

# 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 Garfield County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	46	Median	93.44
Total Sales Price	\$2,451,551	Mean	95.51
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,676,550	Wgt. Mean	86.99
Total Assessed Value	\$2,328,315	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$46,165
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$58,186	Avg. Assessed Value	\$50,616

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	87.64 to 99.95
95% Mean C.I	81.89 to 92.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.67 to 102.35
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	18.53
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.06
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.55

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	45	96	96
2009	63	98	98
2008	76	97	97
2007	72	98	98

## 2011 Commission Summary for Garfield County

---

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	3	Median	88.01
Total Sales Price	\$475,000	Mean	75.07
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$175,000	Wgt. Mean	75.54
Total Assessed Value	\$132,190	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$54,415
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$58,333	Avg. Assessed Value	\$44,063

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	14.25 to 135.89
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.36
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.14
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.74

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	7	100	83
2009	7	100	65
2008	5	100	67
2007	6	100	79



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

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	93	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	70	The qualitative measures calculated in the random exclude sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Special Valuation of Agricultural Land</b>	70	The qualitative measures calculated in the random exclude sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



*Ruth A. Sorensen*

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



## **2011 Assessment Actions for Garfield County**

**taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:**

### **Residential**

The valuation groupings and current sales rosters were reviewed for statistical compliance.

Burwell City and Rural Residential were not adjusted for 2011.

The Calamus Lake lots and homes were revalued according to the sales from those subdivisions. Camper/RV courts were reviewed with the emphasis being on unlicensed/expired plates on campers. Those not having a current license plate were added to the assessment rolls.

The annual permits and pick-up work was completed timely.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Garfield County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Appraisal Staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Burwell is all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of Burwell. Population of approximately 1,130 located on HWY's 11 and 91. Public school system for K-12 grades. The town offers a variety of jobs, services, and goods that make living in it desirable.
	02	Calamus is all improved and unimproved properties within the subdivisions located at the Calamus Lake. The southeast corner of the lake is located in Garfield County.
	03	Rural is all improved and unimproved properties located outside the City limits in the rural areas.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	The cost approach to value is applied using local depreciation derived from a market analysis. The sales comparison approach is also utilized through unit of comparison studies.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	Burwell-2009, Calamus-2011, Rural-2009	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	Vacant land sales – based on the size of the parcel the \$/sq. ft. was determined or \$/acre with consideration given to excess land.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June 2007 Marshall-Swift is used for each valuation grouping.	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The depreciation studies are developed based on local market information.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	Statistical market indicators are studied annually which provides valuation direction within the valuation groupings.	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>	

	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

**36 Garfield**  
**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 : 46  
Total Sales Price : 2,451,551  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,676,550  
Total Assessed Value : 2,328,315  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 58,186  
Avg. Assessed Value : 50,616

MEDIAN : 93  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 96  
COD : 18.27  
PRD : 109.79

COV : 24.79  
STD : 23.68  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.07  
MAX Sales Ratio : 179.24  
MIN Sales Ratio : 58.88

95% Median C.I. : 87.64 to 99.95  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 81.89 to 92.09  
95% Mean C.I. : 88.67 to 102.35

Printed:3/24/2011 3:38:16PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	7	93.07	88.77	84.44	09.50	105.13	69.79	101.37	69.79 to 101.37	74,286	62,725
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	120.30	117.07	109.62	09.59	106.80	97.73	129.96	N/A	27,875	30,558
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	87.64	87.64	87.64	00.00	100.00	87.64	87.64	N/A	54,500	47,765
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	93.88	101.90	90.07	24.87	113.13	66.46	179.24	66.46 to 179.24	59,743	53,810
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	10	98.39	99.33	90.18	18.03	110.15	58.88	149.10	79.84 to 118.67	68,300	61,592
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	101.11	99.60	99.49	14.41	100.11	74.38	124.24	N/A	21,400	21,290
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	73.82	76.04	75.55	10.85	100.65	65.13	89.17	N/A	71,133	53,738
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	9	82.10	87.04	80.67	16.69	107.90	60.78	133.78	73.30 to 94.83	63,217	50,999
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	19	96.00	99.51	89.27	17.71	111.47	66.46	179.24	87.64 to 106.81	58,116	51,881
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	27	89.17	92.70	85.39	18.58	108.56	58.88	149.10	77.90 to 101.11	58,235	49,725
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	23	96.83	99.66	90.82	19.31	109.73	58.88	179.24	87.64 to 106.81	54,900	49,861
<u>ALL</u>	46	93.44	95.51	86.99	18.27	109.79	58.88	179.24	87.64 to 99.95	58,186	50,616

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	35	93.88	95.42	88.60	18.56	107.70	58.88	179.24	83.96 to 101.37	54,677	48,446
02	8	94.32	100.52	86.21	19.02	116.60	66.46	149.10	66.46 to 149.10	52,806	45,525
03	3	89.17	83.19	78.88	07.26	105.46	70.50	89.90	N/A	113,467	89,505
<u>ALL</u>	46	93.44	95.51	86.99	18.27	109.79	58.88	179.24	87.64 to 99.95	58,186	50,616

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	41	92.92	94.15	87.20	17.42	107.97	58.88	179.24	83.96 to 99.95	62,050	54,109
06	4	112.40	116.74	106.48	20.28	109.64	93.07	149.10	N/A	13,625	14,508
07	1	66.46	66.46	66.46	00.00	100.00	66.46	66.46	N/A	78,000	51,835
<u>ALL</u>	46	93.44	95.51	86.99	18.27	109.79	58.88	179.24	87.64 to 99.95	58,186	50,616

**36 Garfield**  
**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 : 46  
Total Sales Price : 2,451,551  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,676,550  
Total Assessed Value : 2,328,315  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 58,186  
Avg. Assessed Value : 50,616

MEDIAN : 93  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 96  
COD : 18.27  
PRD : 109.79

COV : 24.79  
STD : 23.68  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.07  
MAX Sales Ratio : 179.24  
MIN Sales Ratio : 58.88

95% Median C.I. : 87.64 to 99.95  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 81.89 to 92.09  
95% Mean C.I. : 88.67 to 102.35

Printed:3/24/2011 3:38:16PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	2	97.02	97.02	93.08	04.23	104.23	92.92	101.11	N/A	114,750	106,815	
5000 TO 9999	3	149.10	146.32	144.60	15.34	101.19	110.63	179.24	N/A	6,733	9,737	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	5	110.63	126.60	97.25	24.28	130.18	92.92	179.24	N/A	49,940	48,568	
10000 TO 29999	14	95.42	97.87	97.97	19.43	99.90	69.79	133.78	73.82 to 127.27	16,750	16,409	
30000 TO 59999	11	101.37	101.14	99.63	09.04	101.52	87.64	124.24	87.65 to 113.33	40,091	39,942	
60000 TO 99999	9	79.84	79.13	79.70	15.79	99.28	58.88	99.95	60.78 to 93.88	79,211	63,131	
100000 TO 149999	4	79.56	77.05	77.31	07.52	99.66	65.13	83.96	N/A	123,488	95,470	
150000 TO 249999	3	90.01	85.78	85.64	09.75	100.16	70.50	96.83	N/A	181,500	155,442	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	46	93.44	95.51	86.99	18.27	109.79	58.88	179.24	87.64 to 99.95	58,186	50,616	



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Garfield County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

The residential sales file for Garfield County consists of 46 qualified sales. This sample will be considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. The calculated median is 93%. All valuation groupings that are adequately represented in the sales file are within the acceptable range. Even though both qualitative measures are above the acceptable range, based on the known assessment practices it is believed the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

All residential sales are reviewed through research of the deed. Questionnaires are mailed to both the buyer and seller of the property. Telephone contact is made to the buyer or seller if there are any additional questions concerning the sale. Additional resources such as attorneys and real estate agents are utilized in this process to acquire more accurate information concerning sales. Physical on-site reviews are also performed on the sales as deemed appropriate to verify data at time of sale. Percentage return of the questionnaires is 72%. Sales in the study period are monitored for any changes that may take place after the purchase.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 93% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Garfield 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 Garfield 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 Garfield 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 Garfield 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 Garfield County**

### **taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Commercial**

The assessor locations and current sales rosters were reviewed for compliance.

Due to lack of sales in this class of property no adjustments were made to the entire population. However, some adjustments were made through sales review, pick-up work and data entry corrections.

Commercial properties are being reviewed with the balance of the class to be reviewed for 2012.

The annual permits and pick-up work was completed timely.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Garfield County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Appraisal Staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Burwell is all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of Burwell. Population of approximately 1,130 located on HWY's 11 and 91. Public school system for K-12 grades. The town offers a variety of jobs, services, and goods that make living in it desirable.
	02	Calamus is all improved and unimproved properties within the subdivisions located at the Calamus Lake. The southeast corner of the lake is located in Garfield County.
	03	Rural is all improved and unimproved properties located outside the City limits in the rural areas.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	The cost approach to value is applied using Marshall & Swift with depreciation tables supplied by the CAMA vendor and adjusted as needed. The sales comparison approach is also utilized through unit of comparison studies.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	Burwell - 2006	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Vacant lot sales were used – based on the size of the parcel the \$/sq. ft. was determined.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June 2002 Marshal-Swift	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The depreciation studies are based on the tables provided by the CAMA vendor with adjustments if necessary.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	At present County uses depreciation tables provided by the CAMA vendor and adjusted as needed.	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	Statistical market indicators are studied annually which provides valuation direction within the valuation groupings.	

10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

**36 Garfield**  
**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 : 3  
Total Sales Price : 475,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 175,000  
Total Assessed Value : 132,190  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 58,333  
Avg. Assessed Value : 44,063

MEDIAN : 88  
WGT. MEAN : 76  
MEAN : 75  
COD : 16.49  
PRD : 99.38

COV : 32.61  
STD : 24.48  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.51  
MAX Sales Ratio : 90.36  
MIN Sales Ratio : 46.84

95% Median C.I. : N/A  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A  
95% Mean C.I. : 14.25 to 135.89

Printed:3/24/2011 3:38:19PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08											
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	88.01	88.01	88.01	00.00	100.00	88.01	88.01	N/A	85,000	74,805
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	90.36	90.36	90.36	00.00	100.00	90.36	90.36	N/A	35,000	31,625
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	46.84	46.84	46.84	00.00	100.00	46.84	46.84	N/A	55,000	25,760
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	1	88.01	88.01	88.01	00.00	100.00	88.01	88.01	N/A	85,000	74,805
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	1	90.36	90.36	90.36	00.00	100.00	90.36	90.36	N/A	35,000	31,625
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	1	46.84	46.84	46.84	00.00	100.00	46.84	46.84	N/A	55,000	25,760
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	89.19	89.19	88.69	01.32	100.56	88.01	90.36	N/A	60,000	53,215
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09											
<u>ALL</u>	3	88.01	75.07	75.54	16.49	99.38	46.84	90.36	N/A	58,333	44,063

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	3	88.01	75.07	75.54	16.49	99.38	46.84	90.36	N/A	58,333	44,063
<u>ALL</u>	3	88.01	75.07	75.54	16.49	99.38	46.84	90.36	N/A	58,333	44,063

**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	3	88.01	75.07	75.54	16.49	99.38	46.84	90.36	N/A	58,333	44,063
04											
<u>ALL</u>	3	88.01	75.07	75.54	16.49	99.38	46.84	90.36	N/A	58,333	44,063

**36 Garfield**  
**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 : 3  
Total Sales Price : 475,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 175,000  
Total Assessed Value : 132,190  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 58,333  
Avg. Assessed Value : 44,063

MEDIAN : 88  
WGT. MEAN : 76  
MEAN : 75  
COD : 16.49  
PRD : 99.38

COV : 32.61  
STD : 24.48  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.51  
MAX Sales Ratio : 90.36  
MIN Sales Ratio : 46.84

95% Median C.I. : N/A  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A  
95% Mean C.I. : 14.25 to 135.89

Printed:3/24/2011 3:38:19PM

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											
5000 TO 9999											
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999											
10000 TO 29999											
30000 TO 59999	1	46.84	46.84	46.84	00.00	100.00	46.84	46.84	N/A	55,000	25,760
60000 TO 99999											
100000 TO 149999											
150000 TO 249999	1	88.01	88.01	88.01	00.00	100.00	88.01	88.01	N/A	85,000	74,805
250000 TO 499999	1	90.36	90.36	90.36	00.00	100.00	90.36	90.36	N/A	35,000	31,625
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	3	88.01	75.07	75.54	16.49	99.38	46.84	90.36	N/A	58,333	44,063

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
306	1	88.01	88.01	88.01	00.00	100.00	88.01	88.01	N/A	85,000	74,805
353	1	90.36	90.36	90.36	00.00	100.00	90.36	90.36	N/A	35,000	31,625
477	1	46.84	46.84	46.84	00.00	100.00	46.84	46.84	N/A	55,000	25,760
<u>ALL</u>	3	88.01	75.07	75.54	16.49	99.38	46.84	90.36	N/A	58,333	44,063



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Garfield County**

---

**A. Commerical Real Property**

With only three qualified commercial sales it is believed that with the diversity of the sales, the representativeness of the sample to the population is unreliable. The calculated median from the sample will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Garfield County, nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of property.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Garfield 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 Garfield 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 Garfield 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 Garfield 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 Garfield County**

### **taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Agricultural**

The market area and current sales rosters were reviewed for compliance. Corrections were made to the sales where needed. The changes made would consist of corrections to land use and any corrections to data entry discovered through sales review.

Market analysis was completed on the minimally improved (unimproved & minimally improved) three-year roster. Sales were plotted on a large soil map to assist in the market analysis. An irrigated sale was borrowed from Valley County to balance the number of sales in the three year study period and percentages representative to each land class. An excel spreadsheet is used for this purpose to reflect a “what if” assessed value on proposed new values.

A sub-class of Valentine Sand was created after researching the soils with the NRCS Representative and local ranchers. This soil is classified the same as the “hard grass” but does not reflect the same in the market.

Also recognized was the non-agricultural influence along the Calamus and North Loup Rivers, as well as along Nebraska State Highway 96 from Burwell to the Garfield/Loup County line. The special valuation area is being monitored for possible expansion and continued agricultural use of the parcels.

Agricultural values were adjusted to reflect current market activity. A sub-class of the Conservation Reserve Program acres and meadowland is tracked and adjusted to its own market. Also, the Wetlands Reserve Program was recognized in the county with their assessed values being brought to 100% of market.

The annual permits and pick-up work was completed timely.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Garfield County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Appraisal Staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	The specific characteristics for the non influenced area are soils, land use, and land enrolled in federal programs in which payments are received for removing such land from agricultural production.
	5, 6, 7, 8	The special valuation area is located along the two rivers as well as land associated with HWY 96.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The valuation grouping for the non influenced area is developed by similar topography, soil characteristics and geographic characteristics. The recreational influenced area is monitored for the determination of the primary use of the parcel.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	Rural residential and recreational land is identified by size of parcel, residence and non-agricultural influences in the market. Value is then based upon selling prices of the vacant land.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?</b>	
	Yes, they carry the same value.	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	Land characteristics taken into consideration are soils, land use, land enrolled in federal/state programs in which payments are received to remove the land from agricultural production.	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	Land is continually being reviewed or checked through NRD certifications, CRP letters to property owners, conversation with property owners, sales verification and FSA maps.	
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	A special value area was developed in 2010 and is continually monitored for possible further expansion.	
9.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	Yes, applications have been filed and there is a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as</b>	

	<b>was used for the general population of the class?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added or land use changes that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

**36 Garfield**  
**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 : 17  
 Total Sales Price : 16,898,110  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,898,110  
 Total Assessed Value : 11,079,825  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 994,006  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 651,754

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 66  
 MEAN : 74  
 COD : 23.82  
 PRD : 113.36

COV : 29.38  
 STD : 21.84  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.06  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 114.86  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.04

95% Median C.I. : 55.67 to 98.30  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.17 to 73.97  
 95% Mean C.I. : 63.10 to 85.56

Printed:3/24/2011 3:38:21PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08											
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	6	73.08	72.79	62.08	18.73	117.25	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	218,153	135,425
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	69.46	69.46	55.93	19.85	124.19	55.67	83.25	N/A	3,571,763	1,997,530
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	63.04	63.04	70.44	18.67	89.49	51.27	74.80	N/A	172,400	121,430
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	59.53	59.53	59.53	00.00	100.00	59.53	59.53	N/A	50,000	29,765
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	89.02	89.02	111.42	29.04	79.90	63.17	114.86	N/A	196,780	219,248
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	79.17	79.17	91.49	39.32	86.53	48.04	110.29	N/A	198,600	181,693
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	82.96	82.96	71.59	18.49	115.88	67.62	98.30	N/A	3,630,052	2,598,855
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	6	73.08	72.79	62.08	18.73	117.25	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	218,153	135,425
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	65.24	66.25	56.59	19.59	117.07	51.27	83.25	N/A	1,872,082	1,059,480
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	67.62	80.26	74.43	32.27	107.83	48.04	114.86	48.04 to 114.86	1,157,266	861,336
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	73.08	71.96	56.88	18.76	126.51	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	1,056,556	600,951
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	63.17	72.73	90.20	24.96	80.63	51.27	114.86	N/A	157,672	142,224
<u>ALL</u>	17	71.61	74.33	65.57	23.82	113.36	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	994,006	651,754

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	17	71.61	74.33	65.57	23.82	113.36	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	994,006	651,754
<u>ALL</u>	17	71.61	74.33	65.57	23.82	113.36	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	994,006	651,754

**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>Grass</u>											
County	14	74.68	77.18	65.93	24.13	117.06	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 107.50	1,162,422	766,357
1	14	74.68	77.18	65.93	24.13	117.06	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 107.50	1,162,422	766,357
<u>ALL</u>	17	71.61	74.33	65.57	23.82	113.36	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	994,006	651,754

**36 Garfield**  
**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 : 17  
 Total Sales Price : 16,898,110  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,898,110  
 Total Assessed Value : 11,079,825  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 994,006  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 651,754

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 66  
 MEAN : 74  
 COD : 23.82  
 PRD : 113.36

COV : 29.38  
 STD : 21.84  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.06  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 114.86  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.04

95% Median C.I. : 55.67 to 98.30  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.17 to 73.97  
 95% Mean C.I. : 63.10 to 85.56

Printed:3/24/2011 3:38:21PM

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	1	71.61	71.61	71.61	00.00	100.00	71.61	71.61	N/A	195,000	139,645
1	1	71.61	71.61	71.61	00.00	100.00	71.61	71.61	N/A	195,000	139,645
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	16	71.09	74.50	65.50	25.49	113.74	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	1,043,944	683,761
1	16	71.09	74.50	65.50	25.49	113.74	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	1,043,944	683,761
<b>_____ALL_____</b>											
	17	71.61	74.33	65.57	23.82	113.36	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	994,006	651,754

**36 Garfield**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 18  
 Total Sales Price : 17,329,840  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,329,840  
 Total Assessed Value : 11,353,492  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 962,769  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 630,750

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 66  
 MEAN : 74  
 COD : 23.79  
 PRD : 112.53

COV : 28.95  
 STD : 21.34  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.56  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 114.86  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.04

95% Median C.I. : 57.40 to 83.25  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.37 to 73.66  
 95% Mean C.I. : 63.11 to 84.33

Printed:3/24/2011 3:38:24PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08											
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	6	73.08	72.79	62.08	18.73	117.25	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	218,153	135,425
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	69.46	69.46	55.93	19.85	124.19	55.67	83.25	N/A	3,571,763	1,997,530
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	63.39	63.39	63.39	00.00	100.00	63.39	63.39	N/A	431,730	273,667
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	63.04	63.04	70.44	18.67	89.49	51.27	74.80	N/A	172,400	121,430
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	59.53	59.53	59.53	00.00	100.00	59.53	59.53	N/A	50,000	29,765
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	89.02	89.02	111.42	29.04	79.90	63.17	114.86	N/A	196,780	219,248
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	79.17	79.17	91.49	39.32	86.53	48.04	110.29	N/A	198,600	181,693
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	82.96	82.96	71.59	18.49	115.88	67.62	98.30	N/A	3,630,052	2,598,855
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	6	73.08	72.79	62.08	18.73	117.25	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	218,153	135,425
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	5	63.39	65.68	56.96	16.12	115.31	51.27	83.25	N/A	1,584,011	902,317
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	67.62	80.26	74.43	32.27	107.83	48.04	114.86	48.04 to 114.86	1,157,266	861,336
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	9	71.61	71.01	57.19	18.29	124.17	48.30	107.50	55.67 to 83.25	987,131	564,586
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	63.17	72.73	90.20	24.96	80.63	51.27	114.86	N/A	157,672	142,224
<u>ALL</u>	18	69.62	73.72	65.51	23.79	112.53	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 83.25	962,769	630,750

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	18	69.62	73.72	65.51	23.79	112.53	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 83.25	962,769	630,750
<u>ALL</u>	18	69.62	73.72	65.51	23.79	112.53	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 83.25	962,769	630,750

**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>Grass</u>											
County	14	74.68	77.18	65.93	24.13	117.06	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 107.50	1,162,422	766,357
1	14	74.68	77.18	65.93	24.13	117.06	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 107.50	1,162,422	766,357
<u>ALL</u>	18	69.62	73.72	65.51	23.79	112.53	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 83.25	962,769	630,750

**36 Garfield**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 18  
 Total Sales Price : 17,329,840  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,329,840  
 Total Assessed Value : 11,353,492  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 962,769  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 630,750

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 66  
 MEAN : 74  
 COD : 23.79  
 PRD : 112.53

COV : 28.95  
 STD : 21.34  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.56  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 114.86  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.04

95% Median C.I. : 57.40 to 83.25  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 57.37 to 73.66  
 95% Mean C.I. : 63.11 to 84.33

Printed:3/24/2011 3:38:24PM

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	2	67.50	67.50	65.95	06.09	102.35	63.39	71.61	N/A	313,365	206,656
1	2	67.50	67.50	65.95	06.09	102.35	63.39	71.61	N/A	313,365	206,656
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	16	71.09	74.50	65.50	25.49	113.74	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	1,043,944	683,761
1	16	71.09	74.50	65.50	25.49	113.74	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	1,043,944	683,761
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>69.62</b>	<b>73.72</b>	<b>65.51</b>	<b>23.79</b>	<b>112.53</b>	<b>48.04</b>	<b>114.86</b>	<b>57.40 to 83.25</b>	<b>962,769</b>	<b>630,750</b>

**36 Garfield**  
**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 : 23  
 Total Sales Price : 18,309,427  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,309,427  
 Total Assessed Value : 12,143,805  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 796,062  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 527,992

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 66  
 MEAN : 75  
 COD : 21.62  
 PRD : 112.42

COV : 26.46  
 STD : 19.73  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.22  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 114.86  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.04

95% Median C.I. : 63.17 to 83.25  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.64 to 74.01  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.04 to 83.10

Printed:3/24/2011 3:38:27PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07												
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	1	90.55	90.55	90.55	00.00	100.00	90.55	90.55	N/A	188,187	170,400	
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08												
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	6	73.08	72.79	62.08	18.73	117.25	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	218,153	135,425	
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	69.46	69.46	55.93	19.85	124.19	55.67	83.25	N/A	3,571,763	1,997,530	
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	63.50	63.50	63.46	00.17	100.06	63.39	63.61	N/A	319,865	202,984	
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09												
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	74.80	73.45	81.99	19.17	89.58	51.27	94.29	N/A	222,933	182,784	
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	59.53	59.53	59.53	00.00	100.00	59.53	59.53	N/A	50,000	29,765	
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	89.02	89.02	111.42	29.04	79.90	63.17	114.86	N/A	196,780	219,248	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	79.17	79.17	91.49	39.32	86.53	48.04	110.29	N/A	198,600	181,693	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	69.90	76.43	71.55	11.34	106.82	67.62	98.30	N/A	1,879,876	1,344,958	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	7	74.55	75.33	65.66	18.81	114.73	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	213,872	140,421	
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	7	63.61	69.47	58.56	18.42	118.63	51.27	94.29	51.27 to 94.29	1,207,437	707,054	
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	9	69.38	77.96	74.30	24.91	104.93	48.04	114.86	59.53 to 110.29	928,918	690,164	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	67.61	70.27	57.34	18.62	122.55	48.30	107.50	55.67 to 83.25	909,218	521,358	
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	68.99	76.32	91.39	26.57	83.51	51.27	114.86	51.27 to 114.86	185,393	169,436	
<u>ALL</u>	23	70.41	74.57	66.33	21.62	112.42	48.04	114.86	63.17 to 83.25	796,062	527,992	

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
1	23	70.41	74.57	66.33	21.62	112.42	48.04	114.86	63.17 to 83.25	796,062	527,992	
<u>ALL</u>	23	70.41	74.57	66.33	21.62	112.42	48.04	114.86	63.17 to 83.25	796,062	527,992	

<b>95%MLU By Market Area</b>											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Grass</u>												
County	16	74.68	77.82	66.53	23.11	116.97	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 98.30	1,050,357	698,801	
1	16	74.68	77.82	66.53	23.11	116.97	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 98.30	1,050,357	698,801	
<u>ALL</u>	23	70.41	74.57	66.33	21.62	112.42	48.04	114.86	63.17 to 83.25	796,062	527,992	

**36 Garfield**  
**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 : 23  
 Total Sales Price : 18,309,427  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,309,427  
 Total Assessed Value : 12,143,805  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 796,062  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 527,992

MEDIAN : 70  
 WGT. MEAN : 66  
 MEAN : 75  
 COD : 21.62  
 PRD : 112.42

COV : 26.46  
 STD : 19.73  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.22  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 114.86  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.04

95% Median C.I. : 63.17 to 83.25  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.64 to 74.01  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.04 to 83.10

Printed:3/24/2011 3:38:27PM

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	3	71.61	75.18	71.63	12.64	104.96	63.39	90.55	N/A	271,639	194,571
1	3	71.61	75.18	71.63	12.64	104.96	63.39	90.55	N/A	271,639	194,571
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	20	69.90	74.48	66.08	23.00	112.71	48.04	114.86	59.53 to 83.25	874,726	578,005
1	20	69.90	74.48	66.08	23.00	112.71	48.04	114.86	59.53 to 83.25	874,726	578,005
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>70.41</b>	<b>74.57</b>	<b>66.33</b>	<b>21.62</b>	<b>112.42</b>	<b>48.04</b>	<b>114.86</b>	<b>63.17 to 83.25</b>	<b>796,062</b>	<b>527,992</b>



2011

## Methodology for Special Valuation

### Garfield County

The State Assessment office for Garfield County submits this report to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment and Taxation Division pursuant to Title 350, Neb. R. & Regs., Reg-11-005.04. The following methodologies are used to value agricultural land that is influenced by market factors other than purely agricultural or horticultural purposes. The following non-agricultural influences have been identified: Residential, Commercial, and Recreational. The office maintains a file of all data used for determining the special and actual valuation. This file shall be available for inspection at the State Assessment office for Garfield County by any interested person.

Garfield County currently has five market areas throughout the county. Market area 1 includes the majority of the county and consists of some farming but mostly grassland sales. It consists mostly of sandy soils conducive to our ranching industry.

#### **A. Identification of the influenced area:**

The land in market areas 5 through 8 has been identified as areas that are located along the Calamus and North Loup River. Also included in these market areas is the land associated with Nebraska State Highway 96 which runs from Highway 91 on the south end (near Burwell) to the Garfield/Loup County line and directly to and along the Calamus Reservoir.

#### **B. Describe the highest and best use of the properties in the influenced area, and how this was determined:**

Market areas 5, 6, 7 and 8 are located along the river corridors and Nebraska State Highway 96. For over a decade the areas along the Calamus and North Loup River have sold for uses other than agricultural usage. The influence on these sales has been for residential and recreational use such as hunting, fishing, personal pleasure, family campgrounds and quiet enjoyment. Recently there have been sales for commercial development along Highway 96. These sales have been to private individuals. Based on the sales in the areas, it has been determined the highest and best use of the properties located in market areas 5 through 8 to be residential, commercial or recreational.

#### **C. Describe the valuation models used in arriving at the value estimates, and explain why and how they were selected:**

Analysis of sales contained in the special valuation areas creates a market value for properties that are influenced by non-agricultural purposes. In the case of recreational sales, these sales will be located along the two rivers. Residential and commercial sales are located along Highway 96 which is relatively close to the two rivers. After analysis of sales along both rivers and the highway within the county, the market value was set at a price reflective of the use as other than agricultural usage.

**D. Describe which market areas were analyzed, both in the County and in any county deemed comparable:**

Analysis of sales in the special valuation areas create a market value for properties that are influenced by other than agricultural purposes.

Each of the special valuation market areas 5 through 8 was created in conjunction with the surrounding agricultural market area. The special valuation has values determined by the agricultural table developed for the non-influenced market area within the county.

**E. Describe any adjustments made to sales to reflect current cash equivalency of typical market conditions. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

No adjustments were made to sales for any reason.

**F. Describe any estimates of economic rent or net operating income used in an income capitalization approach. Include estimates of yields, commodity prices, typical crop share:**

We have not studied rents for these properties because typically actual income/expense information is not readily available to this office.

**G. Describe the typical expenses allowed in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

N/A

**H. Describe the overall capitalization rate used in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

N/A

**I. Describe any other information used in supporting the estimate of actual and special value. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

Zoning has not been a consideration in the recreational river corridor of market areas 5 through 8; this land is zoned transitional agricultural with primary use of commercial agriculture production but also allows recreational, residential or commercial usage. Therefore, special valuation for properties in these areas has been recommended and approved.

Sharon Boucher  
State Assessor/Appraiser for Garfield County

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2010 Posted Before : 02/17/2011

Number of Sales :	17	Median :	72	COV :	29.38	95% Median C.I. :	55.67 to 98.30
Total Sales Price :	16,898,110	Wgt. Mean :	66	STD :	21.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	57.17 to 73.97
Total Adj. Sales Price :	16,898,110	Mean :	74	Avg.Abs.Dev :	17.06	95% Mean C.I. :	63.10 to 85.56
Total Assessed Value :	11,079,825						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	994,006	COD :	23.82	MAX Sales Ratio :	114.86		
Avg. Assessed Value :	651,754	PRD :	113.36	MIN Sales Ratio :	48.04		

Printed : 03/30/2011

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007											
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007											
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008											
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	6	73.08	72.79	62.08	18.73	117.25	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	218,153	135,425
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	2	69.46	69.46	55.93	19.85	124.19	55.67	83.25	N/A	3,571,763	1,997,530
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008											
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009											
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009	2	63.04	63.04	70.44	18.67	89.49	51.27	74.80	N/A	172,400	121,430
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009	1	59.53	59.53	59.53		100.00	59.53	59.53	N/A	50,000	29,765
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	2	89.02	89.02	111.42	29.04	79.90	63.17	114.86	N/A	196,780	219,248
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	2	79.17	79.17	91.49	39.32	86.53	48.04	110.29	N/A	198,600	181,693
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	2	82.96	82.96	71.59	18.49	115.88	67.62	98.30	N/A	3,630,052	2,598,855
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	6	73.08	72.79	62.08	18.73	117.25	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	218,153	135,425
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	4	65.24	66.25	56.59	19.59	117.07	51.27	83.25	N/A	1,872,082	1,059,480
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	7	67.62	80.26	74.43	32.27	107.83	48.04	114.86	48.04 to 114.86	1,157,266	861,336
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	8	73.08	71.96	56.88	18.76	126.51	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	1,056,556	600,951
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	5	63.17	72.73	90.20	24.96	80.63	51.27	114.86	N/A	157,672	142,224
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	17	71.61	74.33	65.57	23.82	113.36	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	994,006	651,754

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2010 Posted Before : 02/17/2011

Number of Sales :	17	Median :	72	COV :	29.38	95% Median C.I. :	55.67 to 98.30
Total Sales Price :	16,898,110	Wgt. Mean :	66	STD :	21.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	57.17 to 73.97
Total Adj. Sales Price :	16,898,110	Mean :	74	Avg.Abs.Dev :	17.06	95% Mean C.I. :	63.10 to 85.56
Total Assessed Value :	11,079,825						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	994,006	COD :	23.82	MAX Sales Ratio :	114.86		
Avg. Assessed Value :	651,754	PRD :	113.36	MIN Sales Ratio :	48.04		

Printed : 03/30/2011

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
1	17	71.61	74.33	65.57	23.82	113.36	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	994,006	651,754
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	17	71.61	74.33	65.57	23.82	113.36	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	994,006	651,754

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Grass</u>											
County	14	74.68	77.18	65.93	24.13	117.06	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 107.50	1,162,422	766,357
1	14	74.68	77.18	65.93	24.13	117.06	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 107.50	1,162,422	766,357
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	17	71.61	74.33	65.57	23.82	113.36	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	994,006	651,754

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	1	71.61	71.61	71.61		100.00	71.61	71.61	N/A	195,000	139,645
1	1	71.61	71.61	71.61		100.00	71.61	71.61	N/A	195,000	139,645
<u>Grass</u>											
County	16	71.09	74.50	65.50	25.49	113.74	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	1,043,944	683,761
1	16	71.09	74.50	65.50	25.49	113.74	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	1,043,944	683,761
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	17	71.61	74.33	65.57	23.82	113.36	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	994,006	651,754

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM INCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	18	Median :	70	COV :	28.95	95% Median C.I. :	57.40 to 83.25
Total Sales Price :	17,329,840	Wgt. Mean :	66	STD :	21.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	57.37 to 73.66
Total Adj. Sales Price :	17,329,840	Mean :	74	Avg. Abs. Dev :	16.56	95% Mean C.I. :	63.11 to 84.33
Total Assessed Value :	11,353,492						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	962,769	COD :	23.79	MAX Sales Ratio :	114.86		
Avg. Assessed Value :	630,750	PRD :	112.53	MIN Sales Ratio :	48.04		

DATE OF SALE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007											
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007											
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008											
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	6	73.08	72.79	62.08	18.73	117.25	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	218,153	135,425
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	2	69.46	69.46	55.93	19.85	124.19	55.67	83.25	N/A	3,571,763	1,997,530
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	1	63.39	63.39	63.39		100.00	63.39	63.39	N/A	431,730	273,667
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009											
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009	2	63.04	63.04	70.44	18.67	89.49	51.27	74.80	N/A	172,400	121,430
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009	1	59.53	59.53	59.53		100.00	59.53	59.53	N/A	50,000	29,765
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	2	89.02	89.02	111.42	29.04	79.90	63.17	114.86	N/A	196,780	219,248
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	2	79.17	79.17	91.49	39.32	86.53	48.04	110.29	N/A	198,600	181,693
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	2	82.96	82.96	71.59	18.49	115.88	67.62	98.30	N/A	3,630,052	2,598,855
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	6	73.08	72.79	62.08	18.73	117.25	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	218,153	135,425
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	5	63.39	65.68	56.96	16.12	115.31	51.27	83.25	N/A	1,584,011	902,317
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	7	67.62	80.26	74.43	32.27	107.83	48.04	114.86	48.04 to 114.86	1,157,266	861,336
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	9	71.61	71.01	57.19	18.29	124.17	48.30	107.50	55.67 to 83.25	987,131	564,586
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	5	63.17	72.73	90.20	24.96	80.63	51.27	114.86	N/A	157,672	142,224

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
1	18	69.62	73.72	65.51	23.79	112.53	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 83.25	962,769	630,750

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM INCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	18	Median :	70	COV :	28.95	95% Median C.I. :	57.40 to 83.25
Total Sales Price :	17,329,840	Wgt. Mean :	66	STD :	21.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	57.37 to 73.66
Total Adj. Sales Price :	17,329,840	Mean :	74	Avg. Abs. Dev :	16.56	95% Mean C.I. :	63.11 to 84.33
Total Assessed Value :	11,353,492						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	962,769	COD :	23.79	MAX Sales Ratio :	114.86		
Avg. Assessed Value :	630,750	PRD :	112.53	MIN Sales Ratio :	48.04		

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 Value
<u>Grass</u>											
County	14	74.68	77.18	65.93	24.13	117.06	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 107.50	1,162,422	766,357
1	14	74.68	77.18	65.93	24.13	117.06	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 107.50	1,162,422	766,357
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	18	69.62	73.72	65.51	23.79	112.53	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 83.25	962,769	630,750

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 Value
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	2	67.50	67.50	65.95	06.09	102.35	63.39	71.61	N/A	313,365	206,656
1	2	67.50	67.50	65.95	06.09	102.35	63.39	71.61	N/A	313,365	206,656
<u>Grass</u>											
County	16	71.09	74.50	65.50	25.49	113.74	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	1,043,944	683,761
1	16	71.09	74.50	65.50	25.49	113.74	48.04	114.86	55.67 to 98.30	1,043,944	683,761
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	18	69.62	73.72	65.51	23.79	112.53	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 83.25	962,769	630,750

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM EXCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	23	Median :	70	COV :	26.46	95% Median C.I. :	63.17 to 83.25
Total Sales Price :	18,309,427	Wgt. Mean :	66	STD :	19.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	58.64 to 74.01
Total Adj. Sales Price :	18,309,427	Mean :	75	Avg. Abs.Dev :	15.22	95% Mean C.I. :	66.04 to 83.10
Total Assessed Value :	12,143,805						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	796,062	COD :	21.62	MAX Sales Ratio :	114.86		
Avg. Assessed Value :	527,992	PRD :	112.42	MIN Sales Ratio :	48.04		

DATE OF SALE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007											
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	1	90.55	90.55	90.55		100.00	90.55	90.55	N/A	188,187	170,400
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008											
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	6	73.08	72.79	62.08	18.73	117.25	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	218,153	135,425
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	2	69.46	69.46	55.93	19.85	124.19	55.67	83.25	N/A	3,571,763	1,997,530
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	2	63.50	63.50	63.46	00.17	100.06	63.39	63.61	N/A	319,865	202,984
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009											
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009	3	74.80	73.45	81.99	19.17	89.58	51.27	94.29	N/A	222,933	182,784
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009	1	59.53	59.53	59.53		100.00	59.53	59.53	N/A	50,000	29,765
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	2	89.02	89.02	111.42	29.04	79.90	63.17	114.86	N/A	196,780	219,248
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	2	79.17	79.17	91.49	39.32	86.53	48.04	110.29	N/A	198,600	181,693
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	4	69.90	76.43	71.55	11.34	106.82	67.62	98.30	N/A	1,879,876	1,344,958
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	7	74.55	75.33	65.66	18.81	114.73	48.30	107.50	48.30 to 107.50	213,872	140,421
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	7	63.61	69.47	58.56	18.42	118.63	51.27	94.29	51.27 to 94.29	1,207,437	707,054
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	9	69.38	77.96	74.30	24.91	104.93	48.04	114.86	59.53 to 110.29	928,918	690,164
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	10	67.61	70.27	57.34	18.62	122.55	48.30	107.50	55.67 to 83.25	909,218	521,358
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	6	68.99	76.32	91.39	26.57	83.51	51.27	114.86	51.27 to 114.86	185,393	169,436

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
1	23	70.41	74.57	66.33	21.62	112.42	48.04	114.86	63.17 to 83.25	796,062	527,992

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM EXCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	23	Median :	70	COV :	26.46	95% Median C.I. :	63.17 to 83.25
Total Sales Price :	18,309,427	Wgt. Mean :	66	STD :	19.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	58.64 to 74.01
Total Adj. Sales Price :	18,309,427	Mean :	75	Avg. Abs. Dev :	15.22	95% Mean C.I. :	66.04 to 83.10
Total Assessed Value :	12,143,805						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	796,062	COD :	21.62	MAX Sales Ratio :	114.86		
Avg. Assessed Value :	527,992	PRD :	112.42	MIN Sales Ratio :	48.04		

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 Value
<u>Grass</u>											
County	16	74.68	77.82	66.53	23.11	116.97	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 98.30	1,050,357	698,801
1	16	74.68	77.82	66.53	23.11	116.97	48.04	114.86	57.40 to 98.30	1,050,357	698,801
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	23	70.41	74.57	66.33	21.62	112.42	48.04	114.86	63.17 to 83.25	796,062	527,992

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 Value
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	3	71.61	75.18	71.63	12.64	104.96	63.39	90.55	N/A	271,639	194,571
1	3	71.61	75.18	71.63	12.64	104.96	63.39	90.55	N/A	271,639	194,571
<u>Grass</u>											
County	20	69.90	74.48	66.08	23.00	112.71	48.04	114.86	59.53 to 83.25	874,726	578,005
1	20	69.90	74.48	66.08	23.00	112.71	48.04	114.86	59.53 to 83.25	874,726	578,005
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	23	70.41	74.57	66.33	21.62	112.42	48.04	114.86	63.17 to 83.25	796,062	527,992



## **2011 Correlation Section for Garfield County**

---

### **A. Agricultural Land**

Garfield County has one market area for non-influenced agricultural land in the county. The majority of the county is grassland with sandy soils.

In the base statistic, which is comprised of 17 sales within Garfield County, the distribution of the sales among the three year study period was reviewed for adequacy, proportionality and representativeness. The sample was not proportionately distributed, but was adequate and representative of the land use within the county.

To create a proportionate distribution of sales, sales were randomly added in the deficient year from the comparable areas for the random inclusion statistics. Therefore, all thresholds are now being met.

The random exclusion statistics brought in all sales from the comparable areas that adjoin the county. This area consisted of Wheeler, Holt, and Loup and for Valley only the irrigated sales. The irrigated sales were brought in from Valley as they are generally comparable to the southern area of Garfield County where the majority of irrigated land is. No grass or dry sales were borrowed from Valley County. Once you cross the county line the soils are generally siltier and not as comparable to the majority of the grassland which is sandy. All thresholds were met for the random exclusion statistics.

In both the random inclusion and the random exclusion samples, the statistical measures of the overall class and the subclasses correlate fairly closely. The coefficient of dispersion does improve with the larger random exclusion sample.

In analyzing the three sets of statistics it appears all subclasses are at the same proportion to market value. The values are also reasonably similar to adjoining counties with similar influences. The qualitative statistics are above the standard range; however the assessor's process of analyzing the local market, surrounding markets and applying valuation changes is done consistently within the agricultural class. The statistics are considered appropriate for agricultural lands rather than an indicator of lack of assessment uniformity or assessment regressivity.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 70% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

#### **A1. Correlation for Special Valuation of Agricultural Land**

A review of the agricultural land values in Garfield County in areas that have other non-agricultural influences indicates the assessed values used are similar to other areas in the County where no non agricultural influences exist. Therefore, it is the opinion of the Property Tax Administrator that the level of value for Special Valuation of agricultural land in Garfield County is 70%.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Garfield 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 Garfield 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 Garfield 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 Garfield County**

---

July, 2007, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 2,380</b>	<b>Value : 226,449,010</b>	<b>Growth 1,513,480</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	36	178,680	3	99,860	9	111,370	48	389,910	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	525	3,710,435	28	509,365	142	3,139,900	695	7,359,700	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	527	21,326,070	28	1,745,605	183	10,113,070	738	33,184,745	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	563	25,215,185	31	2,354,830	192	13,364,340	786	40,934,355	1,053,025
<b>% of Res Total</b>	71.63	61.60	3.94	5.75	24.43	32.65	33.03	18.08	69.58
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	8	48,310	4	105,825	1	12,460	13	166,595	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	93	702,430	5	147,275	17	290,290	115	1,139,995	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	95	4,341,805	7	343,905	17	880,825	119	5,566,535	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	103	5,092,545	11	597,005	18	1,183,575	132	6,873,125	48,330
<b>% of Com Total</b>	78.03	74.09	8.33	8.69	13.64	17.22	5.55	3.04	3.19
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	6	63,610	1	18,050	1	36,500	8	118,160	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	6	279,800	1	125,745	1	221,265	8	626,810	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	6	343,410	1	143,795	1	257,765	8	744,970	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	75.00	46.10	12.50	19.30	12.50	34.60	0.34	0.33	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	92	709,205	92	709,205	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1	6,515	1	6,515	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	31	313,540	31	313,540	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	123	1,029,260	123	1,029,260	52,555
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	5.17	0.45	3.47
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	563	25,215,185	31	2,354,830	315	14,393,600	909	41,963,615	1,105,580
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	61.94	60.09	3.41	5.61	34.65	34.30	38.19	18.53	73.05
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	109	5,435,955	12	740,800	19	1,441,340	140	7,618,095	48,330
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	77.86	71.36	8.57	9.72	13.57	18.92	5.88	3.36	3.19
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	672	30,651,140	43	3,095,630	334	15,834,940	1,049	49,581,710	1,153,910
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	64.06	61.82	4.10	6.24	31.84	31.94	44.08	21.90	76.24

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	75	17	133	225

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	3	140,195	32	2,570,100	966	107,986,340	1,001	110,696,635
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	78,560	14	2,567,560	298	48,292,135	313	50,938,255
29. Ag Improvements	1	1,510	14	910,905	315	14,319,995	330	15,232,410
30. Ag Total							1,331	176,867,300

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	8	8.00	100,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	9	8.00	544,570	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	12.00	33,600	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	1.00	4,300	14	57.50	152,820	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	1,510	14	0.00	366,335	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	47.74	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	2	2.00	18,000	2	2.00	18,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	209	229.55	2,188,900	217	237.55	2,288,900	
33. HomeSite Improvements	201	216.55	10,373,940	210	224.55	10,918,510	359,570
34. HomeSite Total				<b>212</b>	<b>239.55</b>	<b>13,225,410</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	17	44.43	96,015	18	56.43	129,615	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	261	1,069.53	1,919,880	276	1,128.03	2,077,000	
37. FarmSite Improvements	298	0.00	3,946,055	313	0.00	4,313,900	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>331</b>	<b>1,184.46</b>	<b>6,520,515</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	1,784.32	0	0	1,832.06	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>543</b>	<b>3,256.07</b>	<b>19,745,925</b>	<b>359,570</b>

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	29	2,251.77	2,838,590
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	29	2,251.77	3,974,525
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	64	8,759.39	6,244,570	93	11,011.16	9,083,160
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	3,561.63	20.81%	7,728,745	31.00%	2,170.00
47. 2A1	106.40	0.62%	201,085	0.81%	1,889.90
48. 2A	3,372.17	19.70%	5,547,240	22.25%	1,645.01
49. 3A1	800.64	4.68%	1,289,040	5.17%	1,610.01
50. 3A	2,063.30	12.06%	3,187,805	12.79%	1,545.00
51. 4A1	5,330.67	31.15%	5,197,650	20.85%	975.05
52. 4A	1,880.00	10.98%	1,776,675	7.13%	945.04
53. Total	17,114.81	100.00%	24,928,240	100.00%	1,456.53
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	457.31	5.80%	386,445	7.77%	845.04
56. 2D1	54.70	0.69%	41,025	0.83%	750.00
57. 2D	3,290.08	41.70%	2,352,485	47.33%	715.02
58. 3D1	993.70	12.59%	645,905	12.99%	650.00
59. 3D	116.20	1.47%	67,985	1.37%	585.07
60. 4D1	1,871.94	23.72%	973,380	19.58%	519.98
61. 4D	1,106.48	14.02%	503,445	10.13%	455.00
62. Total	7,890.41	100.00%	4,970,670	100.00%	629.96
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	592.92	0.19%	317,250	0.27%	535.06
65. 2G1	272.53	0.09%	145,810	0.12%	535.02
66. 2G	6,419.52	2.03%	3,434,615	2.94%	535.03
67. 3G1	1,933.60	0.61%	957,395	0.82%	495.14
68. 3G	8,938.28	2.83%	4,211,580	3.61%	471.18
69. 4G1	76,938.88	24.38%	32,391,350	27.76%	421.00
70. 4G	220,546.74	69.87%	75,240,085	64.47%	341.15
71. Total	315,642.47	100.00%	116,698,085	100.00%	369.72
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
Irrigated Total	17,114.81	4.95%	24,928,240	16.94%	1,456.53
<b>Dry Total</b>					
Dry Total	7,890.41	2.28%	4,970,670	3.38%	629.96
<b>Grass Total</b>					
Grass Total	315,642.47	91.26%	116,698,085	79.29%	369.72
72. Waste	5,241.98	1.52%	587,945	0.40%	112.16
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	345,889.67	100.00%	147,184,940	100.00%	425.53

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 5

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	245.25	57.50%	532,190	65.36%	2,169.99
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	29.40	6.89%	48,365	5.94%	1,645.07
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	150.20	35.21%	232,055	28.50%	1,544.97
51. 4A1	0.60	0.14%	585	0.07%	975.00
52. 4A	1.10	0.26%	1,040	0.13%	945.45
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>426.55</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>814,235</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,908.89</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	4.10	1.35%	6,375	2.23%	1,554.88
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	111.75	36.75%	120,140	42.11%	1,075.08
58. 3D1	2.00	0.66%	3,110	1.09%	1,555.00
59. 3D	151.43	49.80%	116,530	40.84%	769.53
60. 4D1	28.80	9.47%	30,815	10.80%	1,069.97
61. 4D	6.00	1.97%	8,340	2.92%	1,390.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>304.08</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>285,310</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>938.27</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	2.00	0.11%	1,070	0.12%	535.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	48.77	2.70%	38,430	4.16%	787.98
67. 3G1	0.60	0.03%	935	0.10%	1,558.33
68. 3G	213.21	11.82%	122,785	13.28%	575.89
69. 4G1	541.75	30.04%	260,435	28.18%	480.73
70. 4G	996.96	55.29%	500,600	54.16%	502.13
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>1,803.29</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>924,255</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>512.54</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	426.55	16.50%	814,235	39.89%	1,908.89
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	304.08	11.76%	285,310	13.98%	938.27
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	1,803.29	69.77%	924,255	45.28%	512.54
72. Waste	50.80	1.97%	17,435	0.85%	343.21
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>2,584.72</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,041,235</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>789.73</b>

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 6

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	66.90	53.95%	145,175	64.37%	2,170.03
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	37.00	29.84%	60,865	26.99%	1,645.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	16.10	12.98%	15,700	6.96%	975.16
52. 4A	4.00	3.23%	3,785	1.68%	946.25
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>124.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>225,525</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,818.75</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1.20	1.31%	645	1.58%	537.50
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	2.90	3.16%	1,550	3.81%	534.48
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	16.50	17.98%	7,755	19.05%	470.00
69. 4G1	33.76	36.79%	15,980	39.26%	473.34
70. 4G	37.40	40.76%	14,770	36.29%	394.92
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>91.76</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>40,700</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>443.55</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>124.00</b>	<b>56.81%</b>	<b>225,525</b>	<b>84.62%</b>	<b>1,818.75</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>91.76</b>	<b>42.04%</b>	<b>40,700</b>	<b>15.27%</b>	<b>443.55</b>
72. Waste	2.50	1.15%	275	0.10%	110.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>218.26</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>266,500</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,221.02</b>

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 7

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	586.00	60.03%	1,271,620	67.10%	2,170.00
47. 2A1	3.30	0.34%	6,235	0.33%	1,889.39
48. 2A	344.93	35.34%	567,420	29.94%	1,645.03
49. 3A1	3.50	0.36%	5,635	0.30%	1,610.00
50. 3A	12.70	1.30%	19,625	1.04%	1,545.28
51. 4A1	10.40	1.07%	10,150	0.54%	975.96
52. 4A	15.30	1.57%	14,460	0.76%	945.10
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>976.13</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,895,145</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,941.49</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	55.80	44.64%	47,150	53.39%	844.98
56. 2D1	0.40	0.32%	300	0.34%	750.00
57. 2D	20.69	16.55%	14,795	16.75%	715.08
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	24.00	19.20%	14,040	15.90%	585.00
60. 4D1	16.50	13.20%	8,575	9.71%	519.70
61. 4D	7.60	6.08%	3,460	3.92%	455.26
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>124.99</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>88,320</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>706.62</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	62.68	4.84%	33,945	4.37%	541.56
65. 2G1	7.50	0.58%	4,010	0.52%	534.67
66. 2G	73.96	5.71%	39,570	5.10%	535.02
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	353.26	27.29%	314,075	40.46%	889.08
69. 4G1	407.13	31.45%	195,755	25.22%	480.82
70. 4G	390.07	30.13%	188,820	24.33%	484.07
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>1,294.60</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>776,175</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>599.55</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>976.13</b>	<b>38.54%</b>	<b>1,895,145</b>	<b>66.44%</b>	<b>1,941.49</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>124.99</b>	<b>4.94%</b>	<b>88,320</b>	<b>3.10%</b>	<b>706.62</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>1,294.60</b>	<b>51.12%</b>	<b>776,175</b>	<b>27.21%</b>	<b>599.55</b>
72. Waste	136.95	5.41%	92,670	3.25%	676.67
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>2,532.67</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,852,310</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,126.21</b>

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 8

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	565.94	32.18%	1,228,090	41.30%	2,170.00
47. 2A1	6.50	0.37%	12,285	0.41%	1,890.00
48. 2A	512.57	29.14%	843,195	28.36%	1,645.03
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	410.38	23.33%	634,045	21.32%	1,545.02
51. 4A1	231.10	13.14%	225,345	7.58%	975.10
52. 4A	32.20	1.83%	30,435	1.02%	945.19
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>1,758.69</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,973,395</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,690.69</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	25.45	7.69%	21,505	10.05%	844.99
56. 2D1	0.40	0.12%	300	0.14%	750.00
57. 2D	135.10	40.85%	96,600	45.13%	715.03
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	120.30	36.37%	70,380	32.88%	585.04
60. 4D1	42.20	12.76%	21,940	10.25%	519.91
61. 4D	7.31	2.21%	3,330	1.56%	455.54
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>330.76</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>214,055</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>647.16</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	65.60	1.67%	35,100	2.22%	535.06
65. 2G1	38.21	0.97%	20,440	1.29%	534.94
66. 2G	337.93	8.59%	181,915	11.51%	538.32
67. 3G1	9.00	0.23%	4,455	0.28%	495.00
68. 3G	510.66	12.98%	241,030	15.25%	472.00
69. 4G1	789.41	20.07%	332,200	21.02%	420.82
70. 4G	2,183.01	55.49%	765,070	48.42%	350.47
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>3,933.82</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,580,210</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>401.70</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>1,758.69</b>	<b>28.82%</b>	<b>2,973,395</b>	<b>62.25%</b>	<b>1,690.69</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>330.76</b>	<b>5.42%</b>	<b>214,055</b>	<b>4.48%</b>	<b>647.16</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>3,933.82</b>	<b>64.46%</b>	<b>1,580,210</b>	<b>33.08%</b>	<b>401.70</b>
72. Waste	79.40	1.30%	8,730	0.18%	109.95
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>6,102.67</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,776,390</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>782.67</b>

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	96.67	206,960	2,197.25	4,208,280	18,106.26	26,421,300	20,400.18	30,836,540
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	5.11	4,265	245.67	199,630	8,399.46	5,354,460	8,650.24	5,558,355
<b>78. Grass</b>	6.04	3,230	928.13	439,855	321,831.77	119,576,340	322,765.94	120,019,425
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	31.60	3,475	5,480.03	703,580	5,511.63	707,055
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>107.82</b>	<b>214,455</b>	<b>3,402.65</b>	<b>4,851,240</b>	<b>353,817.52</b>	<b>152,055,680</b>	<b>357,327.99</b>	<b>157,121,375</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	20,400.18	5.71%	30,836,540	19.63%	1,511.58
<b>Dry Land</b>	8,650.24	2.42%	5,558,355	3.54%	642.57
<b>Grass</b>	322,765.94	90.33%	120,019,425	76.39%	371.85
<b>Waste</b>	5,511.63	1.54%	707,055	0.45%	128.28
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>357,327.99</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>157,121,375</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>439.71</b>

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

36 Garfield

	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	39,387,745	40,934,355	1,546,610	3.93%	1,053,025	1.25%
02. Recreational	1,027,785	1,029,260	1,475	0.14%	52,555	-4.97%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	12,305,235	13,225,410	920,175	7.48%	359,570	4.56%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>52,720,765</b>	<b>55,189,025</b>	<b>2,468,260</b>	<b>4.68%</b>	<b>1,465,150</b>	<b>1.90%</b>
05. Commercial	6,761,085	6,873,125	112,040	1.66%	48,330	0.94%
06. Industrial	748,005	744,970	-3,035	-0.41%	0	-0.41%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	6,327,415	6,520,515	193,100	3.05%	0	3.05%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>13,836,505</b>	<b>14,138,610</b>	<b>302,105</b>	<b>2.18%</b>	<b>48,330</b>	<b>1.83%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>66,557,270</b>	<b>69,327,635</b>	<b>2,770,365</b>	<b>4.16%</b>	<b>1,513,480</b>	<b>1.89%</b>
11. Irrigated	21,772,170	30,836,540	9,064,370	41.63%		
12. Dryland	4,315,490	5,558,355	1,242,865	28.80%		
13. Grassland	122,792,420	120,019,425	-2,772,995	-2.26%		
14. Wasteland	671,435	707,055	35,620	5.31%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>149,551,515</b>	<b>157,121,375</b>	<b>7,569,860</b>	<b>5.06%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>216,108,785</b>	<b>226,449,010</b>	<b>10,340,225</b>	<b>4.78%</b>	<b>1,513,480</b>	<b>4.08%</b>

**2010 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR GARFIELD COUNTY**  
**Assessment Years 2011, 2012 and 2013**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after any changes are made by either the appraiser or county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 ( 2009).

General Description of Real Property in Garfield County:

Per the 2010 County Abstract, Garfield County consists of 2,359 parcels with the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	772	32.73%	17.80%
Commercial	132	5.60%	3.04%
Industrial	8	.34%	.34%
Recreational	117	4.96%	.52%
Agricultural	1,133	48.02%	75.57%
Special Value	197	8.35%	2.73%

Agricultural land - taxable acres: 357,322.77.

Other pertinent facts: 69.87% of the taxable base value in the county is agricultural and of that 82.51% consists primarily of grassland property.

Current Resources:

A. Staff: Shared Assessment Manager and Appraiser II with one Assistant Manager.

The assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every four years to maintain certification. The assistant manager is also required to meet the same guidelines. Both attend workshops and meetings to further their knowledge of the assessment field. The staff has taken classes such as Windows, Terra Scan user education as well as IAAO classes.

The appraiser is credentialed with the Nebraska Real Property Appraiser Board and is required to obtain 28 hours of continuing education every two years.

B. Cadastral Maps

The Garfield County cadastral maps were originally done in 1969. Additional pages have been added to show changes such as annexation and new subdivisions. The assessment staff maintains the cadastral maps. All new subdivision and parcel splits are kept up to date, as well as ownership transfers.

C. Property Record Cards - Property information, photo, sketches, etc.

A concentrated effort towards a “paperless” property record card is in effect. Garfield County Assessment Office went on-line July, 2006 with the property record information.

D. Software for CAMA and Assessment Administration.

Garfield County uses the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division software for CAMA and Assessment Administration. Garfield County does not have GIS.

- E. Web based – property record information access  
Property record information is available at: <http://garfield.pat.gisworkshop.com>
- F. Agridata, Inc software is used to measure rural parcels to aid the conversion from old alpha soil symbols to the new numeric symbols. This was completed for 2009. The software is still being used to measure new field certifications.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

- A. Discover, List & Inventory all property – Assessment staff processes sales transactions in the computer system and prints a copy of the 521 forms and property review sheet which is given to the appraisal staff. This process changes the ownership on the property record card and ownership changes are made on the cadastral maps as each transfer statement is processed. Sales questionnaires are sent to both the buyer and seller for further sales analysis. Telephone calls are sometimes made to realtors, attorneys and brokers when further information is needed. The appraisal staff reviews the sales, takes new pictures, checks the accuracy of the data we currently are using, and visits with property owners whenever possible. Current photos are taken and later entered in the CAMA system. Building permits and information statements are received from city and county zoning personnel, individual taxpayers, and from personal knowledge of changes to the property are entered in the computer for later review.
- B. Data Collection – In accordance with Neb. Statute 77-1311.03 the county is working to ensure that all parcels of real property are reviewed no less frequently than every six years. Further, properties are reviewed as deemed necessary from analysis of the market conditions within each assessor location. These are onsite inspections. The market areas are reviewed annually and compared for equality between like classes of property as well as other classes. If necessary a market boundary will be adjusted to more accurately reflect the market activity. The statistics of the assessor locations are also reviewed annually to determine if new adjustments are necessary to stay current with the sales and building activity that is taking place.

The permit and sales review system offer opportunity for individual property reviews annually. Working with agricultural property owners or tenants with land certification requirements between the Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resource District provides updates for changes.

- C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions – Sales ratio studies are done on an ongoing basis to stay informed with trends in the market. For each assessor location and market area consideration is given to the number of sales in the study and the time frame of the parcel data. This information is reviewed several times throughout the year. Analysis of this data is reviewed with the assigned Field Liaison and the plan of action for the year is developed.

D. Approaches to Value

1) Market Approach; sales comparisons, - Similar properties are studied to determine if and what actions will be necessary for adjustments for the upcoming year.

2) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study-

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division CAMA system is utilized for costing and applying market depreciation. Marshall & Swift cost manuals are updated when appropriate to revaluing and introducing updated depreciation tables. The latest depreciation study varies by assessor location and property class.

3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market, -

Gather income information as available for commercial properties. Rental income has been requested on residential properties. The income approach generally is not used since income/expense data is not readily available.

4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land-

Sales are plotted on a map indicative to the land use at 80% of each class i.e. irrigation, grassland, or dry cropland with the selling price per acre listed. Analysis is completed for agricultural sales based on but not limited to the following components: Number of sales, Time frame of sales, and Number of acres sold. Further review is completed in an attempt to make note of any difference in price paid per acre to be classed as special value.

E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation – The market is analyzed based on the standard approaches to valuation with the final valuation based on the most appropriate method.

F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions. – Sales assessment ratios are reviewed after final values are applied to the sales within all classes and subclasses of properties and then applied to the entire population of properties within the subclasses and classes within the county. Finally a unit of comparison analysis is completed to insure uniformity with the class or sub-class.

G. Notices and Public Relations – Notice of Valuation Changes are mailed to property owners on or before June 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. These are mailed to the last known address of property owners. After notices have been mailed the appraisal staff is available to answer any questions or concerns from the taxpayers with support from the assessment staff as needed.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	96	19.19	105.88
Commercial	N/A	N/A	N/A
Agricultural Land	70	25.21	120.51
Special Value Agland	70	25.21	120.51

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

**Assessment Actions planned for Assessment Year 2011:**

Residential (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete the rural review of properties and revalue. Begin Burwell City review of properties. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Begin review of properties. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Sales will be plotted on the soil map and the topographical map indicative to the use at 80% of each subclass of irrigation, grassland, or dry cropland with the price per acre listed. Market area boundaries, if deemed appropriate will be scrutinized for proportionality of number of sales and timeliness of sales. Consideration will also be given to borrowing sales from the neighboring counties. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Special Value – Agricultural: Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:**

Residential (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Continue to review a portion of the class. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete review of properties and revalue using new Marshall and Swift costing. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Continue to monitor market areas and plot sales. Adjustments to class and subclass values will be analyzed and applied as necessary. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Special Value – Agricultural: Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:**

Residential (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete review of the class. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Review a portion of the class. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Continue to monitor market areas and plot sales. Adjustment to class and subclass values will be analyzed and applied as necessary. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Special Value – Agricultural: Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural.

Other functions performed by the assessor’s office, but not limited to:

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to PAD rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
  - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
  - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property; administer annual filing schedules- prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions; administer annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by Department of Revenue for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
9. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
10. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

11. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information
12. TERC Appeals – appraiser prepares information and attends taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
13. TERC Statewide Equalization – appraiser attends hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
14. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. Retention of the assessor certification requires 60 hours of approved continuing education every four years. Retention of the appraiser license requires 28 hours of continuing education every two years.

Conclusion:

With all the entities of county government that utilize the assessor records in their operation, it is paramount for this office to constantly work toward perfection in record keeping.

With the continual review of all properties, records will become more accurate, and values will be assessed more equally and fairly across the county. With a well-developed plan in place, this process can flow more smoothly. Sales review will continue to be important in order to adjust for market areas in the county.

Respectfully submitted:

Sharon L. Boucher  
Appraiser & Asst Assessment Manager  
for Garfield County

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Garfield County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	1 – Assessment Administrative Assistant
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	2 – The Appraiser/Assessment Administrative Manager and Appraiser Assistant are shared between Garfield and Greeley Counties.
6.	<b>Assessor’s requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$167,436.76
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	Same as above
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$73,100.43
9.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	\$0
10.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$3,723.92
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$0
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	\$0
13.	<b>Amount of last year’s budget not used:</b>
	None

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Terra Scan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessment Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>

	No
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Burwell
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	County – 2000 City of Burwell - 1970

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	None
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None



# 2011 Certification for Garfield 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 Garfield 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



