

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 Frontier County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	56	Median	100.37
Total Sales Price	\$3,188,549	Mean	113.91
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,188,549	Wgt. Mean	101.46
Total Assessed Value	\$3,235,141	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$46,108
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$56,938	Avg. Assessed Value	\$57,770

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.00 to 104.68
95% Mean C.I	95.59 to 107.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	99.15 to 128.67
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	13.04
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.86
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.09

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	55	99	99
2009	81	98	98
2008	89	92	92
2007	80	94	94

2011 Commission Summary for Frontier County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	16	Median	97.47
Total Sales Price	\$567,895	Mean	109.00
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$567,895	Wgt. Mean	102.23
Total Assessed Value	\$580,557	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$89,422
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$35,493	Avg. Assessed Value	\$36,285

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.68 to 101.05
95% Mean C.I	90.26 to 127.74
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	95.01 to 109.45
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.17
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.42
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.42

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	9	100	96
2009	11	92	92
2008	16	93	93
2007	19	94	94

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Frontier County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	75	The qualitative measures calculated in the random include sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator



2011 Assessment Actions for Frontier County

taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Residential

A sales study was completed within the Villages and the lake areas. The ratio study for Curtis indicated that the older homes in Curtis were somewhat overvalued. Homes built in 1939 and later received more depreciation for 2011. The rest of the villages and the lake area only received routine maintenance.

A reappraisal of the rural homes was completed for 2011. The assessor physically inspected all improved rural parcels. New photographs were taken; new measurements were taken when necessary. Because the assessor has discovered numerous inconsistencies in the quality rating during this appraisal cycle, the quality of each home was reviewed to ensure consistency within the class. Condition was also updated where warranted. Sketches of improvements were corrected where necessary.

A study of land values was completed; and new home site values were established.

The costing tables were updated to the Marshall and Swift June, 2008 tables. An effective age was established for all parcels, and a new market depreciation study was completed. The assessor also developed a book of rural residential properties to aid in explaining the reappraisal process to the taxpayers.

Pickup work was also completed for the residential class.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Frontier County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The assessor	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Curtis – is the largest town in Frontier County and is home to the Nebraska College of Technical Agriculture. The college brings jobs, commerce and a demand for housing that is not found in the other communities in the county.
	02	Eustis – is a small village in the North East part of the county. Its proximity to three larger communities in Dawson County provides easy commuting for jobs and shopping opportunities. The real estate market is generally less active than the market in Curtis, but homes here will generally bring a good price.
	03	Maywood – is a small village, with little retail or service business. The market is much softer in Maywood and sales tend to be sporadic.
	04	Small Villages – this grouping consists of the Villages of Stockville and Moorefield. There is no organization to the market in these communities. For 2011, there are no sales within this group.
	05	Lake Properties – this group consists of properties at the Medicine Creek Reservoir and the Hugh Butler Lake. There are very few sales at either location, yet they receive significant market influence due to the recreational appeal of the lakes.
	06	Rural – all parcels not located within the political boundaries of the villages excluding those around the lakes. Demand for rural housing remains strong in Frontier County, and homes will generally sell for a premium in the rural area.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Only the cost approach is used to value property in the residential class. There is insufficient sales activity to establish either the income or the sales comparison approach.	
4	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	For 2009	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	The lot values were established by completing a sales study using a cost per square foot analysis.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June, 2008 for the entire class	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables	

	provided by the CAMA vendor?
	Depreciation tables are developed by the assessor using local market information.
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?
	At minimum new tables are established in conjunction with the cyclical reappraisal of the residential class. A sales study is completed annually, and the depreciation tables are adjusted when warranted.
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.
	Generally, a parcel is considered substantially changed when an improvement is added to or removed from a parcel. Improvements with additions or major remodels are reviewed during pickup work and may constitute being coded out as substantially changed.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.
	There are no procedures specific to the residential class; however, the assessor does have a procedure manual for use in the office.

**32 Frontier
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 : 56
 Total Sales Price : 3,188,549
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,188,549
 Total Assessed Value : 3,235,141
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,938
 Avg. Assessed Value : 57,770

MEDIAN : 100
 WGT. MEAN : 101
 MEAN : 114
 COD : 24.06
 PRD : 112.27

COV : 49.47
 STD : 56.35
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.15
 MAX Sales Ratio : 474.75
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.67

95% Median C.I. : 97.00 to 104.68
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.59 to 107.33
 95% Mean C.I. : 99.15 to 128.67

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:38PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	6	98.19	104.84	100.17	09.60	104.66	94.24	122.38	94.24 to 122.38	64,833	64,941
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	101.39	168.81	97.57	73.44	173.01	85.70	474.75	85.70 to 474.75	26,284	25,644
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	138.86	138.86	140.25	01.31	99.01	137.04	140.67	N/A	42,500	59,605
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	5	98.20	100.62	101.63	04.85	99.01	93.53	109.67	N/A	53,860	54,736
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	14	96.94	100.38	103.90	18.68	96.61	40.67	159.76	88.62 to 120.44	64,164	66,668
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	106.78	114.42	103.05	18.95	111.03	71.59	176.74	92.47 to 156.40	52,606	54,213
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	102.03	103.90	101.05	08.43	102.82	89.87	119.69	89.87 to 119.69	68,557	69,276
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	92.83	102.10	87.59	25.82	116.57	68.19	135.31	N/A	71,400	62,536
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	20	100.85	129.58	103.75	33.80	124.90	85.70	474.75	96.08 to 120.10	46,364	48,102
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	36	100.30	105.20	100.52	18.57	104.66	40.67	176.74	92.83 to 113.96	62,813	63,142
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	31	100.44	107.43	105.04	18.77	102.28	40.67	176.74	96.77 to 113.96	57,376	60,270
<u>ALL</u>	56	100.37	113.91	101.46	24.06	112.27	40.67	474.75	97.00 to 104.68	56,938	57,770

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	28	98.57	106.62	97.97	15.39	108.83	68.19	222.94	94.24 to 103.99	55,637	54,507
02	11	109.67	117.46	107.14	22.25	109.63	71.59	176.74	92.51 to 159.76	83,455	89,417
03	11	100.30	107.05	104.70	13.46	102.24	80.73	156.40	91.48 to 122.38	35,091	36,741
05	3	71.39	77.00	85.63	36.55	89.92	40.67	118.95	N/A	47,100	40,333
06	3	113.96	230.89	107.99	108.46	213.81	103.95	474.75	N/A	61,800	66,739
<u>ALL</u>	56	100.37	113.91	101.46	24.06	112.27	40.67	474.75	97.00 to 104.68	56,938	57,770

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	51	100.44	116.37	101.97	23.76	114.12	68.19	474.75	97.11 to 104.68	58,593	59,746
06	3	71.39	77.00	85.63	36.55	89.92	40.67	118.95	N/A	47,100	40,333
07	2	106.33	106.33	113.74	13.27	93.49	92.22	120.44	N/A	29,500	33,555
<u>ALL</u>	56	100.37	113.91	101.46	24.06	112.27	40.67	474.75	97.00 to 104.68	56,938	57,770

**32 Frontier
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 : 56
 Total Sales Price : 3,188,549
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,188,549
 Total Assessed Value : 3,235,141
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 56,938
 Avg. Assessed Value : 57,770

MEDIAN : 100
 WGT. MEAN : 101
 MEAN : 114
 COD : 24.06
 PRD : 112.27

COV : 49.47
 STD : 56.35
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 24.15
 MAX Sales Ratio : 474.75
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.67

95% Median C.I. : 97.00 to 104.68
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.59 to 107.33
 95% Mean C.I. : 99.15 to 128.67

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:38PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	4	166.26	224.69	133.56	74.68	168.23	91.48	474.75	N/A	2,096	2,800	
5000 TO 9999												
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	4	166.26	224.69	133.56	74.68	168.23	91.48	474.75	N/A	2,096	2,800	
10000 TO 29999	11	120.10	124.95	125.05	20.91	99.92	92.22	176.74	96.77 to 159.76	18,591	23,248	
30000 TO 59999	18	100.92	99.90	99.46	13.64	100.44	40.67	133.44	92.47 to 116.62	41,348	41,125	
60000 TO 99999	14	96.00	99.45	98.31	11.13	101.16	71.59	140.67	92.51 to 113.96	78,314	76,989	
100000 TO 149999	8	101.02	102.56	102.42	14.11	100.14	68.19	136.98	68.19 to 136.98	121,875	124,827	
150000 TO 249999	1	94.69	94.69	94.69	00.00	100.00	94.69	94.69	N/A	160,000	151,510	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	56	100.37	113.91	101.46	24.06	112.27	40.67	474.75	97.00 to 104.68	56,938	57,770	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Frontier County**

A. Residential Real Property

The residential statistics for Frontier County are reliable for measurement purposes. The median and the weighted mean correlate closely. The mean, COD, and PRD are all above the acceptable range, but are affected by four low dollar sales. The four sales all have selling prices less than \$5,000 with assessment ratios ranging from 91% to 475%. When the four sales are removed from the sample, there is no effect on the calculated median or weighted mean; the mean is reduced to 103%. The COD and PRD are brought into the range recommended by IAAO at 14.09% and 102.09%, and support the reliability of the statistics for measurement purposes.

All subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are in the acceptable range, with the exception of valuation grouping 2. This grouping represents residential parcels in the Village of Eustis. Two outlier sales are having an impact on the calculated median of this small subclass. Sales 2009-463 and 2009-570 are both mobile homes on permanent foundations. These sales are not representative of residential parcels within Eustis, and are fairly low dollar sales at \$14,000 and \$15,000. When these sales are removed from the sample the median of the subclass drops to 100%, the COD is decreased to 15.72% and the PRD to 100.97%.

The assessor is knowledgeable of the real estate market in the county and is thorough in completing the sales verification process. A sales verification questionnaire is sent to the buyer and seller of all sales. When necessary, interviews are conducted with buyers, sellers, and real estate professionals involved in the sale to determine sale terms. A review of the qualified and non-qualified sales rosters revealed that there was no apparent bias in qualification determinations.

The assessor has made a creditable effort to become educated in mass appraisal and completes all residential appraisal work herself. Compliance with the six year inspection requirement is accomplished by dividing review work into four segments; village residential, rural improvements, lake properties, and commercial properties. One of these areas is physically inspected each year. When the review work is complete, the land values are analyzed and a new depreciation study is completed to arrive at final value. The assessor is very open in explaining her processes to the Division, the County Board of Equalization, and to the taxpayers of Frontier County. Because the assessment processes are consistently applied, it is believed that assessments are uniform and proportionate in the residential class.

Based on all available information, the level of value of residential property in Frontier County is 100%; all subclasses are within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Assessment Actions for Frontier County

taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Commercial

Only routine maintenance occurred within the commercial class for 2011. A complete reappraisal of the class was just completed for 2010. A sales study was conducted and supported the continued use of the appraisal tables established for 2010. The pickup work was completed timely.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Frontier County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The assessor	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	The assessor does not differentiate valuation groupings within the commercial class. The commercial market in Frontier County is sporadic and unorganized. There are so few sales in any given study period it would be inappropriate to claim that there are different market influences within the county.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	All three approaches to value were developed and considered when the commercial reappraisal was completed for 2010. Because of the limited market information, the cost approach was relied upon to establish the commercial values.	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	A lot study was completed for the 2010 assessment year.	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	The lot values were established by completing a sales study. Values were established using a cost per square foot analysis.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June, 2009 is used for the entire commercial class.	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Depreciation tables are developed using local market information.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	There are no valuation groupings in Frontier County; there is one depreciation table for the entire class.	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	At minimum, the table is updated during the cyclical review of the commercial class. A sales study is completed annually, and adjustments are made to the depreciation tables when warranted.	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	Generally, a parcel is considered substantially changed when an improvement is	

	added to or removed from a parcel. Improvements with additions or major remodels are reviewed during pickup work and may constitute being coded out as substantially changed.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.
	There are no procedures specific to the commercial class; however, the assessor does have a procedure manual for use in the office.

**32 Frontier
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 : 16
Total Sales Price : 567,895
Total Adj. Sales Price : 567,895
Total Assessed Value : 580,557
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 35,493
Avg. Assessed Value : 36,285

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 102
MEAN : 109
COD : 15.43
PRD : 106.62

COV : 32.27
STD : 35.17
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.04
MAX Sales Ratio : 211.92
MIN Sales Ratio : 87.82

95% Median C.I. : 94.68 to 101.05
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.01 to 109.45
95% Mean C.I. : 90.26 to 127.74

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:40PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	93.46	93.46	93.04	01.32	100.45	92.23	94.68	N/A	22,375	20,817
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	103.23	103.23	103.23	00.00	100.00	103.23	103.23	N/A	3,000	3,097
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	95.69	96.07	95.81	00.52	100.27	95.50	97.01	N/A	23,115	22,147
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	96.85	94.20	96.96	03.48	97.15	87.82	97.92	N/A	19,933	19,327
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	98.31	97.58	99.02	01.89	98.55	91.93	101.05	N/A	73,300	72,584
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	197.61	197.61	197.90	07.24	99.85	183.30	211.92	N/A	12,250	24,243
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	3	94.68	96.71	93.68	03.88	103.23	92.23	103.23	N/A	15,917	14,910
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	6	96.27	95.13	96.34	02.21	98.74	87.82	97.92	87.82 to 97.92	21,524	20,737
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	98.39	126.16	105.22	30.18	119.90	91.93	211.92	91.93 to 211.92	55,857	58,772
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	96.35	97.86	96.12	02.35	101.81	95.50	103.23	N/A	18,086	17,385
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	98.06	96.31	98.73	02.73	97.55	87.82	101.05	87.82 to 101.05	53,288	52,612
<u>ALL</u>	16	97.47	109.00	102.23	15.43	106.62	87.82	211.92	94.68 to 101.05	35,493	36,285

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	16	97.47	109.00	102.23	15.43	106.62	87.82	211.92	94.68 to 101.05	35,493	36,285
<u>ALL</u>	16	97.47	109.00	102.23	15.43	106.62	87.82	211.92	94.68 to 101.05	35,493	36,285

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	16	97.47	109.00	102.23	15.43	106.62	87.82	211.92	94.68 to 101.05	35,493	36,285
04											
<u>ALL</u>	16	97.47	109.00	102.23	15.43	106.62	87.82	211.92	94.68 to 101.05	35,493	36,285

**32 Frontier
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 : 16
 Total Sales Price : 567,895
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 567,895
 Total Assessed Value : 580,557
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 35,493
 Avg. Assessed Value : 36,285

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 102
 MEAN : 109
 COD : 15.43
 PRD : 106.62

COV : 32.27
 STD : 35.17
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.04
 MAX Sales Ratio : 211.92
 MIN Sales Ratio : 87.82

95% Median C.I. : 94.68 to 101.05
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.01 to 109.45
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.26 to 127.74

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:40PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
_____Low \$_____												
1 TO 4999	1	103.23	103.23	103.23	00.00	100.00	103.23	103.23	N/A	3,000	3,097	
5000 TO 9999	3	96.85	94.29	95.31	03.57	98.93	87.82	98.20	N/A	7,000	6,672	
_____Total \$_____												
1 TO 9999	4	97.53	96.53	96.30	04.30	100.24	87.82	103.23	N/A	6,000	5,778	
10000 TO 29999	6	96.26	129.06	120.07	36.38	107.49	91.93	211.92	91.93 to 211.92	16,433	19,731	
30000 TO 59999	4	96.81	96.04	96.45	02.15	99.57	92.23	98.31	N/A	39,325	37,928	
60000 TO 99999												
100000 TO 149999	1	98.39	98.39	98.39	00.00	100.00	98.39	98.39	N/A	138,000	135,782	
150000 TO 249999	1	101.05	101.05	101.05	00.00	100.00	101.05	101.05	N/A	150,000	151,568	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
_____ALL_____	16	97.47	109.00	102.23	15.43	106.62	87.82	211.92	94.68 to 101.05	35,493	36,285	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	2	95.53	95.53	93.60	08.07	102.06	87.82	103.23	N/A	4,000	3,744	
326	1	183.30	183.30	183.30	00.00	100.00	183.30	183.30	N/A	12,000	21,996	
344	2	96.44	96.44	96.06	01.82	100.40	94.68	98.20	N/A	12,125	11,647	
350	1	101.05	101.05	101.05	00.00	100.00	101.05	101.05	N/A	150,000	151,568	
352	1	98.39	98.39	98.39	00.00	100.00	98.39	98.39	N/A	138,000	135,782	
353	5	96.85	118.17	106.89	25.96	110.55	91.93	211.92	N/A	24,460	26,146	
391	1	95.50	95.50	95.50	00.00	100.00	95.50	95.50	N/A	24,345	23,250	
468	1	97.01	97.01	97.01	00.00	100.00	97.01	97.01	N/A	10,000	9,701	
470	1	95.69	95.69	95.69	00.00	100.00	95.69	95.69	N/A	35,000	33,490	
543	1	98.31	98.31	98.31	00.00	100.00	98.31	98.31	N/A	44,000	43,256	
_____ALL_____	16	97.47	109.00	102.23	15.43	106.62	87.82	211.92	94.68 to 101.05	35,493	36,285	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Frontier County**

A. Commerical Real Property

The sales in the commercial sample are not representative of commercial parcels in Frontier County. The sixteen sales occurred in nine different occupancy codes and include two vacant parcels. Four of the sales are extreme low dollar sales with selling prices of less than \$10,000.

The assessor is knowledgeable of the real estate market in the county and is thorough in completing the sales verification process. A sales verification questionnaire is sent to the buyer and seller of all sales. When necessary, interviews are conducted with buyers, sellers, and real estate professionals involved in the sale to determine sale terms. A review of the qualified and non-qualified sales rosters revealed that there was no apparent bias in qualification determinations.

All commercial parcels in the county were reappraised for the 2010 assessment year, with the assistance of a contract appraiser. A physical inspection of all parcels was completed, a land study was conducted and a new land valuation table was established. The costing tables were updated and a depreciation study was completed. All three approaches to value were considered where applicable. Because there are typically few commercial sales in any study period, the contract appraiser used an expanded time period and market data from outside of the county to establish the valuation model.

Because the assessment process was consistently applied, it is believed that assessments are uniform and proportionate within the commercial class. There is no reliable information available to determine the level of value of commercial parcels in Frontier County.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Assessment Actions for Frontier County

taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Agricultural

A reappraisal of all improved rural parcels was completed for 2011. The assessor physically inspected all parcels; many new outbuildings and miscellaneous improvements were picked up. New photographs were taken; measurements were checked when necessary. Condition was reviewed and adjusted where warranted. Sketches of improvements were corrected where necessary.

A study of land values was completed; and new home site and farm site values were established.

The costing tables were updated to the Marshall and Swift June, 2008 tables for all rural homes. An effective age was established for the houses, and a new market depreciation study was completed. The assessor also developed a book of rural residential properties to aid in explaining the reappraisal process to the taxpayers.

For 2010, a market value of outbuildings and grain bins was conducted for the commercial reappraisal. The valuation table that was implemented as a result of this study was also used to value agricultural outbuildings and grain bins for 2011.

A farm site plan was drawn for each rural parcel. The farm site plan is a layout of all outbuildings as they sit on the parcel; pictures were also taken for every outbuilding. These farm site plans will aid the assessor's office in explaining this year's valuation change to tax payers; it will also be helpful in completing the physical review work going forward.

New imagery was obtained for the GIS System this year, and a use study was completed using the imagery. As part of the land use study, the assessor mailed colored maps to all agricultural land owners along with a questionnaire. Taxpayers were asked to contact the assessor if the land use shown on the map was not accurate; taxpayers were also asked to identify any acres that are currently enrolled in government programs.

A sales study was completed of agricultural land. Irrigated land remained unchanged for 2011, after a significant increase in 2010. Dry and grass lands were increased approximately 13-15%.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Frontier County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	The assessor	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	There are no market areas in Frontier County.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	n/a	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	The primary use of the parcel is determined by physical inspection, sales verification, reviewing GIS imagery, and other means of normal discovery. Currently, parcels are considered recreational only when they have been enrolled in the WRP program. These parcels are easily identified because a Conservation Easement is filed when the land is enrolled in the program. Recreational land is currently valued at 100% of the agricultural land market because there have been no sales of recreational land within the county. Rural residential land is valued using local sales data.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	Farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites countywide.	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	Grassland is valued by land use; the assessor assigns a value for grassland that is not irrigated, and a value for irrigated grassland. Irrigation and dry land values are assigned by lcg.	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	Land use is updated using GIS imagery, as well as information received from tax payers and NRD's, and some physical inspection.	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales are plotted annually to monitor for non-agricultural influence. The sales verification procedure also includes questions to help the assessor determine whether there was a non-agricultural influence in the sale price. There have historically been a few sales that sold with non-agricultural influence, but not enough for the assessor to establish common characteristics in the sales.	
9.	Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?	
	Yes	

11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.
	Generally, a parcel is considered substantially changed when an improvement is added to or removed from a parcel. Improvements with additions or major remodels are reviewed during pickup work and may constitute being coded out as substantially changed. In the agricultural class, land use changes will also be considered substantially changed.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.
	<p>The county has the following written policy for classifying land:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">LAND ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</p> <p>Land in Frontier County classified as either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved lots by neighborhood 2. Unimproved lots by neighborhood 3. Acreages either as rural residential, suburban 4. Agland 5. Recreational 6. Agland home site and/or farm site <p>If a whole, half section, quarter section, or half quarter section belongs to the same owner; it shall be included in one description. If all lots on the same block belong to one owner, they shall be included in one description.</p> <p>Any item of real property that is situated in more than one tax district, the portion thereof in each district shall be listed separately.</p> <p>Definitions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved lots – land upon which buildings are located or land which has utilities available. 2. Unimproved lots – land without buildings or structures and no utilities available. 3. Acreages – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Suburban acreage is a parcel of land, which the <u>PRIMARY</u> use is not for Ag or Horticultural production and is within a mile of the city limits. b. Rural Residential acreage is a parcel of land, which the <u>PRIMARY</u> use is not for Ag or Horticultural production and is greater than 1 mile from city limits. 4. Recreational – land that is <u>not</u> currently being used for the <u>commercial</u> production of agricultural or horticultural products, including wasteland lying adjacent to it, but for recreational purposes or programs. 5. Agland and horticultural land – land primarily used for the production of agricultural or horticultural products, including wasteland lying adjacent to it. 6. Farm home site – 1 acre of land that is contiguous to a farm site and upon

which is located an inhabitable residence.

7. Farm site – land containing improvements that are Ag or horticultural in nature including an uninhabitable or unimproved farm home site and contiguous to Ag or horticultural land.
8. Market/Sales valuation approach – process of analyzing sales information of similar recently sold properties in order to derive an indication of the most probable sales price of the property being appraised.

Classes and subclasses divide Agland in Frontier County. The classes in the county are: irrigated cropland, dry land cropland, grassland and irrigated grassland, wasteland, roads and ditches, and exempt acres. The subclasses are based on soil classification standards developed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

32 Frontier
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 : 70
Total Sales Price : 18,413,434
Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,413,434
Total Assessed Value : 13,362,388
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 263,049
Avg. Assessed Value : 190,891

MEDIAN : 78
WGT. MEAN : 73
MEAN : 77

COV : 26.29
STD : 20.17
Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.30

95% Median C.I. : 70.33 to 81.61
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 68.33 to 76.81
95% Mean C.I. : 71.99 to 81.45

COD : 20.83
PRD : 105.72

MAX Sales Ratio : 120.96
MIN Sales Ratio : 39.82

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:43PM

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	5	93.52	85.66	68.68	19.94	124.72	41.70	112.86	N/A	223,560	153,531
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	8	94.40	93.05	89.63	10.79	103.82	69.08	108.46	69.08 to 108.46	181,726	162,872
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	13	77.97	76.57	73.64	17.60	103.98	43.45	119.44	62.89 to 88.27	292,779	215,608
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	7	90.40	88.79	80.98	10.51	109.64	72.33	111.18	72.33 to 111.18	335,900	272,012
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	90.87	90.87	90.87	00.00	100.00	90.87	90.87	N/A	55,000	49,976
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	86.68	88.20	69.74	25.06	126.47	60.15	120.96	N/A	180,000	125,540
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	65.67	63.19	62.25	22.54	101.51	41.40	92.71	41.40 to 92.71	163,955	102,056
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	9	56.78	62.44	67.33	15.08	92.74	50.36	82.70	52.02 to 81.61	306,840	206,590
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	76.40	82.53	78.20	08.22	105.54	76.17	95.02	N/A	287,667	224,951
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	80.78	75.63	78.68	13.27	96.12	47.44	92.61	N/A	332,422	261,538
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	62.44	62.52	59.08	08.30	105.82	54.79	70.33	N/A	288,000	170,154
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	60.71	58.93	59.09	15.90	99.73	39.82	79.48	N/A	319,000	188,487
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	33	85.27	84.53	77.64	17.36	108.87	41.70	119.44	78.51 to 93.52	264,516	205,382
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	21	62.71	70.14	67.00	25.85	104.69	41.40	120.96	56.72 to 82.70	223,823	149,968
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	16	72.39	69.25	68.93	17.92	100.46	39.82	95.02	54.79 to 80.78	311,507	214,715
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	26	79.94	82.64	75.71	18.81	109.15	43.45	120.96	72.33 to 90.87	273,555	207,103
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	23	70.18	68.12	71.04	19.58	95.89	41.40	95.02	56.72 to 80.78	272,626	193,661
<u>ALL</u>	70	78.24	76.72	72.57	20.83	105.72	39.82	120.96	70.33 to 81.61	263,049	190,891

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	70	78.24	76.72	72.57	20.83	105.72	39.82	120.96	70.33 to 81.61	263,049	190,891
<u>ALL</u>	70	78.24	76.72	72.57	20.83	105.72	39.82	120.96	70.33 to 81.61	263,049	190,891

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
<u>Dry</u>											
County	3	76.17	73.51	72.91	16.78	100.82	53.02	91.35	N/A	104,383	76,104
1	3	76.17	73.51	72.91	16.78	100.82	53.02	91.35	N/A	104,383	76,104
<u>Grass</u>											
County	8	69.19	76.66	70.81	19.45	108.26	60.71	119.44	60.71 to 119.44	140,955	99,814
1	8	69.19	76.66	70.81	19.45	108.26	60.71	119.44	60.71 to 119.44	140,955	99,814
<u>ALL</u>	70	78.24	76.72	72.57	20.83	105.72	39.82	120.96	70.33 to 81.61	263,049	190,891

32 Frontier
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 : 70
 Total Sales Price : 18,413,434
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,413,434
 Total Assessed Value : 13,362,388
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 263,049
 Avg. Assessed Value : 190,891

MEDIAN : 78
 WGT. MEAN : 73
 MEAN : 77
 COD : 20.83
 PRD : 105.72

COV : 26.29
 STD : 20.17
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.30
 MAX Sales Ratio : 120.96
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.82

95% Median C.I. : 70.33 to 81.61
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 68.33 to 76.81
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.99 to 81.45

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:43PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	1	39.82	39.82	39.82	00.00	100.00	39.82	39.82	N/A	369,999	147,324
1	1	39.82	39.82	39.82	00.00	100.00	39.82	39.82	N/A	369,999	147,324
_____Dry_____											
County	7	53.02	59.16	53.25	23.54	111.10	41.40	91.35	41.40 to 91.35	156,381	83,273
1	7	53.02	59.16	53.25	23.54	111.10	41.40	91.35	41.40 to 91.35	156,381	83,273
_____Grass_____											
County	16	71.33	75.58	73.32	16.65	103.08	54.97	119.44	62.44 to 85.75	229,460	168,244
1	16	71.33	75.58	73.32	16.65	103.08	54.97	119.44	62.44 to 85.75	229,460	168,244
_____ALL_____											
	70	78.24	76.72	72.57	20.83	105.72	39.82	120.96	70.33 to 81.61	263,049	190,891

32 Frontier
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 85
 Total Sales Price : 22,070,384
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,220,384
 Total Assessed Value : 15,488,581
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 261,416
 Avg. Assessed Value : 182,219

MEDIAN : 75
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 23.89
 PRD : 107.47

COV : 29.41
 STD : 22.03
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.83
 MAX Sales Ratio : 135.80
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.39

95% Median C.I. : 68.04 to 80.46
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.60 to 73.81
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.23 to 79.59

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:45PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	5	93.52	85.66	68.68	19.94	124.72	41.70	112.86	N/A	223,560	153,531
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	8	94.40	93.05	89.63	10.79	103.82	69.08	108.46	69.08 to 108.46	181,726	162,872
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	13	77.97	76.57	73.64	17.60	103.98	43.45	119.44	62.89 to 88.27	292,779	215,608
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	7	90.40	88.79	80.98	10.51	109.64	72.33	111.18	72.33 to 111.18	335,900	272,012
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	90.87	84.53	71.73	29.66	117.84	40.94	121.79	N/A	91,000	65,274
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	6	74.70	81.27	65.54	33.17	124.00	46.61	120.96	46.61 to 120.96	183,333	120,154
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	65.67	63.19	62.25	22.54	101.51	41.40	92.71	41.40 to 92.71	163,955	102,056
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	11	56.78	59.99	61.72	15.41	97.20	39.39	82.70	50.36 to 81.61	337,415	208,264
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	76.29	79.04	77.27	08.74	102.29	68.58	95.02	N/A	238,750	184,486
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	70.72	70.53	73.44	17.17	96.04	47.44	92.61	47.44 to 92.61	288,889	212,168
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	54.79	66.08	54.86	33.75	120.45	44.49	135.80	44.49 to 135.80	305,421	167,560
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	61.62	64.99	63.53	19.98	102.30	39.82	80.46	39.82 to 80.46	288,428	183,252
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	33	85.27	84.53	77.64	17.36	108.87	41.70	119.44	78.51 to 93.52	264,516	205,382
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	26	60.65	68.47	62.95	29.28	108.77	39.39	121.79	54.97 to 81.61	233,396	146,923
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	26	67.79	69.15	65.89	21.99	104.95	39.82	135.80	57.29 to 79.48	285,502	188,114
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	29	79.20	81.31	74.68	21.96	108.88	40.94	121.79	71.48 to 90.87	259,670	193,922
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	29	66.99	66.19	67.06	19.24	98.70	39.39	95.02	56.78 to 76.17	274,531	184,087
<u>ALL</u>	85	74.63	74.91	69.70	23.89	107.47	39.39	135.80	68.04 to 80.46	261,416	182,219

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	85	74.63	74.91	69.70	23.89	107.47	39.39	135.80	68.04 to 80.46	261,416	182,219
<u>ALL</u>	85	74.63	74.91	69.70	23.89	107.47	39.39	135.80	68.04 to 80.46	261,416	182,219

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
<u>Dry</u>											
County	4	83.76	85.58	81.84	25.06	104.57	53.02	121.79	N/A	95,788	78,392
1	4	83.76	85.58	81.84	25.06	104.57	53.02	121.79	N/A	95,788	78,392
<u>Grass</u>											
County	10	65.47	71.60	66.56	21.52	107.57	45.51	119.44	57.29 to 92.71	154,359	102,738
1	10	65.47	71.60	66.56	21.52	107.57	45.51	119.44	57.29 to 92.71	154,359	102,738
<u>ALL</u>	85	74.63	74.91	69.70	23.89	107.47	39.39	135.80	68.04 to 80.46	261,416	182,219

32 Frontier
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 85
 Total Sales Price : 22,070,384
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,220,384
 Total Assessed Value : 15,488,581
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 261,416
 Avg. Assessed Value : 182,219

MEDIAN : 75
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 23.89
 PRD : 107.47

COV : 29.41
 STD : 22.03
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.83
 MAX Sales Ratio : 135.80
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.39

95% Median C.I. : 68.04 to 80.46
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.60 to 73.81
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.23 to 79.59

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:45PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	5	44.49	64.27	47.92	53.25	134.12	39.39	135.80	N/A	456,600	218,822
1	5	44.49	64.27	47.92	53.25	134.12	39.39	135.80	N/A	456,600	218,822
_____Dry_____											
County	8	54.87	66.99	57.37	35.57	116.77	41.40	121.79	41.40 to 121.79	145,583	83,521
1	8	54.87	66.99	57.37	35.57	116.77	41.40	121.79	41.40 to 121.79	145,583	83,521
_____Grass_____											
County	19	69.08	71.51	70.30	19.08	101.72	45.51	119.44	60.71 to 81.61	225,648	158,631
1	19	69.08	71.51	70.30	19.08	101.72	45.51	119.44	60.71 to 81.61	225,648	158,631
_____ALL_____											
	85	74.63	74.91	69.70	23.89	107.47	39.39	135.80	68.04 to 80.46	261,416	182,219

32 Frontier
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 : 119
 Total Sales Price : 29,813,828
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 30,147,428
 Total Assessed Value : 20,249,252
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 253,340
 Avg. Assessed Value : 170,162

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 67
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 26.88
 PRD : 111.28

COV : 32.07
 STD : 23.97
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.44
 MAX Sales Ratio : 149.56
 MIN Sales Ratio : 18.98

95% Median C.I. : 66.71 to 79.20
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.25 to 72.08
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.44 to 79.06

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:48PM

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	7	93.52	95.38	75.92	23.37	125.63	41.70	149.56	41.70 to 149.56	183,900	139,609
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	9	97.45	95.68	91.13	11.48	104.99	69.08	116.66	85.27 to 108.46	171,056	155,884
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	20	78.27	76.29	72.29	17.43	105.53	43.45	119.44	66.71 to 87.59	270,832	195,776
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	9	81.46	84.37	79.79	13.71	105.74	59.35	111.18	72.33 to 94.17	286,811	228,858
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	7	82.60	73.82	64.25	35.93	114.89	29.10	121.79	29.10 to 121.79	87,486	56,209
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	62.71	76.52	59.15	37.22	129.37	46.61	120.96	46.61 to 120.96	247,571	146,428
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	9	61.15	64.04	59.01	27.46	108.52	41.40	99.19	42.62 to 92.71	216,397	127,706
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	16	58.66	62.49	62.79	17.73	99.52	39.39	97.57	52.02 to 68.81	294,992	185,234
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	8	76.29	84.35	78.88	21.89	106.93	59.99	116.43	59.99 to 116.43	254,596	200,818
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	74.44	74.69	74.30	19.51	100.52	47.44	107.96	57.29 to 92.61	263,346	195,671
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	9	54.33	59.54	42.21	33.79	141.06	18.98	135.80	44.49 to 70.33	378,328	159,682
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	9	61.62	63.26	62.35	17.75	101.46	39.82	80.46	51.06 to 79.81	277,555	173,056
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	45	85.27	84.75	77.19	18.81	109.79	41.70	149.56	78.51 to 91.35	240,550	185,677
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	39	60.38	67.40	61.37	30.46	109.83	29.10	121.79	52.15 to 71.08	231,099	141,835
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	35	65.86	70.06	61.71	26.66	113.53	18.98	135.80	59.99 to 76.40	294,566	181,778
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	43	78.57	77.62	71.48	22.71	108.59	29.10	121.79	68.24 to 87.59	240,543	171,947
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	42	66.43	69.60	67.55	23.29	103.03	39.39	116.43	58.78 to 74.44	263,674	178,112
<u>ALL</u>	119	72.33	74.75	67.17	26.88	111.28	18.98	149.56	66.71 to 79.20	253,340	170,162

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	119	72.33	74.75	67.17	26.88	111.28	18.98	149.56	66.71 to 79.20	253,340	170,162
<u>ALL</u>	119	72.33	74.75	67.17	26.88	111.28	18.98	149.56	66.71 to 79.20	253,340	170,162

32 Frontier
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 : 119
 Total Sales Price : 29,813,828
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 30,147,428
 Total Assessed Value : 20,249,252
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 253,340
 Avg. Assessed Value : 170,162

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 67
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 26.88
 PRD : 111.28

COV : 32.07
 STD : 23.97
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.44
 MAX Sales Ratio : 149.56
 MIN Sales Ratio : 18.98

95% Median C.I. : 66.71 to 79.20
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.25 to 72.08
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.44 to 79.06

Printed:3/13/2011 3:51:48PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	66.71	66.71	66.71	00.00	100.00	66.71	66.71	N/A	225,000	150,100
1	1	66.71	66.71	66.71	00.00	100.00	66.71	66.71	N/A	225,000	150,100
Dry											
County	5	91.35	90.12	85.90	22.09	104.91	53.02	121.79	N/A	90,530	77,765
1	5	91.35	90.12	85.90	22.09	104.91	53.02	121.79	N/A	90,530	77,765
Grass											
County	15	65.25	73.91	72.03	24.41	102.61	45.51	119.44	60.38 to 92.71	158,780	114,375
1	15	65.25	73.91	72.03	24.41	102.61	45.51	119.44	60.38 to 92.71	158,780	114,375
ALL	119	72.33	74.75	67.17	26.88	111.28	18.98	149.56	66.71 to 79.20	253,340	170,162

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	9	51.06	60.02	49.93	31.71	120.21	39.39	135.80	39.82 to 66.71	372,000	185,757
1	9	51.06	60.02	49.93	31.71	120.21	39.39	135.80	39.82 to 66.71	372,000	185,757
Dry											
County	11	56.72	71.75	61.19	41.84	117.26	41.40	121.79	43.45 to 108.29	134,909	82,556
1	11	56.72	71.75	61.19	41.84	117.26	41.40	121.79	43.45 to 108.29	134,909	82,556
Grass											
County	26	68.56	72.20	71.41	21.97	101.11	43.18	119.44	60.71 to 81.61	204,958	146,357
1	26	68.56	72.20	71.41	21.97	101.11	43.18	119.44	60.71 to 81.61	204,958	146,357
ALL	119	72.33	74.75	67.17	26.88	111.28	18.98	149.56	66.71 to 79.20	253,340	170,162

2011 Correlation Section for Frontier County

A. Agricultural Land

Frontier County's agricultural land consists of rolling plains with moderate to steep slopes. The majority of the county is grass land and dry land cropland with little irrigated land. The majority of parcels in the county are mixed use; nearly every sale will contain some portion of dry and grass acres. The county is in the Middle Republican NRD; the NRD imposes irrigation allocation restrictions on irrigated parcels. In general, parcels of land within six miles of the county border were considered comparable; however, irrigated parcels from Dawson and Gosper County were not used because they do not have irrigation restrictions.

Three statistical samples were analyzed to determine the level of value of agricultural land in Frontier County. The base sample is representative of land uses within the population; overall the sample is large, but, the dry and irrigated subclasses are not statistically adequate. The sample is not proportionate. The median of the base sample is outside of the acceptable range.

In the second and third samples, comparable sales from up to six miles away from the subject county were brought into the samples. In both expanded samples the thresholds for proportionate and representative distribution were achieved. Both expanded samples have medians within the acceptable range, indicating that the median of the base sample is affected by the disproportionate mix of sales.

In the two expanded samples, there is some dispersion in the medians of the two samples; the coefficient of dispersion of the third sample is higher than the second sample. The third method has the largest subclass samples, however, in both the irrigated and the dry land subclasses the samples are heavily weighted towards the newest year, and the coefficients of dispersion are quite high, 32% and 42% respectively. The random inclusion sample clearly contains less dispersion.

While the calculated median of the small subclass samples suggests that cropland is under assessed; it is believed that the values established by the county are both acceptable and equalized. First, statistics of less than 80% majority land use were analyzed. In reviewing samples of 70% majority land use or less, the dry land subclass consistently produced medians at or above 75% with samples ranging from 16 to 37 sales; while these statistics are not conclusive, they do provide support that dry land in Frontier County is not under assessed. Further, an adjustment to the dry land to bring the 80% MLU statistics into the acceptable range would both move the overall class out of the acceptable range and would make Frontier County's dry land values higher than any surrounding county.

For the irrigated subclass, samples of 70% and less majority land use remained small with significant disparity, even within individual study period years. Because Frontier County contains very little irrigated land (only 13% in the county) there is a lack of conclusive evidence to determine that the values are not acceptable. A look at a three year history of valuation increases in the county reveals that irrigated and dry land have increased at very similar proportions since 2008; supporting that crop land has been uniformly assessed in the county.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Frontier County**

A comparison of Frontier County's values with surrounding comparable counties was examined. In comparing grass land values to the surrounding counties, Frontier's values are very similar to Lincoln County's market area 4 and Dawson County's market area 2, somewhat higher than Hayes and Red Willow Counties, and slightly lower Gosper County. The crop land values fluctuate more on a county by county comparison; generally, the values are reasonably comparable and typical for the market.

The assessor is knowledgeable of the real estate market in this portion of the state and strives to set values at 75% of the most probable selling price of each land use. All indications support that values are uniform and proportionate.

Based on the correlation of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 75% of market value in the agricultural class of property; all subclasses are within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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 Frontier 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.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 4,032

Value : 407,231,584

Growth 814,122

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	68	296,710	11	85,445	11	87,884	90	470,039	
02. Res Improve Land	717	3,539,972	45	470,700	77	1,476,596	839	5,487,268	
03. Res Improvements	724	34,014,932	46	3,855,844	81	5,521,972	851	43,392,748	
04. Res Total	792	37,851,614	57	4,411,989	92	7,086,452	941	49,350,055	171,969
% of Res Total	84.17	76.70	6.06	8.94	9.78	14.36	23.34	12.12	21.12
05. Com UnImp Land	19	77,604	1	4,391	5	82,760	25	164,755	
06. Com Improve Land	123	514,093	3	16,871	13	230,571	139	761,535	
07. Com Improvements	133	12,709,689	5	137,839	27	3,216,440	165	16,063,968	
08. Com Total	152	13,301,386	6	159,101	32	3,529,771	190	16,990,258	258,610
% of Com Total	80.00	78.29	3.16	0.94	16.84	20.78	4.71	4.17	31.77
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	6	91,881	6	91,881	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	9	47,715	9	47,715	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	205	3,627,268	205	3,627,268	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	211	3,766,864	211	3,766,864	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	5.23	0.92	0.00
Res & Rec Total	792	37,851,614	57	4,411,989	303	10,853,316	1,152	53,116,919	171,969
% of Res & Rec Total	68.75	71.26	4.95	8.31	26.30	20.43	28.57	13.04	21.12
Com & Ind Total	152	13,301,386	6	159,101	32	3,529,771	190	16,990,258	258,610
% of Com & Ind Total	80.00	78.29	3.16	0.94	16.84	20.78	4.71	4.17	31.77
17. Taxable Total	944	51,153,000	63	4,571,090	335	14,383,087	1,342	70,107,177	430,579
% of Taxable Total	70.34	72.96	4.69	6.52	24.96	20.52	33.28	17.22	52.89

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	3	43,938	1,377,672	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	3	43,938	1,377,672
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				3	43,938	1,377,672

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	6	3,359,410	6	3,359,410	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	6	3,359,410	6	3,359,410	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	95	3	268	366

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	7	59,052	0	0	1,999	195,905,042	2,006	195,964,094
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	1	13,942	645	99,805,503	646	99,819,445
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	1	155,109	677	37,826,349	678	37,981,458
30. Ag Total							2,684	333,764,997

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	7,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	138,287	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	2.88	5,645	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	16,822	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	1	1.00	7,000	1	1.00	7,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	373	385.00	2,695,000	374	386.00	2,702,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	374	379.00	22,680,693	375	380.00	22,818,980	383,543
34. HomeSite Total				376	387.00	25,527,980	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	53	148.59	290,703	53	148.59	290,703	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	625	3,143.03	5,411,780	626	3,145.91	5,417,425	
37. FarmSite Improvements	659	0.00	15,145,656	660	0.00	15,162,478	0
38. FarmSite Total				713	3,294.50	20,870,606	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,653.21	0	0	5,653.21	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,089	9,334.71	46,398,586	383,543

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	141.35	0.19%	141,350	0.20%	1,000.00
46. 1A	59,508.29	79.49%	59,452,429	83.17%	999.06
47. 2A1	1,926.55	2.57%	1,774,648	2.48%	921.15
48. 2A	941.41	1.26%	882,539	1.23%	937.47
49. 3A1	5,359.96	7.16%	4,528,523	6.34%	844.88
50. 3A	9.56	0.01%	8,078	0.01%	844.98
51. 4A1	1,537.61	2.05%	1,044,674	1.46%	679.41
52. 4A	5,434.74	7.26%	3,648,928	5.10%	671.41
53. Total	74,859.47	100.00%	71,481,169	100.00%	954.87
Dry					
54. 1D1	723.75	0.46%	441,493	0.49%	610.01
55. 1D	115,980.50	73.71%	70,748,286	78.42%	610.00
56. 2D1	2,182.31	1.39%	1,243,920	1.38%	570.00
57. 2D	1,304.28	0.83%	743,447	0.82%	570.01
58. 3D1	21,303.17	13.54%	10,225,522	11.33%	480.00
59. 3D	1.63	0.00%	782	0.00%	479.75
60. 4D1	4,920.40	3.13%	2,115,812	2.35%	430.01
61. 4D	10,933.58	6.95%	4,701,543	5.21%	430.01
62. Total	157,349.62	100.00%	90,220,805	100.00%	573.38
Grass					
63. 1G1	575.30	0.16%	198,482	0.16%	345.01
64. 1G	29,511.40	8.10%	10,181,573	8.10%	345.00
65. 2G1	2,583.29	0.71%	891,243	0.71%	345.00
66. 2G	979.12	0.27%	337,804	0.27%	345.01
67. 3G1	5,011.39	1.38%	1,728,960	1.38%	345.01
68. 3G	0.92	0.00%	318	0.00%	345.65
69. 4G1	7,643.79	2.10%	2,637,122	2.10%	345.00
70. 4G	317,938.61	87.29%	109,688,935	87.29%	345.00
71. Total	364,243.82	100.00%	125,664,437	100.00%	345.00
Irrigated Total					
	74,859.47	12.55%	71,481,169	24.87%	954.87
Dry Total					
	157,349.62	26.38%	90,220,805	31.40%	573.38
Grass Total					
	364,243.82	61.07%	125,664,437	43.73%	345.00
72. Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	157.69	0.03%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	596,452.91	100.00%	287,366,411	100.00%	481.79

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.88	827	0.00	0	74,858.59	71,480,342	74,859.47	71,481,169
77. Dry Land	87.96	51,664	0.00	0	157,261.66	90,169,141	157,349.62	90,220,805
78. Grass	19.02	6,561	3.76	1,297	364,221.04	125,656,579	364,243.82	125,664,437
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	157.69	0	157.69	0
82. Total	107.86	59,052	3.76	1,297	596,341.29	287,306,062	596,452.91	287,366,411

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	74,859.47	12.55%	71,481,169	24.87%	954.87
Dry Land	157,349.62	26.38%	90,220,805	31.40%	573.38
Grass	364,243.82	61.07%	125,664,437	43.73%	345.00
Waste	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	157.69	0.03%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	596,452.91	100.00%	287,366,411	100.00%	481.79

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

32 Frontier

	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	48,517,935	49,350,055	832,120	1.72%	171,969	1.36%
02. Recreational	3,763,125	3,766,864	3,739	0.10%	0	0.10%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	22,334,698	25,527,980	3,193,282	14.30%	383,543	12.58%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	74,615,758	78,644,899	4,029,141	5.40%	555,512	4.66%
05. Commercial	16,745,440	16,990,258	244,818	1.46%	258,610	-0.08%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	12,570,772	20,870,606	8,299,834	66.02%	0	66.02%
08. Minerals	1,203,690	3,359,410	2,155,720	179.09	0	179.09
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	30,519,902	41,220,274	10,700,372	35.06%	258,610	34.21%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	105,135,660	119,865,173	14,729,513	14.01%	814,122	13.24%
11. Irrigated	71,573,725	71,481,169	-92,556	-0.13%		
12. Dryland	78,732,524	90,220,805	11,488,281	14.59%		
13. Grassland	110,894,333	125,664,437	14,770,104	13.32%		
14. Wasteland	0	0	0			
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	261,200,582	287,366,411	26,165,829	10.02%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	366,336,242	407,231,584	40,895,342	11.16%	814,122	10.94%

FRONTIER COUNTY ASSESSOR'S 3-YEAR PLAN

The following is a revised 3-year plan of assessment for years 2011, 2012, and 2013 pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB170, Section 5 and directive 05-4. The purpose of this plan is to update and inform the County Board of Equalization and the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division of the progress this county has achieved from year to year. The plan and any updates shall examine the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment within Frontier County.

Property Summary in Frontier County (Parcel Summary):

Personal Property

Property Type	Total Parcel Count	Percent Of Parcels	Total Value	Percent Of Total Value
Commercial	158	30%	3,624,571	15%
Agricultural	356	70%	21,487,849	85%
2010 Total	514		25,112,420	

2009 totals: Parcel count: 511 Total value: \$22,779,823 increase in value for '10 by \$2,332,597

Real Property

Property Type	Taxable Acres	Unimproved Parcels	Improved Parcels	Total Parcel Count	Percent Of Parcels	Total Value	Percent Total Value
Commercial		24	165	189	4.70%	18,533,430	5.05%
Agricultural	596,179	1995	682	2677	66.51% Irrigated= 13% Dry= 26% Grass= 61%	295,839,732	80.60%
Residential	175	93	856	949	23.71%	48,931,094	13.34%
Recreational	0	6	204	210	5.14%	3,763,125	1.03%
Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Val	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010 Total	596,354	2118	1907	4025	100%	367,067,381	100%

2009 totals:

Parcel count: 4,054 - decrease of 29 for '10

Commercial: \$15,455,168 – increase of \$3,078,262 for '10

Agricultural: \$264,484,275 – increase of \$31,355,457 for '10

Residential: \$48,843,948 – increase of \$87,146 for '10

Recreational: \$3,689,794 – increase of \$73,331 for '10

Total value for '09: \$332,473,185 increase of \$34,594,196 for '10

Misc. Parcel Counts

Property Type	Total Parcel Count	Total Value
TIF	3	Excess= 1,377,672 Base=43,938
Mineral / Oil Interest	4	1,203,690
Exempt	362	0
Homesteads Applications for 2009	134	5,386,959
Building / Zoning Info Applications for 2010	Permits = 19 Found = 5	

2009 totals: TIF Ex: \$1,245,633 – increase of \$132,039 for '10

Mineral: \$2,028,430 - decrease of \$824,740 for '10

Current Resources in Frontier County:

- Budget:** Requested Budget for 2010-2011 = \$ 115,029
Requested Reappraisal Budget for 2010-2011 = \$ 0
Adopted Budget for 2010-2011 = \$ 113,914
Adopted Reappraisal Budget for 2010-2011 = \$ 0
- Staffing:** **Assessor** – Regina Andrijeski, full time,
Deputy Assessor – None as of 09/27/10. There are no plans to appoint one at this time as the position is currently being re-evaluated to see if there is a need for another full time employee.
- Training:** The assessor has her assessor's certificate and is in good standing with the state and is completing continuing education to comply with required hours to be current through December 31, 2010, and to continue to further her education in every area of her job. So far the assessor has taken the following classes for continuing education: 2007 Assessor GIS Seminar, Sales File Practice Manual, Residential Quality, Condition & Effective Age Seminar, IAAO 101 Fundamentals of Real Estate Property Appraisal, IAAO 300 Fundamentals of Mass Appraisal, Basic Depreciation, R & O Tables, Residential Data Collection, Sand Pits, River & Recreational Land Valuation, County Board of Equalization Workshop and many other miscellaneous classes & workshops for a total of 188.25 hours toward her required 60 hours for recertification.
- Maps:** Frontier County has contracted with GIS Workshop for their GIS mapping program and as of January 1st, 2008 it was fully implemented. The aerial maps and cadastral maps are no longer updated, due to the fact that all that information is now on the GIS system and kept current on there.
- CAMA:** Frontier County uses the TerraScan Administrative System. This county began using the system in 1999. As stated above the office is now contracting its mapping system with GIS Workshop. The office server is a Dell and was purchased in July of 2005. The office purchased a new Dell PC for the deputy assessor's workstation in 2007. The office has a Sony digital camera, 9 years old, that we use for taking photos of improvements, upon which are later entered into the Terra-Scan electronic file. The office intends to continuously review and update our equipment as needed to keep our records accurate and the office running well.
- Web:** Frontier County, with system provider GIS Workshop, offers a basic web property information service. Any individual with access to the Internet will have access to county parcel information by going to the following site <http://frontier.gisworkshop.com>

Property Record Cards:

The assessor and the deputy assessor update each property record file, as needed both electronically and with hard copies. Only the most recent data is kept in the record card. Historic information on each parcel is kept in a separate file cabinet from the current files. Each property record file is interrelated through codes and references and contains the following:

1. Parcel information.
 - ◆ Current owner and address
 - ◆ Ownership changes, sales information, splits or additions, and deed recordings
 - ◆ Legal description and situs
 - ◆ Property classification code, tax district, and school district
 - ◆ Current year and up to 4 years prior history of land and improvements assessed values
2. Ag-land land use and soil type worksheets.
3. Current copy of the electronic appraisal file worksheet.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

Discover, List and Inventory all property:

Sales review and procedures for processing 521's in Frontier County:

* Current data available on sales file:

1. Agricultural land & Commercial = 3 years of data. July 1 - June 30
2. Residential = 2 years of data. July 1 – June 30

* All sales are deemed to be qualified sales. For a sale to be considered non-qualified or if any adjustments are to be made to the selling price the sale is reviewed pursuant to professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques and through the review documenting sufficient and compelling information regarding the sale. Opinions are based on the results of returned questionnaires and/or conversations with buyers and/or sellers.

* All 521's are entered into the computer, however, only the 521's with an amount stated for Documentary Stamp Tax greater than \$2.25 or consideration greater than \$100.00 is captured in the sales file database as a qualified sale.

* If the stated value of personal property is more than 5% of the total sale price for residential property or more than 25% for commercial property, the sale is EXCLUDED unless the sales sample is small and there is strong evidence to support the value estimate of personal property.

* Both the assessor and the deputy process sales. Every transfer statement has the following work done: Updates made to the property record card, electronic appraisal file, GIS if applicable, and sales book. All sales are now sent electronically to the PAD. Sales questionnaires are sent to BOTH buyer

and seller of ALL types of property (Ag, residential, commercial). A physical improvements data confirmation sheet is also sent to either the buyer or the seller. When the data sheet is returned the information is compared to that already present in the appraisal file and updated as needed. A record is kept of all individuals receiving a questionnaire and all individuals returning the questionnaire. Our return rate on the verification questionnaires is at 42% this year. The office also initiates phone contact with the buyer and seller on any sales with questions or concerns. All sales whether qualified or not are recorded in the TerraScan computer sales file. The Treasurer's office, FSA, and the NRD office are informed of ownership changes. Lastly the offices sales spreadsheet, used to determine sales ratios, is updated.

Building Permits / Information Sheets:

- * No building amounting to a value of \$2,500 or more shall be erected, or structurally altered or repaired, and no electrical, heating, plumbing, or other installation or connection, or other improvement to real property, amounting to a value of \$2,500 or more, shall hereafter be made until an information statement or building permit has been filed with the assessor.
- * Urban Zoning regulations in place in: Curtis, Eustis, and Maywood. No zoning regulations in place in: Stockville and Moorefield. Entire rural areas of the county require a zoning permit when changes are made to the property.
- * When there is an increase in square footage of a current improvement or the addition of another improvement to an urban property a building permit is required in the towns of Curtis and Eustis. Information sheets shall be used in a city or village that does not require a building permit under its zoning laws.
- * All permits and information sheets are reviewed for percentage of completion and value changes in the fall (November/December), prior to January 1, of the year the permits were turned into the assessors' office.
- * Frontier County data logs include: Spiral pick-up work listing notebook, permit collection envelope, and the electronic Terra-scan permits file.

Data Collection:

* Real Property Improvements:

Appraisal work is being done on a continuing basis. Our office uses data gathered from sales questionnaires as well as detailed reviews and updates. Detailed reviews include an on-site physical inspection of all improvements, by the county assessor & deputy, interior inspections when possible, new digital photographs and any needed updating of improvement sketches. Frontier County is scheduling detailed reviews to be performed on all property types with improvements throughout the entire County on a 4-year cycle. Rural properties and all ag parcels are scheduled to be done for the 2011 tax year, lake and cabin properties for the tax year 2012, residential properties for 2013, commercial properties for 2014 and then the process starts again. Either the county assessor or deputy completes updates annually. All property types are reviewed on the computer for correctness of parcel information/ appraisal record data.

* Personal Property:

Currently data is gathered primarily from the taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule and previous personal property schedules. Occasionally owners will report new property themselves and we review all copies of any UCC filing statements and zoning permits that are recorded in the clerk's office. Our office mails out reminders one month prior to the May first deadline as well as make phone calls to remind those that have not filed a week prior to the May 1st deadline.

* Ag land:

As of January 1st 2008 Frontier County has fully implemented the GIS system and it is now used to keep all of our land use current by viewing the current satellite imagery for Frontier County.

* Improvements on Leased Land:

Improvements on leased land have been inspected using the same methods as those used with other real property improvements.

Assessment sales ratios and assessment actions:

* Our office now performs three review assessments. Two prior to the AVU and abstract submission and one after the Reports and Opinions has been released.

* Reviews of the level of value for all types of property are done using the sales rosters provided by the state as well as using our in house "what if's" spread sheets. The office also utilizes our field liaison when needed. We understand that the reliability of the ratio studies depends on representativeness of the sample. Therefore, when information is entered into the sales file and the rosters they are reviewed for correctness several times.

* The appraisal uniformity guide our offices employs and strives to be in compliance with is:

1. Mean / Median / Aggregate lie between:

- * 92-100% for residential properties
- * 92-100% for commercial properties
- * 69-75% for Agland

* In normal distribution all 3 should be equal

2. COD lies between:

- * <15 for residential
- * <20 for Agland & commercial
- * <5 considered extremely low, maybe a flawed study

3. PRD lies between:

- * 98-103% for all types of properties
- * PRD <98 means high value parcels are over appraised
- * PRD >103 means high valued parcels are under appraised and low valued parcels are overappraised

4. Fairness and uniformity between sold and unsold properties equals a trended preliminary ratio that correlates closely with the R & O median ratio and a percentage change in the sales file and the assessed base would be similar.

Approaches to value:

* Land valuation process in Frontier County is based upon site date and the market (sales) approach for land.

1. Site data

a. Lots evaluated per use, square-foot, acre, neighborhood, size and shape, road type and access, topography, improved or unimproved, and zoning. Evaluated through onsite review and measurement (tape measure and GIS), city maps, property record card, and owner.

b. Agland evaluated per acre, class (use), and subclass. Evaluated through GIS satellite imagery, GIS soil layer and land use calculator, property record card, and landowner.

2. Market sales data

a. Lots. Use comparable sales within a 2-year period for residential lots and a 3-year period for commercial lots. Only arms lengths transactions used (based upon 521 and questionnaire information). All assessments must be done on or before March 19 of each year. Review ratio studies (mean, median, aggregate, COD, and PRD)

b. Agland. Valued at 75% of actual value. Use unimproved comparable sales within a 3-year period. Use only arms lengths transactions (based upon 521 and questionnaire information). All assessments must be done on or before March 19 of each year. Review ratio studies (mean, median, aggregate, COD, and PRD)

* Real property, improvement valuation process in Frontier County is based upon the cost approach (physical data), and the sales approach.

1. Improvements data noted includes conforming to highest and best use for site, size, style, construction characteristics, actual age / remaining life / effective age, plus any rehabilitation, modernization and or remodeling

2. Physical data evaluated through onsite physical inspection by assessor and/or deputy, photographs, owner, property record card, and questionnaires.

4. Cost approach.

- Estimate replacement cost of improvements using Marshall & Swift cost handbook for year 2008 for residential, 2009 for commercial, and 2004 for ag and lake properties.
- Deduct for physical depreciation and or economic depreciation. For residential, percent depreciation was reviewed and rebuilt in 2009 by the assessor. For commercial, percent depreciation was reviewed and rebuilt in 2010 by appraiser Larry Rexroth.
- Age / life components, income loss, cost to correct, completion of improvements, questionnaires, property record card, and the market.

4. Sales approach. Use comparable sales within a 2-year period. Only arm's lengths transactions used (based upon 521 information, owner/buyer questionnaires or one on one contact with owner/buyer). Valued at 100% of actual value. Review of ratio studies (mean/median/aggregate/COD/PRD).

Customer service, Notices and Public relations:

* Our office regularly aids realtors, appraisers, insurance agents, title insurance agents, and property owners in locating parcel information by the availability of all our parcel information online. In order to access sales information and more detailed information about a parcel, we have also implemented a premium parcel information portion on our website, that requires a \$200/year

subscription. This allows realtors, appraisers and others access to sales information, GIS images and other information not available to the general public on the website. This has helped in reducing phone calls to the office as well as having to copy and fax parcel information to these people. We currently have 4 premium subscribers.

* In addition to the required publications our office has begun to publish reminders and notices regarding several issues. Such topics include personal property schedule reminders; homestead application reminders, zoning and building permit information, etc.

* In an attempt to educate and inform taxpayers, thus increasing public relations, the assessor produces property information newsletters. One newsletter is mailed to all property owners in their valuation change notice and another in their tax statement notice. We also publish some of these informational items as articles in our local paper.

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

Property Class	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	98.98% (92-100)	16.82 (<15)	111 (98-103)
Commercial	100% (92-100)	2.68 (<20)	100.94 (98-103)
Ag-land	74.00% (69-75)	22.07 (<20)	104.07 (98-103)

Functions performed by the Assessor’s Office:

Along with the sales reviews, property record keeping, mapping updates, ownership changes and valuing property, the assessor’s office will annually:

1. Administer Homestead Exemption Applications. Carry out the approval or denial process. Provide taxpayer assistance and notification.
2. Administer Organization Exemptions & Affidavits to PAD. Administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to the county board.
3. Review government owned property not used for public purpose and send notices of intent to tax.
4. File personal property schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and apply penalties as required.
5. Review the level of value for all types of property and adjust by proper percentage to achieve the standards set out by TERC.
6. When applicable prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.

7. When applicable attend TERC Statewide Equalization hearings to defend values, and or implement orders of the TERC.
8. Prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
9. Complete valuation reports due to each subdivision for levy setting.
10. Prepare and certify tax lists to the county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Review centrally assessed values, establish assessment records and tax billing for the tax list.
12. Management of properties in the community redevelopment projects, TIF properties, for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
13. Management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information.
14. Review of Sales and Sales Ratios especially noting the median, the COD, PRD, and aggregate.
15. Review the level of value for all Agland types and adjust by proper amount to achieve the standards set out TERC.
16. Attend CBE hearings. Prior to hearings assessor will re-inspect all protest properties and bring to the hearings recommendations. Assessor will attend CBE meetings for valuation protests, assemble and provide all needed information by the CBE.
17. Perform pickup work. Review improvements or changes that have been reported by individuals or have been found by driving by or have received building or zoning permits on or found on sales questionnaires. The assessor and deputy complete the pickup work. Pickup work is usually done in December and is completed by January 1.
18. Send out a notice of valuation change to every owner of real property where there has been either an increase or decrease in value.
19. Attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.
20. Complete administrative reports due to PAD. Reports include the Real Property Abstract, Personal Property Abstract, School District Taxable Value Report, Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Summary certificate, Certificate of Taxable values, and the Certificate of Taxes Levied Report, Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions, Assessed Value Update, Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands and Funds, the Annual Plan of Assessment Report, and the Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property.
21. Re-grade land at owners request or because of changes noticed upon evaluation of GIS maps.

3-Year Appraisal Plan

2011:

Residential. Appraisal maintenance will only be performed for residential properties in the towns of Curtis, Maywood, Eustis, Moorefield, and Stockville for the 2011 tax year. Maintenance appraisal includes an evaluation of all residential records for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files. Updates also include any information picked up from sales questionnaires, physical facility questionnaires and or building permits or information sheets.

Commercial. A complete review (reappraisal) by appraiser Larry Rexroth was completed for tax year 2010 on all commercial properties located in the county. Therefore this year a maintenance appraisal will be done. Maintenance appraisals include an evaluation of all physical property and site data for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files as well as information gained from pickup work or sales questionnaires.

Ag-improvements. A complete review (reappraisal) was completed by the assessor and deputy on all agriculture improvements in 2010 for the 2011 tax year. All properties were physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sale value approaches were also used whenever applicable to the property.

Ag-land. A complete review was completed by the assessor and deputy on all Ag parcels in 2010 for 2011. Land use maps for each Ag parcel were printed from the GIS and mailed to all landowners for their review of their current land classifications. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will also be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. The office uses the sales approach when determining value. The office plots land sales on a large county map, visible to all visitors, to help determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales.

Recreational improvements. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy will be completed in 2011 for the tax year 2012 on all recreational properties at Hugh Butler Lake and Harry Strunk Lake. All properties will be physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken, measured and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sales value approaches will be used whenever applicable to the property

2012:

Residential. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy will be completed in 2012 for the tax year 2013 on all residential properties in the towns of Curtis, Maywood, Eustis, Moorefield and Stockville. All properties will be physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken, measured and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sales value approaches will be used whenever applicable to the property.

Commercial. Appraisal maintenance will only be performed for commercial properties in the county for the 2012 tax year. Maintenance appraisal includes an evaluation of all commercial records for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files. Updates also include any information picked up from sales questionnaires, physical facility questionnaires and or building permits or information sheets.

Ag-land. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. The office uses the sales approach when determining value. The office plots land sales on a large county map, visible to all visitors, to help determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales.

Ag-improvements. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy was completed in 2010 for the 2011 tax year on all Ag improvements located in the county. Therefore this year a maintenance appraisal will be done. Maintenance appraisals include an evaluation of all physical property and site data for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files as well as information gained from pickup work or sales questionnaires.

Recreational improvements. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy was completed in 2011 for the tax year 2012 on all recreational properties at Hugh Butler Lake and Harry Strunk Lake. All properties were physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken, measured and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sales value approaches were used whenever applicable to the property.

2013:

Residential. A complete review (reappraisal) was completed by the assessor and deputy on all residential properties in Curtis, Maywood, Eustis, Moorefield and Stockville in 2012 for the 2013 tax year. All properties were physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost and sale value approaches were also used whenever applicable to the property.

Commercial. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy will be completed in 2013 for the tax year 2014 on all commercial properties in the county. All properties will be physically inspected, interior inspections done when possible, new digital photographs taken, measured and any needed updating of improvement sketches performed. The cost, sales and income value approaches will be used whenever applicable to the property.

Ag-land. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. The office uses the sales approach when determining value. The office plots land sales on a large county map, visible to all visitors, to help determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales.

Ag-improvements. Appraisal maintenance will only be performed for Ag improvements in the county for the 2013 tax year. Maintenance appraisal includes an evaluation of all ag improvements records for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files. Updates also include any information picked up from sales questionnaires, physical facility questionnaires and or building permits or information sheets.

Recreational improvements. A complete review (reappraisal) by the assessor and deputy was completed in 2011 for the 2012 tax year on all recreational properties at Hugh Butler Lake and Harry Strunk Lake. Therefore this year a maintenance appraisal will be done. Maintenance appraisals include an evaluation of all physical property and site data for accuracy in the computer and hard copy appraisal files as well as information gained from pickup work or sales questionnaires.

CLASS	2011	2012	2013
Residential	Appraisal maintenance	Appraisal maintenance	Complete reappraisal of all residential parcels in the county for tax year 2013.
Recreational / lake MH	Appraisal maintenance	Complete reappraisal of all recreational parcels in the county for tax year 2012	Appraisal maintenance
Commercial	Appraisal maintenance	Appraisal maintenance	Appraisal maintenance
Agricultural Land & Improvements	Market analysis by land classification groupings Complete reappraisal of all ag parcels in the county for tax year 2011.	Appraisal maintenance of ag-improvements Market analysis by land classification groupings	Market analysis by land classification groupings Appraisal maintenance of ag-improvements

Miscellaneous Accomplishments for 2009-2010

- * Created and mailed out information letters to go along with the valuation changes notices and tax statements.
- * As a public service the office began having announcements regarding homestead exemptions, personal property schedule and various information articles published in the local newspaper.
- * In regards to the homestead exemption application process our office provides personal assistance not only in our office but also in three other locations throughout the county to better serve this group of individuals.
- * Have a web page up and running that contains parcel and sales information.
<http://frontier.gisworkshop.com>
- * Continue to update and modify features in Terrascan to make office more efficient and up to date.
- * Post in our office a large county plat map with the agricultural sales appropriately mapped for taxpayers to effortlessly view recent markets trends.
- * Attached a GIS land use image of all Ag parcels to the appropriate Terrascan record and made them viewable to all website subscribers.
- * Scan all new 521's, deeds and mobile home transfers and attach to appropriate Terrascan record.

2011 Assessment Survey for Frontier County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	0
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$114,029
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$113,914
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$300
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	n/a
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$16,100 is budget to include the GIS System, TerraScan, network maintenance, and the parcel search website.
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$500
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	None
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	\$22,003

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	TerraScan
2.	CAMA software:
	TerraScan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	No
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	n/a
5.	Does the county have GIS software?

	Yes
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	The Assessor
7.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Curtis, Eustis, and Maywood
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Pritchard & Abbott are contracted to do the oil and gas mineral appraisal annually.
2.	Other services:
	None

2011 Certification for Frontier 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 Frontier County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

