

# 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 Morrill County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	70	Median	97.12
Total Sales Price	\$5,594,212	Mean	100.95
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,591,212	Wgt. Mean	97.47
Total Assessed Value	\$5,449,577	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$39,726
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$79,874	Avg. Assessed Value	\$77,851

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.13 to 97.87
95% Mean C.I	95.96 to 98.97
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	95.88 to 106.02
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	19.56
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.88
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.65

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	114	97	97
2009	155	93	93
2008	181	96	96
2007	185	96	96

## 2011 Commission Summary for Morrill County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	9	Median	94.84
Total Sales Price	\$439,000	Mean	96.99
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$439,000	Wgt. Mean	98.59
Total Assessed Value	\$432,810	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$73,224
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$48,778	Avg. Assessed Value	\$48,090

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.63 to 98.00
95% Mean C.I	92.59 to 101.39
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.27 to 106.91
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.47
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.45
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.61

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	12	94	94
2009	20	100	95
2008	40	96	96
2007	42	96	96



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

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	72	The qualitative measures calculated in the include sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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



## **2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Morrill County**

Within the residential class of real property no major changes occurred. Stanard Appraisal Services has been retained to consult with the county and assist when needed. The appraisal company did review the residential sales to confirm that the models they had built during the reappraisal did not need to be calibrated and that they were still working with the current residential market.

The annual residential pickup work was completed for assessment year 2011.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Morrill County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Office and Stanard Appraisal Service	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Bridgeport would be considered the main business district for the county, and would have a higher exposure to the market and highway traffic. There are enough sales to analyze the market on its own merits.
	2	Bayard has the closest proximity to Scottsbluff and enough sales to analyze its own market.
	3	Broadwater lies to the east of Bridgeport and there are no other villages within the county to compare it to, it is a market within itself.
	4	The rural market is a reflection of those wanting to live outside of town and enjoy the amenities of country living.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	All three approaches will be looked at but the market will carry the most weight.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	2010	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	From the market a square foot method has been developed.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2008	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The appraisal company will review the sales and determine the depreciation from the market. New construction will be pulled to compare to the factoring tables and the correct local cost multipliers will be inputted into the pricing. The sales will also be used as a guide to compare to the new construction for age and condition. Models will then be built, and sales charted, for a cost range per square foot (less depreciation, land and outbuildings) based on style, quality, age, condition and size. Adjustment factors will also be developed that can be applied for, but not limited to; basement, basement finish, garage, central air, and so on.	

8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>
	Following a reappraisal, and then review and update if needed every four to six years.
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	A property is considered substantially changed when improvements surpass the market at time of sale. Motivation, change of use, and the removal of buildings are also determining factors.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>
	At this time there are no written policies or procedures in place specific to Morrill County, however the applicable statutes, regulations, and directives are followed.

**62 Morrill  
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 : 70  
Total Sales Price : 5,594,212  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,591,212  
Total Assessed Value : 5,449,577  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 79,874  
Avg. Assessed Value : 77,851

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 97  
MEAN : 101  
COD : 08.55  
PRD : 103.57

COV : 21.45  
STD : 21.65  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 08.30  
MAX Sales Ratio : 195.83  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.64

95% Median C.I. : 96.13 to 97.87  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.96 to 98.97  
95% Mean C.I. : 95.88 to 106.02

Printed:3/21/2011 5:12:56PM

**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	20	96.96	96.81	96.01	01.68	100.83	92.18	101.70	95.97 to 97.87	90,660	87,044
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	96.30	98.51	97.71	02.60	100.82	95.65	104.10	N/A	62,000	60,580
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	9	98.00	107.41	96.17	12.59	111.69	94.15	193.33	94.23 to 99.39	77,111	74,155
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	97.34	95.79	95.75	02.55	100.04	90.97	98.94	90.97 to 98.94	98,700	94,509
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	13	97.36	104.70	97.77	08.99	107.09	94.73	195.83	95.92 to 99.48	63,269	61,861
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	92.81	79.88	92.37	17.03	86.48	22.64	98.58	N/A	68,700	63,456
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	103.35	108.10	104.35	12.61	103.59	92.41	133.27	N/A	79,928	83,408
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	102.45	115.37	104.07	20.04	110.86	91.27	163.35	91.27 to 163.35	85,343	88,820
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	41	97.08	99.17	96.14	04.41	103.15	90.97	193.33	95.97 to 98.12	85,563	82,262
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	29	97.36	103.47	99.70	14.36	103.78	22.64	195.83	95.23 to 99.48	71,831	71,615
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	34	97.01	99.93	96.06	10.08	104.03	22.64	195.83	95.23 to 98.12	75,026	72,071
<u>ALL</u>	70	97.12	100.95	97.47	08.55	103.57	22.64	195.83	96.13 to 97.87	79,874	77,851

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	31	97.08	101.99	97.34	07.88	104.78	90.97	195.83	95.32 to 98.58	73,568	71,610
02	23	97.65	102.95	98.36	08.12	104.67	91.13	193.33	95.62 to 98.79	63,152	62,114
03	2	127.88	127.88	160.07	27.74	79.89	92.41	163.35	N/A	13,106	20,979
04	14	96.99	91.50	96.03	06.62	95.28	22.64	98.94	95.94 to 98.14	130,850	125,650
<u>ALL</u>	70	97.12	100.95	97.47	08.55	103.57	22.64	195.83	96.13 to 97.87	79,874	77,851

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	70	97.12	100.95	97.47	08.55	103.57	22.64	195.83	96.13 to 97.87	79,874	77,851
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	70	97.12	100.95	97.47	08.55	103.57	22.64	195.83	96.13 to 97.87	79,874	77,851

**62 Morrill**  
**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 : 70  
Total Sales Price : 5,594,212  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,591,212  
Total Assessed Value : 5,449,577  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 79,874  
Avg. Assessed Value : 77,851

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 97  
MEAN : 101  
COD : 08.55  
PRD : 103.57

COV : 21.45  
STD : 21.65  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 08.30  
MAX Sales Ratio : 195.83  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.64

95% Median C.I. : 96.13 to 97.87  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.96 to 98.97  
95% Mean C.I. : 95.88 to 106.02

Printed:3/21/2011 5:12:56PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	4	142.87	143.18	137.05	35.98	104.47	91.13	195.83	N/A	2,553	3,499	
5000 TO 9999	1	96.51	96.51	96.51	00.00	100.00	96.51	96.51	N/A	7,600	7,335	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	5	96.51	133.84	119.76	42.61	111.76	91.13	195.83	N/A	3,562	4,266	
10000 TO 29999	7	97.08	97.24	102.67	22.76	94.71	22.64	163.35	22.64 to 163.35	18,886	19,389	
30000 TO 59999	17	97.87	101.75	100.86	06.23	100.88	90.97	142.65	95.62 to 98.98	38,412	38,742	
60000 TO 99999	22	97.90	98.86	99.16	03.24	99.70	93.45	118.42	95.32 to 99.48	80,495	79,816	
100000 TO 149999	10	96.12	95.85	95.89	01.64	99.96	92.36	98.94	92.81 to 98.58	123,480	118,404	
150000 TO 249999	9	95.97	94.84	95.03	02.26	99.80	91.27	97.72	91.33 to 97.34	198,056	188,214	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	70	97.12	100.95	97.47	08.55	103.57	22.64	195.83	96.13 to 97.87	79,874	77,851	



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Morrill County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

The statistical sampling of 70 residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Morrill County. There is a close relationship between two of the measures of central tendency, the median and the weighted mean, the mean is slightly above the acceptable standard but is most like to be effected by outliers. The qualitative measures, coefficient of dispersion and price related differential, are within the prescribed parameters as set out in the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) standards, and are reflective of the countywide reappraisal that was completed in assessment year 2010.

A sales verification process has been implemented in Morrill County. A questionnaire, specific to each property class (residential, commercial, and agricultural), is sent to both the buyer and seller with a stamped return envelope. The assessor has developed a tracking process for the questionnaires, each time one is returned it is noted on the spreadsheet. Phone calls will still be utilized when needed and the information will be documented. Other sources of data collection are county board members, neighbors, and personal knowledge in some instances, the realtors, title insurance agents, and attorneys are also helpful in verifying sales data.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill County**

Within the commercial class of real property no major changes occurred. Stanard Appraisal Services has been retained to consult with the county and assist when needed. The appraisal company did review the commercial sales to confirm that the models they had built during the reappraisal did not need to be calibrated and that they were still working with the current commercial market.

The annual commercial pickup work was completed for assessment year 2011.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Morrill County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Office staff and Stanard Appraisal Service.	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u> - <i>Each town is different in size, economy, and job availability.</i>
	1	Bridgeport would be considered the main business district for the county, and would have a higher exposure to the market and highway traffic. There are enough sales to analyze the market on its own merits.
	2	Bayard has the closest proximity to Scottsbluff and several going businesses.
	3	Broadwater lies to the east of Bridgeport and there are no other villages within the county to compare it to. The closest like village would be Lisco in Garden County to the east of Morrill.
	4	The rural market would be somewhat specialized with sugar beet holding and processing plants due to the sugar beets grown in the area.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	All three approaches will be looked at, but primarily the market and income approaches will carry the most weight.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	2010	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	From the market a square foot method will be developed.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2008	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Models are built from the market.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	

9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>
	Following a reappraisal, and then review and update if needed every four to six years.
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	A property is considered substantially changed when improvements surpass the market at time of sale. Motivation and change of use are also determining factors.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>
	At this time there are no written policies or procedures in place specific to Morrill County, however the applicable statutes, regulations, and directives are followed.

**62 Morrill**  
**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 : 9  
Total Sales Price : 439,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 439,000  
Total Assessed Value : 432,810  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 48,778  
Avg. Assessed Value : 48,090

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 99  
MEAN : 97  
COD : 03.44  
PRD : 98.38

COV : 05.91  
STD : 05.73  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 03.26  
MAX Sales Ratio : 111.30  
MIN Sales Ratio : 91.60

95% Median C.I. : 93.63 to 98.00  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.27 to 106.91  
95% Mean C.I. : 92.59 to 101.39

Printed:3/21/2011 5:12:59PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Qtrts</b>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	1	94.36	94.36	94.36	00.00	100.00	94.36	94.36	N/A	19,500	18,400
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	91.60	91.60	91.60	00.00	100.00	91.60	91.60	N/A	5,000	4,580
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	94.84	94.84	94.84	00.00	100.00	94.84	94.84	N/A	47,000	44,575
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	94.77	95.47	94.34	01.54	101.20	93.63	98.00	N/A	69,167	65,250
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	96.92	96.92	96.92	00.00	100.00	96.92	96.92	N/A	50,000	48,460
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	97.45	97.45	97.45	00.00	100.00	97.45	97.45	N/A	10,000	9,745
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	111.30	111.30	111.30	00.00	100.00	111.30	111.30	N/A	100,000	111,300
<b>Study Yrs</b>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	3	94.36	93.60	94.48	01.14	99.07	91.60	94.84	N/A	23,833	22,518
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	3	94.77	95.47	94.34	01.54	101.20	93.63	98.00	N/A	69,167	65,250
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	3	97.45	101.89	105.94	04.92	96.18	96.92	111.30	N/A	53,333	56,502
<b>Calendar Yrs</b>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	93.22	93.22	94.53	01.74	98.61	91.60	94.84	N/A	26,000	24,578
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	96.92	96.15	94.94	01.45	101.27	93.63	98.00	N/A	53,500	50,791
<b>ALL</b>	9	94.84	96.99	98.59	03.44	98.38	91.60	111.30	93.63 to 98.00	48,778	48,090

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	4	94.81	95.04	94.56	00.89	100.51	93.63	96.92	N/A	69,875	66,071
02	4	97.73	100.28	106.11	04.47	94.51	94.36	111.30	N/A	38,625	40,986
03	1	91.60	91.60	91.60	00.00	100.00	91.60	91.60	N/A	5,000	4,580
<b>ALL</b>	9	94.84	96.99	98.59	03.44	98.38	91.60	111.30	93.63 to 98.00	48,778	48,090

**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	9	94.84	96.99	98.59	03.44	98.38	91.60	111.30	93.63 to 98.00	48,778	48,090
04											
<b>ALL</b>	9	94.84	96.99	98.59	03.44	98.38	91.60	111.30	93.63 to 98.00	48,778	48,090

**62 Morrill**  
**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 : 9  
Total Sales Price : 439,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 439,000  
Total Assessed Value : 432,810  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 48,778  
Avg. Assessed Value : 48,090

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 99  
MEAN : 97  
COD : 03.44  
PRD : 98.38

COV : 05.91  
STD : 05.73  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 03.26  
MAX Sales Ratio : 111.30  
MIN Sales Ratio : 91.60

95% Median C.I. : 93.63 to 98.00  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.27 to 106.91  
95% Mean C.I. : 92.59 to 101.39

Printed:3/21/2011 5:12:59PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
_____ Low \$ _____												
1 TO 4999												
5000 TO 9999	1	91.60	91.60	91.60	00.00	100.00	91.60	91.60	N/A	5,000	4,580	
_____ Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	1	91.60	91.60	91.60	00.00	100.00	91.60	91.60	N/A	5,000	4,580	
10000 TO 29999	3	97.45	96.60	96.60	01.24	100.00	94.36	98.00	N/A	18,167	17,548	
30000 TO 59999	3	94.84	95.51	95.63	00.76	99.87	94.77	96.92	N/A	43,167	41,278	
60000 TO 99999												
100000 TO 149999	1	111.30	111.30	111.30	00.00	100.00	111.30	111.30	N/A	100,000	111,300	
150000 TO 249999	1	93.63	93.63	93.63	00.00	100.00	93.63	93.63	N/A	150,000	140,450	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
_____ ALL _____	9	94.84	96.99	98.59	03.44	98.38	91.60	111.30	93.63 to 98.00	48,778	48,090	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
344	2	95.64	95.64	96.20	01.34	99.42	94.36	96.92	N/A	34,750	33,430	
350	1	94.77	94.77	94.77	00.00	100.00	94.77	94.77	N/A	32,500	30,800	
353	4	94.24	94.52	94.32	02.02	100.21	91.60	98.00	N/A	56,750	53,526	
528	1	97.45	97.45	97.45	00.00	100.00	97.45	97.45	N/A	10,000	9,745	
531	1	111.30	111.30	111.30	00.00	100.00	111.30	111.30	N/A	100,000	111,300	
_____ ALL _____	9	94.84	96.99	98.59	03.44	98.38	91.60	111.30	93.63 to 98.00	48,778	48,090	



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Morrill County**

---

**A. Commerical Real Property**

The statistical sampling for the commercial class of real property is made up of 9 sales. There is a close relationship between all three measures of central tendency, and the qualitative measures are remarkably below the prescribed parameters of the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) standards. The same would hold true for the subclasses Valuation Groupings and Occupancy Codes. When further stratifying the sample by occupancy codes the samples become very small and unreliable when spread out over five different occupancy codes.

A sales verification process has been implemented in Morrill County. A questionnaire, specific to each property class (residential, commercial, and agricultural), is sent to both the buyer and seller with a stamped return envelope. The assessor has developed a tracking process for the questionnaires, each time one is returned it is noted on the spreadsheet. Phone calls will still be utilized when needed and the information will be documented. Other sources of data collection are county board members, neighbors, and personal knowledge in some instances, the realtors, title insurance agents, and attorneys are also helpful in verifying sales data.

An attempt has been made to treat the commercial properties in a uniform and proportionate manner. However, the level of value for the commercial class of property cannot be made without a reasonable degree of certainty that the commercial sample is adequate and representative of the commercial population as a whole.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill County**

The agricultural land market was analyzed for 2011 by each market area (4 of them) and by the county as a whole. Research was expanded to adjoining counties for comparable sales unique to the market area it adjoined. For example in market area 1, there are portions of Garden and Box Butte counties that would be appropriate to search for comparables.

Modifications were made to the land values in each market area as identified in the agland analysis.

The final phase to completing the Order issued by the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division to Morrill County is to finish the land usage review by May 4, 2011. An enormous effort is being made to meet this deadline.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Morrill County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Part-time clerical is doing the land usage and office staff and Stanard Appraisal Services do the improvements.	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Sand hills (in the northeast corner) similar to Garden with lush grasses and better feeding conditions for cattle.
	2	Is the remainder of the sand hills and the composition of soil changes to a very fine to powder like sand and the grasses are thinly populated even though they are the same as in market area one, because of the makeup of this ground the carrying capacity for cattle lessens.
	3	Begins at the escarpments and falls off into the valley and covers the remainder of Morrill County. GIS Workshop was contacted for help in determining what soil type(s) would be the best indicator in determining the line for this change in topography and they have indicated that soils 4810 through 4807 are the best; the makeup of this area makes it difficult to give one specific soil as the key factor.
	4	(recreational) – is the area along the river as identified by numerical code 9999 (which is the river itself) and 6312 the islands.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The determination is made through the process of a sales review and verification, location and use of the property and a physical inspection if needed.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	The primary use of the land is a good indicator in determining if it is agricultural, after an on-site review and if the verification process reveals the parcel was not purchased with the intent to farm or ranch it is considered residential, normally after verification with the buyer and/or seller, or realtor listed on the Real Estate Transfer Statement, Form 521 it can be determined if the parcel is going to be used for recreational purposes.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?</b>	
	Yes	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	Land use and soil types as identified in each market area.	

7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	A part-time individual has been hired to review all agricultural land in Morrill County. Physical inspections, NRD and FSA maps, and personal property listing irrigated equipment. The county is in the early stages of implementing a GIS system that will be an added asset.
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>
	Values will be developed from a market analysis of the sales of parcels along the river to determine if there is a recreational influence.
9.	<b>Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>
	No
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	A property is considered substantially changed when improvements surpass the market at time of sale. Motivation, change of use, and the removal of buildings are also determining factors.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>
	At this time there are no written policies or procedures in place specific to Morrill County, however the applicable statutes, regulations, and directives are followed.

**62 Morrill**  
**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 : 40  
 Total Sales Price : 10,202,047  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,202,047  
 Total Assessed Value : 5,951,384  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 255,051  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 148,785

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 58  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 23.49  
 PRD : 125.03

COV : 38.39  
 STD : 28.00  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.87  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 189.62  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 21.00

95% Median C.I. : 64.51 to 75.05  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 39.57 to 77.10  
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.26 to 81.62

Printed:3/21/2011 5:13:02PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	4	75.10	72.80	67.59	10.01	107.71	58.43	82.58	N/A	102,028	68,960
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	71.50	67.87	70.18	08.32	96.71	53.81	76.75	N/A	102,800	72,150
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	77.41	109.15	105.04	55.63	103.91	60.43	189.62	N/A	106,000	111,338
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	7	68.75	70.01	63.91	15.78	109.54	52.55	104.98	52.55 to 104.98	273,437	174,749
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	64.68	64.95	62.04	09.34	104.69	56.02	74.14	N/A	88,500	54,908
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	76.95	76.95	76.95	00.00	100.00	76.95	76.95	N/A	250,000	192,375
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	74.42	74.42	74.42	00.00	100.00	74.42	74.42	N/A	76,200	56,705
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	75.05	75.64	72.93	12.99	103.72	62.68	96.20	N/A	84,360	61,525
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	73.81	72.55	38.04	32.48	190.72	35.97	107.87	N/A	1,376,500	523,598
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	39.94	42.87	54.88	52.98	78.12	21.00	70.59	N/A	295,875	162,363
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	90.08	88.99	113.10	25.46	78.68	43.46	132.34	N/A	180,344	203,965
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	19	71.67	76.22	69.55	20.18	109.59	52.55	189.62	60.34 to 77.41	166,009	115,466
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	5	74.14	69.24	69.93	08.27	99.01	56.02	76.95	N/A	118,340	82,761
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	16	72.20	70.20	51.79	31.77	135.55	21.00	132.34	43.46 to 91.49	403,511	208,983
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	13	68.75	77.88	68.95	26.40	112.95	52.55	189.62	59.81 to 77.41	192,120	132,460
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	74.74	74.72	43.62	16.64	171.30	35.97	107.87	62.68 to 96.20	487,750	212,750
<u>ALL</u>	40	71.83	72.94	58.34	23.49	125.03	21.00	189.62	64.51 to 75.05	255,051	148,785

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	1	71.67	71.67	71.67	00.00	100.00	71.67	71.67	N/A	395,680	283,585
2	10	72.09	78.54	44.58	28.89	176.18	35.97	189.62	52.55 to 82.58	512,059	228,265
3	22	69.67	71.93	78.58	24.47	91.54	21.00	132.34	60.43 to 79.75	130,194	102,305
4	7	71.50	68.31	62.28	17.57	109.68	43.46	96.20	43.46 to 96.20	260,214	162,061
<u>ALL</u>	40	71.83	72.94	58.34	23.49	125.03	21.00	189.62	64.51 to 75.05	255,051	148,785

**62 Morrill**  
**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 : 40  
 Total Sales Price : 10,202,047  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,202,047  
 Total Assessed Value : 5,951,384  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 255,051  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 148,785

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 58  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 23.49  
 PRD : 125.03

COV : 38.39  
 STD : 28.00  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.87  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 189.62  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 21.00

95% Median C.I. : 64.51 to 75.05  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 39.57 to 77.10  
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.26 to 81.62

Printed:3/21/2011 5:13:02PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	12	73.06	72.31	65.09	18.70	111.09	22.41	104.98	59.81 to 88.66	207,007	134,749
2	2	73.20	73.20	73.18	01.67	100.03	71.98	74.42	N/A	77,490	56,705
3	6	73.08	70.34	69.60	27.38	101.06	22.41	104.98	22.41 to 104.98	168,350	117,178
4	4	72.82	74.83	60.69	14.20	123.30	57.47	96.20	N/A	329,750	200,128
<b>Dry</b>											
County	7	72.14	71.38	68.22	08.68	104.63	56.02	82.58	56.02 to 82.58	71,344	48,674
2	4	75.10	72.20	67.70	10.81	106.65	56.02	82.58	N/A	90,153	61,030
3	3	70.59	70.30	69.59	04.63	101.02	65.25	75.05	N/A	46,267	32,198
<b>Grass</b>											
County	6	71.86	63.49	70.46	16.30	90.11	21.00	79.75	21.00 to 79.75	159,197	112,165
1	1	71.67	71.67	71.67	00.00	100.00	71.67	71.67	N/A	395,680	283,585
2	1	72.04	72.04	72.04	00.00	100.00	72.04	72.04	N/A	168,000	121,030
3	4	68.25	59.31	68.55	25.60	86.52	21.00	79.75	N/A	97,875	67,094
<b>ALL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>71.83</b>	<b>72.94</b>	<b>58.34</b>	<b>23.49</b>	<b>125.03</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>189.62</b>	<b>64.51 to 75.05</b>	<b>255,051</b>	<b>148,785</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	14	71.74	70.46	63.99	18.83	110.11	22.41	104.98	58.43 to 88.66	223,470	142,988
2	2	73.20	73.20	73.18	01.67	100.03	71.98	74.42	N/A	77,490	56,705
3	7	68.75	68.91	66.83	26.71	103.11	22.41	104.98	22.41 to 104.98	206,014	137,679
4	5	71.50	71.55	60.38	15.23	118.50	57.47	96.20	N/A	306,300	184,934
<b>Dry</b>											
County	7	72.14	71.38	68.22	08.68	104.63	56.02	82.58	56.02 to 82.58	71,344	48,674
2	4	75.10	72.20	67.70	10.81	106.65	56.02	82.58	N/A	90,153	61,030
3	3	70.59	70.30	69.59	04.63	101.02	65.25	75.05	N/A	46,267	32,198
<b>Grass</b>											
County	8	71.86	67.67	67.93	21.85	99.62	21.00	107.87	21.00 to 107.87	175,023	118,887
1	1	71.67	71.67	71.67	00.00	100.00	71.67	71.67	N/A	395,680	283,585
2	2	62.30	62.30	58.69	15.65	106.15	52.55	72.04	N/A	266,500	156,420
3	5	73.81	69.02	75.22	28.17	91.76	21.00	107.87	N/A	94,300	70,934
<b>ALL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>71.83</b>	<b>72.94</b>	<b>58.34</b>	<b>23.49</b>	<b>125.03</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>189.62</b>	<b>64.51 to 75.05</b>	<b>255,051</b>	<b>148,785</b>

**62 Morrill**  
**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 : 65  
 Total Sales Price : 16,186,219  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,186,219  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,664,227  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 249,019  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 148,680

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 60  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 22.17  
 PRD : 121.74

COV : 35.84  
 STD : 26.05  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.89  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 189.62  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 21.00

95% Median C.I. : 67.94 to 74.14  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 47.10 to 72.32  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.36 to 79.02

Printed:3/21/2011 5:13:05PM

**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>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	4	75.10	72.80	67.59	10.01	107.71	58.43	82.58	N/A	102,028	68,960
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	8	71.77	73.54	75.70	13.24	97.15	53.81	93.73	53.81 to 93.73	88,281	66,829
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	77.41	109.15	105.04	55.63	103.91	60.43	189.62	N/A	106,000	111,338
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	12	68.91	66.63	57.72	14.45	115.44	32.44	104.98	59.81 to 71.67	390,613	225,459
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	64.68	64.95	62.04	09.34	104.69	56.02	74.14	N/A	88,500	54,908
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	72.40	81.96	72.27	18.37	113.41	67.94	115.10	N/A	161,812	116,946
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	73.55	71.20	69.99	06.05	101.73	57.21	76.95	N/A	180,337	126,209
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	74.92	70.78	70.48	08.30	100.43	48.52	79.59	48.52 to 79.59	226,233	159,444
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	75.05	75.64	72.93	12.99	103.72	62.68	96.20	N/A	84,360	61,525
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	90.84	91.50	39.16	40.30	233.66	35.97	148.33	N/A	1,043,000	408,459
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	49.17	44.13	54.29	34.43	81.29	21.00	70.59	N/A	263,900	143,263
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	70.75	74.98	95.40	41.24	78.60	41.12	132.34	41.12 to 132.34	163,563	156,039
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	27	71.50	74.32	62.91	19.13	118.14	32.44	189.62	65.25 to 76.75	226,656	142,592
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	18	73.85	72.41	70.00	10.64	103.44	48.52	115.10	67.94 to 75.41	176,213	123,346
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	20	67.55	70.74	52.13	38.00	135.70	21.00	148.33	49.17 to 88.66	344,734	179,701
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	22	69.23	74.99	62.05	21.88	120.85	32.44	189.62	60.43 to 74.14	269,005	166,910
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	20	74.74	76.24	51.50	17.14	148.04	35.97	148.33	70.74 to 76.95	342,644	176,459
<u>ALL</u>	65	71.67	72.69	59.71	22.17	121.74	21.00	189.62	67.94 to 74.14	249,019	148,680

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	6	69.23	63.70	56.51	10.41	112.72	32.44	71.67	32.44 to 71.67	563,281	318,309
2	16	72.01	76.70	48.28	31.80	158.86	35.97	189.62	52.55 to 79.59	381,537	184,197
3	34	71.75	72.71	75.02	20.84	96.92	21.00	132.34	64.68 to 75.97	130,895	98,193
4	9	74.14	71.47	65.23	16.09	109.57	43.46	96.20	57.47 to 89.64	250,167	163,184
<u>ALL</u>	65	71.67	72.69	59.71	22.17	121.74	21.00	189.62	67.94 to 74.14	249,019	148,680

**62 Morrill**  
**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 : 65  
 Total Sales Price : 16,186,219  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,186,219  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,664,227  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 249,019  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 148,680

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 60  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 22.17  
 PRD : 121.74

COV : 35.84  
 STD : 26.05  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.89  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 189.62  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 21.00

95% Median C.I. : 67.94 to 74.14  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 47.10 to 72.32  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.36 to 79.02

Printed:3/21/2011 5:13:05PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	18	73.85	71.72	65.56	19.51	109.40	22.41	104.98	59.81 to 88.66	176,654	115,820
2	4	60.58	59.17	55.03	23.16	107.52	41.12	74.42	N/A	108,995	59,975
3	9	75.97	73.92	72.45	20.51	102.03	22.41	104.98	59.81 to 93.73	150,532	109,067
4	5	74.14	77.79	62.15	15.34	125.16	57.47	96.20	N/A	277,800	172,652
<b>Dry</b>											
County	9	72.14	71.19	68.31	08.26	104.22	56.02	82.58	65.25 to 78.06	58,034	39,641
2	4	75.10	72.20	67.70	10.81	106.65	56.02	82.58	N/A	90,153	61,030
3	5	70.59	70.37	69.67	05.57	101.00	65.25	75.41	N/A	32,338	22,531
<b>Grass</b>											
County	17	72.04	74.93	71.70	19.50	104.50	21.00	148.33	66.15 to 79.59	227,569	163,164
1	3	71.67	70.80	70.57	01.21	100.33	69.07	71.67	N/A	529,196	373,456
2	4	75.82	92.68	79.14	28.08	117.11	70.74	148.33	N/A	189,000	149,571
3	9	72.90	68.37	67.26	22.21	101.65	21.00	115.10	48.52 to 79.75	129,454	87,074
4	1	75.41	75.41	75.41	00.00	100.00	75.41	75.41	N/A	360,000	271,475
<b>ALL</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>71.67</b>	<b>72.69</b>	<b>59.71</b>	<b>22.17</b>	<b>121.74</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>189.62</b>	<b>67.94 to 74.14</b>	<b>249,019</b>	<b>148,680</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	23	71.50	68.24	57.31	20.88	119.07	22.41	104.98	58.43 to 75.97	238,233	136,529
1	1	32.44	32.44	32.44	00.00	100.00	32.44	32.44	N/A	1,210,100	392,577
2	4	60.58	59.17	55.03	23.16	107.52	41.12	74.42	N/A	108,995	59,975
3	12	71.88	71.09	68.12	20.35	104.36	22.41	104.98	59.81 to 88.66	185,982	126,689
4	6	72.82	74.56	61.66	16.62	120.92	57.47	96.20	57.47 to 96.20	266,917	164,570
<b>Dry</b>											
County	9	72.14	71.19	68.31	08.26	104.22	56.02	82.58	65.25 to 78.06	58,034	39,641
2	4	75.10	72.20	67.70	10.81	106.65	56.02	82.58	N/A	90,153	61,030
3	5	70.59	70.37	69.67	05.57	101.00	65.25	75.41	N/A	32,338	22,531
<b>Grass</b>											
County	21	71.67	74.84	70.45	19.97	106.23	21.00	148.33	67.94 to 75.41	233,127	164,229
1	5	69.39	69.95	69.93	01.83	100.03	67.94	71.67	N/A	433,918	303,456
2	5	72.04	84.65	70.48	29.05	120.10	52.55	148.33	N/A	224,200	158,019
3	10	73.36	72.32	69.87	24.63	103.51	21.00	115.10	48.52 to 107.87	124,509	86,996
4	1	75.41	75.41	75.41	00.00	100.00	75.41	75.41	N/A	360,000	271,475
<b>ALL</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>71.67</b>	<b>72.69</b>	<b>59.71</b>	<b>22.17</b>	<b>121.74</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>189.62</b>	<b>67.94 to 74.14</b>	<b>249,019</b>	<b>148,680</b>

**62 Morrill**  
**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 : 65  
 Total Sales Price : 16,186,219  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,186,219  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,664,227  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 249,019  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 148,680

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 60  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 22.17  
 PRD : 121.74

COV : 35.84  
 STD : 26.05  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.89  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 189.62  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 21.00

95% Median C.I. : 67.94 to 74.14  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 47.10 to 72.32  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.36 to 79.02

Printed:3/21/2011 5:13:08PM

**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	4	75.10	72.80	67.59	10.01	107.71	58.43	82.58	N/A	102,028	68,960
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	8	71.77	73.54	75.70	13.24	97.15	53.81	93.73	53.81 to 93.73	88,281	66,829
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	77.41	109.15	105.04	55.63	103.91	60.43	189.62	N/A	106,000	111,338
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	12	68.91	66.63	57.72	14.45	115.44	32.44	104.98	59.81 to 71.67	390,613	225,459
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	64.68	64.95	62.04	09.34	104.69	56.02	74.14	N/A	88,500	54,908
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	72.40	81.96	72.27	18.37	113.41	67.94	115.10	N/A	161,812	116,946
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	73.55	71.20	69.99	06.05	101.73	57.21	76.95	N/A	180,337	126,209
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	74.92	70.78	70.48	08.30	100.43	48.52	79.59	48.52 to 79.59	226,233	159,444
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	75.05	75.64	72.93	12.99	103.72	62.68	96.20	N/A	84,360	61,525
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	90.84	91.50	39.16	40.30	233.66	35.97	148.33	N/A	1,043,000	408,459
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	49.17	44.13	54.29	34.43	81.29	21.00	70.59	N/A	263,900	143,263
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	70.75	74.98	95.40	41.24	78.60	41.12	132.34	41.12 to 132.34	163,563	156,039
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	27	71.50	74.32	62.91	19.13	118.14	32.44	189.62	65.25 to 76.75	226,656	142,592
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	18	73.85	72.41	70.00	10.64	103.44	48.52	115.10	67.94 to 75.41	176,213	123,346
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	20	67.55	70.74	52.13	38.00	135.70	21.00	148.33	49.17 to 88.66	344,734	179,701
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	22	69.23	74.99	62.05	21.88	120.85	32.44	189.62	60.43 to 74.14	269,005	166,910
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	20	74.74	76.24	51.50	17.14	148.04	35.97	148.33	70.74 to 76.95	342,644	176,459
<u>ALL</u>	65	71.67	72.69	59.71	22.17	121.74	21.00	189.62	67.94 to 74.14	249,019	148,680

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	6	69.23	63.70	56.51	10.41	112.72	32.44	71.67	32.44 to 71.67	563,281	318,309
2	16	72.01	76.70	48.28	31.80	158.86	35.97	189.62	52.55 to 79.59	381,537	184,197
3	34	71.75	72.71	75.02	20.84	96.92	21.00	132.34	64.68 to 75.97	130,895	98,193
4	9	74.14	71.47	65.23	16.09	109.57	43.46	96.20	57.47 to 89.64	250,167	163,184
<u>ALL</u>	65	71.67	72.69	59.71	22.17	121.74	21.00	189.62	67.94 to 74.14	249,019	148,680

**62 Morrill**  
**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 : 65  
 Total Sales Price : 16,186,219  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,186,219  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,664,227  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 249,019  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 148,680

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 60  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 22.17  
 PRD : 121.74

COV : 35.84  
 STD : 26.05  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.89  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 189.62  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 21.00

95% Median C.I. : 67.94 to 74.14  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 47.10 to 72.32  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.36 to 79.02

Printed:3/21/2011 5:13:08PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	18	73.85	71.72	65.56	19.51	109.40	22.41	104.98	59.81 to 88.66	176,654	115,820
2	4	60.58	59.17	55.03	23.16	107.52	41.12	74.42	N/A	108,995	59,975
3	9	75.97	73.92	72.45	20.51	102.03	22.41	104.98	59.81 to 93.73	150,532	109,067
4	5	74.14	77.79	62.15	15.34	125.16	57.47	96.20	N/A	277,800	172,652
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	9	72.14	71.19	68.31	08.26	104.22	56.02	82.58	65.25 to 78.06	58,034	39,641
2	4	75.10	72.20	67.70	10.81	106.65	56.02	82.58	N/A	90,153	61,030
3	5	70.59	70.37	69.67	05.57	101.00	65.25	75.41	N/A	32,338	22,531
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	17	72.04	74.93	71.70	19.50	104.50	21.00	148.33	66.15 to 79.59	227,569	163,164
1	3	71.67	70.80	70.57	01.21	100.33	69.07	71.67	N/A	529,196	373,456
2	4	75.82	92.68	79.14	28.08	117.11	70.74	148.33	N/A	189,000	149,571
3	9	72.90	68.37	67.26	22.21	101.65	21.00	115.10	48.52 to 79.75	129,454	87,074
4	1	75.41	75.41	75.41	00.00	100.00	75.41	75.41	N/A	360,000	271,475
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>71.67</b>	<b>72.69</b>	<b>59.71</b>	<b>22.17</b>	<b>121.74</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>189.62</b>	<b>67.94 to 74.14</b>	<b>249,019</b>	<b>148,680</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	23	71.50	68.24	57.31	20.88	119.07	22.41	104.98	58.43 to 75.97	238,233	136,529
1	1	32.44	32.44	32.44	00.00	100.00	32.44	32.44	N/A	1,210,100	392,577
2	4	60.58	59.17	55.03	23.16	107.52	41.12	74.42	N/A	108,995	59,975
3	12	71.88	71.09	68.12	20.35	104.36	22.41	104.98	59.81 to 88.66	185,982	126,689
4	6	72.82	74.56	61.66	16.62	120.92	57.47	96.20	57.47 to 96.20	266,917	164,570
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	9	72.14	71.19	68.31	08.26	104.22	56.02	82.58	65.25 to 78.06	58,034	39,641
2	4	75.10	72.20	67.70	10.81	106.65	56.02	82.58	N/A	90,153	61,030
3	5	70.59	70.37	69.67	05.57	101.00	65.25	75.41	N/A	32,338	22,531
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	21	71.67	74.84	70.45	19.97	106.23	21.00	148.33	67.94 to 75.41	233,127	164,229
1	5	69.39	69.95	69.93	01.83	100.03	67.94	71.67	N/A	433,918	303,456
2	5	72.04	84.65	70.48	29.05	120.10	52.55	148.33	N/A	224,200	158,019
3	10	73.36	72.32	69.87	24.63	103.51	21.00	115.10	48.52 to 107.87	124,509	86,996
4	1	75.41	75.41	75.41	00.00	100.00	75.41	75.41	N/A	360,000	271,475
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>71.67</b>	<b>72.69</b>	<b>59.71</b>	<b>22.17</b>	<b>121.74</b>	<b>21.00</b>	<b>189.62</b>	<b>67.94 to 74.14</b>	<b>249,019</b>	<b>148,680</b>



## 2011 Correlation Section for Morrill County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Morrill County is in the western part of Nebraska more commonly known as the Panhandle, and nearer to the states of Colorado, Wyoming and South Dakota. In the 1800's early travelers followed the Mormon Trail, Oregon Trail and Deadwood Trail along what today are considered the prominent landmarks of Chimney Rock, Courthouse Rock, Jail Rock, and the Mud Springs pony express, stage coach and telegraph stations. In 1908 Morrill County was split from Cheyenne County. The makeup of the county is a mixture of sand hills, rough escarpments, the North Platte River flowing west to east, grass tablelands, scattered eroded buttes, and cropland. Early settlers found the high table lands bordering the North Platte River Valley ideal for raising grain, and meadows in the northern part of the county were excellent for cattle ranching. Morrill County is part of the North Platte Natural Resource District. In western Nebraska ground water is greatly dependent on a series of canals, tributaries, and seasonal irrigation run-off, which recharge the aquifer. In 2001 a moratorium on new water well drilling was put into effect. Primary roads running through the county are highways 26 from east to west and 385 going northeast out of Bridgeport and 92 going to the southeast out of Bridgeport.

The ability of Morrill County to locate comparable sales is somewhat hindered by its location, even though six counties (Box Butte, Sheridan, Morrill, Cheyenne, Banner and Scotts Bluff) adjoin it. The fact that it is located within three of the Major Land Resource Areas (MLRA) adds to the complexity of the position when looking for comparables. In the northeastern corner is MLRA 65 (Nebraska Sand Hills) which is part of a large sand-dune area and the average annual precipitation is 15 to 26 inches. Next is a narrow strip of land running from the northwest corner down to a point in the southeast corner known as MLRA 64 (Mixed Sandy and Silty Tableland and Badlands) which comprises 42% in South Dakota, 41% in Nebraska and 17% in Wyoming. Land use consists of eroded walls and escarpments, grass tablelands and scattered eroded buttes. The last MLRA is 67A (Central High Plains, Northern Part) which comprises 68% in Wyoming, 29% in Nebraska and 3% in Colorado. Land use is predominantly grass, and approximately a third cropland. Higher parts of the tableland are nearly level to moderately sloping, but steeper areas are on the sides of ridges and drainage ways. Average annual precipitation in the last two areas is approximately 12-19 inches.

Four market areas have been established that somewhat mirror the MLRA it is located in. For instance market area 1 (in the northeast corner) is sand hills similar to Garden with lush grasses and better feeding conditions for cattle.

Market area 2 is the remainder of the sand hills and the composition of soil changes to a very fine to powder like sand and the grasses are thinly populated even though they are the same as in market area one, because of the makeup of this ground the carrying capacity for cattle lessens.

Market Area 3 will take in the escarpments and falls off into the valley and covers the remainder of Morrill County. GIS Workshop was contacted for help in determining what soil type(s) would be the best indicator in determining the line for this change in topography and they indicated that soils 4810 through 4807 would work best. The makeup of this area makes

## 2011 Correlation Section for Morrill County

---

it difficult to give one specific soil as the key factor. An effort was made to keep the boundary line on sections lines, any other attempt at establishing this line to the contour of the escarpments would have entailed a great deal of cost to hire a contracted surveyor to establish it.

Market area 4 is along the river as identified by numerical code 9999 (which is the river itself) and 6312 (the islands) as established by the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the US Department of Agriculture. This area may become special value due to the hunting and recreational potential along the Platte River. The section lines were used for this boundary as well since hiring a surveyor to account for the curves in the river would have been costly.

A sales verification process has been implemented in Morrill County. A questionnaire, specific to each property class (residential, commercial, and agricultural), is sent to both the buyer and seller with a stamped return envelope. The assessor has developed a tracking process for the questionnaires, each time one is returned it is noted on the spreadsheet. Phone calls will still be utilized when needed and the information will be documented. Other sources of data collection are county board members, neighbors, and personal knowledge in some instances, the realtors, title insurance agents, and attorneys are also helpful in verifying sales data.

A review of the agricultural sales in Morrill County from 7/1/07 to 6/30/10 revealed a total of 41 sales, further broke down by 1 sale in market area one, 10 sales in market area two, 23 sales in market area three and 7 sales in market area four. It is possible that by the way these sales are distributed across the sales file study years a time bias could exist when used to compare to counties with a balanced distribution across the time period. A review of the breakdown of the sales demonstrates that in market area one the sale occurred in the oldest year of the study period, and a time bias does exist. In market area two there are 7 sales in the oldest year, 2 in the middle year and 1 in the current, therefore a time bias exists and the sample is over represented with irrigated sales and the grass is under represented. In market area 3 the middle year is under-represented in comparison to the first and third years and again the sales file is heavily weighted with irrigated sales. In market area 4 the sample is small but proportionate, small samples will cause concern of the reliability of the data for measurement purposes. The sample once again is over represented with irrigated sales.

In determining the level of value and the quality of assessment within and across county lines three measurement tests were reviewed: the first, being the base statistical profile which is an analysis of only the sales within Morrill County; the second, an analysis of the sales in Morrill County with the inclusion of a minimal number of sales from surrounding counties with similar soils, land use makeup, and topography appropriate for each market area and study period. The search for similar sales was extended to twelve miles due to the number of MLRA's and market areas. From a pool of 35 sales; 5 were appropriate for market area one, 6 for area two, 12 for area three, and 2 for area four. The data was sorted according to sale date, usage, soils, topography, proximity, and market. These selection criteria coupled with the aforementioned discussion of major land resource areas left few sales available for inclusion,

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Morrill County**

---

per year within market area, in the analysis for Morrill County. The resulting endeavor was not ideal but did mitigate the time bias that had previously existed and improved or retained the makeup of the sales file in comparison to the composition of each market area.

The third test was to bring in as many sales from the pool as possible to maintain a proportionate and representative sample and to meet the 10% threshold between study years. For this test none of the remaining 10 comparable sales were available for inclusion due to variances in the market areas or time. Therefore test three was a virtual reflection of test two.

From the assessors analysis of the agricultural land market it was determined that values would be changed per market area as needed.

The correlation of the tests one and two will demonstrate the same median measure of central tendency, and when examining the overall median per market area all five areas were found to be within an acceptable level of value for all three tests.

In examining each market area on its own merit, the sample per land classification (irrigated, dry, grass) in some instances becomes smaller and less reliable. However, in the groupings of ten or more sales there is evidence that those particular land classifications are within an acceptable level of value.

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. Morrill County has a consistent method of assigning and implementing agricultural land values, it is believed that the assessments are uniform and proportionate.

There will be no non binding recommendations made for the agricultural class of property.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill 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 Morrill County**

---

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

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

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



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 7,087</b>	<b>Value : 493,000,524</b>	<b>Growth 2,657,327</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	445	1,020,105	111	197,655	65	688,105	621	1,905,865	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,248	5,941,880	72	290,175	304	3,527,125	1,624	9,759,180	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,356	58,048,123	72	2,973,135	363	22,483,240	1,791	83,504,498	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,801	65,010,108	183	3,460,965	428	26,698,470	2,412	95,169,543	916,511
<b>% of Res Total</b>	74.67	68.31	7.59	3.64	17.74	28.05	34.03	19.30	34.49
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	40	178,290	8	11,120	17	186,755	65	376,165	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	245	1,768,735	14	53,395	43	1,937,495	302	3,759,625	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	245	14,678,251	14	381,865	42	6,404,655	301	21,464,771	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	285	16,625,276	22	446,380	59	8,528,905	366	25,600,561	376,720
<b>% of Com Total</b>	77.87	64.94	6.01	1.74	16.12	33.32	5.16	5.19	14.18
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	4,435	0	0	1	112,680	2	117,115	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	1	1,980	0	0	1	1,226,670	2	1,228,650	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	1	6,415	0	0	1	1,339,350	2	1,345,765	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	50.00	0.48	0.00	0.00	50.00	99.52	0.03	0.27	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	13	580,680	13	580,680	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	3	200,740	3	200,740	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	3	504,056	3	504,056	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	16	1,285,476	16	1,285,476	35,880
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.23	0.26	1.35
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,801	65,010,108	183	3,460,965	444	27,983,946	2,428	96,455,019	952,391
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	74.18	67.40	7.54	3.59	18.29	29.01	34.26	19.56	35.84
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	286	16,631,691	22	446,380	60	9,868,255	368	26,946,326	376,720
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	77.72	61.72	5.98	1.66	16.30	36.62	5.19	5.47	14.18
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,087	81,641,799	205	3,907,345	504	37,852,201	2,796	123,401,345	1,329,111
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	74.64	66.16	7.33	3.17	18.03	30.67	39.45	25.03	50.02

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	3	14,085	294,915	0	0	0
20. Industrial	1	6,415	41,573,885	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	3	14,085	294,915
20. Industrial	0	0	0	1	6,415	41,573,885
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				4	20,500	41,868,800

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	52	6,510,020	52	6,510,020	43,740
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	42	39,215	42	39,215	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	94	6,549,235	94	6,549,235	43,740

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	213	30	259	502

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	3,354	223,862,385	3,354	223,862,385
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	843	82,025,455	843	82,025,455
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	843	57,162,104	843	57,162,104
30. Ag Total							4,197	363,049,944

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	65	68.00	544,000	65	68.00	544,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	579	671.16	5,373,100	579	671.16	5,373,100	
33. HomeSite Improvements	600	0.00	36,789,072	600	0.00	36,789,072	692,590
34. HomeSite Total				<b>665</b>	<b>739.16</b>	<b>42,706,172</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	101	101.28	101,280	101	101.28	101,280	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	737	749.76	749,760	737	749.76	749,760	
37. FarmSite Improvements	793	0.00	20,373,032	793	0.00	20,373,032	591,886
38. FarmSite Total				<b>894</b>	<b>851.04</b>	<b>21,224,072</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	2,126	7,203.99	0	2,126	7,203.99	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,559</b>	<b>8,794.19</b>	<b>63,930,244</b>	<b>1,284,476</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	2	591.00	248,940	2	591.00	248,940

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	5.00	4.46%	3,275	4.46%	655.00
51. 4A1	66.00	58.93%	43,230	58.93%	655.00
52. 4A	41.00	36.61%	26,855	36.61%	655.00
53. Total	112.00	100.00%	73,360	100.00%	655.00
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass</b>					
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	51.00	0.08%	10,965	0.08%	215.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	357.50	0.58%	76,865	0.58%	215.01
69. 4G1	13,237.41	21.50%	2,846,090	21.50%	215.00
70. 4G	47,910.98	77.83%	10,300,880	77.83%	215.00
71. Total	61,556.89	100.00%	13,234,800	100.00%	215.00
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	112.00	0.18%	73,360	0.55%	655.00
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	61,556.89	96.31%	13,234,800	98.95%	215.00
72. Waste	1,412.32	2.21%	42,370	0.32%	30.00
73. Other	837.38	1.31%	25,120	0.19%	30.00
74. Exempt	506.63	0.79%	102,930	0.77%	203.17
75. Market Area Total	63,918.59	100.00%	13,375,650	100.00%	209.26

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	761.50	5.19%	742,465	7.24%	975.00
47. 2A1	1.00	0.01%	925	0.01%	925.00
48. 2A	2,696.85	18.38%	2,224,930	21.70%	825.01
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	4,909.85	33.47%	3,191,410	31.12%	650.00
51. 4A1	5,171.50	35.25%	3,361,485	32.78%	650.00
52. 4A	1,128.91	7.70%	733,805	7.16%	650.01
53. Total	14,669.61	100.00%	10,255,020	100.00%	699.07
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	5,493.95	14.69%	1,318,550	14.69%	240.00
56. 2D1	4.50	0.01%	1,080	0.01%	240.00
57. 2D	9,875.49	26.41%	2,370,115	26.41%	240.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	9,730.42	26.03%	2,335,305	26.03%	240.00
60. 4D1	8,831.27	23.62%	2,119,490	23.62%	240.00
61. 4D	3,452.28	9.23%	828,550	9.23%	240.00
62. Total	37,387.91	100.00%	8,973,090	100.00%	240.00
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1,469.70	0.55%	323,335	0.63%	220.00
65. 2G1	14.00	0.01%	3,080	0.01%	220.00
66. 2G	6,330.05	2.38%	1,392,615	2.70%	220.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	14,152.09	5.31%	2,830,420	5.49%	200.00
69. 4G1	51,507.32	19.33%	10,301,475	19.99%	200.00
70. 4G	193,000.98	72.43%	36,670,240	71.18%	190.00
71. Total	266,474.14	100.00%	51,521,165	100.00%	193.34
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	14,669.61	4.59%	10,255,020	14.47%	699.07
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	37,387.91	11.70%	8,973,090	12.66%	240.00
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	266,474.14	83.40%	51,521,165	72.71%	193.34
72. Waste	764.70	0.24%	22,940	0.03%	30.00
73. Other	235.00	0.07%	87,810	0.12%	373.66
74. Exempt	267.88	0.08%	1,575	0.00%	5.88
75. Market Area Total	319,531.36	100.00%	70,860,025	100.00%	221.76

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	1,723.00	2.20%	2,067,600	2.31%	1,200.00
47. 2A1	8,139.79	10.39%	9,767,750	10.92%	1,200.00
48. 2A	31,894.85	40.70%	38,273,805	42.78%	1,200.00
49. 3A1	817.76	1.04%	879,090	0.98%	1,075.00
50. 3A	11,264.16	14.37%	12,109,055	13.54%	1,075.01
51. 4A1	21,865.66	27.90%	23,505,730	26.27%	1,075.01
52. 4A	2,659.30	3.39%	2,858,785	3.20%	1,075.01
53. Total	78,364.52	100.00%	89,461,815	100.00%	1,141.61
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	7,563.18	19.10%	2,495,855	23.03%	330.00
56. 2D1	1,791.30	4.52%	591,130	5.45%	330.00
57. 2D	15,453.92	39.02%	4,327,090	39.92%	280.00
58. 3D1	435.00	1.10%	121,800	1.12%	280.00
59. 3D	4,410.17	11.14%	1,014,340	9.36%	230.00
60. 4D1	8,852.81	22.35%	2,036,150	18.79%	230.00
61. 4D	1,098.32	2.77%	252,615	2.33%	230.00
62. Total	39,604.70	100.00%	10,838,980	100.00%	273.68
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	3,760.35	1.22%	1,222,145	1.90%	325.01
65. 2G1	964.00	0.31%	289,200	0.45%	300.00
66. 2G	30,681.70	9.98%	8,437,595	13.11%	275.00
67. 3G1	293.00	0.10%	73,250	0.11%	250.00
68. 3G	19,006.73	6.18%	3,801,345	5.91%	200.00
69. 4G1	96,866.59	31.51%	19,373,335	30.10%	200.00
70. 4G	155,798.95	50.69%	31,159,790	48.42%	200.00
71. Total	307,371.32	100.00%	64,356,660	100.00%	209.38
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	78,364.52	18.31%	89,461,815	54.15%	1,141.61
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	39,604.70	9.25%	10,838,980	6.56%	273.68
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	307,371.32	71.82%	64,356,660	38.96%	209.38
72. Waste	1,833.93	0.43%	55,015	0.03%	30.00
73. Other	781.62	0.18%	488,710	0.30%	625.25
74. Exempt	1,134.48	0.27%	137,480	0.08%	121.18
75. Market Area Total	427,956.09	100.00%	165,201,180	100.00%	386.02

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

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	1,798.95	7.48%	3,058,210	9.20%	1,700.00
47. 2A1	1,824.72	7.59%	2,965,190	8.92%	1,625.01
48. 2A	5,709.25	23.75%	8,992,145	27.06%	1,575.01
49. 3A1	188.23	0.78%	263,520	0.79%	1,399.99
50. 3A	3,064.94	12.75%	4,061,060	12.22%	1,325.00
51. 4A1	8,686.12	36.14%	10,857,695	32.67%	1,250.01
52. 4A	2,761.97	11.49%	3,038,165	9.14%	1,100.00
53. Total	24,034.18	100.00%	33,235,985	100.00%	1,382.86
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	9.00	1.39%	4,050	2.02%	450.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	113.45	17.49%	45,380	22.67%	400.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	150.00	23.13%	48,755	24.35%	325.03
60. 4D1	320.79	49.47%	88,215	44.06%	274.99
61. 4D	55.24	8.52%	13,810	6.90%	250.00
62. Total	648.48	100.00%	200,210	100.00%	308.74
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	217.50	0.48%	81,565	0.79%	375.01
65. 2G1	140.31	0.31%	49,110	0.48%	350.01
66. 2G	2,599.04	5.72%	844,705	8.18%	325.01
67. 3G1	41.85	0.09%	12,555	0.12%	300.00
68. 3G	3,276.38	7.21%	819,125	7.93%	250.01
69. 4G1	20,009.02	44.04%	4,502,110	43.58%	225.00
70. 4G	19,151.65	42.15%	4,021,860	38.93%	210.00
71. Total	45,435.75	100.00%	10,331,030	100.00%	227.38
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	24,034.18	28.60%	33,235,985	66.90%	1,382.86
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	648.48	0.77%	200,210	0.40%	308.74
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	45,435.75	54.08%	10,331,030	20.79%	227.38
72. Waste	2,073.80	2.47%	62,210	0.13%	30.00
73. Other	11,830.60	14.08%	5,853,410	11.78%	494.77
74. Exempt	924.54	1.10%	48,755	0.10%	52.73
75. Market Area Total	84,022.81	100.00%	49,682,845	100.00%	591.30

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	117,180.31	133,026,180	117,180.31	133,026,180
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	77,641.09	20,012,280	77,641.09	20,012,280
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	680,838.10	139,443,655	680,838.10	139,443,655
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	6,084.75	182,535	6,084.75	182,535
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	13,684.60	6,455,050	13,684.60	6,455,050
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,833.53	290,740	2,833.53	290,740
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>895,428.85</b>	<b>299,119,700</b>	<b>895,428.85</b>	<b>299,119,700</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	117,180.31	13.09%	133,026,180	44.47%	1,135.23
<b>Dry Land</b>	77,641.09	8.67%	20,012,280	6.69%	257.75
<b>Grass</b>	680,838.10	76.03%	139,443,655	46.62%	204.81
<b>Waste</b>	6,084.75	0.68%	182,535	0.06%	30.00
<b>Other</b>	13,684.60	1.53%	6,455,050	2.16%	471.70
<b>Exempt</b>	2,833.53	0.32%	290,740	0.10%	102.61
<b>Total</b>	<b>895,428.85</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>299,119,700</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>334.05</b>

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

62 Morrill

	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	93,518,842	95,169,543	1,650,701	1.77%	916,511	0.79%
02. Recreational	347,075	1,285,476	938,401	270.37%	35,880	260.04%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	42,656,497	42,706,172	49,675	0.12%	692,590	-1.51%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>136,522,414</b>	<b>139,161,191</b>	<b>2,638,777</b>	<b>1.93%</b>	<b>1,644,981</b>	<b>0.73%</b>
05. Commercial	25,272,662	25,600,561	327,899	1.30%	376,720	-0.19%
06. Industrial	1,339,350	1,345,765	6,415	0.48%	0	0.48%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	20,780,123	21,224,072	443,949	2.14%	591,886	-0.71%
08. Minerals	4,458,765	6,549,235	2,090,470	46.88	43,740	45.90
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>51,850,900</b>	<b>54,719,633</b>	<b>2,868,733</b>	<b>5.53%</b>	<b>1,012,346</b>	<b>3.58%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>188,373,314</b>	<b>193,880,824</b>	<b>5,507,510</b>	<b>2.92%</b>	<b>2,657,327</b>	<b>1.51%</b>
11. Irrigated	113,136,590	133,026,180	19,889,590	17.58%		
12. Dryland	19,763,340	20,012,280	248,940	1.26%		
13. Grassland	140,694,245	139,443,655	-1,250,590	-0.89%		
14. Wasteland	238,145	182,535	-55,610	-23.35%		
15. Other Agland	6,573,880	6,455,050	-118,830	-1.81%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>280,406,200</b>	<b>299,119,700</b>	<b>18,713,500</b>	<b>6.67%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>468,779,514</b>	<b>493,000,524</b>	<b>24,221,010</b>	<b>5.17%</b>	<b>2,657,327</b>	<b>4.60%</b>

## **MORRILL COUNTY**

### **2010 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT**

#### **PLAN OF ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:**

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

#### **REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:**

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.”

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003)

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1. One hundred (100) percent of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2. Seventy-five (75) percent of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3. Seventy-five (75) percent of special value as defined in §77-1343 and at its actual value when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347 for agricultural land and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R.S. Supp. 2006)

## GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY IN MORRILL COUNTY:

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

	Parcel/Acre Count	% Parcel	Total Value	% Value	Land Value	Improvement Value
Residential/Rec	2439	35%	93,708,246	20%	12,335,070	81,373,176
Commercial/Ind	376	5%	26,989,045	6%	4,341,450	22,647,595
Agricultur/Recr	4232	60%	344,471,037	74%	286,593,830	57,877,207
TIF	4	0%	20,500	0%	Bs20,500	(Ex41,868,800)
Total	1653	100%	465,188,828	100%	303,290,850	161,897,978

Agricultural land is the predominant property type in Morrill County, with the majority consisting of grassland, primarily used for cow/calf operations.

Additional information is contained in the 2010 Reports & Opinions, issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2010.

## CURRENT RESOURCES:

### Staff/Budget/Training

In addition to the assessor, there are 2 full-time clerks and 2 part time clerks on staff, and 1 part time person completing the land review required by the Department of Revenue to be completed by the end of 2010. The county contracts with an independent appraiser, as needed, for appraisal maintenance.

The proposed budget for the assessment portion of the Assessor's budget for FY 2010-2011 is \$243,201. The increase in budget is due to a possible maintenance contract of appraisal through Stanard Appraisal, and also the continued work of part-time staff for continued records clean up in the Assessment Office of Morrill County.

The assessor believes continuing education is vital to maintaining proper assessment action. The assessor attends as many monthly district meetings as possible, as well as workshops offered by the Nebraska Association of County Officials, the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue and the International Association of Assessing Officers. The current assessor will be taking 3 continuing education courses offered through IAAO in 2010, which is required for her to retain her certificate by the end of 2013.

### Record Maintenance

Morrill County's cadastral maps have not been consistently maintained since the mid 1990's. The county board has recognized the need for consistent maintenance of the records and approved the development of a web based GIS system through GIS Workshop. Development

began in June 2007 and currently part time staff is working on the completion of the system by entering all parcels in Morrill County.

New property record cards are currently being created for each parcel of real property in 2010. Each property record card is filed by legal description and contains up-to-date listings, photographs and sketches for those properties that have improvements.

Morrill County utilizes software provided by MIPS for assessment and CAMA (computer assisted mass appraisal) administration. Upon completion of development of the GIS system, this office will have the ability to maintain all records electronically and make them available via the Internet.

## **ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES:**

### Discover/List/Inventory Property

The assessor also keeps in close contact with the register of deeds and all zoning administrators of Morrill County, which is an aid in the process of property discovery. Data collection is done on a regular basis to ensure listings are current and accurate. Utilization of the local FSA, NRCS, and NRD offices are also useful in tracking land usage.

Morrill County processes more than four-hundred Real Estate Transfer Form 521's annually. These are filed on a timely basis with the Department of Assessment & Taxation. Standards of sales review from the International Association of Assessing Officers, Standard of Ratio Studies, 1999, are adhered to.

### Data Collection

Morrill County will implement procedures to complete a physical routine inspection of all properties on a six-year cycle.

### Ratio Studies

Ratio studies are a vital tool in considering any assessment actions taken. Ratio studies are conducted internally to determine whether any assessment action is required in a specific area or class of property. Consultation with the field liaison is an important part of this process.

### Value Approaches

**Market Approach:** The market approach is used on all classes of property to obtain market value for each parcel of property. Sales comparison is the most common way to determine market value on similar properties.

**Cost Approach:** The cost approach is primarily used in the valuation process of residential and commercial properties. Marshall/Swift costing dated 2008 is used to arrive at Replacement Cost

New (RCN). A depreciation factor derived from market analysis within the county is used to apply to the RCN to determine market value. A depreciation study completed in 2009 by the county's contracted appraiser for residential, rural residential and commercial revaluation was used for the current year market values.

Income Approach: The income approach is primarily used in the valuation of commercial properties. Collection and analysis of income and expense data was completed in 2009 by the county's contracted appraiser.

Land valuation studies will be performed on an annual basis. A three-year study of arms-length transactions will be used to obtain current market values.

#### Reconciliation of Value

A reconciliation of the three approaches to value (if applicable) will be completed and documented.

#### Sales Ratio Review

Upon completion of assessment actions, sales ratio studies are reviewed to determine if the statistics are within the guidelines set forth by the state.

#### Notices

Change of value notices are sent to the property owner of record no later than June 1<sup>st</sup> of each year as required by §77-1315. Prior to notices being sent, an article is published in the paper to keep taxpayers informed of the process.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Ratio (Level of Value)</u>	<u>*COD</u>	<u>*PRD</u>
Residential	97.00	9.77	105.66
Commercial	94.00	9.76	108.95
Agricultural	73.00	27.45	111.22

(\*Co-efficient of dispersion and price-related differential)

For more information regarding statistical measures, see 2010 Reports & Opinions issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2010.

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

**Residential:** The assessor will continue to monitor and review all urban and suburban residential parcels within the county. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

**Commercial:** The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

**Agricultural:** A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. A physical inspection will be started in a portion of Morrill County on all improved rural parcels. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

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

**Residential:** The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

**Commercial:** A physical inspection to be started on commercial parcels within the county will be completed by the assessor and/or contract appraiser. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments.

**Agricultural:** A continued physical inspection of all ag-improved parcels within a portion of the county will be completed by the assessor and/or contract appraiser. A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies.

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

**Residential:** The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. A physical review will be started for the Village of Broadwater. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios

are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

**Commercial:** The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. A physical inspection will continue on portions of commercial properties. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

**Agricultural:** A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

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

Permissive Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use and make recommendation to county board. This office receives approximately 35 applications annually.

Homestead Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications; process approvals and denials; send denial notifications to applicants no later than July 31; prepare and send applications to Department of Revenue no later than August 1 annually. This office receives approximately 270 applications annually.

Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report: Compile tax loss due to Homestead Exemptions and report no later than November 30 annually.

Personal Property Schedules: Review annual filings of agricultural and commercial schedules. This office receives approximately 700 personal property schedules annually.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property and Assessed Value Update: Compile all real property valuation information and report no later than March 19 annually.

Board of Educational Land and Funds Report: Compile all valuations for properties owned by BELF and report no later than March 31 annually.

Change of Value Notification: Notification sent no later than June 1 annually to all property owners whose value changed from the prior year.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Personal Property: Compile all personal property valuation information and file by June 15 annually.

Tax List Corrections: Prepare tax list corrections documents for County Board of Equalization review.

Taxable Value and Growth Certifications: Total assessments for real, personal and centrally assessed properties are reported to all political subdivisions no later than August 20 annually.

School District Taxable Value Report: Final report of taxable value for all school districts located within the county to be filed no later than August 25 annually.

Annual Inventory Statement: Report of all personal property in possession of this office to be filed with the County Board by August 31 annually.

Average Residential Value Report: Certification of the average residential value for Homestead Exemption purposes filed no later than September 1 annually.

Three Year Plan of Assessment: Assessment plan detailing the next three years that must be prepared by June 15 annually, submitted to the County Board of Equalization no later than July 31 annually and filed no later than October 31 annually.

Ag Land Trust Report: Report of all property within the county owned by trusts to be filed with the Secretary of State no later than October 1 annually.

Tax List: Certification of the tax list, for both real and personal property within the county, which must be delivered to the treasurer no later than November 22 annually.

Certificate of Taxes Levied: Final report of the total taxes to be collected by the county to be filed no later than December 1 annually.

Government Owned Properties Report: Report of taxable and exempt state or governmental political subdivision owned properties to be filed for the year 2004 and every 4<sup>th</sup> year thereafter no later than December 1 annually.

## **Conclusion:**

The Morrill County Assessor makes every effort to comply with state statute and the rules and regulations of the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation to attempt to assure uniform and proportionate assessments of all properties in Morrill County.

Considering the broad range of duties this office is responsible for, it is anticipated that there will always be a need for the services of a contract appraiser. However, it is a goal of this office to ultimately complete the majority of the appraisal work by the assessor and deputy, as budgetary concerns exist.

Lastly, it is a high priority that this office makes every effort to promote good public relations and keep the public apprised of the assessment practices required by law.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose M. Nelson  
Morrill County Assessor

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Morrill County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	2
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	3
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$243,201
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$238,040
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$53,586 – finish appraisal contract and future appraisal consulting
9.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	0
10.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$17,600
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$3,000
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	0
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	\$40,000

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and clerk
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	GIS Workshop
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS Workshop and office – work is still in progress to get the county on.
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS

## C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Bridgeport, Bayard, and Broadwater
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2001

## D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal Services and Pritchard & Abbott
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None



## 2011 Certification for Morrill 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 Morrill 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



