

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 Gosper County

Residential Real Property - Current

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|----------|
| Number of Sales | 75 | Median | 95.67 |
| Total Sales Price | \$5,773,925 | Mean | 106.98 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$5,778,425 | Wgt. Mean | 94.58 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$5,465,228 | Average Assessed Value of the Base | \$77,484 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$77,046 | Avg. Assessed Value | \$72,870 |

Confidence Interval - Current

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| 95% Median C.I | 94.43 to 97.63 |
| 95% Mean C.I | 90.84 to 98.32 |
| 95% Wgt. Mean C.I | 95.56 to 118.40 |
| % of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 24.25 |
| % of Records Sold in the Study Period | 6.51 |
| % of Value Sold in the Study Period | 6.12 |

Residential Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
|------|-----------------|-----|--------|
| 2010 | 65 | 96 | 96 |
| 2009 | 59 | 95 | 95 |
| 2008 | 70 | 93 | 93 |
| 2007 | 67 | 95 | 95 |

2011 Commission Summary for Gosper County

Commercial Real Property - Current

| | | | |
|------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------|----------|
| Number of Sales | 10 | Median | 94.10 |
| Total Sales Price | \$590,500 | Mean | 89.26 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | \$590,500 | Wgt. Mean | 90.11 |
| Total Assessed Value | \$532,121 | Average Assessed Value of the Base | \$76,383 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | \$59,050 | Avg. Assessed Value | \$53,212 |

Confidence Interval - Current

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| 95% Median C.I | 67.10 to 102.42 |
| 95% Mean C.I | 78.87 to 99.65 |
| 95% Wgt. Mean C.I | 77.21 to 103.02 |
| % of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 2.03 |
| % of Records Sold in the Study Period | 10.20 |
| % of Value Sold in the Study Period | 7.11 |

Commercial Real Property - History

| Year | Number of Sales | LOV | Median |
|------|-----------------|-----|--------|
| 2010 | 8 | 100 | 100 |
| 2009 | 5 | 100 | 98 |
| 2008 | 5 | 100 | 94 |
| 2007 | 3 | 94 | 94 |

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Gosper County

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

| Class | Level of Value | Quality of Assessment | Non-binding recommendation |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---|----------------------------|
| Residential Real Property | 96 | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices. | No recommendation. |
| | | | |
| Commercial Real Property | *NEI | Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices. | No recommendation. |
| | | | |
| Agricultural Land | 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 Gosper County

taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Residential

The costing manuals were updated to the Marshall and Swift June, 2010 tables.

A lot value study was completed. Leasehold values at Johnson Lake were increased; rural home sites were also increased. Lot values in a portion of Elwood that had previously been blighted were increased to full value for 2010. Otherwise, lot values remained unchanged in the villages.

A new depreciation study was completed for the entire class. The study included reviewing the effective age of all parcels as well as developing new depreciation tables for each valuation grouping.

The pick-up work was completed timely.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Gosper County

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: | |
| | The contract appraiser and the deputy | |
| 2. | List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value: | |
| | <u>Valuation Grouping</u> | <u>Description of unique characteristics</u> |
| | 01 | Elwood – this is the largest community. It’s location along Highway 283, only 20 miles south of Lexington provides easy commuting to job opportunities, shopping, and other services in Lexington. The market is fairly active in Elwood, and growth is fairly steady. |
| | 02 | Smithfield – is a very small village with no services or retail business. The market is sporadic as is typical for small towns. |
| | 03 | Johnson Lake – strong demand due to the recreational opportunities at the lake. Demand and growth are both strong in this area. |
| | 04 | Rural – all properties outside of the Villages of Elwood or Smithfield with the exception of those located at Johnson lake. |
| 3. | List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties. | |
| | Only the cost approach is used in the county, as there are too few sales to develop a sales comparison approach. | |
| 4 | When was the last lot value study completed? | |
| | A lot value study was completed for 2011. | |
| 5. | Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values. | |
| | For Elwood and Smithfield, values are applied to lots based on the width of the lot. For example, all lots 1-25 ft wide are given a set lot value; all lots 26-50 ft wide are assessed differently, etc. At Johnson Lake, lot values are established by neighborhood. Areas that are located along the lakefront are valued higher than those that are not, size is not considered a factor when establishing lot values at the lake. | |
| 6. | What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping? | |
| | June, 2010 is used for the entire class. | |
| 7. | If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor? | |
| | Depreciation tables are developed using local market information. | |
| 8. | Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping? | |
| | Yes | |
| 9. | How often does the County update the depreciation tables? | |
| | New depreciation tables are developed at least every other year when the costing tables are updated. A sales study is completed during the years that a costing update has not been completed, and depreciation is adjusted if warranted. | |

| | |
|-----|--|
| 10. | Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping? |
| | Yes |
| 11. | Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed. |
| | Generally, a parcel is considered substantially changed when an addition or new improvement to the property has been constructed or it has received major remodeling. |
| 12. | Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property. |
| | n/a |

**37 Gosper
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 : 75
 Total Sales Price : 5,773,925
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,778,425
 Total Assessed Value : 5,465,228
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 77,046
 Avg. Assessed Value : 72,870

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 107
 COD : 21.64
 PRD : 113.11

COV : 47.17
 STD : 50.46
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.70
 MAX Sales Ratio : 395.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 28.44

95% Median C.I. : 94.43 to 97.63
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.84 to 98.32
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.56 to 118.40

Printed:3/18/2011 4:05:29PM

DATE OF SALE *

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| <u>Qtrts</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08 | 19 | 95.25 | 103.13 | 97.61 | 14.31 | 105.66 | 67.82 | 172.31 | 94.14 to 98.66 | 87,995 | 85,893 |
| 01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08 | 8 | 96.94 | 113.90 | 100.83 | 21.94 | 112.96 | 85.12 | 238.49 | 85.12 to 238.49 | 57,938 | 58,420 |
| 01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09 | 3 | 78.54 | 70.08 | 75.70 | 31.75 | 92.58 | 28.44 | 103.27 | N/A | 64,325 | 48,697 |
| 01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09 | 6 | 99.96 | 102.72 | 101.64 | 04.58 | 101.06 | 97.82 | 114.90 | 97.82 to 114.90 | 91,500 | 93,002 |
| 01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09 | 16 | 94.22 | 109.34 | 87.09 | 29.03 | 125.55 | 69.82 | 395.00 | 77.26 to 102.60 | 79,619 | 69,339 |
| 01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09 | 9 | 96.90 | 94.71 | 90.68 | 06.05 | 104.44 | 73.13 | 105.26 | 86.61 to 101.39 | 89,556 | 81,209 |
| 01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10 | 2 | 176.68 | 176.68 | 130.07 | 52.76 | 135.83 | 83.47 | 269.89 | N/A | 30,000 | 39,022 |
| 01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10 | 12 | 95.08 | 114.25 | 97.67 | 26.34 | 116.98 | 80.00 | 253.33 | 89.13 to 98.32 | 63,429 | 61,954 |
| <u>Study Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09 | 36 | 96.41 | 102.70 | 97.43 | 16.27 | 105.41 | 28.44 | 238.49 | 94.94 to 98.66 | 79,927 | 77,873 |
| 01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10 | 39 | 94.84 | 110.93 | 91.75 | 26.62 | 120.90 | 69.82 | 395.00 | 91.56 to 97.63 | 74,386 | 68,251 |
| <u>Calendar Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09 | 34 | 96.79 | 100.84 | 90.17 | 19.22 | 111.83 | 28.44 | 395.00 | 93.19 to 99.84 | 82,996 | 74,836 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 75 | 95.67 | 106.98 | 94.58 | 21.64 | 113.11 | 28.44 | 395.00 | 94.43 to 97.63 | 77,046 | 72,870 |

VALUATION GROUPING

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 01 | 24 | 100.58 | 133.22 | 104.09 | 39.64 | 127.99 | 72.75 | 395.00 | 96.23 to 107.50 | 42,871 | 44,625 |
| 02 | 6 | 94.22 | 91.31 | 92.21 | 05.53 | 99.02 | 80.00 | 98.66 | 80.00 to 98.66 | 31,042 | 28,624 |
| 03 | 33 | 94.43 | 94.66 | 91.78 | 11.26 | 103.14 | 67.82 | 172.31 | 91.52 to 96.67 | 105,247 | 96,596 |
| 04 | 12 | 95.94 | 96.22 | 94.93 | 15.90 | 101.36 | 28.44 | 170.56 | 88.99 to 100.15 | 90,844 | 86,236 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 75 | 95.67 | 106.98 | 94.58 | 21.64 | 113.11 | 28.44 | 395.00 | 94.43 to 97.63 | 77,046 | 72,870 |

PROPERTY TYPE *

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 01 | 75 | 95.67 | 106.98 | 94.58 | 21.64 | 113.11 | 28.44 | 395.00 | 94.43 to 97.63 | 77,046 | 72,870 |
| 06 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 07 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>ALL</u> | 75 | 95.67 | 106.98 | 94.58 | 21.64 | 113.11 | 28.44 | 395.00 | 94.43 to 97.63 | 77,046 | 72,870 |

**37 Gosper
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 : 75
 Total Sales Price : 5,773,925
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,778,425
 Total Assessed Value : 5,465,228
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 77,046
 Avg. Assessed Value : 72,870

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 107
 COD : 21.64
 PRD : 113.11

COV : 47.17
 STD : 50.46
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.70
 MAX Sales Ratio : 395.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 28.44

95% Median C.I. : 94.43 to 97.63
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.84 to 98.32
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.56 to 118.40

Printed:3/18/2011 4:05:29PM

| SALE PRICE * | | | | | | | | | | | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|------|
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val | |
| Low \$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 TO 4999 | 5 | 107.50 | 188.67 | 168.39 | 85.74 | 112.04 | 80.00 | 395.00 | N/A | 1,550 | 2,610 | |
| 5000 TO 9999 | 2 | 101.96 | 101.96 | 101.53 | 03.24 | 100.42 | 98.66 | 105.26 | N/A | 5,750 | 5,838 | |
| Total \$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 TO 9999 | 7 | 107.50 | 163.89 | 128.45 | 62.72 | 127.59 | 80.00 | 395.00 | 80.00 to 395.00 | 2,750 | 3,532 | |
| 10000 TO 29999 | 7 | 101.39 | 146.36 | 135.88 | 67.30 | 107.71 | 28.44 | 269.89 | 28.44 to 269.89 | 21,732 | 29,530 | |
| 30000 TO 59999 | 20 | 97.57 | 102.96 | 103.29 | 12.64 | 99.68 | 72.75 | 172.31 | 95.19 to 101.31 | 43,395 | 44,823 | |
| 60000 TO 99999 | 21 | 94.94 | 94.89 | 94.85 | 07.78 | 100.04 | 67.82 | 133.95 | 93.13 to 97.21 | 76,095 | 72,176 | |
| 100000 TO 149999 | 8 | 94.62 | 92.45 | 91.94 | 05.62 | 100.55 | 78.54 | 105.68 | 78.54 to 105.68 | 121,831 | 112,015 | |
| 150000 TO 249999 | 12 | 92.80 | 88.36 | 88.88 | 07.70 | 99.41 | 69.82 | 97.82 | 78.86 to 96.59 | 180,542 | 160,459 | |
| 250000 TO 499999 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 500000 + | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ALL | 75 | 95.67 | 106.98 | 94.58 | 21.64 | 113.11 | 28.44 | 395.00 | 94.43 to 97.63 | 77,046 | 72,870 | |

2011 Correlation Section for Gosper County

A. Residential Real Property

The residential statistics in Gosper County are reliable for use in the measurement of the residential class. The median and the weighted mean correlate closely. The 95% median confidence interval is sufficiently narrow and supports a median within the acceptable range. The mean is affected by seven sales with selling prices less than \$10,000, when these sales are removed the mean is reduced to 101%; the coefficient of dispersion improves to 16.08% and the price related differential improves to 107.05%. The measures of dispersion support the use of the statistics for the measurement of the residential class.

All subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range, except for valuation grouping 01. This grouping represents residential parcels within the Village of Elwood. Four of the low dollar sales, previously described, occur within this valuation grouping; all four are sales of unimproved lots. Currently, the Village of Elwood is offering free residential lots to residents ready to build homes. It is the assessor's opinion that this temporary offering has caused some turmoil in the market. The four lot sales are the only transactions of vacant parcels within the substrata, giving no reliable measurement of land assessments. When the four sales are removed from the sample, the median of the valuation grouping substrata improves to 98%; the COD and PRD also improve to 24.95% and 112.67% respectively.

Sales verification is conducted in the county by mailing verification questionnaires to the buyer in all transactions. When necessary, the seller or professional people involved in the transaction will be interviewed to gain additional information. The assessor and the deputy are both knowledgeable of the tax payers within the county, which aids in the verification process. A review of the qualified and non-qualified sales rosters revealed no bias in the qualification determinations.

The property records cards were brought up to date through the cyclical review requirement, which was completed in 2010. The deputy and the contract appraiser complete the pickup work annually. The assessor updated the costing index this year; this is done biannually in the county. After re-costing, a land use study and a new market depreciation study were completed. The assessor learned and implemented a new process for determining market depreciation this year in an attempt to improve assessment uniformity.

After removing low dollar sales, the qualitative measures remain slightly above the range indicated by IAAO. However, the qualitative measures are reasonable considering the dispersion that exists in rural markets. Because the assessment process employed by the assessor for 2011 was consistently applied, it is believed that assessments are uniform and proportionate within the residential class.

Based on an analysis of all available information, the level of value of residential parcel in Gosper County is 96%; all subclasses are within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper County

taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Commercial

The costing manuals were updated to the Marshall and Swift June, 2010 tables. A lot value study and a new depreciation study were completed. Lot values remained unchanged for 2010; however, a new depreciation table was implemented.

The pick-up work was completed timely.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Gosper County

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: | |
| | The contract appraiser and the deputy assessor | |
| 2. | List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value: | |
| | <u>Valuation Grouping</u> | <u>Description of unique characteristics</u> |
| | 01 | Elwood – this is the largest community. It’s location along Highway 283, only 20 miles south of Lexington provides easy commuting to job opportunities, shopping, and other services in Lexington. There is a downtown commercial district in Elwood; however, there are very few sales annually. |
| | 02 | Smithfield – is a very small village with no services or retail business. There are typically no commercial sales in Smithfield. |
| | 03 | Johnson Lake – there are few commercial parcels at Johnson Lake, but the influence from their location makes them unique to either Elwood or Johnson Lake. |
| 3. | List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties. | |
| | Only the cost approach is used. | |
| 4. | When was the last lot value study completed? | |
| | The last commercial lot value study was completed for 2007. | |
| 5. | Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values. | |
| | For Elwood and Smithfield, values are applied to lots based on the width of the lot. For example, all lots 1-25 ft wide are given a set lot value; all lots 26-50 ft wide are assessed differently, etc. At Johnson Lake, lot values are established by neighborhood. Areas that are located along the lakefront are valued higher than those that are not, size is not considered a factor when establishing lot values at the lake. | |
| 6. | What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping? | |
| | June, 2010 is used for the entire class. | |
| 7. | If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor? | |
| | Depreciation tables are established using local market information. | |
| 8. | Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping? | |
| | Yes, when there are sufficient sales to do so. | |
| 9. | How often does the County update the depreciation tables? | |
| | New depreciation tables are developed every other year, when the costing tables are updated. In the years in between costing updates, a ratio study is completed, and adjustments are made to the depreciation tables if warranted. | |
| 10. | Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market | |

| | |
|-----|--|
| | comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping? |
| | Yes |
| 11. | Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed. |
| | A parcel is considered substantially changed when an addition or major remodel has occurred. Within the commercial class, parcels can also be substantially changed if there has been a change in use in the parcel that would dramatically affect the market value of the parcel. |
| 12. | Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property. |
| | n/a |

37 Gosper
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 : 10
Total Sales Price : 590,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 590,500
Total Assessed Value : 532,121
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 59,050
Avg. Assessed Value : 53,212

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 90
MEAN : 89
COD : 10.58
PRD : 99.06

COV : 16.27
STD : 14.52
Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.96
MAX Sales Ratio : 102.54
MIN Sales Ratio : 60.35

95% Median C.I. : 67.10 to 102.42
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 77.21 to 103.02
95% Mean C.I. : 78.87 to 99.65

Printed:3/18/2011 4:05:32PM

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 | 91.76 | 91.76 | 91.76 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 91.76 | 91.76 | N/A | 18,000 | 16,517 |
| 01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08 | 1 | 92.44 | 92.44 | 92.44 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 92.44 | 92.44 | N/A | 37,000 | 34,202 |
| 01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09 | 1 | 96.93 | 96.93 | 96.93 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 96.93 | 96.93 | N/A | 65,500 | 63,488 |
| 01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09 | 2 | 100.50 | 100.50 | 101.68 | 02.03 | 98.84 | 98.46 | 102.54 | N/A | 47,500 | 48,298 |
| 01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09 | 1 | 84.86 | 84.86 | 84.86 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 84.86 | 84.86 | N/A | 50,000 | 42,430 |
| 01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10 | 2 | 78.05 | 78.05 | 76.57 | 22.68 | 101.93 | 60.35 | 95.75 | N/A | 60,000 | 45,945 |
| 01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10 | 2 | 84.76 | 84.76 | 91.22 | 20.84 | 92.92 | 67.10 | 102.42 | N/A | 102,500 | 93,500 |
| <u>Study Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08 | 1 | 91.76 | 91.76 | 91.76 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 91.76 | 91.76 | N/A | 18,000 | 16,517 |
| 01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09 | 4 | 97.70 | 97.59 | 98.37 | 02.98 | 99.21 | 92.44 | 102.54 | N/A | 49,375 | 48,572 |
| 01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10 | 5 | 84.86 | 82.10 | 85.68 | 16.66 | 95.82 | 60.35 | 102.42 | N/A | 75,000 | 64,264 |
| <u>Calendar Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08 | 2 | 92.10 | 92.10 | 92.22 | 00.37 | 99.87 | 91.76 | 92.44 | N/A | 27,500 | 25,360 |
| 01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09 | 4 | 97.70 | 95.70 | 96.21 | 04.91 | 99.47 | 84.86 | 102.54 | N/A | 52,625 | 50,629 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 10 | 94.10 | 89.26 | 90.11 | 10.58 | 99.06 | 60.35 | 102.54 | 67.10 to 102.42 | 59,050 | 53,212 |

VALUATION GROUPING

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 01 | 8 | 93.76 | 87.22 | 85.74 | 11.95 | 101.73 | 60.35 | 102.54 | 60.35 to 102.54 | 51,688 | 44,317 |
| 02 | 1 | 92.44 | 92.44 | 92.44 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 92.44 | 92.44 | N/A | 37,000 | 34,202 |
| 03 | 1 | 102.42 | 102.42 | 102.42 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 102.42 | 102.42 | N/A | 140,000 | 143,384 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 10 | 94.10 | 89.26 | 90.11 | 10.58 | 99.06 | 60.35 | 102.54 | 67.10 to 102.42 | 59,050 | 53,212 |

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 | 10 | 94.10 | 89.26 | 90.11 | 10.58 | 99.06 | 60.35 | 102.54 | 67.10 to 102.42 | 59,050 | 53,212 |
| 04 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>ALL</u> | 10 | 94.10 | 89.26 | 90.11 | 10.58 | 99.06 | 60.35 | 102.54 | 67.10 to 102.42 | 59,050 | 53,212 |

37 Gosper
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 : 10
Total Sales Price : 590,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 590,500
Total Assessed Value : 532,121
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 59,050
Avg. Assessed Value : 53,212

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 90
MEAN : 89
COD : 10.58
PRD : 99.06

COV : 16.27
STD : 14.52
Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.96
MAX Sales Ratio : 102.54
MIN Sales Ratio : 60.35

95% Median C.I. : 67.10 to 102.42
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 77.21 to 103.02
95% Mean C.I. : 78.87 to 99.65

Printed:3/18/2011 4:05:32PM

| SALE PRICE * | | | | | | | | | | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
|----------------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| _____ Low \$ _____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 TO 4999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5000 TO 9999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _____ Total \$ _____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 TO 9999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10000 TO 29999 | 2 | 95.11 | 95.11 | 95.29 | 03.52 | 99.81 | 91.76 | 98.46 | N/A | 19,000 | 18,105 |
| 30000 TO 59999 | 3 | 92.44 | 91.02 | 91.05 | 03.93 | 99.97 | 84.86 | 95.75 | N/A | 47,333 | 43,098 |
| 60000 TO 99999 | 4 | 82.02 | 81.73 | 82.53 | 21.96 | 99.03 | 60.35 | 102.54 | N/A | 67,625 | 55,808 |
| 100000 TO 149999 | 1 | 102.42 | 102.42 | 102.42 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 102.42 | 102.42 | N/A | 140,000 | 143,384 |
| 150000 TO 249999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 250000 TO 499999 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 500000 + | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _____ ALL _____ | 10 | 94.10 | 89.26 | 90.11 | 10.58 | 99.06 | 60.35 | 102.54 | 67.10 to 102.42 | 59,050 | 53,212 |

| OCCUPANCY CODE | | | | | | | | | | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|------------|-----------|
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Sale Price | Assd. Val |
| Blank | 1 | 84.86 | 84.86 | 84.86 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 84.86 | 84.86 | N/A | 50,000 | 42,430 |
| 340 | 1 | 95.75 | 95.75 | 95.75 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 95.75 | 95.75 | N/A | 55,000 | 52,663 |
| 349 | 1 | 60.35 | 60.35 | 60.35 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 60.35 | 60.35 | N/A | 65,000 | 39,226 |
| 386 | 1 | 98.46 | 98.46 | 98.46 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 98.46 | 98.46 | N/A | 20,000 | 19,692 |
| 406 | 2 | 84.82 | 84.82 | 86.09 | 20.89 | 98.52 | 67.10 | 102.54 | N/A | 70,000 | 60,260 |
| 410 | 2 | 94.35 | 94.35 | 95.81 | 02.75 | 98.48 | 91.76 | 96.93 | N/A | 41,750 | 40,003 |
| 442 | 1 | 102.42 | 102.42 | 102.42 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 102.42 | 102.42 | N/A | 140,000 | 143,384 |
| 472 | 1 | 92.44 | 92.44 | 92.44 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 92.44 | 92.44 | N/A | 37,000 | 34,202 |
| _____ ALL _____ | 10 | 94.10 | 89.26 | 90.11 | 10.58 | 99.06 | 60.35 | 102.54 | 67.10 to 102.42 | 59,050 | 53,212 |

**2011 Correlation Section
for Gosper County**

A. Commerical Real Property

The commercial sample is not representative of commercial parcels in Gosper County. The ten sales represent seven different occupancy codes and include one vacant lot. A query of non-qualified sales indicated that only five sales were excluded from the statistics, all were not arm's length transactions. The assessor clearly attempted to make all arm's length transactions available for measurement purposes.

All commercial parcels in the county were physically inspected for the 2010 assessment year. New costing tables were implemented this year, this is done biannually. When a lack of reliable information exists, determinations regarding assessment quality must be based on the assessment process. Since every effort has been made to keep both the property listing and the costing indexes current, and because the assessor uses a consistent process to apply depreciation, it is believed that assessments are uniform and proportionate within the commercial class.

There is no reliable information available to determine the level of value of commercial parcels in Gosper County.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper County

taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Agricultural

Agricultural improvements were revalued using the Marshall and Swift June, 2010 costing tables. The pickup work was completed timely.

The county received updated imagery, and began a county wide review of agricultural land parcels. This project will take two years to complete and will be implemented for 2012.

A study of agricultural land sales was completed to determine the market value of agricultural land within the county. The preliminary statistics indicated that the market value of grassland was very similar in both market areas. After conducting the ratio study and plotting sales the assessor determined that grassland would be valued the same throughout the county. The result was that grassland within market area 1 had very little change while area 4 was increased approximately 25%.

The assessor also valued dry land the same in both market areas. There are very few sales of dry land within Gosper County. The assessor considered sales from outside the county, but still found very few sales. After reviewing all available information, the assessor decided to value dry land as one market area. For 2011, dry land was increased 32% in area 1 and 36% in area 4.

Irrigated land increased 21% in area 1 and about 7% in area 4.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Gosper County

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | Valuation data collection done by: | |
| | The contracted appraiser and the deputy assessor. | |
| 2. | List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique. | |
| | Market Area | Description of unique characteristics |
| | 01 | This area consists of flat, rich farmland. Irrigation is accessible and well depths are shallow. There are currently no irrigation restrictions in this area. |
| | 04 | The terrain in this area is rougher than area 1, and generally the soils are poorer. Well depths can be extreme. There are currently no water restrictions, except in one township; however, it is not always possible for irrigators to pump a sufficient amount of water for their crops in this area. |
| 3. | Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas. | |
| | The market areas were developed based on topography, soil type and access to water for irrigation. Sales are plotted annually, and a sales study is completed to monitor the market areas. | |
| 4. | Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county. | |
| | Non-agricultural land uses are indentified by completing the land use study and through the sales verification process. Currently, the only recreational parcels within the county are those at Johnson Lake. Both recreational and rural residential parcels are valued using current sales data. | |
| 5. | Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences? | |
| | Farm home sites and rural home sites carry the same value countywide. | |
| 6. | What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values? | |
| | Primarily, lcg's are used to assign values; however, the assessor also differentiates a value (by lcg) for irrigated grassland acres. | |
| 7. | What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) | |
| | Discovery through information collected from NRD's, tax payers, and some physical inspection. Land use maps are reviewed when they are available. The office did obtain new imagery in 2010. | |
| 8. | Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics. | |
| | The assessor conducts a sales ratio study and a sales verification process to attempt to identify sales that have a non-agricultural influence. Land sales are also plotted annually to look for areas of non-agricultural influence. At this time, the office has not observed a non-agricultural influence in the sales of agricultural land. | |
| 9. | Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels. | |

| | |
|-----|---|
| | No |
| 10. | Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class? |
| | Yes |
| 11. | Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed. |
| | Generally a parcel is considered substantially changed when an improvement has been added to or removed from a parcel. In the agricultural class land use changes will also constitute a parcel being coded substantially changed. |
| 12. | Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property. |
| | <p>The assessor has the following written policy to aid in the classification of land within the county.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Standards for Agricultural/Horticultural Parcels and Standards for Residential/Commercial Parcels</p> <p><u>Agricultural/Horticultural Parcels</u></p> <p>Agricultural parcels and horticultural parcels consist of land used for the production of agricultural products such as grain and feed crops; forages and sod crops; animal production including breeding, feeding, or grazing of cattle, horses, swine, sheep, goats, bees or poultry; or horticultural products such as fruits, vegetables, flowers or ornamental plants, seeds, grasses, trees, and other horticultural crops.</p> <p><u>Residential Parcels</u></p> <p>Parcels of land under and directly surrounding residential buildings and their outbuildings that are primarily used for residential purposes not for agricultural, horticultural or commercial purposes within a village or established rural subdivision.</p> <p><u>Acreage Parcels</u></p> <p>Parcels of land under and directly surrounding residential buildings and their outbuildings that are primarily used for residential purposes outside of an established village or rural subdivision.</p> <p><u>Commercial Parcels</u></p> <p>Parcels of land under and directly surrounding commercial buildings and their outbuildings, used primarily for commercial purposes not for agricultural, horticultural or residential purposes.</p> |

Recreational Parcels

Parcels of land directly surrounding recreational areas (such as lakes or canals) that are primarily used for recreational, residential, or commercial purposes. These parcels may be deeded or leased lots and are not used for agricultural or horticultural purposes.

37 Gosper
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 : 33
 Total Sales Price : 10,130,533
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,110,533
 Total Assessed Value : 7,145,518
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 306,380
 Avg. Assessed Value : 216,531

MEDIAN : 77
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 20.20
 PRD : 107.06

COV : 26.58
 STD : 20.11
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.48
 MAX Sales Ratio : 130.62
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.34

95% Median C.I. : 66.26 to 82.69
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.54 to 78.81
 95% Mean C.I. : 68.80 to 82.52

Printed:3/18/2011 4:05:34PM

DATE OF SALE *

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------------------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| <u>Qtrts</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07 | 4 | 80.37 | 71.89 | 77.11 | 21.94 | 93.23 | 33.34 | 93.48 | N/A | 100,018 | 77,126 |
| 01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08 | 7 | 84.31 | 91.28 | 93.55 | 11.14 | 97.57 | 80.34 | 110.72 | 80.34 to 110.72 | 238,389 | 223,018 |
| 01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08 | 3 | 66.95 | 65.26 | 66.58 | 03.94 | 98.02 | 60.46 | 68.37 | N/A | 309,654 | 206,171 |
| 01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08 | 2 | 62.99 | 62.99 | 56.10 | 25.29 | 112.28 | 47.06 | 78.91 | N/A | 115,163 | 64,603 |
| 01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08 | 1 | 53.25 | 53.25 | 53.25 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 53.25 | 53.25 | N/A | 200,000 | 106,494 |
| 01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09 | 3 | 89.38 | 92.52 | 83.97 | 27.24 | 110.18 | 57.57 | 130.62 | N/A | 255,533 | 214,574 |
| 01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09 | 2 | 78.71 | 78.71 | 78.50 | 02.62 | 100.27 | 76.65 | 80.77 | N/A | 249,500 | 195,851 |
| 01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09 | 2 | 85.89 | 85.89 | 89.89 | 09.75 | 95.55 | 77.52 | 94.26 | N/A | 175,928 | 158,136 |
| 01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09 | 2 | 67.44 | 67.44 | 61.45 | 11.46 | 109.75 | 59.71 | 75.17 | N/A | 311,500 | 191,409 |
| 01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10 | 4 | 60.25 | 58.29 | 58.49 | 12.07 | 99.66 | 46.38 | 66.26 | N/A | 862,250 | 504,320 |
| 01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10 | 3 | 68.31 | 73.44 | 67.46 | 19.40 | 108.86 | 56.13 | 95.89 | N/A | 331,000 | 223,293 |
| <u>Study Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08 | 14 | 82.07 | 80.16 | 83.00 | 16.55 | 96.58 | 33.34 | 110.72 | 66.95 to 98.54 | 214,125 | 177,725 |
| 01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09 | 8 | 77.78 | 76.78 | 74.95 | 23.32 | 102.44 | 47.06 | 130.62 | 47.06 to 130.62 | 211,991 | 158,891 |
| 01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10 | 11 | 66.26 | 69.10 | 62.51 | 17.63 | 110.54 | 46.38 | 95.89 | 55.65 to 94.26 | 492,441 | 307,841 |
| <u>Calendar Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08 | 13 | 80.34 | 78.00 | 79.77 | 17.59 | 97.78 | 47.06 | 110.72 | 60.46 to 98.54 | 232,924 | 185,795 |
| 01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09 | 9 | 77.52 | 82.41 | 77.42 | 18.05 | 106.45 | 57.57 | 130.62 | 59.71 to 94.26 | 248,939 | 192,724 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 33 | 76.65 | 75.66 | 70.67 | 20.20 | 107.06 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 66.26 to 82.69 | 306,380 | 216,531 |

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 | 78.91 | 78.02 | 76.04 | 19.29 | 102.60 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 64.85 to 89.38 | 311,420 | 236,813 |
| 4 | 16 | 75.17 | 73.15 | 64.77 | 20.51 | 112.94 | 46.38 | 100.92 | 55.65 to 93.48 | 301,025 | 194,981 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 33 | 76.65 | 75.66 | 70.67 | 20.20 | 107.06 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 66.26 to 82.69 | 306,380 | 216,531 |

37 Gosper
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 : 33 | MEDIAN : 77 | COV : 26.58 | 95% Median C.I. : 66.26 to 82.69 |
| Total Sales Price : 10,130,533 | WGT. MEAN : 71 | STD : 20.11 | 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.54 to 78.81 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,110,533 | MEAN : 76 | Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.48 | 95% Mean C.I. : 68.80 to 82.52 |
| Total Assessed Value : 7,145,518 | | | |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 306,380 | COD : 20.20 | MAX Sales Ratio : 130.62 | |
| Avg. Assessed Value : 216,531 | PRD : 107.06 | MIN Sales Ratio : 33.34 | |

Printed:3/18/2011 4:05:34PM

95%MLU By Market Area

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Irrigated | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 6 | 88.48 | 89.02 | 80.92 | 25.83 | 110.01 | 56.13 | 130.62 | 56.13 to 130.62 | 346,129 | 280,099 |
| 1 | 6 | 88.48 | 89.02 | 80.92 | 25.83 | 110.01 | 56.13 | 130.62 | 56.13 to 130.62 | 346,129 | 280,099 |
| Grass | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 5 | 68.37 | 65.58 | 68.58 | 17.24 | 95.63 | 33.34 | 80.34 | N/A | 210,172 | 144,145 |
| 1 | 5 | 68.37 | 65.58 | 68.58 | 17.24 | 95.63 | 33.34 | 80.34 | N/A | 210,172 | 144,145 |
| ALL | 33 | 76.65 | 75.66 | 70.67 | 20.20 | 107.06 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 66.26 to 82.69 | 306,380 | 216,531 |

80%MLU By Market Area

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Irrigated | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 9 | 89.38 | 86.33 | 80.56 | 21.81 | 107.16 | 56.13 | 130.62 | 57.57 to 110.72 | 324,464 | 261,377 |
| 1 | 7 | 89.38 | 89.07 | 82.10 | 21.91 | 108.49 | 56.13 | 130.62 | 56.13 to 130.62 | 344,539 | 282,859 |
| 4 | 2 | 76.73 | 76.73 | 73.25 | 24.97 | 104.75 | 57.57 | 95.89 | N/A | 254,200 | 186,190 |
| Dry | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 2 | 84.33 | 84.33 | 83.70 | 10.86 | 100.75 | 75.17 | 93.48 | N/A | 114,750 | 96,050 |
| 4 | 2 | 84.33 | 84.33 | 83.70 | 10.86 | 100.75 | 75.17 | 93.48 | N/A | 114,750 | 96,050 |
| Grass | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 8 | 67.63 | 62.07 | 64.56 | 17.63 | 96.14 | 33.34 | 80.34 | 33.34 to 80.34 | 207,607 | 134,029 |
| 1 | 6 | 68.34 | 66.04 | 68.53 | 14.40 | 96.37 | 33.34 | 80.34 | 33.34 to 80.34 | 215,976 | 148,013 |
| 4 | 2 | 50.16 | 50.16 | 50.45 | 06.18 | 99.43 | 47.06 | 53.25 | N/A | 182,500 | 92,075 |
| ALL | 33 | 76.65 | 75.66 | 70.67 | 20.20 | 107.06 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 66.26 to 82.69 | 306,380 | 216,531 |

37 Gosper
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 : 37
 Total Sales Price : 11,248,533
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 11,228,533
 Total Assessed Value : 7,888,073
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 303,474
 Avg. Assessed Value : 213,191

MEDIAN : 75
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 19.53
 PRD : 106.43

COV : 25.64
 STD : 19.17
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.68
 MAX Sales Ratio : 130.62
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.34

95% Median C.I. : 66.95 to 80.77
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.93 to 77.57
 95% Mean C.I. : 68.59 to 80.95

Printed:3/18/2011 4:05:37PM

DATE OF SALE *

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------------------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| <u>Qtrts</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07 | 4 | 80.37 | 71.89 | 77.11 | 21.94 | 93.23 | 33.34 | 93.48 | N/A | 100,018 | 77,126 |
| 01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08 | 7 | 84.31 | 91.28 | 93.55 | 11.14 | 97.57 | 80.34 | 110.72 | 80.34 to 110.72 | 238,389 | 223,018 |
| 01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08 | 3 | 66.95 | 65.26 | 66.58 | 03.94 | 98.02 | 60.46 | 68.37 | N/A | 309,654 | 206,171 |
| 01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08 | 3 | 68.62 | 64.86 | 60.68 | 15.48 | 106.89 | 47.06 | 78.91 | N/A | 121,108 | 73,490 |
| 01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08 | 1 | 53.25 | 53.25 | 53.25 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 53.25 | 53.25 | N/A | 200,000 | 106,494 |
| 01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09 | 4 | 75.48 | 84.79 | 75.83 | 33.41 | 111.82 | 57.57 | 130.62 | N/A | 301,025 | 228,270 |
| 01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09 | 4 | 73.23 | 74.24 | 73.93 | 06.10 | 100.42 | 69.72 | 80.77 | N/A | 261,625 | 193,409 |
| 01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09 | 2 | 85.89 | 85.89 | 89.89 | 09.75 | 95.55 | 77.52 | 94.26 | N/A | 175,928 | 158,136 |
| 01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09 | 2 | 67.44 | 67.44 | 61.45 | 11.46 | 109.75 | 59.71 | 75.17 | N/A | 311,500 | 191,409 |
| 01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10 | 4 | 60.25 | 58.29 | 58.49 | 12.07 | 99.66 | 46.38 | 66.26 | N/A | 862,250 | 504,320 |
| 01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10 | 3 | 68.31 | 73.44 | 67.46 | 19.40 | 108.86 | 56.13 | 95.89 | N/A | 331,000 | 223,293 |
| <u>Study Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08 | 14 | 82.07 | 80.16 | 83.00 | 16.55 | 96.58 | 33.34 | 110.72 | 66.95 to 98.54 | 214,125 | 177,725 |
| 01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09 | 12 | 69.77 | 73.66 | 71.56 | 20.11 | 102.93 | 47.06 | 130.62 | 57.57 to 80.77 | 234,494 | 167,807 |
| 01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10 | 11 | 66.26 | 69.10 | 62.51 | 17.63 | 110.54 | 46.38 | 95.89 | 55.65 to 94.26 | 492,441 | 307,841 |
| <u>Calendar Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08 | 14 | 79.63 | 77.33 | 79.30 | 17.52 | 97.52 | 47.06 | 110.72 | 60.46 to 98.54 | 225,786 | 179,043 |
| 01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09 | 12 | 75.91 | 78.56 | 73.97 | 17.09 | 106.21 | 57.57 | 130.62 | 61.57 to 89.38 | 268,788 | 198,817 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 37 | 75.17 | 74.77 | 70.25 | 19.53 | 106.43 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 66.95 to 80.77 | 303,474 | 213,191 |

AREA (MARKET)

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 19 | 76.65 | 76.72 | 74.73 | 19.43 | 102.66 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 64.85 to 84.31 | 314,691 | 235,156 |
| 4 | 18 | 72.45 | 72.70 | 65.15 | 19.83 | 111.59 | 46.38 | 100.92 | 57.57 to 85.56 | 291,633 | 190,006 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 37 | 75.17 | 74.77 | 70.25 | 19.53 | 106.43 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 66.95 to 80.77 | 303,474 | 213,191 |

37 Gosper
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 : 37
 Total Sales Price : 11,248,533
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 11,228,533
 Total Assessed Value : 7,888,073
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 303,474
 Avg. Assessed Value : 213,191

MEDIAN : 75
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 75
 COD : 19.53
 PRD : 106.43

COV : 25.64
 STD : 19.17
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.68
 MAX Sales Ratio : 130.62
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.34

95% Median C.I. : 66.95 to 80.77
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.93 to 77.57
 95% Mean C.I. : 68.59 to 80.95

Printed:3/18/2011 4:05:37PM

95%MLU By Market Area

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Irrigated | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 8 | 76.25 | 83.19 | 76.86 | 28.04 | 108.24 | 56.13 | 130.62 | 56.13 to 130.62 | 345,222 | 265,340 |
| 1 | 8 | 76.25 | 83.19 | 76.86 | 28.04 | 108.24 | 56.13 | 130.62 | 56.13 to 130.62 | 345,222 | 265,340 |
| Grass | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 5 | 68.37 | 65.58 | 68.58 | 17.24 | 95.63 | 33.34 | 80.34 | N/A | 210,172 | 144,145 |
| 1 | 5 | 68.37 | 65.58 | 68.58 | 17.24 | 95.63 | 33.34 | 80.34 | N/A | 210,172 | 144,145 |
| ALL | 37 | 75.17 | 74.77 | 70.25 | 19.53 | 106.43 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 66.95 to 80.77 | 303,474 | 213,191 |

80%MLU By Market Area

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Irrigated | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 12 | 76.25 | 81.51 | 76.92 | 25.04 | 105.97 | 56.13 | 130.62 | 59.71 to 95.89 | 325,431 | 250,307 |
| 1 | 9 | 82.69 | 83.88 | 78.21 | 23.88 | 107.25 | 56.13 | 130.62 | 59.71 to 110.72 | 344,086 | 269,127 |
| 4 | 3 | 69.72 | 74.39 | 71.94 | 18.32 | 103.41 | 57.57 | 95.89 | N/A | 269,467 | 193,847 |
| Dry | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 2 | 84.33 | 84.33 | 83.70 | 10.86 | 100.75 | 75.17 | 93.48 | N/A | 114,750 | 96,050 |
| 4 | 2 | 84.33 | 84.33 | 83.70 | 10.86 | 100.75 | 75.17 | 93.48 | N/A | 114,750 | 96,050 |
| Grass | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 8 | 67.63 | 62.07 | 64.56 | 17.63 | 96.14 | 33.34 | 80.34 | 33.34 to 80.34 | 207,607 | 134,029 |
| 1 | 6 | 68.34 | 66.04 | 68.53 | 14.40 | 96.37 | 33.34 | 80.34 | 33.34 to 80.34 | 215,976 | 148,013 |
| 4 | 2 | 50.16 | 50.16 | 50.45 | 06.18 | 99.43 | 47.06 | 53.25 | N/A | 182,500 | 92,075 |
| ALL | 37 | 75.17 | 74.77 | 70.25 | 19.53 | 106.43 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 66.95 to 80.77 | 303,474 | 213,191 |

37 Gosper
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 : 81
 Total Sales Price : 21,085,588
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,007,363
 Total Assessed Value : 14,697,103
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 259,350
 Avg. Assessed Value : 181,446

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 23.55
 PRD : 107.93

COV : 31.16
 STD : 23.53
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.44
 MAX Sales Ratio : 167.73
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.34

95% Median C.I. : 68.12 to 75.17
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.54 to 74.39
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.39 to 80.63

Printed:3/18/2011 4:05:40PM

DATE OF SALE *

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| <u>Qtrts</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07 | 6 | 89.52 | 88.76 | 85.93 | 26.89 | 103.29 | 33.34 | 140.44 | 33.34 to 140.44 | 85,526 | 73,491 |
| 01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07 | 1 | 116.61 | 116.61 | 116.61 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 116.61 | 116.61 | N/A | 69,375 | 80,900 |
| 01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08 | 17 | 80.34 | 81.42 | 77.88 | 23.19 | 104.55 | 51.48 | 167.73 | 58.87 to 98.54 | 229,896 | 179,037 |
| 01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08 | 8 | 67.66 | 78.35 | 77.83 | 26.75 | 100.67 | 55.38 | 121.13 | 55.38 to 121.13 | 317,120 | 246,807 |
| 01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08 | 7 | 68.62 | 65.69 | 62.02 | 19.34 | 105.92 | 33.67 | 94.45 | 33.67 to 94.45 | 91,675 | 56,859 |
| 01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08 | 2 | 53.76 | 53.76 | 54.02 | 00.95 | 99.52 | 53.25 | 54.27 | N/A | 405,000 | 218,772 |
| 01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09 | 7 | 64.09 | 75.14 | 69.21 | 26.32 | 108.57 | 54.43 | 130.62 | 54.43 to 130.62 | 340,106 | 235,401 |
| 01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09 | 10 | 73.49 | 73.67 | 72.92 | 11.28 | 101.03 | 57.32 | 85.45 | 59.73 to 85.11 | 207,570 | 151,354 |
| 01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09 | 5 | 77.52 | 88.38 | 78.67 | 24.36 | 112.34 | 66.87 | 135.15 | N/A | 225,291 | 177,243 |
| 01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09 | 7 | 69.97 | 69.01 | 63.16 | 12.21 | 109.26 | 55.18 | 87.64 | 55.18 to 87.64 | 275,296 | 173,887 |
| 01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10 | 5 | 55.65 | 56.86 | 58.32 | 12.08 | 97.50 | 46.38 | 66.26 | N/A | 705,790 | 411,635 |
| 01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10 | 6 | 68.48 | 69.53 | 67.07 | 11.96 | 103.67 | 56.13 | 95.89 | 56.13 to 95.89 | 248,167 | 166,445 |
| <u>Study Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08 | 32 | 80.90 | 83.13 | 78.83 | 26.13 | 105.45 | 33.34 | 167.73 | 66.95 to 93.48 | 219,616 | 173,123 |
| 01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09 | 26 | 69.20 | 70.39 | 67.65 | 18.67 | 104.05 | 33.67 | 130.62 | 59.73 to 78.91 | 227,237 | 153,727 |
| 01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10 | 23 | 68.12 | 70.72 | 63.93 | 17.32 | 110.62 | 46.38 | 135.15 | 59.71 to 73.64 | 350,934 | 224,359 |
| <u>Calendar Yrs</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08 | 34 | 69.26 | 75.83 | 74.13 | 25.90 | 102.29 | 33.67 | 167.73 | 60.46 to 82.69 | 232,262 | 172,166 |
| 01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09 | 29 | 69.99 | 75.44 | 70.10 | 18.19 | 107.62 | 54.43 | 135.15 | 64.09 to 80.77 | 258,964 | 181,544 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 81 | 69.81 | 75.51 | 69.96 | 23.55 | 107.93 | 33.34 | 167.73 | 68.12 to 75.17 | 259,350 | 181,446 |

AREA (MARKET)

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|------------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1 | 35 | 69.84 | 74.40 | 71.86 | 20.95 | 103.53 | 33.34 | 130.62 | 64.85 to 80.34 | 292,835 | 210,421 |
| 4 | 46 | 69.20 | 76.36 | 68.16 | 25.74 | 112.03 | 33.67 | 167.73 | 60.84 to 81.45 | 233,873 | 159,399 |
| <u>ALL</u> | 81 | 69.81 | 75.51 | 69.96 | 23.55 | 107.93 | 33.34 | 167.73 | 68.12 to 75.17 | 259,350 | 181,446 |

37 Gosper
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 : 81
 Total Sales Price : 21,085,588
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,007,363
 Total Assessed Value : 14,697,103
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 259,350
 Avg. Assessed Value : 181,446

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 23.55
 PRD : 107.93

COV : 31.16
 STD : 23.53
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.44
 MAX Sales Ratio : 167.73
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.34

95% Median C.I. : 68.12 to 75.17
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.54 to 74.39
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.39 to 80.63

Printed:3/18/2011 4:05:40PM

95%MLU By Market Area

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| _____Irrigated_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 20 | 66.95 | 75.83 | 69.89 | 26.96 | 108.50 | 51.83 | 140.44 | 57.82 to 85.11 | 302,781 | 211,621 |
| 1 | 17 | 69.81 | 74.50 | 70.71 | 21.93 | 105.36 | 54.27 | 130.62 | 57.32 to 85.44 | 325,649 | 230,250 |
| 4 | 3 | 57.82 | 83.36 | 61.23 | 51.09 | 136.14 | 51.83 | 140.44 | N/A | 173,195 | 106,055 |
| _____Dry_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 1 | 58.87 | 58.87 | 58.87 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 58.87 | 58.87 | N/A | 180,000 | 105,970 |
| 4 | 1 | 58.87 | 58.87 | 58.87 | 00.00 | 100.00 | 58.87 | 58.87 | N/A | 180,000 | 105,970 |
| _____Grass_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 12 | 68.66 | 75.25 | 68.86 | 25.44 | 109.28 | 33.34 | 167.73 | 58.23 to 80.34 | 147,806 | 101,783 |
| 1 | 8 | 68.51 | 65.09 | 67.98 | 14.80 | 95.75 | 33.34 | 80.34 | 33.34 to 80.34 | 183,472 | 124,732 |
| 4 | 4 | 78.16 | 95.57 | 73.08 | 41.10 | 130.77 | 58.23 | 167.73 | N/A | 76,475 | 55,885 |
| _____ALL_____ | 81 | 69.81 | 75.51 | 69.96 | 23.55 | 107.93 | 33.34 | 167.73 | 68.12 to 75.17 | 259,350 | 181,446 |

80%MLU By Market Area

| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT.MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95%_Median_C.I. | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd. Val |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| _____Irrigated_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 26 | 69.83 | 75.88 | 71.12 | 23.30 | 106.69 | 51.83 | 140.44 | 59.71 to 85.11 | 302,508 | 215,139 |
| 1 | 19 | 69.84 | 75.24 | 71.88 | 21.38 | 104.67 | 54.27 | 130.62 | 59.71 to 85.44 | 329,188 | 236,637 |
| 4 | 7 | 69.72 | 77.61 | 68.14 | 28.50 | 113.90 | 51.83 | 140.44 | 51.83 to 140.44 | 230,089 | 156,789 |
| _____Dry_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 3 | 75.17 | 75.84 | 72.79 | 15.35 | 104.19 | 58.87 | 93.48 | N/A | 136,500 | 99,357 |
| 4 | 3 | 75.17 | 75.84 | 72.79 | 15.35 | 104.19 | 58.87 | 93.48 | N/A | 136,500 | 99,357 |
| _____Grass_____ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 16 | 68.51 | 72.88 | 66.44 | 24.89 | 109.69 | 33.34 | 167.73 | 53.25 to 80.34 | 151,386 | 100,579 |
| 1 | 9 | 68.37 | 65.45 | 68.03 | 13.19 | 96.21 | 33.34 | 80.34 | 51.15 to 78.91 | 190,308 | 129,468 |
| 4 | 7 | 68.68 | 82.43 | 62.60 | 39.79 | 131.68 | 47.06 | 167.73 | 47.06 to 167.73 | 101,343 | 63,436 |
| _____ALL_____ | 81 | 69.81 | 75.51 | 69.96 | 23.55 | 107.93 | 33.34 | 167.73 | 68.12 to 75.17 | 259,350 | 181,446 |

2011 Correlation Section for Gosper County

A. Agricultural Land

Gosper County is divided into two different market areas, however, the dry and the grass land is valued with one schedule of values countywide; only irrigated land is valued differently. In area 1, well depths are fairly shallow and there are no pumping restrictions on irrigated parcels. In area 4, the well depths can be severe and while there are only regulatory pumping restrictions (from the NRD) in one township, irrigators are often unable to pump the amount of water that irrigators in area 1 can. All areas surrounding Gosper County were considered comparable to either market area 1 or 4. Although Frontier County borders both market areas, it is only comparable to market area 4.

Three statistical samples were analyzed to determine the level of value in Gosper County. The analysis of the base sample indicated several weaknesses in the makeup of the sample. Area 4 contained a disproportionate sample of sales; area 1 was proportionately distributed. Area 1 contained a sample of sales that did not represent the population; crop land was under represented in the sales file and grass land was over represented. The area 4 sample was representative in terms of land use. Also, in the base sample the majority land use subclasses were very small, with none of the substrata containing an adequate number of sales.

Sales from the comparable areas outside of Gosper County were used to expand the base sample. In both the random inclusion and the random exclusion samples, the thresholds for proportionality and representativeness were achieved. In the random inclusion sample, only a very small number of sales were brought in and the subclass samples were still inadequate for measurement purposes. In the random exclusion sample, only the dry subclass and the irrigated subclass for market area 4 remained inadequately small. (Since dry and grass land are valued using one schedule, the county total 95% and 80% majority land use statistics were considered in evaluating these substrata).

A comparison of the statistical measures indicates disparity between all three statistical profiles. The most discrepancy exists within market area 1, with the irrigated substratum containing the most dispersion. In determining which sample(s) were the most reliable, all information was considered.

First, measures of dispersion were considered. The 95% median confidence interval around the random exclusion median is the narrowest, and supports a median within the acceptable range; the interval around both the base and random inclusion medians is considerably wider. In reviewing the coefficient of dispersion in each of the samples, it appears that the random exclusion sample has the highest COD; however, the COD is affected by three mixed use outliers in area 4. When these sales are removed, the COD of the random exclusion sample improves to 20.62%. Further, the COD of the irrigated subclass in market area 1 decreases significantly (from 24-19%) as the sample size increases in each of the three samples, with the random exclusion sample containing the least dispersion.

After analyzing measures of dispersion, a comparison of surrounding county values can be useful in determining which measurement(s) are the most logical in the marketplace. Specifically, since the irrigated subclass in market area 1 contains the most dispersion, an

2011 Correlation Section for Gosper County

analysis of the area 1 values compared to surrounding counties was conducted. Historically, Gosper County's market area 1 irrigated values have been very similar to Dawson and Phelps County's value. For 2010, the values between the three counties only differed by 5-6%, supporting that the three counties share a common market. For 2011, Dawson County's irrigated values rose 15%, Phelps County's values rose 25% and Gosper County's values rose 20% resulting in average irrigated values of \$2020, \$2250, and \$2067, respectively. This analysis supports that the county has established values within the acceptable range for the irrigated subclass in area 1; all information supports that the random exclusion sample produced the most reliable statistical indicators.

The analysis of surrounding county values also supports that inter-county equalization has been achieved. The irrigated values in market area 4 and the dry and grass land values established by the county are reasonably comparable to surrounding counties. All values are generally higher than Frontier and Furnas and lower than Dawson and Phelps.

The assessor attempted to establish values for 2011 based on the general movement of the agricultural market in the region, and considered all available information in making valuation adjustments. The random exclusion statistic supports that all subclasses are within the required range, and where sufficient sales exists, suggests that all land subclasses are assessed proportionately. In the dry land subclass, where market information was lacking, a significant increase (33-36%) in the assessed values was made to keep dry land equalized with irrigated and grass land. All information supports that assessments are uniform and proportionate.

Based on the analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Gosper County has been determined to be at 70%; all subclasses are within the required range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper County**

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

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

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

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30 | Records : 2,887 | Value : 368,144,722 | Growth 2,119,809 | Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41 |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

| | Urban | | SubUrban | | Rural | | Total | | Growth |
|---------------------------------|---------|------------|----------|-------|---------|------------|---------|------------|-----------|
| | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | |
| 01. Res UnImp Land | 71 | 176,050 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 710,795 | 125 | 886,845 | |
| 02. Res Improve Land | 306 | 1,258,810 | 0 | 0 | 597 | 15,767,479 | 903 | 17,026,289 | |
| 03. Res Improvements | 322 | 19,708,382 | 0 | 0 | 667 | 51,546,190 | 989 | 71,254,572 | |
| 04. Res Total | 393 | 21,143,242 | 0 | 0 | 721 | 68,024,464 | 1,114 | 89,167,706 | 1,930,233 |
| % of Res Total | 35.28 | 23.71 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 64.72 | 76.29 | 38.59 | 24.22 | 91.06 |
| 05. Com UnImp Land | 5 | 21,932 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18,200 | 8 | 40,132 | |
| 06. Com Improve Land | 51 | 260,375 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 438,310 | 79 | 698,685 | |
| 07. Com Improvements | 52 | 3,296,715 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 2,503,566 | 88 | 5,800,281 | |
| 08. Com Total | 57 | 3,579,022 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 2,960,076 | 96 | 6,539,098 | 79,088 |
| % of Com Total | 59.38 | 54.73 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 40.63 | 45.27 | 3.33 | 1.78 | 3.73 |
| 09. Ind UnImp Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 10. Ind Improve Land | 1 | 9,035 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9,035 | |
| 11. Ind Improvements | 2 | 937,406 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 937,406 | |
| 12. Ind Total | 2 | 946,441 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 946,441 | 0 |
| % of Ind Total | 100.00 | 100.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.00 |
| 13. Rec UnImp Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 14. Rec Improve Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 27,000 | 36 | 27,000 | |
| 15. Rec Improvements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 66,570 | 38 | 66,570 | |
| 16. Rec Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 93,570 | 38 | 93,570 | 0 |
| % of Rec Total | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 1.32 | 0.03 | 0.00 |
| Res & Rec Total | 393 | 21,143,242 | 0 | 0 | 759 | 68,118,034 | 1,152 | 89,261,276 | 1,930,233 |
| % of Res & Rec Total | 34.11 | 23.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 65.89 | 76.31 | 39.90 | 24.25 | 91.06 |
| Com & Ind Total | 59 | 4,525,463 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 2,960,076 | 98 | 7,485,539 | 79,088 |
| % of Com & Ind Total | 60.20 | 60.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 39.80 | 39.54 | 3.39 | 2.03 | 3.73 |
| 17. Taxable Total | 452 | 25,668,705 | 0 | 0 | 798 | 71,078,110 | 1,250 | 96,746,815 | 2,009,321 |
| % of Taxable Total | 36.16 | 26.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 63.84 | 73.47 | 43.30 | 26.28 | 94.79 |

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

| | Urban | | | SubUrban | | |
|------------------|---------|------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------------|
| | Records | Value Base | Value Excess | Records | Value Base | Value Excess |
| 18. Residential | 4 | 8,600 | 458,931 | 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 | 4 | 8,600 | 458,931 |
| 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 | | | | 4 | 8,600 | 458,931 |

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

| Mineral Interest | Records | Urban Value | Records | SubUrban Value | Records | Rural Value | Records | Total Value | Growth |
|-------------------|---------|-------------|---------|----------------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|--------|
| 23. Producing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24. Non-Producing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8,478 | 3 | 8,478 | 0 |
| 25. Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8,478 | 3 | 8,478 | 0 |

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

| | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
|------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 26. Exempt | 32 | 0 | 227 | 259 |

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

| | Urban | | SubUrban | | Rural | | Total | |
|----------------------|---------|--------|----------|-------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------|
| | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value | Records | Value |
| 27. Ag-Vacant Land | 2 | 41,564 | 0 | 0 | 1,312 | 185,816,692 | 1,314 | 185,858,256 |
| 28. Ag-Improved Land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 306 | 68,058,291 | 306 | 68,058,291 |
| 29. Ag Improvements | 1 | 81,460 | 0 | 0 | 319 | 17,391,422 | 320 | 17,472,882 |
| 30. Ag Total | | | | | | | 1,634 | 271,389,429 |

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 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | |
| 34. HomeSite Total | | | | | | | |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 1 | 0.00 | 81,460 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | |
| 38. FarmSite Total | | | | | | | |
| 39. Road & Ditches | 0 | 0.45 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | |
| | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value | Growth |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 9 | 9.00 | 54,900 | 9 | 9.00 | 54,900 | |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 222 | 226.58 | 1,375,260 | 222 | 226.58 | 1,375,260 | |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 198 | 199.58 | 11,236,401 | 198 | 199.58 | 11,236,401 | 110,488 |
| 34. HomeSite Total | | | | 207 | 235.58 | 12,666,561 | |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 18 | 47.56 | 32,915 | 18 | 47.56 | 32,915 | |
| 36. FarmSite Improv Land | 261 | 897.28 | 546,728 | 261 | 897.28 | 546,728 | |
| 37. FarmSite Improvements | 302 | 0.00 | 6,155,021 | 303 | 0.00 | 6,236,481 | 0 |
| 38. FarmSite Total | | | | 321 | 944.84 | 6,816,124 | |
| 39. Road & Ditches | 0 | 4,477.48 | 0 | 0 | 4,477.93 | 0 | |
| 40. Other- Non Ag Use | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | |
| 41. Total Section VI | | | | 528 | 5,658.35 | 19,482,685 | 110,488 |

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

| Irrigated | Acres | % of Acres* | Value | % of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
|------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| 45. 1A1 | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 46. 1A | 47,292.04 | 87.78% | 101,659,039 | 91.29% | 2,149.60 |
| 47. 2A1 | 1,835.09 | 3.41% | 3,303,162 | 2.97% | 1,800.00 |
| 48. 2A | 500.23 | 0.93% | 750,345 | 0.67% | 1,500.00 |
| 49. 3A1 | 2,377.27 | 4.41% | 3,320,106 | 2.98% | 1,396.60 |
| 50. 3A | 173.34 | 0.32% | 234,010 | 0.21% | 1,350.01 |
| 51. 4A1 | 570.34 | 1.06% | 741,442 | 0.67% | 1,300.00 |
| 52. 4A | 1,129.64 | 2.10% | 1,353,543 | 1.22% | 1,198.21 |
| 53. Total | 53,877.95 | 100.00% | 111,361,647 | 100.00% | 2,066.92 |
| Dry | | | | | |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 55. 1D | 5,898.64 | 69.99% | 4,158,552 | 75.67% | 705.00 |
| 56. 2D1 | 358.21 | 4.25% | 223,882 | 4.07% | 625.00 |
| 57. 2D | 187.72 | 2.23% | 106,062 | 1.93% | 565.00 |
| 58. 3D1 | 1,094.52 | 12.99% | 558,206 | 10.16% | 510.00 |
| 59. 3D | 52.94 | 0.63% | 26,999 | 0.49% | 509.99 |
| 60. 4D1 | 426.31 | 5.06% | 215,287 | 3.92% | 505.00 |
| 61. 4D | 409.85 | 4.86% | 206,977 | 3.77% | 505.01 |
| 62. Total | 8,428.19 | 100.00% | 5,495,965 | 100.00% | 652.09 |
| Grass | | | | | |
| 63. 1G1 | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 64. 1G | 4,329.38 | 7.75% | 2,303,020 | 10.57% | 531.95 |
| 65. 2G1 | 631.57 | 1.13% | 296,066 | 1.36% | 468.78 |
| 66. 2G | 1,032.13 | 1.85% | 434,694 | 2.00% | 421.16 |
| 67. 3G1 | 1,690.42 | 3.03% | 653,195 | 3.00% | 386.41 |
| 68. 3G | 127.15 | 0.23% | 58,407 | 0.27% | 459.36 |
| 69. 4G1 | 1,619.68 | 2.90% | 614,480 | 2.82% | 379.38 |
| 70. 4G | 46,425.35 | 83.12% | 17,418,216 | 79.98% | 375.19 |
| 71. Total | 55,855.68 | 100.00% | 21,778,078 | 100.00% | 389.90 |
| Irrigated Total | | | | | |
| Irrigated Total | 53,877.95 | 45.45% | 111,361,647 | 80.32% | 2,066.92 |
| Dry Total | | | | | |
| Dry Total | 8,428.19 | 7.11% | 5,495,965 | 3.96% | 652.09 |
| Grass Total | | | | | |
| Grass Total | 55,855.68 | 47.11% | 21,778,078 | 15.71% | 389.90 |
| 72. Waste | 356.91 | 0.30% | 10,708 | 0.01% | 30.00 |
| 73. Other | 35.57 | 0.03% | 4,268 | 0.00% | 119.99 |
| 74. Exempt | 5,980.22 | 5.04% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 75. Market Area Total | 118,554.30 | 100.00% | 138,650,666 | 100.00% | 1,169.51 |

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 4

| Irrigated | Acres | % of Acres* | Value | % of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
|------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| 45. 1A1 | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 46. 1A | 23,706.43 | 60.18% | 40,417,350 | 74.34% | 1,704.91 |
| 47. 2A1 | 321.20 | 0.82% | 476,157 | 0.88% | 1,482.43 |
| 48. 2A | 303.48 | 0.77% | 353,554 | 0.65% | 1,165.00 |
| 49. 3A1 | 6,828.65 | 17.33% | 7,067,654 | 13.00% | 1,035.00 |
| 50. 3A | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 51. 4A1 | 1,520.69 | 3.86% | 1,185,977 | 2.18% | 779.89 |
| 52. 4A | 6,712.31 | 17.04% | 4,866,437 | 8.95% | 725.00 |
| 53. Total | 39,392.76 | 100.00% | 54,367,129 | 100.00% | 1,380.13 |
| Dry | | | | | |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 55. 1D | 30,903.94 | 70.20% | 21,784,340 | 76.30% | 704.90 |
| 56. 2D1 | 741.69 | 1.68% | 463,561 | 1.62% | 625.01 |
| 57. 2D | 318.43 | 0.72% | 179,914 | 0.63% | 565.00 |
| 58. 3D1 | 7,874.84 | 17.89% | 4,012,819 | 14.05% | 509.57 |
| 59. 3D | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 60. 4D1 | 2,455.14 | 5.58% | 1,239,673 | 4.34% | 504.93 |
| 61. 4D | 1,726.12 | 3.92% | 871,475 | 3.05% | 504.88 |
| 62. Total | 44,020.16 | 100.00% | 28,551,782 | 100.00% | 648.61 |
| Grass | | | | | |
| 63. 1G1 | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 64. 1G | 5,330.70 | 6.80% | 2,801,106 | 9.24% | 525.47 |
| 65. 2G1 | 729.72 | 0.93% | 339,718 | 1.12% | 465.55 |
| 66. 2G | 565.23 | 0.72% | 237,257 | 0.78% | 419.75 |
| 67. 3G1 | 4,178.76 | 5.33% | 1,590,797 | 5.25% | 380.69 |
| 68. 3G | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 69. 4G1 | 4,960.73 | 6.33% | 1,863,422 | 6.14% | 375.63 |
| 70. 4G | 62,625.68 | 79.89% | 23,493,968 | 77.47% | 375.15 |
| 71. Total | 78,390.82 | 100.00% | 30,326,268 | 100.00% | 386.86 |
| Irrigated Total | | | | | |
| | 39,392.76 | 24.31% | 54,367,129 | 48.00% | 1,380.13 |
| Dry Total | | | | | |
| | 44,020.16 | 27.17% | 28,551,782 | 25.21% | 648.61 |
| Grass Total | | | | | |
| | 78,390.82 | 48.38% | 30,326,268 | 26.78% | 386.86 |
| 72. Waste | 173.30 | 0.11% | 5,199 | 0.00% | 30.00 |
| 73. Other | 47.50 | 0.03% | 5,700 | 0.01% | 120.00 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.00 | 0.00% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| 75. Market Area Total | 162,024.54 | 100.00% | 113,256,078 | 100.00% | 699.01 |

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

| | Urban | | SubUrban | | Rural | | Total | |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76. Irrigated | 13.00 | 27,950 | 0.00 | 0 | 93,257.71 | 165,700,826 | 93,270.71 | 165,728,776 |
| 77. Dry Land | 19.31 | 13,614 | 0.00 | 0 | 52,429.04 | 34,034,133 | 52,448.35 | 34,047,747 |
| 78. Grass | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 134,246.50 | 52,104,346 | 134,246.50 | 52,104,346 |
| 79. Waste | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 530.21 | 15,907 | 530.21 | 15,907 |
| 80. Other | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 83.07 | 9,968 | 83.07 | 9,968 |
| 81. Exempt | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 5,980.22 | 0 | 5,980.22 | 0 |
| 82. Total | 32.31 | 41,564 | 0.00 | 0 | 280,546.53 | 251,865,180 | 280,578.84 | 251,906,744 |

| | Acres | % of Acres* | Value | % of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Irrigated | 93,270.71 | 33.24% | 165,728,776 | 65.79% | 1,776.86 |
| Dry Land | 52,448.35 | 18.69% | 34,047,747 | 13.52% | 649.17 |
| Grass | 134,246.50 | 47.85% | 52,104,346 | 20.68% | 388.12 |
| Waste | 530.21 | 0.19% | 15,907 | 0.01% | 30.00 |
| Other | 83.07 | 0.03% | 9,968 | 0.00% | 120.00 |
| Exempt | 5,980.22 | 2.13% | 0 | 0.00% | 0.00 |
| Total | 280,578.84 | 100.00% | 251,906,744 | 100.00% | 897.81 |

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

37 Gosper

| | 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 | 84,050,096 | 89,167,706 | 5,117,610 | 6.09% | 1,930,233 | 3.79% |
| 02. Recreational | 102,795 | 93,570 | -9,225 | -8.97% | 0 | -8.97% |
| 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling | 11,791,112 | 12,666,561 | 875,449 | 7.42% | 110,488 | 6.49% |
| 04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 95,944,003 | 101,927,837 | 5,983,834 | 6.24% | 2,040,721 | 4.11% |
| 05. Commercial | 6,785,375 | 6,539,098 | -246,277 | -3.63% | 79,088 | -4.80% |
| 06. Industrial | 978,830 | 946,441 | -32,389 | -3.31% | 0 | -3.31% |
| 07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 6,871,919 | 6,816,124 | -55,795 | -0.81% | 0 | -0.81% |
| 08. Minerals | 8,478 | 8,478 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 14,644,602 | 14,310,141 | -334,461 | -2.28% | 79,088 | -2.82% |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 110,588,605 | 116,237,978 | 5,649,373 | 5.11% | 2,119,809 | 3.19% |
| 11. Irrigated | 143,196,150 | 165,728,776 | 22,532,626 | 15.74% | | |
| 12. Dryland | 25,049,845 | 34,047,747 | 8,997,902 | 35.92% | | |
| 13. Grassland | 46,072,676 | 52,104,346 | 6,031,670 | 13.09% | | |
| 14. Wasteland | 16,207 | 15,907 | -300 | -1.85% | | |
| 15. Other Agland | 9,968 | 9,968 | 0 | 0.00% | | |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 214,344,846 | 251,906,744 | 37,561,898 | 17.52% | | |
| 17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed) | 324,933,451 | 368,144,722 | 43,211,271 | 13.30% | 2,119,809 | 12.65% |

**THREE-YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN
GOSPER COUNTY
June 09, 2010
Amended July
Amended October**

Introduction

Pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2005 Nebraska Legislature, the Assessor shall prepare a Plan of Assessment by June 15 and submit this plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year. On or before October 31 the Assessor shall mail the plan and any amendments to the Department of Revenue, Property Tax Division.

2010 Assessment Year

Level of Value, Quality, Uniformity

| PROPERTY CLASS | MEDIAN | COD | PRD |
|-----------------------|---------------|------------|------------|
| Residential | 96 | 12.05 | 104.19 |
| Commercial | 100 | 6.52 | 99.04 |
| Agricultural | 70 | 18.29 | 98.26 |

2011 Assessment Year

Residential

1. All residential buildings to be repriced using the **06/10** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2011, using **06/10** pricing.
3. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value.

Commercial

1. All commercial buildings to be repriced using the **06/10** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2011, using **06/10** pricing.
3. Complete sales ratio study to determine level of value.

Agricultural

1. All agricultural buildings to be repriced using the **06/10** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2011, using **06/10** pricing.
3. Ratio studies and market area study to be completed by March 1, 2011 to determine if level of value is correct and whether market areas should be changed. Correct if needed.
4. Land use will be updated from the FSA CD flown from the 2009 crop year.

Other

The six-year relisting project was completed with the 2009 pickup work. All changes have been implemented that were indicated by the appraiser's notes. Pictures of each site were retaken and have replaced the previous pictures on the property record cards.

2012 Assessment Year

Residential

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2012 using **06/10** pricing.
2. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value. New depreciation applied, if needed.

Commercial

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2012, using **06/10** pricing.
2. Complete the sales ratio studies to determine level of value. New depreciation schedules made up if needed.

Agricultural

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2012, using **06/10** pricing.
2. Market area and ratio studies to be completed to determine the accuracy of market areas and the level of value. Corrections to areas and values completed as needed.
3. No CD for land use will be available from the FSA office.

2013 Assessment Year

Residential

1. All residential buildings to be repriced using the **06/12** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2013 using **06/12** pricing.
3. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value. New depreciation applied, if needed.

Commercial

1. All commercial buildings to be repriced using the **06/12** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2013, using **06/12** pricing.
3. Complete the sales ratio studies to determine level of value. New depreciation schedules made up if needed.

Agricultural

1. All agricultural buildings to be repriced using **06/12** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2013, using **06/12** pricing.
3. Market area and ratio studies to be completed to determine the accuracy of market areas and the level of value. Corrections to areas and values completed as needed.
4. If a CD for land use will be available from the FSA office, we will update the land use.

Summary/Conclusion

Gosper County presently uses the TerraScan CAMA system contracted with the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation. At present, we have no plans to switch to any other system. There are a few problems with this system, but TerraScan seems open to suggestions for improvement and changes.

All of our personal property schedules and real estate records are in both hardcopy and in the computer. We continue to enter all sales into the computer and we use the sales reports generated to compare to our own ratio reports developed on our PC and to sales reports and rosters provided by Property Tax. We also utilize the "Expanded What If" program for ag sales.

We acquired a new server from TerraScan in October, 2005 and at this time we replaced the battery backup on the server. A new PC was purchased in March, 2009 since the mother board on the old PC went down. We were advised to purchase new, rather than put that much money into an old computer.

All other functions and duties required by the Assessor's office are performed in a timely fashion.

2010/11 Budget Request

Salaries
Telephone
PTAS/CAMA
Repair
Mileage
Dues, Registration
Reappraisal
Schooling
Office Supplies
Equipment

Total Request

The budget listed above was approved by the Gosper County Board of Commissioners on.

Cheryl L. Taft, Gosper County Assessor

June 09, 2010

2011 Assessment Survey for Gosper County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

| | |
|-----|---|
| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff: |
| | 1 |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff: |
| | 0 |
| 3. | Other full-time employees: |
| | 0 |
| 4. | Other part-time employees: |
| | 0 |
| 5. | Number of shared employees: |
| | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year: |
| | \$78,916.75 |
| 7. | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above: |
| | n/a |
| 8. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work: |
| | \$500 |
| 9. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget: |
| | n/a |
| 10. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system: |
| | \$4,087.58 |
| 11. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops: |
| | \$500 |
| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds: |
| | n/a |
| 13. | Amount of last year's budget not used: |
| | \$182.83 |

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| | |
|----|---|
| 1. | Administrative software: |
| | TerraScan |
| 2. | CAMA software: |
| | TerraScan |
| 3. | Are cadastral maps currently being used? |
| | Yes |
| 4. | If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps? |
| | The assessor |
| 5. | Does the county have GIS software? |
| | No |

| | |
|----|---|
| 6. | Who maintains the GIS software and maps? |
| | n/a |
| 7. | Personal Property software: |
| | TerraScan |

C. Zoning Information

| | |
|----|---|
| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| | Yes |
| 2. | If so, is the zoning countywide? |
| | Yes |
| 3. | What municipalities in the county are zoned? |
| | All municipalities are zoned |
| 4. | When was zoning implemented? |
| | 1991 |

D. Contracted Services

| | |
|----|---|
| 1. | Appraisal Services: |
| | Gene Witte, Hawk Eye, Inc is hired to assist the deputy with data collection and pickup work. He will not participate in the valuation process. |
| 2. | Other services: |
| | None |

2011 Certification for Gosper 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 Gosper County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

