial, Industrial, or Agricultural improvements have a CAMA pricing sheet, current photo, and a sketch of the house or business. All rural cards have a print-out showing the number of acres, land use and current value per acre, improvement values and the prior year value; they also have an outbuilding printout that shows the building dimensions, depreciation and value.
- D. The software for pricing the improvements is MIPS. The Assessment Administration programming is from MIPS. GIS Workshop provides the programming and support for our GIS system.
- E. We have a Web site for property record information access. The address is [nebraskataxesonline.us](http://nebraskataxesonline.us).

**Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property**

- A. The real estate transfers are photo copied as they are brought in from the Clerk’s office to make a sales book that is available to the public. From the information on the real estate transfer statements the name on the real estate card, the counter book, and the rolodex file are all changed and a sheet for the sales book is made. Building permits are received from the zoning manager and from the towns that have building permit ordinances. All sales are reviewed.
- B. Drive by reviews of the residential properties in town will be done on an annual basis. New photos will be taken every two years, or as the property is altered.
- C. Assessment sales ratio studies are done annually with new sales added, and old sales deleted.
- D. The market approach and the cost approach are used mainly for our residential properties; all three approaches are used on the commercial. Our information to determine value is arrayed by age, quality, size, location, condition and the amenities to the property. Land valuation studies are done by land usage. Sales are plotted by township and usage to determine market areas
- E. Reconciliation of final value and documentation is done by doing a ratio study using the sales in the sales file.
- F. Continual market analysis will be conducted in all categories of properties to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Franklin County is in compliance to state statutes.
- G. Notices of valuation are mailed to every real estate owner each year. One page notices showing land use, number of acres and current value per acre are mailed to each rural land owner.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	99.00%	38.69%	123.91%
Commercial	94.00%	46.40%	165.45%
Agricultural Land	73.00%	19.26%	107.12 %
Special Value Agland			

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

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

- 1. Residential properties will be reviewed and any new information discovered will be added or deleted from the property.
- 2. Commercial properties will be reviewed and updated as necessary.
- 3. Ag Land use will be checked using the information available from the FSA and NRD offices.

4. An inventory of Ag improvements will be started in the fall of 2010 with photos being taken as the sites are inventoried.
5. Ag Improvements will be repriced for 2012 using the new outbuilding pricing.

**Assessment Action Planned for the Assessment Year 2012:**

Residential properties will be reviewed and any new information discovered will be added to or deleted from the property. New pictures of the residential properties will be taken.

Commercial properties will be reviewed and updated as necessary. New pictures will be taken.

Ag Land use will be checked using the information available from the FSA and NRD offices.

**Assessment Action Planned for the Assessment Year 2013:**

Residential properties will be reviewed and any new information discovered will be added to or deleted from the property.

Commercial properties will be reviewed and updated as necessary.

Ag Land use will be checked using the information available from the FSA and NRD offices.

**Other functions preformed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:**

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, and Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real and Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters and annual Assessed Value Update w/abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Land & Funds
  - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
  - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 814 schedules; prepare subsequent notices of incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied as required. **Postcard notices are mailed to all persons or businesses filing schedules in the previous year**

4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board. **Applications are mailed to those that have an application on file.**
5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions: administer 250 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance. **Pre printed forms are mailed to the previous years applicants.**
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
9. Tax lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed
10. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
11. County Board of Equalization – attends county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.
12. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation
13. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
14. Education: Assessor and /or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

**Conclusion:**

A request for \$98,210. for the Assessor’s office and \$64,500. For the Appraisal Fund was submitted to the Franklin County Board Supervisors for approval for the 2010-2011 budget year.

The Franklin County Assessor’s office will work to maintain an efficient and professional office.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## 2011 Assessment Survey for Franklin 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>
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$98,210
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	Separate budget
9.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	\$64,500
10.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	General Fund
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,500
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	0
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	0

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

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

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Franklin and Hildreth
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2000

### D. Contracted Services

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



# 2011 Certification for Franklin 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 Franklin 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



