

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 Holt County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	252	Median	94.35
Total Sales Price	\$16,179,015	Mean	105.53
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$16,168,515	Wgt. Mean	90.13
Total Assessed Value	\$14,572,245	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$51,706
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$64,161	Avg. Assessed Value	\$57,826

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.28 to 98.35
95% Mean C.I	
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	97.61 to 113.45
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	13.97
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.75
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.43

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	259	96	96
2009	266	97	97
2008	256	95	95
2007	260	100	100

2011 Commission Summary for Holt County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	39	Median	95.04
Total Sales Price	\$5,330,550	Mean	91.17
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,287,300	Wgt. Mean	85.94
Total Assessed Value	\$4,543,665	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$82,439
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$135,572	Avg. Assessed Value	\$116,504

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	77.60 to 106.76
95% Mean C.I	80.52 to 101.82
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	78.23 to 93.64
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.86
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.13
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.25

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	37	95	95
2009	48	95	95
2008	52	95	95
2007	57	100	100

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Holt 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	94	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	72	The qualitative measures calculated in the random exclude sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Holt County

For assessment year 2011 the newly elected assessor worked on making sure the sales file was updated with all sales being accurately listed. Returned sales questionnaires were gone through to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

No valuation changes were made to the residential class of property other than sales review and pick up work.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Holt County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and 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	O'Neill- all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of O'Neill. Population of approximately 3,733. Public school as well as a Catholic school. The town offers a variety of jobs, services and goods.
	02	Atkinson- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Atkinson. Population of approximately 1,244, public school, variety of jobs, services and goods. Located on the junction of HWY's 20 & 11.
	03	Stuart- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Stuart. Population of approximately 625. Economic Development Corporation has bought several of the older houses, removed the improvements and resells the vacant lot. Nursing Home and assisted living, grocery store, gas station, lumberyard, bank, café, butcher shop, furniture store, insurance agency, and a six unit motel.
	04	Ewing- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Ewing. Population of approximately 422. Public school, grocery store, bar, post office, bank, feed stores, electrician shop, gas station, 4 unit motel.
	05	Page- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Page. Population of approximately 157. Café/Bar, bank, clinic, feed & trailer store, Coop, electrician shop.
	06	Chambers- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Chambers. Population of approximately 333, public school, Coop/Gas Station, grocery store, bank, mechanic shop, bar, vet clinic, legion hall, church, feed store.
	07	Inman- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Inman. Population of approximately 148. Post office, grocery store, bar, church.
	08	Emmet- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Emmet. Population of approximately 97. Located on HWY 75 eight miles west of O'Neill. Post office, Coop, and hay company.
	09	Rural and Amelia - all improved and unimproved properties located outside the City limits in the rural areas as well as Amelia.

3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.
4	When was the last lot value study completed?
	2001 for all valuation groupings.
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.
	The lot values were established by completing a vacant lot sales study using a price per square foot analysis.
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?
	2002 for each valuation grouping
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?
	The county uses the depreciation tables provided by their CAMA vendor.
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes, in 2006 these were developed for each valuation grouping.
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?
	The last time the depreciation tables were updated was approximately 2002. The new assessor is developing a plan to update these within ever six years.
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 to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

45 Holt
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 : 252
Total Sales Price : 16,179,015
Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,168,515
Total Assessed Value : 14,572,245
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 64,161
Avg. Assessed Value : 57,826

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 90
MEAN : 106
COD : 34.03
PRD : 117.09

COV : 60.79
STD : 64.15
Avg. Abs. Dev : 32.11
MAX Sales Ratio : 608.20
MIN Sales Ratio : 13.67

95% Median C.I. : 90.28 to 98.35
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
95% Mean C.I. : 97.61 to 113.45

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:05PM

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	27	89.12	97.17	86.36	28.74	112.52	41.95	224.60	75.35 to 101.51	54,256	46,855
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	30	98.13	102.66	93.78	26.24	109.47	42.31	294.80	88.20 to 110.57	46,993	44,073
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	21	99.19	119.27	93.08	46.61	128.14	13.67	484.14	77.78 to 129.94	44,627	41,539
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	34	86.38	92.63	86.84	24.48	106.67	39.73	161.90	78.47 to 101.09	83,912	72,865
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	33	90.10	108.18	88.46	42.45	122.29	13.67	503.50	80.05 to 101.00	63,848	56,478
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	36	103.42	113.10	96.99	34.16	116.61	34.96	316.21	92.08 to 112.42	58,569	56,808
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	16	91.34	100.27	85.83	31.11	116.82	43.53	241.68	72.81 to 117.56	103,275	88,640
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	55	93.71	108.92	90.99	35.89	119.71	32.84	608.20	87.47 to 101.53	66,105	60,148
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	112	94.55	101.41	89.08	30.38	113.84	13.67	484.14	86.41 to 99.19	59,508	53,009
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	140	94.13	108.83	90.86	36.98	119.78	13.67	608.20	90.10 to 100.72	67,883	61,680
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	124	94.58	107.22	90.67	36.66	118.25	13.67	503.50	86.41 to 101.00	64,561	58,537
<u>ALL</u>	252	94.35	105.53	90.13	34.03	117.09	13.67	608.20	90.28 to 98.35	64,161	57,826

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	115	94.84	109.72	93.32	33.38	117.57	13.67	503.50	90.84 to 101.01	72,372	67,536
02	45	93.02	98.62	81.87	36.25	120.46	32.84	277.40	72.97 to 104.64	47,083	38,547
03	20	95.47	122.52	90.29	48.19	135.70	62.53	608.20	78.47 to 114.13	53,034	47,883
04	10	94.76	84.42	77.46	23.84	108.99	18.00	132.92	33.98 to 103.55	21,750	16,849
05	7	93.34	101.47	81.70	62.76	124.20	13.67	224.60	13.67 to 224.60	25,986	21,229
06	14	93.00	123.63	89.69	50.35	137.84	67.06	316.21	72.87 to 162.50	29,339	26,314
07	2	115.35	115.35	111.86	07.67	103.12	106.50	124.20	N/A	33,000	36,915
08	1	43.53	43.53	43.53	00.00	100.00	43.53	43.53	N/A	70,000	30,470
09	38	91.52	92.86	89.34	17.81	103.94	58.31	147.82	83.72 to 100.88	97,899	87,462
<u>ALL</u>	252	94.35	105.53	90.13	34.03	117.09	13.67	608.20	90.28 to 98.35	64,161	57,826

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	249	94.51	105.65	90.09	34.10	117.27	13.67	608.20	90.38 to 98.35	64,556	58,158
06											
07	3	79.38	95.47	96.82	21.59	98.61	77.81	129.22	N/A	31,333	30,338
<u>ALL</u>	252	94.35	105.53	90.13	34.03	117.09	13.67	608.20	90.28 to 98.35	64,161	57,826

45 Holt
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 : 252
 Total Sales Price : 16,179,015
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,168,515
 Total Assessed Value : 14,572,245
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 64,161
 Avg. Assessed Value : 57,826

MEDIAN : 94
 WGT. MEAN : 90
 MEAN : 106
 COD : 34.03
 PRD : 117.09

COV : 60.79
 STD : 64.15
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 32.11
 MAX Sales Ratio : 608.20
 MIN Sales Ratio : 13.67

95% Median C.I. : 90.28 to 98.35
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.61 to 113.45

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:05PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	15	154.00	203.39	209.83	66.62	96.93	13.67	608.20	101.00 to 263.25	2,936	6,161	
5000 TO 9999	15	129.94	177.33	168.95	66.62	104.96	76.64	503.50	88.80 to 241.68	6,897	11,652	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	30	139.98	190.36	181.16	68.15	105.08	13.67	608.20	101.00 to 207.47	4,917	8,907	
10000 TO 29999	43	108.80	113.32	112.48	32.02	100.75	18.00	294.80	97.00 to 124.20	17,418	19,592	
30000 TO 59999	62	98.24	98.03	96.51	20.28	101.57	39.73	160.33	90.02 to 106.50	44,282	42,735	
60000 TO 99999	62	80.32	82.76	83.85	23.19	98.70	13.67	155.03	73.57 to 90.38	76,272	63,953	
100000 TO 149999	37	84.84	85.06	84.98	14.24	100.09	58.05	114.13	76.70 to 90.84	118,049	100,318	
150000 TO 249999	14	89.99	89.23	88.47	14.39	100.86	63.81	140.37	75.82 to 96.17	185,707	164,304	
250000 TO 499999	3	101.05	100.78	100.70	01.01	100.08	99.11	102.17	N/A	273,333	275,257	
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	252	94.35	105.53	90.13	34.03	117.09	13.67	608.20	90.28 to 98.35	64,161	57,826	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Holt County**

A. Residential Real Property

The residential sales file for Holt County consists of 252 qualified sales. This sample will be considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. The calculated median is 94%. All valuation groupings that are adequately represented in the sales file are within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is slightly below the range and the mean is above, but most likely to be effected by outliers. The qualitative statistics are above the recommended range but are showing influence from low dollar sales.

All residential sales are reviewed to determine if they are arms length transactions by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A phone call as well as a physical review of the property is performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

The newly elected assessor is developing a plan that will be put in place to inspect and review all properties within the six-year inspection cycle. GIS is currently being implemented as well as the electronic transfer of sales. Holt County is committed to moving forward technologically.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 94% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Holt 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 Holt 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 Holt 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 Holt County**

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

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

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

2011 Commercial Assessment Actions for Holt County

For assessment year 2011 the newly elected assessor worked on making sure the sales file was updated with all sales being accurately listed. Returned sales questionnaires were gone through to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

No valuation changes were made to the commercial class of property other than sales review and pick up work.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Holt County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and 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	O'Neill- all improved and unimproved properties located within the City of O'Neill. Population of approximately 3,733. Public school as well as a Catholic school. The town offers a variety of jobs, services and goods.
	02	Atkinson- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Atkinson. Population of approximately 1,244, public school, variety of jobs, services and goods. Located on the junction of HWY's 20 & 11.
	03	Stuart- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Stuart. Population of approximately 625. Economic Development Corporation has bought several of the older houses, removed the improvements and resells the vacant lot. Nursing Home and assisted living, grocery store, gas station, lumberyard, bank, café, butcher shop, furniture store, insurance agency, and a six unit motel.
	04	Ewing- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Ewing. Population of approximately 422. Public school, grocery store, bar, post office, bank, feed stores, electrician shop, gas station, 4 unit motel.
	05	Page- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Page. Population of approximately 157. Café/Bar, bank, clinic, feed & trailer store, Coop, electrician shop.
	06	Chambers- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Chambers. Population of approximately 333, public school, Coop/Gas Station, grocery store, bank, mechanic shop, bar, vet clinic, legion hall, church, feed store.
	07	Inman- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Inman. Population of approximately 148. Post office, grocery store, bar, church.
	08	Emmet- all improved and unimproved properties located within the Village of Emmet. Population of approximately 97. Located on HWY 75 eight miles west of O'Neill. Post office, Coop, and hay company.
	09	Rural and Amelia - all improved and unimproved properties located outside the City limits in the rural areas as well as Amelia.

3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?
	2002 for all valuation groupings.
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.
	The lot values were established by completing a vacant lot sales study using a price per square foot analysis.
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?
	2002 for all valuation groupings
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?
	The county uses the depreciation tables provided by the CAMA vendor.
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes, these were developed in 2004.
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?
	The last time the depreciation tables were updated was approximately 2004. The new assessor is developing a plan to update these within ever six years.
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 to be substantially changed when improvements are added that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

45 Holt
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 : 39
Total Sales Price : 5,330,550
Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,287,300
Total Assessed Value : 4,543,665
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 135,572
Avg. Assessed Value : 116,504

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 86
MEAN : 91
COD : 26.94
PRD : 106.09

COV : 37.23
STD : 33.94
Avg. Abs. Dev : 25.60
MAX Sales Ratio : 178.19
MIN Sales Ratio : 21.02

95% Median C.I. : 77.60 to 106.76
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 78.23 to 93.64
95% Mean C.I. : 80.52 to 101.82

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:08PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	5	115.84	119.66	119.44	18.47	100.18	91.16	178.19	N/A	79,700	95,191
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	98.06	85.54	93.65	30.09	91.34	39.18	131.84	N/A	66,600	62,373
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	83.60	84.48	76.93	07.95	109.81	74.95	94.90	N/A	162,667	125,138
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	73.92	73.92	94.10	28.57	78.55	52.80	95.04	N/A	113,000	106,335
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	116.62	120.56	83.20	24.10	144.90	80.39	164.68	N/A	839,000	698,020
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	97.34	97.34	97.82	01.14	99.51	96.23	98.45	N/A	41,250	40,350
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	117.56	117.56	117.56	00.00	100.00	117.56	117.56	N/A	25,000	29,390
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	65.05	65.05	62.90	19.29	103.42	52.50	77.60	N/A	24,125	15,175
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	103.00	92.29	65.56	23.80	140.77	55.60	125.50	N/A	16,660	10,922
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	109.77	109.77	110.48	04.13	99.36	105.24	114.30	N/A	95,000	104,960
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	93.58	89.60	89.85	14.14	99.72	67.76	107.45	N/A	116,250	104,445
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	59.65	62.40	64.97	48.05	96.04	21.02	121.62	21.02 to 121.62	91,167	59,233
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	15	95.04	95.15	95.19	24.93	99.96	39.18	178.19	74.95 to 115.84	96,367	91,727
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	8	97.34	100.50	83.60	24.47	120.22	52.50	164.68	52.50 to 164.68	334,094	279,313
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	16	92.50	82.76	79.83	30.22	103.67	21.02	125.50	59.15 to 114.30	73,066	58,329
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	94.97	95.77	83.38	19.42	114.86	52.80	164.68	74.95 to 116.62	331,350	276,285
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	104.12	92.86	93.57	21.76	99.24	52.50	125.50	55.60 to 117.56	34,655	32,427
<u>ALL</u>	39	95.04	91.17	85.94	26.94	106.09	21.02	178.19	77.60 to 106.76	135,572	116,504

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	16	92.50	101.14	88.04	27.43	114.88	51.87	178.19	77.60 to 125.50	223,734	196,967
02	11	96.23	81.88	83.66	26.83	97.87	39.18	117.56	52.50 to 115.84	48,295	40,404
03	1	107.45	107.45	107.45	00.00	100.00	107.45	107.45	N/A	90,000	96,705
04	1	96.59	96.59	96.59	00.00	100.00	96.59	96.59	N/A	23,000	22,215
06	3	105.24	107.75	105.24	03.80	102.39	103.00	115.00	N/A	28,100	29,572
09	7	74.95	72.76	75.60	44.20	96.24	21.02	121.62	21.02 to 121.62	139,857	105,731
<u>ALL</u>	39	95.04	91.17	85.94	26.94	106.09	21.02	178.19	77.60 to 106.76	135,572	116,504

45 Holt
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 : 39
Total Sales Price : 5,330,550
Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,287,300
Total Assessed Value : 4,543,665
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 135,572
Avg. Assessed Value : 116,504

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 86
MEAN : 91
COD : 26.94
PRD : 106.09

COV : 37.23
STD : 33.94
Avg. Abs. Dev : 25.60
MAX Sales Ratio : 178.19
MIN Sales Ratio : 21.02

95% Median C.I. : 77.60 to 106.76
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 78.23 to 93.64
95% Mean C.I. : 80.52 to 101.82

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:08PM

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	39	95.04	91.17	85.94	26.94	106.09	21.02	178.19	77.60 to 106.76	135,572	116,504
04											
<u>ALL</u>	39	95.04	91.17	85.94	26.94	106.09	21.02	178.19	77.60 to 106.76	135,572	116,504

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$</u>											
1 TO 4999	3	115.00	114.50	115.00	06.52	99.57	103.00	125.50	N/A	2,767	3,182
5000 TO 9999	1	52.80	52.80	52.80	00.00	100.00	52.80	52.80	N/A	5,000	2,640
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	4	109.00	99.08	91.62	19.43	108.14	52.80	125.50	N/A	3,325	3,046
10000 TO 29999	7	55.60	67.48	67.86	42.64	99.44	21.02	117.56	21.02 to 117.56	22,964	15,583
30000 TO 59999	9	96.59	92.83	89.33	24.75	103.92	21.03	164.68	62.33 to 115.84	40,167	35,879
60000 TO 99999	7	106.76	110.12	108.35	20.13	101.63	60.15	178.19	60.15 to 178.19	78,286	84,824
100000 TO 149999	6	102.73	93.48	96.08	26.71	97.29	39.18	131.84	39.18 to 131.84	103,958	99,879
150000 TO 249999	3	95.04	101.71	100.67	08.05	101.03	93.58	116.52	N/A	177,000	178,178
250000 TO 499999	2	67.05	67.05	68.85	11.78	97.39	59.15	74.95	N/A	343,500	236,513
500000 +	1	80.39	80.39	80.39	00.00	100.00	80.39	80.39	N/A	2,362,000	1,898,885
<u>ALL</u>	39	95.04	91.17	85.94	26.94	106.09	21.02	178.19	77.60 to 106.76	135,572	116,504

45 Holt
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 : 39
Total Sales Price : 5,330,550
Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,287,300
Total Assessed Value : 4,543,665
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 135,572
Avg. Assessed Value : 116,504

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 86
MEAN : 91
COD : 26.94
PRD : 106.09

COV : 37.23
STD : 33.94
Avg. Abs. Dev : 25.60
MAX Sales Ratio : 178.19
MIN Sales Ratio : 21.02

95% Median C.I. : 77.60 to 106.76
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 78.23 to 93.64
95% Mean C.I. : 80.52 to 101.82

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:08PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	6	57.57	66.28	41.64	60.20	159.17	21.02	125.50	21.02 to 125.50	21,967	9,148
300	1	93.58	93.58	93.58	00.00	100.00	93.58	93.58	N/A	160,000	149,720
306	1	115.84	115.84	115.84	00.00	100.00	115.84	115.84	N/A	50,500	58,500
326	1	103.00	103.00	103.00	00.00	100.00	103.00	103.00	N/A	3,500	3,605
340	1	116.52	116.52	116.52	00.00	100.00	116.52	116.52	N/A	150,000	174,785
341	2	104.67	104.67	101.44	09.20	103.18	95.04	114.30	N/A	165,500	167,880
343	2	74.08	74.08	79.89	08.53	92.73	67.76	80.39	N/A	1,230,375	982,898
344	2	90.86	90.86	80.94	17.51	112.26	74.95	106.76	N/A	260,000	210,453
352	1	91.16	91.16	91.16	00.00	100.00	91.16	91.16	N/A	105,000	95,720
353	2	131.57	131.57	120.78	25.17	108.93	98.45	164.68	N/A	44,500	53,745
386	1	59.15	59.15	59.15	00.00	100.00	59.15	59.15	N/A	265,000	156,740
404	1	52.50	52.50	52.50	00.00	100.00	52.50	52.50	N/A	28,250	14,830
406	6	94.74	89.20	102.82	24.17	86.75	51.87	121.62	51.87 to 121.62	54,167	55,693
419	1	105.24	105.24	105.24	00.00	100.00	105.24	105.24	N/A	80,000	84,190
442	3	83.60	80.11	71.41	14.53	112.18	60.15	96.59	N/A	46,333	33,087
444	1	178.19	178.19	178.19	00.00	100.00	178.19	178.19	N/A	70,000	124,735
470	2	106.23	106.23	104.34	10.67	101.81	94.90	117.56	N/A	30,000	31,303
528	2	67.71	67.71	51.54	42.14	131.37	39.18	96.23	N/A	54,250	27,960
531	1	107.45	107.45	107.45	00.00	100.00	107.45	107.45	N/A	90,000	96,705
532	1	131.84	131.84	131.84	00.00	100.00	131.84	131.84	N/A	100,000	131,840
556	1	77.60	77.60	77.60	00.00	100.00	77.60	77.60	N/A	20,000	15,520
<u>ALL</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>95.04</u>	<u>91.17</u>	<u>85.94</u>	<u>26.94</u>	<u>106.09</u>	<u>21.02</u>	<u>178.19</u>	<u>77.60 to 106.76</u>	<u>135,572</u>	<u>116,504</u>

**2011 Correlation Section
for Holt County**

A. Commerical Real Property

A review of the statistical analysis reveals 39 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate the level of value is within the acceptable range, there are not a sufficient number of sales to have confidence in the calculated statistics. Commercial parcels in Holt County are generally valued by occupancy code. When reviewing the occupancy code of the 39 sales, warehouses (406) have the most number of sales with six. The sample is not representative of the population as a whole. Since commercial parcels in Holt County are made up of a much broader mix of occupancies, the calculated median should not be used as an indication of the level of value in the county.

All commercial sales are reviewed to determine if they are arms length transactions by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A phone call as well as a physical review of the property is performed if there was still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

The newly elected assessor is developing a plan that will be put in place to inspect and review all properties within the six-year inspection cycle. GIS is currently being implemented as well as the electronic transfer of sales. Holt County is committed to moving forward technologically.

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Holt 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 Holt 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 Holt 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 Holt County**

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

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

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

2011 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Holt County

For assessment year 2011 the Holt County Assessor performed a spreadsheet analysis of agricultural sales and adjusted values according to the market. The previous market area 4002 was eliminated and combined into market area 4001.

Market area 4003 is still intact with the only difference from area 4001 being the irrigated values. This market area consists of eight townships in the southern part of the county. The water table in this area is much higher than the other area making it harder to irrigate.

Through the analysis it was determined the dry and grass land values throughout the county would be the same.

All agricultural sales are reviewed by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible. A physical review of the property was performed if there is still a question regarding the sale after the receipt of the questionnaire.

Work is continuing with the implementation of GIS.

Pickup work was completed and placed on the 2011 assessment roll.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Holt County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Deputy	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	4001	This market area is the majority of the county. This area contains a mix of excessively drained sandy soils, well drained silty soils formed in loess and alluvium on stream terraces, and well to somewhat excessively drained loamy soils.
	4003	This market area consists of eight townships in the southern part of the county. The water table in this area is much higher than the other area making it harder to irrigate. It contains excessively drained sandy soils formed in alluvium in valleys and eolian sand on uplands in sandhills.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	The market areas are developed by similar topography, soil characteristics and geographic characteristics. A sale analysis is completed each year to monitor the market areas.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	Residential is land directly associated with a residence, and is defined in Regulation 10.001.05A. Recreational land is defined according to Regulation 10.001.05E.	
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?	
	Yes, they carry the same value.	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	Irrigated, Dry, Grass, CRP, meadow and timber cover.	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	Physical inspection, FSA maps, and GIS imagery.	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales are monitored and studied on a yearly basis to see if there are any non-agricultural characteristics.	
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.
	A parcel is considered to be substantially changed when improvements are added or land use changes that significantly affect the value such that the parcel no longer represents what sold. These sales are discussed with the field liaison as well.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.
	The assessor follows statutes, regulations, and directives, even though there are no specific written county policies or procedures.

45 Holt
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 : 224
Total Sales Price : 140,443,232
Total Adj. Sales Price : 132,857,232
Total Assessed Value : 88,872,810
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 593,113
Avg. Assessed Value : 396,754

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 67
MEAN : 76
COD : 23.98
PRD : 112.89

COV : 30.06
STD : 22.70
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.18
MAX Sales Ratio : 173.28
MIN Sales Ratio : 25.16

95% Median C.I. : 68.25 to 74.84
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
95% Mean C.I. : 72.54 to 78.48

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:11PM

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>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	12	87.66	89.68	85.93	22.09	104.36	60.93	121.76	65.14 to 110.97	555,679	477,514
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	44	82.96	85.46	76.22	21.28	112.12	37.66	150.07	73.03 to 90.52	731,520	557,587
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	22	70.63	74.95	66.22	24.76	113.18	41.88	137.88	59.05 to 88.88	397,727	263,382
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	13	46.88	54.36	44.93	31.29	120.99	34.91	99.40	38.04 to 67.04	985,660	442,906
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	22	68.20	73.42	61.42	24.41	119.54	39.73	112.73	57.97 to 93.49	1,367,317	839,745
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	20	67.65	74.65	73.34	18.33	101.79	53.10	146.76	62.80 to 72.78	427,871	313,817
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	34	72.25	71.34	69.95	18.03	101.99	38.91	104.38	62.46 to 79.22	398,067	278,441
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	6	71.89	68.80	62.77	26.46	109.61	40.22	99.11	40.22 to 99.11	281,163	176,486
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	16	74.48	74.04	76.93	22.76	96.24	25.16	100.71	59.41 to 96.48	228,248	175,593
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	11	61.04	64.31	55.14	18.89	116.63	38.00	102.73	49.66 to 78.16	801,671	442,025
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	24	74.03	78.54	67.25	23.71	116.79	34.43	173.28	62.60 to 86.84	254,526	171,178
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	78	78.53	83.14	75.74	23.61	109.77	37.66	150.07	72.86 to 87.01	610,321	462,287
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	89	67.04	70.12	61.51	22.00	114.00	34.91	146.76	62.88 to 71.79	730,183	449,163
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	57	71.25	73.50	63.35	23.80	116.02	25.16	173.28	62.60 to 78.16	355,543	225,245
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	101	72.28	76.54	65.08	26.16	117.61	34.91	150.07	67.04 to 77.65	830,014	540,202
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	76	70.35	72.58	71.50	20.34	101.51	25.16	146.76	63.86 to 76.77	360,930	258,049
<u>ALL</u>	224	71.64	75.51	66.89	23.98	112.89	25.16	173.28	68.25 to 74.84	593,113	396,754

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
4001	211	72.39	75.38	66.65	23.64	113.10	25.16	173.28	68.25 to 75.04	616,675	411,042
4003	13	68.62	77.67	78.24	25.37	99.27	55.54	146.76	60.39 to 84.94	210,682	164,843
<u>ALL</u>	224	71.64	75.51	66.89	23.98	112.89	25.16	173.28	68.25 to 74.84	593,113	396,754

45 Holt
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 : 224
 Total Sales Price : 140,443,232
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 132,857,232
 Total Assessed Value : 88,872,810
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 593,113
 Avg. Assessed Value : 396,754

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 67
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 23.98
 PRD : 112.89

COV : 30.06
 STD : 22.70
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.18
 MAX Sales Ratio : 173.28
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.16

95% Median C.I. : 68.25 to 74.84
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.54 to 78.48

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:11PM

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	9	87.41	86.62	79.28	15.92	109.26	66.80	125.69	69.46 to 102.73	605,533	480,096
4001	9	87.41	86.62	79.28	15.92	109.26	66.80	125.69	69.46 to 102.73	605,533	480,096
Grass											
County	52	70.13	76.89	76.25	24.00	100.84	37.66	150.07	63.86 to 77.43	160,972	122,740
4001	48	71.56	77.81	76.92	24.90	101.16	37.66	150.07	63.86 to 84.67	163,929	126,089
4003	4	65.89	65.88	65.78	06.24	100.15	60.39	71.36	N/A	125,500	82,551
ALL	224	71.64	75.51	66.89	23.98	112.89	25.16	173.28	68.25 to 74.84	593,113	396,754

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	100	73.13	76.92	65.33	26.51	117.74	34.43	173.28	66.80 to 81.01	705,025	460,609
4001	99	73.09	76.22	65.06	25.78	117.15	34.43	173.28	66.80 to 80.74	709,808	461,830
4003	1	146.76	146.76	146.76	00.00	100.00	146.76	146.76	N/A	231,500	339,760
Dry											
County	2	61.93	61.93	61.90	00.94	100.05	61.35	62.51	N/A	177,180	109,673
4001	1	62.51	62.51	62.51	00.00	100.00	62.51	62.51	N/A	168,000	105,020
4003	1	61.35	61.35	61.35	00.00	100.00	61.35	61.35	N/A	186,360	114,325
Grass											
County	83	70.47	75.84	76.81	21.12	98.74	37.66	150.07	68.13 to 75.08	255,463	196,218
4001	76	70.82	75.76	77.21	21.07	98.12	37.66	150.07	67.04 to 77.43	266,204	205,543
4003	7	68.62	76.66	68.40	20.62	112.08	60.39	127.22	60.39 to 127.22	138,857	94,973
ALL	224	71.64	75.51	66.89	23.98	112.89	25.16	173.28	68.25 to 74.84	593,113	396,754

45 Holt
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 : 236
 Total Sales Price : 144,008,923
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 136,422,923
 Total Assessed Value : 92,679,508
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 578,063
 Avg. Assessed Value : 392,710

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 24.36
 PRD : 112.10

COV : 30.36
 STD : 23.12
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.62
 MAX Sales Ratio : 173.28
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.16

95% Median C.I. : 69.45 to 75.04
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 73.21 to 79.11

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:14PM

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>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	12	87.66	89.68	85.93	22.09	104.36	60.93	121.76	65.14 to 110.97	555,679	477,514
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	44	82.96	85.46	76.22	21.28	112.12	37.66	150.07	73.03 to 90.52	731,520	557,587
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	22	70.63	74.95	66.22	24.76	113.18	41.88	137.88	59.05 to 88.88	397,727	263,382
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	13	46.88	54.36	44.93	31.29	120.99	34.91	99.40	38.04 to 67.04	985,660	442,906
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	20	67.55	69.49	60.99	20.52	113.94	39.73	109.35	57.97 to 73.09	1,491,608	909,697
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	20	67.65	74.65	73.34	18.33	101.79	53.10	146.76	62.80 to 72.78	427,871	313,817
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	36	72.93	72.93	70.69	18.95	103.17	38.91	104.38	62.88 to 80.74	385,530	272,550
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	7	76.77	74.71	66.84	27.45	111.77	40.22	110.16	40.22 to 110.16	263,611	176,185
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	78.19	77.44	81.70	23.10	94.79	25.16	130.62	62.33 to 96.48	233,171	190,509
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	14	61.16	63.16	55.42	18.46	113.97	38.00	102.73	49.66 to 73.09	656,567	363,878
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	30	76.36	82.44	80.28	26.18	102.69	34.43	173.28	70.01 to 88.79	283,378	227,485
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	78	78.53	83.14	75.74	23.61	109.77	37.66	150.07	72.86 to 87.01	610,321	462,287
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	89	67.04	69.83	61.52	21.58	113.51	34.91	146.76	62.88 to 71.79	731,261	449,886
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	69	72.98	76.44	69.86	25.88	109.42	25.16	173.28	63.86 to 79.98	343,995	240,309
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	99	71.49	75.81	64.94	25.82	116.74	34.91	150.07	66.95 to 76.34	844,269	548,282
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	81	71.79	74.51	72.86	21.49	102.26	25.16	146.76	66.24 to 77.70	351,591	256,180
<u>ALL</u>	236	72.34	76.16	67.94	24.36	112.10	25.16	173.28	69.45 to 75.04	578,063	392,710

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
4001	221	72.70	75.86	67.64	24.04	112.15	25.16	173.28	69.46 to 75.08	603,345	408,107
4003	15	68.79	80.64	80.68	28.00	99.95	55.54	146.76	60.93 to 100.00	205,577	165,851
<u>ALL</u>	236	72.34	76.16	67.94	24.36	112.10	25.16	173.28	69.45 to 75.04	578,063	392,710

45 Holt
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 : 236
 Total Sales Price : 144,008,923
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 136,422,923
 Total Assessed Value : 92,679,508
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 578,063
 Avg. Assessed Value : 392,710

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 24.36
 PRD : 112.10

COV : 30.36
 STD : 23.12
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.62
 MAX Sales Ratio : 173.28
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.16

95% Median C.I. : 69.45 to 75.04
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 73.21 to 79.11

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:14PM

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	9	87.41	86.62	79.28	15.92	109.26	66.80	125.69	69.46 to 102.73	605,533	480,096
4001	9	87.41	86.62	79.28	15.92	109.26	66.80	125.69	69.46 to 102.73	605,533	480,096
Dry											
County	1	78.67	78.67	78.67	00.00	100.00	78.67	78.67	N/A	177,750	139,831
4001	1	78.67	78.67	78.67	00.00	100.00	78.67	78.67	N/A	177,750	139,831
Grass											
County	58	71.55	78.72	85.37	25.91	92.21	37.66	150.07	66.24 to 81.15	189,664	161,919
4001	52	72.30	78.89	85.84	26.47	91.90	37.66	150.07	65.14 to 84.67	195,264	167,621
4003	6	69.99	77.25	79.71	18.86	96.91	60.39	100.00	60.39 to 100.00	141,133	112,501
ALL	236	72.34	76.16	67.94	24.36	112.10	25.16	173.28	69.45 to 75.04	578,063	392,710

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	100	73.13	76.92	65.33	26.51	117.74	34.43	173.28	66.80 to 81.01	705,025	460,609
4001	99	73.09	76.22	65.06	25.78	117.15	34.43	173.28	66.80 to 80.74	709,808	461,830
4003	1	146.76	146.76	146.76	00.00	100.00	146.76	146.76	N/A	231,500	339,760
Dry											
County	3	62.51	67.51	67.50	09.23	100.01	61.35	78.67	N/A	177,370	119,725
4001	2	70.59	70.59	70.82	11.45	99.68	62.51	78.67	N/A	172,875	122,426
4003	1	61.35	61.35	61.35	00.00	100.00	61.35	61.35	N/A	186,360	114,325
Grass											
County	91	71.36	77.83	81.39	23.28	95.63	37.66	150.07	68.14 to 77.70	265,843	216,365
4001	82	71.49	77.39	81.66	23.08	94.77	37.66	150.07	68.13 to 77.70	278,963	227,800
4003	9	71.36	81.85	76.67	24.76	106.76	60.39	127.22	60.93 to 100.00	146,311	112,179
ALL	236	72.34	76.16	67.94	24.36	112.10	25.16	173.28	69.45 to 75.04	578,063	392,710

45 Holt
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 : 253
 Total Sales Price : 147,397,749
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 139,811,749
 Total Assessed Value : 95,032,883
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 552,616
 Avg. Assessed Value : 375,624

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 24.00
 PRD : 111.58

COV : 30.14
 STD : 22.86
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.37
 MAX Sales Ratio : 173.28
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.16

95% Median C.I. : 69.46 to 74.84
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 73.02 to 78.66

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:17PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	1	69.87	69.87	69.87	00.00	100.00	69.87	69.87	N/A	133,500	93,279
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	13	82.89	87.05	84.36	24.10	103.19	55.54	121.76	63.61 to 110.97	540,935	456,334
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	49	81.30	84.14	75.98	20.85	110.74	37.66	150.07	74.84 to 87.01	680,011	516,701
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	27	70.47	72.11	65.63	23.94	109.87	41.88	137.88	58.64 to 78.29	359,588	236,007
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	13	46.88	54.36	44.93	31.29	120.99	34.91	99.40	38.04 to 67.04	985,660	442,906
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	23	68.25	74.36	61.52	25.05	120.87	39.73	112.73	60.29 to 93.49	1,312,042	807,207
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	20	67.65	74.65	73.34	18.33	101.79	53.10	146.76	62.80 to 72.78	427,871	313,817
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	38	72.93	71.88	70.71	17.26	101.65	38.91	104.38	62.88 to 79.21	377,187	266,725
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	7	76.77	74.71	66.84	27.45	111.77	40.22	110.16	40.22 to 110.16	263,611	176,185
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	78.19	77.44	81.70	23.10	94.79	25.16	130.62	62.33 to 96.48	233,171	190,509
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	14	61.16	63.16	55.42	18.46	113.97	38.00	102.73	49.66 to 73.09	656,567	363,878
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	30	76.36	82.44	80.28	26.18	102.69	34.43	173.28	70.01 to 88.79	283,378	227,485
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	90	76.35	80.79	75.14	23.59	107.52	37.66	150.07	72.28 to 84.34	557,723	419,069
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	94	67.65	70.65	61.83	21.82	114.26	34.91	146.76	62.88 to 72.70	700,862	433,355
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	69	72.98	76.44	69.86	25.88	109.42	25.16	173.28	63.86 to 79.98	343,995	240,309
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	112	72.40	75.77	65.12	25.47	116.35	34.91	150.07	67.04 to 76.64	768,035	500,126
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	83	71.79	73.99	72.84	20.66	101.58	25.16	146.76	66.24 to 76.77	348,589	253,907
<u>ALL</u>	253	72.39	75.84	67.97	24.00	111.58	25.16	173.28	69.46 to 74.84	552,616	375,624

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
4001	234	72.61	75.75	67.67	23.98	111.94	25.16	173.28	69.87 to 75.08	581,342	393,410
4003	19	68.79	76.87	78.75	24.09	97.61	49.95	146.76	60.93 to 84.94	198,824	156,570
<u>ALL</u>	253	72.39	75.84	67.97	24.00	111.58	25.16	173.28	69.46 to 74.84	552,616	375,624

45 Holt
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 : 253
 Total Sales Price : 147,397,749
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 139,811,749
 Total Assessed Value : 95,032,883
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 552,616
 Avg. Assessed Value : 375,624

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 24.00
 PRD : 111.58

COV : 30.14
 STD : 22.86
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.37
 MAX Sales Ratio : 173.28
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.16

95% Median C.I. : 69.46 to 74.84
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 73.02 to 78.66

Printed:3/24/2011 3:40:17PM

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	9	87.41	86.62	79.28	15.92	109.26	66.80	125.69	69.46 to 102.73	605,533	480,096
4001	9	87.41	86.62	79.28	15.92	109.26	66.80	125.69	69.46 to 102.73	605,533	480,096
Dry											
County	1	78.67	78.67	78.67	00.00	100.00	78.67	78.67	N/A	177,750	139,831
4001	1	78.67	78.67	78.67	00.00	100.00	78.67	78.67	N/A	177,750	139,831
Grass											
County	70	72.12	77.83	83.39	24.47	93.33	37.66	150.07	68.13 to 76.77	186,120	155,202
4001	60	72.69	78.90	84.46	25.86	93.42	37.66	150.07	66.24 to 81.15	191,459	161,701
4003	10	69.99	71.45	75.42	15.02	94.74	49.95	95.70	60.39 to 95.20	154,080	116,208
ALL	253	72.39	75.84	67.97	24.00	111.58	25.16	173.28	69.46 to 74.84	552,616	375,624

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	100	73.13	76.92	65.33	26.51	117.74	34.43	173.28	66.80 to 81.01	705,025	460,609
4001	99	73.09	76.22	65.06	25.78	117.15	34.43	173.28	66.80 to 80.74	709,808	461,830
4003	1	146.76	146.76	146.76	00.00	100.00	146.76	146.76	N/A	231,500	339,760
Dry											
County	4	70.59	71.72	71.39	13.87	100.46	61.35	84.34	N/A	173,028	123,531
4001	3	78.67	75.17	75.10	09.25	100.09	62.51	84.34	N/A	168,583	126,599
4003	1	61.35	61.35	61.35	00.00	100.00	61.35	61.35	N/A	186,360	114,325
Grass											
County	105	71.36	76.78	80.22	22.93	95.71	37.66	150.07	68.14 to 76.64	254,101	203,828
4001	92	71.49	76.90	80.69	23.30	95.30	37.66	150.07	68.14 to 76.77	268,150	216,361
4003	13	71.36	75.97	74.43	19.94	102.07	49.95	127.22	60.93 to 95.20	154,677	115,129
ALL	253	72.39	75.84	67.97	24.00	111.58	25.16	173.28	69.46 to 74.84	552,616	375,624

2011 Correlation Section for Holt County

A. Agricultural Land

Holt County has two market areas with the majority of the county consisting of grassland which makes up 76%. Irrigated land follows at 16%. The difference between market area 4001 and 4003 is in the irrigated land. Market area 4003 is in the southern part of the county, the water table in this area is much higher than area 4001 making it harder to irrigate. In reviewing the comparability of the surrounding counties, it was determined that land within six miles of the county border was comparable in terms of soil type and topography.

In the base statistic, which is comprised of 224 total sales within Holt County, the distribution of the sales among the three year study period for both areas was reviewed for adequacy, proportionality and representativeness. The sample was not proportionately distributed, nor representative of the make-up of land uses within each market area in the county. In both areas irrigated land is over representative in the sales file.

Sales from the comparable areas outside the county were used in the expanded samples and now represent a proportionate distribution of sales. Despite the attempt to make it so, the thresholds for representativeness by land use were not achieved, due to the over representation of irrigated land. However, the two samples are reliable because the subclasses are at the same proportion to the market. In both the random inclusion and the random exclusion samples, the statistical measures of the overall class and the subclasses correlate closely. The changes to both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are very minimal in both samples.

The medians of the subclasses also support that the land uses have been assessed at similar portions of market value. The values are also reasonably similar to adjoining counties with similar influences. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are above the standard range, but based on the systematic approach the assessor used to assign agricultural land values, it is believed that assessments are uniform and proportionate in the agricultural class. All indications support that the county has achieved both inter and intra-county equalization.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 72% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Holt 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 Holt 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 Holt 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 Holt 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 : 12,153	Value : 1,621,654,780	Growth 10,223,306	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	521	1,942,100	60	613,595	34	283,600	615	2,839,295	
02. Res Improve Land	2,878	13,307,120	283	3,576,485	390	4,647,830	3,551	21,531,435	
03. Res Improvements	2,977	140,475,080	323	26,014,005	466	35,664,270	3,766	202,153,355	
04. Res Total	3,498	155,724,300	383	30,204,085	500	40,595,700	4,381	226,524,085	2,589,131
% of Res Total	79.84	68.75	8.74	13.33	11.41	17.92	36.05	13.97	25.33
05. Com UnImp Land	85	457,105	11	90,600	20	90,785	116	638,490	
06. Com Improve Land	508	3,326,040	25	203,115	69	659,855	602	4,189,010	
07. Com Improvements	518	35,026,970	29	2,001,945	86	10,368,365	633	47,397,280	
08. Com Total	603	38,810,115	40	2,295,660	106	11,119,005	749	52,224,780	1,659,455
% of Com Total	80.51	74.31	5.34	4.40	14.15	21.29	6.16	3.22	16.23
09. Ind UnImp Land	3	107,055	1	5,390	0	0	4	112,445	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	2	12,060	5	89,395	7	101,455	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	2	636,670	5	9,578,140	7	10,214,810	
12. Ind Total	3	107,055	3	654,120	5	9,667,535	11	10,428,710	0
% of Ind Total	27.27	1.03	27.27	6.27	45.45	92.70	0.09	0.64	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	3,498	155,724,300	383	30,204,085	500	40,595,700	4,381	226,524,085	2,589,131
% of Res & Rec Total	79.84	68.75	8.74	13.33	11.41	17.92	36.05	13.97	25.33
Com & Ind Total	606	38,917,170	43	2,949,780	111	20,786,540	760	62,653,490	1,659,455
% of Com & Ind Total	79.74	62.11	5.66	4.71	14.61	33.18	6.25	3.86	16.23
17. Taxable Total	4,104	194,641,470	426	33,153,865	611	61,382,240	5,141	289,177,575	4,248,586
% of Taxable Total	79.83	67.31	8.29	11.46	11.88	21.23	42.30	17.83	41.56

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	11	8,490	1,345,935	0	0	0
19. Commercial	12	300,745	8,267,572	0	0	0
20. Industrial	2	58,980	32,301,555	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	11	8,490	1,345,935
19. Commercial	0	0	0	12	300,745	8,267,572
20. Industrial	0	0	0	2	58,980	32,301,555
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				25	368,215	41,915,062

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	304	18	99	421

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	8	136,625	7	381,580	4,990	825,684,725	5,005	826,202,930
28. Ag-Improved Land	4	87,105	8	112,075	1,904	405,368,505	1,916	405,567,685
29. Ag Improvements	4	205,890	9	107,615	1,994	100,393,085	2,007	100,706,590
30. Ag Total							7,012	1,332,477,205

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	4	4.00	24,000	4	3.33	20,005	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2	2.00	120,345	2	2.00	20,720	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	4	4.60	4,600	5	6.15	6,150	
37. FarmSite Improvements	4	0.00	85,545	9	0.00	86,895	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	8.81	0	0	0.01	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	28	30.82	167,520	28	30.82	167,520	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,176	1,273.26	7,639,560	1,184	1,280.59	7,683,565	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,182	1,216.84	50,653,390	1,186	1,220.84	50,794,455	5,974,720
34. HomeSite Total				1,214	1,311.41	58,645,540	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	71	3,262.92	869,400	71	3,262.92	869,400	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,701	3,330.88	2,525,595	1,710	3,341.63	2,536,345	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,909	0.00	49,739,695	1,922	0.00	49,912,135	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,993	6,604.55	53,317,880	
39. Road & Ditches	0	18,345.68	0	0	18,354.50	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				3,207	26,270.46	111,963,420	5,974,720

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	5	740.39	316,485	5	740.39	316,485

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	1,808.96	0.72%	4,621,085	0.87%	2,554.55
46. 1A	15,153.05	6.03%	38,933,065	7.37%	2,569.32
47. 2A1	35,173.67	14.00%	85,921,050	16.26%	2,442.77
48. 2A	24,843.18	9.89%	60,664,325	11.48%	2,441.89
49. 3A1	14,685.44	5.85%	32,053,925	6.07%	2,182.70
50. 3A	90,209.33	35.91%	196,360,855	37.15%	2,176.72
51. 4A1	57,289.79	22.80%	90,783,275	17.18%	1,584.63
52. 4A	12,064.23	4.80%	19,155,035	3.62%	1,587.75
53. Total	251,227.65	100.00%	528,492,615	100.00%	2,103.64
Dry					
54. 1D1	831.72	1.46%	780,860	1.70%	938.85
55. 1D	6,096.51	10.73%	5,628,080	12.23%	923.16
56. 2D1	13,272.72	23.36%	11,406,655	24.78%	859.41
57. 2D	9,240.94	16.26%	7,945,475	17.26%	859.81
58. 3D1	4,021.13	7.08%	3,308,190	7.19%	822.70
59. 3D	13,984.49	24.61%	11,665,590	25.34%	834.18
60. 4D1	7,398.78	13.02%	4,180,390	9.08%	565.01
61. 4D	1,976.47	3.48%	1,116,440	2.43%	564.87
62. Total	56,822.76	100.00%	46,031,680	100.00%	810.09
Grass					
63. 1G1	958.27	0.10%	629,480	0.12%	656.89
64. 1G	11,144.66	1.16%	7,538,125	1.45%	676.39
65. 2G1	23,269.13	2.43%	15,798,265	3.03%	678.94
66. 2G	26,075.49	2.72%	17,656,525	3.39%	677.13
67. 3G1	11,334.81	1.18%	7,257,700	1.39%	640.30
68. 3G	180,976.79	18.90%	123,413,230	23.68%	681.93
69. 4G1	399,089.89	41.67%	218,186,110	41.86%	546.71
70. 4G	304,872.44	31.83%	130,740,960	25.08%	428.84
71. Total	957,721.48	100.00%	521,220,395	100.00%	544.23
Irrigated Total					
	251,227.65	18.97%	528,492,615	47.94%	2,103.64
Dry Total					
	56,822.76	4.29%	46,031,680	4.18%	810.09
Grass Total					
	957,721.48	72.31%	521,220,395	47.28%	544.23
72. Waste	51,733.70	3.91%	5,256,475	0.48%	101.61
73. Other	7,029.22	0.53%	1,404,240	0.13%	199.77
74. Exempt	122.40	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	1,324,534.81	100.00%	1,102,405,405	100.00%	832.30

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 4003

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	27.00	0.16%	45,630	0.19%	1,690.00
49. 3A1	784.17	4.62%	1,186,270	5.03%	1,512.77
50. 3A	8,083.01	47.67%	12,253,100	52.00%	1,515.91
51. 4A1	7,941.71	46.84%	9,927,140	42.13%	1,250.00
52. 4A	120.00	0.71%	150,000	0.64%	1,250.00
53. Total	16,955.89	100.00%	23,562,140	100.00%	1,389.61
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	247.72	3.53%	212,665	3.95%	858.49
58. 3D1	1,165.08	16.59%	960,695	17.83%	824.57
59. 3D	3,894.98	55.48%	3,247,450	60.26%	833.75
60. 4D1	1,566.07	22.31%	884,825	16.42%	565.00
61. 4D	147.00	2.09%	83,055	1.54%	565.00
62. Total	7,020.85	100.00%	5,388,690	100.00%	767.53
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	2,433.38	1.77%	1,635,020	1.86%	671.91
67. 3G1	2,220.05	1.61%	1,449,805	1.65%	653.05
68. 3G	53,646.27	39.02%	39,206,230	44.68%	730.83
69. 4G1	66,330.03	48.25%	39,304,815	44.79%	592.56
70. 4G	12,851.68	9.35%	6,148,645	7.01%	478.43
71. Total	137,481.41	100.00%	87,744,515	100.00%	638.23
Irrigated Total	16,955.89	9.75%	23,562,140	19.95%	1,389.61
Dry Total	7,020.85	4.04%	5,388,690	4.56%	767.53
Grass Total	137,481.41	79.02%	87,744,515	74.29%	638.23
72. Waste	11,485.24	6.60%	1,202,980	1.02%	104.74
73. Other	1,050.28	0.60%	210,055	0.18%	200.00
74. Exempt	100.99	0.06%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	173,993.67	100.00%	118,108,380	100.00%	678.81

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	15.35	33,925	3.13	7,970	268,165.06	552,012,860	268,183.54	552,054,755
77. Dry Land	4.05	3,250	32.18	27,520	63,807.38	51,389,600	63,843.61	51,420,370
78. Grass	278.85	155,555	843.98	427,710	1,094,080.06	608,381,645	1,095,202.89	608,964,910
79. Waste	4.00	400	21.00	2,100	63,193.94	6,456,955	63,218.94	6,459,455
80. Other	10.00	2,000	11.00	2,200	8,058.50	1,610,095	8,079.50	1,614,295
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	223.39	0	223.39	0
82. Total	312.25	195,130	911.29	467,500	1,497,304.94	1,219,851,155	1,498,528.48	1,220,513,785

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	268,183.54	17.90%	552,054,755	45.23%	2,058.50
Dry Land	63,843.61	4.26%	51,420,370	4.21%	805.41
Grass	1,095,202.89	73.09%	608,964,910	49.89%	556.03
Waste	63,218.94	4.22%	6,459,455	0.53%	102.18
Other	8,079.50	0.54%	1,614,295	0.13%	199.80
Exempt	223.39	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	1,498,528.48	100.00%	1,220,513,785	100.00%	814.47

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

45 Holt

	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	223,486,560	226,524,085	3,037,525	1.36%	2,589,131	0.20%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	57,296,800	58,645,540	1,348,740	2.35%	5,974,720	-8.07%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	280,783,360	285,169,625	4,386,265	1.56%	8,563,851	-1.49%
05. Commercial	50,680,525	52,224,780	1,544,255	3.05%	1,659,455	-0.23%
06. Industrial	10,428,710	10,428,710	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	47,978,325	53,317,880	5,339,555	11.13%	0	11.13%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	109,087,560	115,971,370	6,883,810	6.31%	1,659,455	4.79%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	389,870,920	401,140,995	11,270,075	2.89%	10,223,306	0.27%
11. Irrigated	466,936,645	552,054,755	85,118,110	18.23%		
12. Dryland	41,565,850	51,420,370	9,854,520	23.71%		
13. Grassland	596,838,675	608,964,910	12,126,235	2.03%		
14. Wasteland	3,311,660	6,459,455	3,147,795	95.05%		
15. Other Agland	1,624,095	1,614,295	-9,800	-0.60%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	1,110,276,925	1,220,513,785	110,236,860	9.93%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,500,147,845	1,621,654,780	121,506,935	8.10%	10,223,306	7.42%

PLAN OF ASSESSMENT HOLT COUNTY

Pursuant to section 77-1311 of the statutes of Nebraska, as amended, submitted herewith is the 3-year Plan of Assessment. Said plan is originally submitted to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 of each year and a copy sent to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

Holt County has a total count of 12,152 taxable parcels, being further identified as: 36% (4,393) residential parcels; 6% (752) commercial/industrial parcels; and 58% (7,007) agricultural parcels. There are also 412 exempt parcels.

For 2010, 2308 personal property schedules were filed, plus, approximately 575 applications were taken for homestead exemptions. Applications for exemption and/or affidavits for continuing exemption are received annually. For 2010, affidavits were filed by 62 organizations, plus two new applications.

Staff for the office consists of the elected assessor, one deputy, and three full-time clerks, although one is shared seasonally with the treasurer's office. Maintenance of property record cards is performed by any staff member. Changes due to transfer are primarily completed by either the assessor or one of the clerks. Personal property filings are managed by the assessor, the deputy or another of the clerks. The third clerk assists with maintaining computer files of real property, plus wherever else needed. Reports required are prepared by the assessor with assistance of all personnel.

The budget requested for 2010-11 is \$179,380, approximately \$65,455 of which is expected to be used for appraisal maintenance. The CAMA portion within the appraisal maintenance includes a cost of about \$11,954. The GIS licensing cost is \$1500.

The assessor anticipates attending the 2010 Workshop, which offers continuing education for maintaining the Assessor's certificate. To date, the assessor has accumulated 111.25 hours towards renewal of the certificate. Both the assessor and deputy plan to obtain additional hours toward renewal of their respective certificates. No other staff member holds an Assessor's certificate.

Cadastral maps are maintained by the assessor and the clerk processing the transfer statements. Photo background of the cadastral maps is 1966. Ownership and descriptions are kept current by the assessor and said clerk. A contract has been entered into with GIS Workshop for conversion to the new soil survey and continuing data maintenance and retention.

Reports are generated as follows:

- Real Estate Abstract is to be submitted on or before March 19.
- The Personal Property Abstract is to be submitted on or before June 15.
- A report on the review of ownership and use of all cemetery real property is to be presented to the county board of equalization on or before August 1.

- Certificates of value for taxing authorities are to be submitted on or before August 20.
- School District Taxable Value Report is to be submitted on or before August 25.
- The Plan of Assessment is to be submitted on or before July 31.
- The report of the average assessed value of single-family residential properties is to be reported on or before September 1.
- A list of trusts owning agricultural land is certified to the Nebraska Secretary of State by October 1.
- The Tax Roll is to be delivered to the County Treasurer by November 22, along with tax bills.
- Homestead Exemption Tax Loss is to be certified on or before November 30.
- The Certificate of Taxes Levied is to be submitted on or before December 1.

Tax List Corrections are periodically submitted to the County Board of Equalization for approval, showing reasons for said corrections. Meetings of the County Board of Equalization are attended by the County Assessor, or his/her representative.

Notice is published in local newspapers that a list of the applications from organizations seeking tax exemption, descriptions of the property, and the recommendation of the county assessor is available in the county assessor's office. Said notice is published at least ten days prior to consideration of the applications by the county board of equalization.

By March 1, governmental subdivisions are notified of the intent to tax property if not used for a public purpose, and the entity does not pay an in-lieu-of tax.

Property record cards contain all information required by Reg. 10-004, including legal description, property owner, classification codes and supporting documentation. New property record cards were obtained for residential properties for 2001, for commercial/industrial properties for 2002, and for agricultural properties for 2008.

Applications for Homestead Exemption are accepted February 1 through June 30, according to statute. Applications are mailed on or before April 1 to previous filers if applicants have not yet filed for that year. News releases and newspaper ads are prepared to alert property owners of the time period in which to file, and to summarize qualifications. Information guides prepared by the Department of Revenue are made available to the public. Approved Homestead Exemption applications are sent to the Department of Revenue by August 1.

Personal property schedules are to be filed by May 1 to be timely. In early April, ads are placed in the local newspapers and news releases given to the local radio to remind taxpayers of the filing deadline, the necessary documentation to submit, and of the penalties for not filing in a timely manner. Schedules filed after May 1 and before July 31 receive a 10% penalty. Filings after July 31 receive a 25% penalty. Schedules are pre-printed as soon after the first of the year as possible. Verification is achieved from depreciation worksheets and personal contacts with owners.

Real property is up-dated annually through pick-up work and maintenance. Pick-up work, done by the assessor or deputy, involves physical inspection of properties flagged on computer records as having building permits or other information meriting attention. Lists of approved building permits are gathered from city clerks where permits are required. Improvement Information Statements are received where permits are not required. Personal observation by the staff also triggers flags for possible required changes.

On or before June 1, certification of the real estate assessment roll is made and published in the local newspapers. Also by that date, Notices of Valuation Change are mailed by first-class mail to owners of any real property that has changed in value from the previous year. By June 6, assessment/sales ratio statistics (as determined by the Tax Equalization and Review Commission) are mailed to media and posted in the Assessor's Office.

All residential property (urban, suburban, and rural) was re-appraised for 2001 under contract with High Plains Appraisal Service. New photos were taken and listings were verified and/or corrected, re-measuring where necessary. Properties are sketched into computer records. Costs are generated using CAMA of ASI, utilizing Marshall & Swift costs of June 2002. A depreciation study was made. For 2010, the median level of value for residential property is 96%. The COD is 26.89 and the PRD is 112.11. Subsequent sales need to be studied to determine trends and changes in the market.

Commercial and industrial properties were re-appraised for 2002. New photos were taken, and improvements re-measured and inspected. Properties are sketched into computer records. Costs are generated using CAMA by ASI, utilizing Marshall & Swift costs of June 2002. A depreciation study was made. Income data was gathered where appropriate. The median level of assessment of commercial/industrial properties for 2009 is 95%. The COD is 28.99 and the PRD is 92.66. Subsequent sales need to be studied to determine trends and changes in the market.

The median level of assessment of agricultural property for 2009 is 72%. The COD is 22.92 and the PRD is 117.47. Agricultural improvements need to be re-inspected. Plans are to begin the process, anticipated to require two years, in 2019. Properties will be inspected by the assessor and/or deputy, measurements confirmed and condition noted. Interior inspections are to be completed wherever possible. Appropriate sketches of improvements have been entered into computer records by the clerks, and improvements re-priced using CAMA, utilizing costs of June 2002. A depreciation study is to be completed. Land use is being up-dated, with plans for the assessor and/or deputy to complete physically viewing and verifying land use in 2010 for the 2011 tax year.

Real estate transfer statements are filed in a timely manner. Completion of the supplemental data is by the assessor and the clerk who assists in maintaining cadastral records. Questionnaires are mailed to both the buyers and sellers of properties sold to assist the assessor in verifying sales. The response rate is approximately 66%.

For 2011, any changes in land use observed in the 2010 review will be implemented. Field work by the assessor and/or deputy to begin for the re-appraisal of farm improvements, concentrating on the Southeast quadrant of the county, involving approximately 334 farmsteads. If time permits, work will expand into the Southwest quadrant of the county, approximately 237 additional farmsteads. Sales of residential and commercial properties will be analyzed for any needed adjustments. Strive to improve quality and uniformity in assessments of all properties. Begin review of each property so that all parcels will have been reviewed and inspected over a six-year period. Pick-up work will be completed. Change of Valuation Notices will be mailed as required. Continue input of parcel data on GIS system.

For 2012, continue field work by the assessor and/or deputy on re-appraisal of farm improvements, extending work into the north half of the county. The Northeast quadrant includes approximately 282 farmsteads, and the Northwest quadrant approximately 385. Study sales for possible adjustments needed for residential or commercial properties. Adjust for changes in agricultural land use. Continue review of a portion of all parcels to conclude in a six-year period. Complete pick-up work. Send notices as required. Complete input of data on GIS system.

For 2013, complete pick-up work. Adjust for changes in agricultural land use as required. Study sales for market-based changes of residential, commercial and agricultural properties. Continue on-site review of a portion of all properties to conclude in a six-year period. Mail Change of Valuation notices as appropriate.

Respectfully

Robert L. Bergman
Holt County Assessor

June 15, 2010

2011 Assessment Survey for Holt County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	None
3.	Other full-time employees:
	Three
4.	Other part-time employees:
	None
5.	Number of shared employees:
	One employee is shared with the Treasurer's office four months of the year.
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$179,379.78
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same as above
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	Nothing allocated at this time
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	None
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$16,125
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$600
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	None
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	\$19,850

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Terra Scan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and clerk
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes, implementation stages

6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor office staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

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?
	Atkinson, Ewing, O'Neill and Stuart
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1998

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	N/A
2.	Other services:
	N/A

2011 Certification for Holt 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 Holt County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

