

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 Nemaha County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	211	Median	96.53
Total Sales Price	\$14,253,487	Mean	106.89
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$14,253,487	Wgt. Mean	95.14
Total Assessed Value	\$13,560,085	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$57,398
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$67,552	Avg. Assessed Value	\$64,266

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.72 to 98.13
95% Mean C.I	93.20 to 97.07
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	97.77 to 116.01
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	28.24
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.77
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.58

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	247	97	97
2009	253	94	94
2008	243	96	96
2007	258	96	96

2011 Commission Summary for Nemaha County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	34	Median	95.71
Total Sales Price	\$2,452,960	Mean	106.71
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,452,960	Wgt. Mean	110.80
Total Assessed Value	\$2,717,960	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$59,387
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$72,146	Avg. Assessed Value	\$79,940

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	78.21 to 105.09
95% Mean C.I	89.21 to 124.21
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.23 to 127.38
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.36
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.31
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	9.84

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	37	95	95
2009	39	95	95
2008	38	97	97
2007	45	95	95

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Nemaha County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	69	The qualitative measures calculated in the base stat sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Nemaha County

The county conducted a market analysis and reviewed statistics for the residential class of property. The county also completed pickup and permit work for the class.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Ron Elliot contract appraiser	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Auburn
	02	Brock
	03	Brownville
	04	Johnson
	06	Nemaha
	07	Peru
	08	Rural
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	The county uses a market approach based on appreciation or depreciation of Cost.	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	Auburn in 2008	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	Market analysis. The county completes a study during reviews of the valuation groups.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2007	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The county develops depreciation tables from the local market	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	The county updates the depreciation tables at the time of review of the valuation group.	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?	
	It is the same as was used for the valuation group.	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	The county relies on the appraiser's knowledge and experience and if the change	

	substantially affected market value of the parcel.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.
	The county relies on state statutes and regulations.

**64 Nemaha
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 : 211
 Total Sales Price : 14,253,487
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,253,487
 Total Assessed Value : 13,560,085
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 67,552
 Avg. Assessed Value : 64,266

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 107
 COD : 20.78
 PRD : 112.35

COV : 63.25
 STD : 67.61
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.06
 MAX Sales Ratio : 775.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 31.81

95% Median C.I. : 95.72 to 98.13
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.20 to 97.07
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.77 to 116.01

Printed:3/24/2011 3:45:17PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	30	96.92	95.57	93.95	06.27	101.72	65.90	137.85	94.46 to 97.89	81,050	76,145
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	21	96.00	96.30	95.21	10.77	101.14	31.81	134.73	92.84 to 99.63	65,826	62,672
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	20	96.10	97.09	95.50	05.43	101.66	85.01	121.66	93.98 to 99.52	58,507	55,875
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	33	98.51	101.40	97.32	12.48	104.19	55.24	159.00	96.36 to 102.14	70,974	69,069
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	34	100.13	111.12	98.47	19.83	112.85	65.84	340.40	94.24 to 111.66	53,876	53,050
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	19	94.81	100.61	94.43	12.83	106.54	62.60	185.19	92.67 to 99.17	67,446	63,687
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	24	93.11	117.98	93.30	41.76	126.45	43.03	683.50	87.95 to 105.32	58,563	54,638
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	30	93.98	128.54	92.91	50.88	138.35	58.75	775.00	88.08 to 117.07	80,286	74,593
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	104	96.80	97.86	95.51	09.19	102.46	31.81	159.00	96.00 to 98.06	70,444	67,281
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	107	95.91	115.67	94.74	32.21	122.09	43.03	775.00	93.85 to 99.95	64,741	61,335
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	106	97.68	103.56	96.75	13.98	107.04	55.24	340.40	95.91 to 99.52	62,505	60,476
<u>ALL</u>	211	96.53	106.89	95.14	20.78	112.35	31.81	775.00	95.72 to 98.13	67,552	64,266

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	119	96.73	99.99	95.82	08.78	104.35	58.75	185.19	95.63 to 98.06	78,902	75,605
02	7	101.67	160.62	147.38	64.20	108.98	85.71	340.40	85.71 to 340.40	4,114	6,064
03	7	81.85	92.04	90.59	21.73	101.60	62.60	124.81	62.60 to 124.81	46,257	41,905
04	17	92.26	96.97	95.78	16.33	101.24	47.20	144.23	87.50 to 111.39	36,818	35,265
06	11	95.94	200.94	83.09	144.34	241.83	31.81	775.00	43.03 to 683.50	17,359	14,424
07	22	97.99	104.33	97.16	18.88	107.38	59.44	155.77	92.13 to 121.07	32,025	31,117
08	28	97.56	97.60	93.12	15.19	104.81	55.24	159.00	92.31 to 104.01	106,791	99,447
<u>ALL</u>	211	96.53	106.89	95.14	20.78	112.35	31.81	775.00	95.72 to 98.13	67,552	64,266

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	203	96.37	106.19	95.14	20.18	111.61	31.81	775.00	95.62 to 97.57	69,135	65,775
06	1	67.16	67.16	67.16	00.00	100.00	67.16	67.16	N/A	93,000	62,460
07	7	102.14	132.92	115.38	32.09	115.20	98.43	292.38	98.43 to 292.38	18,000	20,768
<u>ALL</u>	211	96.53	106.89	95.14	20.78	112.35	31.81	775.00	95.72 to 98.13	67,552	64,266

**64 Nemaha
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 : 211
 Total Sales Price : 14,253,487
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,253,487
 Total Assessed Value : 13,560,085
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 67,552
 Avg. Assessed Value : 64,266

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 107
 COD : 20.78
 PRD : 112.35

COV : 63.25
 STD : 67.61
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.06
 MAX Sales Ratio : 775.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 31.81

95% Median C.I. : 95.72 to 98.13
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.20 to 97.07
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.77 to 116.01

Printed:3/24/2011 3:45:17PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	11	100.77	251.91	190.23	165.12	132.42	69.00	775.00	83.79 to 683.50	2,584	4,916	
5000 TO 9999	16	104.50	112.42	114.14	21.44	98.49	31.81	185.19	96.10 to 134.73	7,108	8,112	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	27	102.00	169.25	129.35	79.53	130.85	31.81	775.00	96.10 to 147.47	5,265	6,810	
10000 TO 29999	45	100.31	103.90	101.55	16.78	102.31	47.20	155.77	95.24 to 111.66	18,886	19,178	
30000 TO 59999	52	96.82	99.35	98.69	12.28	100.67	43.03	144.23	94.05 to 99.63	42,777	42,218	
60000 TO 99999	32	95.23	93.55	93.14	07.03	100.44	66.27	117.95	92.84 to 97.26	78,823	73,418	
100000 TO 149999	31	94.09	92.58	92.28	08.45	100.33	58.75	114.66	92.55 to 97.89	122,668	113,193	
150000 TO 249999	21	95.88	94.99	94.55	06.03	100.47	81.61	114.03	92.50 to 99.06	182,524	172,570	
250000 TO 499999	3	98.06	94.84	95.05	05.22	99.78	85.55	100.90	N/A	293,000	278,508	
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	211	96.53	106.89	95.14	20.78	112.35	31.81	775.00	95.72 to 98.13	67,552	64,266	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Nemaha County**

A. Residential Real Property

Nemaha County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Auburn which is centered in the County. Nemaha is bordered to the south by Richardson County, with Johnson County to the east and Otoe County to the north. The county has the Missouri River for a majority of its eastern border with the McKissick Island lying on the east side of the Missouri River. Nemaha County has seen a slight decline in population over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat.

The sales file consists of 211 qualified residential sales and is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the residential class of property. Two of the measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range with only the mean being outside the range. All measures fall within a spread of 12 points. All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for a median.

The qualitative statistics overall were outside the recommended range but the valuation groups with an adequate sample showed a marked improvement. As can be seen in the statistics there are outliers remaining in the file and no doubt low dollar sales are also having an impact. The counties valuation groups represent the assessor locations in the county and they represent the appraisal cycle of the county more than unique markets.

Nemaha County has had a consistent procedure for sales verification. The contract appraiser completes a statistical review of all sales in the file. A physical inspection is completed on any sales with a perceived discrepancy and on all sales in conjunction with a review of a valuation group. The county utilizes an acceptable portion of available sales and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

The Counties assessment plan states that an analysis of the residential sales will be conducted and areas outside the range will be reviewed or adjusted. For 2011 the overall market was relatively flat and a review showed all of the valuation groups fell within the range. The County has a consistent approach to valuing and reviewing the property in Nemaha County. They utilize a contract appraiser who is familiar with the local market. Jana Smith is the newly elected assessor. Jana was the deputy assessor and is very familiar with the operations of the office. The County has a web site for parcel searches and is implementing GIS capabilities for mapping.

Based on the available information the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the residential class of property. The known assessment practices are reliable and consistent and the residential class is treated uniformly and proportionately.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha County

The county completed pickup and permit work for the commercial class of property. The county reviewed the statistical analysis and concluded that there no adjustment was necessary for the class.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Ron Elliot contract appraiser	
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Auburn is the county seat and is the trade center for the county.
	02	Remainder of the assessor locations in the county.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Market approach based off of a depreciated or appreciated Cost	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2007-2008	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Sales comparison with local factors based on sales. Majority on a per square foot basis.	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2007 is the cost year for the entire commercial class of property.	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The county develops depreciation tables based on the local market	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	During the revaluation of the class of property	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	Changes from unimproved to improved or if the change has altered the market value of the parcel.	
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.	
	The county relies on state statutes and regulations	

64 Nemaha
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 : 34
Total Sales Price : 2,452,960
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,452,960
Total Assessed Value : 2,717,960
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 72,146
Avg. Assessed Value : 79,940

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 111
MEAN : 107
COD : 34.27
PRD : 96.31

COV : 48.80
STD : 52.07
Avg. Abs. Dev : 32.80
MAX Sales Ratio : 266.93
MIN Sales Ratio : 54.55

95% Median C.I. : 78.21 to 105.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.23 to 127.38
95% Mean C.I. : 89.21 to 124.21

Printed:3/24/2011 3:45:20PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	1	57.53	57.53	57.53	00.00	100.00	57.53	57.53	N/A	22,442	12,910
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	101.48	101.48	98.69	03.56	102.83	97.87	105.09	N/A	25,400	25,068
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	4	95.21	91.02	94.54	04.58	96.28	78.21	95.46	N/A	69,666	65,859
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	59.69	74.14	73.61	29.94	100.72	54.55	108.17	N/A	44,683	32,893
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	80.00	130.45	88.50	71.50	147.40	69.88	241.47	N/A	23,667	20,945
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	99.48	99.48	99.48	00.00	100.00	99.48	99.48	N/A	110,000	109,430
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	76.40	76.40	78.59	21.98	97.21	59.61	93.18	N/A	57,500	45,188
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	5	88.20	90.32	104.30	25.03	86.60	59.02	136.89	N/A	114,623	119,547
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	146.50	146.50	143.65	09.71	101.98	132.27	160.73	N/A	25,000	35,913
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	98.32	98.32	98.32	00.00	100.00	98.32	98.32	N/A	30,000	29,495
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	100.00	129.60	127.59	41.29	101.58	74.81	236.92	N/A	29,418	37,533
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	120.39	129.30	131.31	44.73	98.47	58.14	266.93	N/A	174,160	228,688
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	10	95.21	84.70	87.49	16.47	96.81	54.55	108.17	57.53 to 105.09	48,596	42,516
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	11	88.20	99.56	98.99	34.54	100.58	59.02	241.47	59.61 to 136.89	79,010	78,216
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	13	120.39	129.68	130.47	36.45	99.39	58.14	266.93	74.81 to 160.73	84,453	110,187
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	11	95.11	97.94	90.01	28.44	108.81	54.55	241.47	59.69 to 108.17	53,974	48,580
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	95.75	99.57	102.77	27.23	96.89	59.02	160.73	59.61 to 136.89	76,812	78,943
<u>ALL</u>	34	95.71	106.71	110.80	34.27	96.31	54.55	266.93	78.21 to 105.09	72,146	79,940

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	25	95.96	112.90	110.31	39.09	102.35	54.55	266.93	74.81 to 120.39	80,649	88,964
02	9	88.20	89.50	113.08	21.35	79.15	57.53	136.89	58.14 to 108.17	48,526	54,873
<u>ALL</u>	34	95.71	106.71	110.80	34.27	96.31	54.55	266.93	78.21 to 105.09	72,146	79,940

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	4	98.68	98.12	98.23	01.65	99.89	95.11	100.00	N/A	104,279	102,430
03	30	95.38	107.85	113.38	38.57	95.12	54.55	266.93	74.81 to 108.17	67,862	76,941
04											
<u>ALL</u>	34	95.71	106.71	110.80	34.27	96.31	54.55	266.93	78.21 to 105.09	72,146	79,940

64 Nemaha
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 : 34
Total Sales Price : 2,452,960
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,452,960
Total Assessed Value : 2,717,960
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 72,146
Avg. Assessed Value : 79,940

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 111
MEAN : 107
COD : 34.27
PRD : 96.31

COV : 48.80
STD : 52.07
Avg. Abs. Dev : 32.80
MAX Sales Ratio : 266.93
MIN Sales Ratio : 54.55

95% Median C.I. : 78.21 to 105.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.23 to 127.38
95% Mean C.I. : 89.21 to 124.21

Printed:3/24/2011 3:45:20PM

SALE PRICE *											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$</u>											
1 TO 4999	1	80.00	80.00	80.00	00.00	100.00	80.00	80.00	N/A	3,500	2,800
5000 TO 9999	3	105.09	148.85	155.52	44.88	95.71	100.00	241.47	N/A	6,547	10,182
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	4	102.55	131.64	144.10	40.60	91.35	80.00	241.47	N/A	5,785	8,336
10000 TO 29999	8	83.21	104.95	97.54	48.68	107.60	54.55	236.92	54.55 to 236.92	18,068	17,624
30000 TO 59999	11	97.87	107.46	109.38	34.18	98.24	58.14	266.93	59.61 to 132.27	43,795	47,901
60000 TO 99999	5	93.18	91.71	93.99	22.79	97.57	59.69	140.32	N/A	73,583	69,158
100000 TO 149999	4	97.30	88.40	87.54	11.65	100.98	59.02	100.00	N/A	128,029	112,076
150000 TO 249999	1	136.89	136.89	136.89	00.00	100.00	136.89	136.89	N/A	248,500	340,175
250000 TO 499999											
500000 +	1	130.73	130.73	130.73	00.00	100.00	130.73	130.73	N/A	675,000	882,440
<u>ALL</u>	34	95.71	106.71	110.80	34.27	96.31	54.55	266.93	78.21 to 105.09	72,146	79,940

OCCUPANCY CODE											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	4	73.61	76.72	62.98	27.08	121.82	54.55	105.09	N/A	47,225	29,740
300	2	97.30	97.30	97.20	02.25	100.10	95.11	99.48	N/A	115,000	111,783
309	1	98.32	98.32	98.32	00.00	100.00	98.32	98.32	N/A	30,000	29,495
336	1	67.47	67.47	67.47	00.00	100.00	67.47	67.47	N/A	22,500	15,180
342	2	120.16	120.16	137.40	16.78	87.45	100.00	140.32	N/A	43,795	60,175
344	2	115.04	115.04	127.83	19.00	89.99	93.18	136.89	N/A	156,750	200,373
352	4	98.94	101.24	99.96	15.06	101.28	74.81	132.27	N/A	63,029	63,005
353	9	95.96	128.72	101.46	52.86	126.87	59.61	241.47	69.88 to 236.92	29,811	30,248
384	1	80.00	80.00	80.00	00.00	100.00	80.00	80.00	N/A	3,500	2,800
387	1	58.14	58.14	58.14	00.00	100.00	58.14	58.14	N/A	53,000	30,815
406	2	64.99	64.99	63.98	08.16	101.58	59.69	70.29	N/A	58,750	37,588
442	1	108.17	108.17	108.17	00.00	100.00	108.17	108.17	N/A	40,950	44,295
455	2	198.83	198.83	141.17	34.25	140.84	130.73	266.93	N/A	365,500	515,960
528	2	76.50	76.50	88.00	24.80	86.93	57.53	95.46	N/A	57,053	50,205
<u>ALL</u>	34	95.71	106.71	110.80	34.27	96.31	54.55	266.93	78.21 to 105.09	72,146	79,940

**2011 Correlation Section
for Nemaha County**

A. Commerical Real Property

Nemaha County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Auburn which is centered in the County. Nemaha is bordered to the south by Richardson County, with Johnson County to the east and Otoe County to the north. The county has the Missouri River for a majority of its eastern border with the McKissick Island lying on the east side of the Missouri River. Nemaha County has seen a slight decline in population over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat.

The 2011 Nemaha County commercial statistical profile reveals a total of 36 qualified commercial sales to be used as a sample for the three-year study period. The calculated median is 96. The profile indicates that of the three measures of central tendency only the median is within the acceptable range.

Regarding the qualitative statistical measures, the COD and the PRD are both outside the recommended range. Valuation group 01, which represents Auburn, is the only group with a large enough sample for any meaningful analysis. Even in this group of 25 sales, 9 occupancies appear as well as 3 vacant land sales. Sale amounts vary from just under 6,000 to 675,000.

The contract appraiser reviews and verifies all commercial sales in the County. The appraiser conducts a physical inspection in conjunction with the sales verification. The appraiser has worked in Nemaha County for a number of years and is familiar with the commercial market in the county.

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha County

The county updated all land use through the GIS system and conducted a market analysis and reviewed market areas for the county. The county made the necessary adjustments to value to bring the level of value within the require range. The county completed pickup work for the agricultural class of property.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Ron Elliot	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	8100	River bottom along the Missouri, Topography
	8300	Difference in Topography
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	The county completed an analysis with all sales combined and they also conduct an analysis looking at different areas of the county. These studies are done to see if they can achieve a reasonable level of value as well as maintaining the quality of assessment with or without market areas.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	Highest and best use or current use of the parcel	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	First acre is higher for rural res homes than for farm home sites. In past years there was a wider gap and more recently the gap has continued to shrink.	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	The county assigns differences in value based on soils more rather than using a straight LCG structure.	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	GIS imagery and physical inspection when required.	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	The county feels that a complete sales verification aids in monitoring if there is an influence from non-agricultural characteristics.	
9.	Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?	
	Yes	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	The county looks at land use changes on the parcel. There have not been a lot of changes noted in the file.	

12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.
	The county relies on statutes and regulations

64 Nemaha
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 : 63
Total Sales Price : 18,221,237
Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,221,237
Total Assessed Value : 12,127,950
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 289,226
Avg. Assessed Value : 192,507

MEDIAN : 69
WGT. MEAN : 67
MEAN : 69
COD : 14.94
PRD : 103.26

COV : 18.30
STD : 12.58
Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.36
MAX Sales Ratio : 96.57
MIN Sales Ratio : 45.52

95% Median C.I. : 61.23 to 72.22
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.54 to 70.58
95% Mean C.I. : 65.62 to 71.84

Printed:3/24/2011 3:45:23PM

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	72.29	70.97	67.75	06.16	104.75	61.23	78.05	N/A	425,207	288,073
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	9	71.59	73.75	73.30	11.24	100.61	59.35	90.67	62.75 to 86.00	317,571	232,790
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	10	72.09	68.80	67.87	13.76	101.37	53.08	83.53	56.58 to 82.49	270,966	183,900
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	56.53	64.22	62.97	15.67	101.99	54.78	81.36	N/A	134,795	84,885
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	8	69.72	69.23	67.21	09.97	103.01	57.34	84.20	57.34 to 84.20	181,144	121,754
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	51.49	51.49	54.14	08.51	95.11	47.11	55.86	N/A	407,481	220,618
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	68.30	68.13	68.55	07.76	99.39	58.67	79.60	58.67 to 79.60	142,470	97,658
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	69.27	73.34	74.69	18.51	98.19	55.94	96.57	55.94 to 96.57	231,836	173,157
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	77.71	77.71	63.69	21.93	122.01	60.67	94.74	N/A	658,282	419,255
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	58.16	59.83	58.69	17.80	101.94	45.52	75.48	45.52 to 75.48	554,000	325,144
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	56.95	68.14	69.98	20.11	97.37	56.57	90.91	N/A	204,683	143,230
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	65.40	65.40	56.68	22.46	115.38	50.71	80.09	N/A	160,000	90,683
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	26	71.70	70.32	69.61	12.43	101.02	53.08	90.67	61.23 to 77.90	295,116	205,425
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	24	69.16	68.85	68.09	13.58	101.12	47.11	96.57	59.13 to 74.64	207,234	141,103
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	13	60.67	65.35	61.00	20.75	107.13	45.52	94.74	50.71 to 80.09	428,816	261,572
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	23	69.12	66.85	65.24	14.47	102.47	47.11	84.20	57.34 to 74.97	233,833	152,562
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	67.73	68.63	64.77	16.55	105.96	45.52	96.57	58.67 to 75.48	334,094	216,390
<u>ALL</u>	63	69.35	68.73	66.56	14.94	103.26	45.52	96.57	61.23 to 72.22	289,226	192,507

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
8100	13	70.31	70.08	70.83	16.43	98.94	47.11	96.57	55.94 to 83.53	229,072	162,255
8300	50	69.27	68.38	65.72	14.49	104.05	45.52	95.16	61.09 to 72.77	304,866	200,373
<u>ALL</u>	63	69.35	68.73	66.56	14.94	103.26	45.52	96.57	61.23 to 72.22	289,226	192,507

64 Nemaha
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 : 63
 Total Sales Price : 18,221,237
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,221,237
 Total Assessed Value : 12,127,950
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 289,226
 Avg. Assessed Value : 192,507

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 67
 MEAN : 69
 COD : 14.94
 PRD : 103.26

COV : 18.30
 STD : 12.58
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.36
 MAX Sales Ratio : 96.57
 MIN Sales Ratio : 45.52

95% Median C.I. : 61.23 to 72.22
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.54 to 70.58
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.62 to 71.84

Printed:3/24/2011 3:45:23PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
8100	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
Dry											
County	16	73.37	70.61	69.67	14.27	101.35	45.52	96.57	58.67 to 79.60	340,556	237,267
8100	2	76.22	76.22	72.44	26.71	105.22	55.86	96.57	N/A	552,481	400,203
8300	14	73.37	69.81	68.97	12.35	101.22	45.52	84.20	58.67 to 79.60	310,282	213,990
Grass											
County	4	65.38	65.36	65.10	15.36	100.40	47.11	83.55	N/A	111,377	72,506
8100	1	47.11	47.11	47.11	00.00	100.00	47.11	47.11	N/A	160,000	75,375
8300	3	67.23	71.44	75.18	09.92	95.03	63.53	83.55	N/A	95,170	71,550
ALL	63	69.35	68.73	66.56	14.94	103.26	45.52	96.57	61.23 to 72.22	289,226	192,507

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
8100	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
Dry											
County	41	71.59	70.39	68.59	15.42	102.62	45.52	96.57	60.67 to 77.90	322,215	220,996
8100	5	70.31	73.39	73.06	18.09	100.45	55.86	96.57	N/A	358,792	262,141
8300	36	71.70	69.97	67.88	15.03	103.08	45.52	95.16	60.67 to 77.90	317,135	215,282
Grass											
County	6	60.06	62.13	62.13	15.50	100.00	47.11	83.55	47.11 to 83.55	108,302	67,290
8100	2	51.85	51.85	50.76	09.14	102.15	47.11	56.58	N/A	130,150	66,060
8300	4	65.38	67.27	69.73	12.42	96.47	54.78	83.55	N/A	97,377	67,905
ALL	63	69.35	68.73	66.56	14.94	103.26	45.52	96.57	61.23 to 72.22	289,226	192,507

64 Nemaha
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 : 81
 Total Sales Price : 23,061,708
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,061,708
 Total Assessed Value : 14,620,119
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 284,712
 Avg. Assessed Value : 180,495

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 63
 MEAN : 67
 COD : 18.91
 PRD : 105.98

COV : 26.31
 STD : 17.68
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.07
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.82
 MIN Sales Ratio : 05.92

95% Median C.I. : 61.09 to 71.59
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 56.43 to 70.36
 95% Mean C.I. : 63.34 to 71.04

Printed:3/24/2011 3:45:26PM

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	72.29	70.97	67.75	06.16	104.75	61.23	78.05	N/A	425,207	288,073
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	11	70.50	65.95	62.71	19.70	105.17	21.64	90.67	40.13 to 86.00	348,494	218,543
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	11	70.82	68.98	68.14	12.74	101.23	53.08	83.53	56.58 to 82.49	271,787	185,208
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	4	64.85	66.46	65.84	16.67	100.94	54.78	81.36	N/A	140,674	92,624
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	8	69.72	69.23	67.21	09.97	103.01	57.34	84.20	57.34 to 84.20	181,144	121,754
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	55.86	59.10	57.41	16.24	102.94	47.11	74.33	N/A	324,154	186,104
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	7	66.27	66.50	66.41	08.92	100.14	56.74	79.60	56.74 to 79.60	149,118	99,026
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	69.27	73.34	74.69	18.51	98.19	55.94	96.57	55.94 to 96.57	231,836	173,157
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	94.74	94.74	70.75	23.98	133.91	60.67	128.82	N/A	492,188	348,206
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	11	61.09	63.26	54.91	26.22	115.21	27.73	103.54	45.52 to 86.83	432,136	237,297
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	58.41	57.39	57.90	28.15	99.12	05.92	90.91	05.92 to 90.91	222,906	129,059
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	54.90	61.90	55.78	17.83	110.97	50.71	80.09	N/A	213,883	119,312
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	30	71.21	67.80	65.64	14.76	103.29	21.64	90.67	61.23 to 74.73	302,887	198,802
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	26	69.16	68.59	67.87	13.50	101.06	47.11	96.57	59.13 to 74.33	204,620	138,876
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	25	60.67	65.00	58.29	29.47	111.51	05.92	128.82	54.90 to 75.48	346,199	201,812
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	26	69.88	67.53	65.95	13.22	102.40	47.11	84.20	57.34 to 74.73	229,768	151,543
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	29	66.27	70.08	62.81	22.32	111.57	27.73	128.82	58.67 to 75.48	314,779	197,701
<u>ALL</u>	81	69.12	67.19	63.40	18.91	105.98	05.92	128.82	61.09 to 71.59	284,712	180,495

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
8100	23	65.70	63.02	59.08	25.22	106.67	05.92	103.54	55.86 to 73.17	243,111	143,634
8300	58	69.27	68.84	64.78	16.76	106.27	27.73	128.82	61.23 to 72.77	301,210	195,113
<u>ALL</u>	81	69.12	67.19	63.40	18.91	105.98	05.92	128.82	61.09 to 71.59	284,712	180,495

64 Nemaha
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 : 81
 Total Sales Price : 23,061,708
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,061,708
 Total Assessed Value : 14,620,119
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 284,712
 Avg. Assessed Value : 180,495

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 63
 MEAN : 67
 COD : 18.91
 PRD : 105.98

COV : 26.31
 STD : 17.68
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.07
 MAX Sales Ratio : 128.82
 MIN Sales Ratio : 05.92

95% Median C.I. : 61.09 to 71.59
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 56.43 to 70.36
 95% Mean C.I. : 63.34 to 71.04

Printed:3/24/2011 3:45:26PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
8100	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
Dry											
County	21	70.82	67.58	64.34	17.50	105.04	27.73	96.57	56.57 to 78.05	348,455	224,211
8100	4	63.34	69.10	68.29	23.03	101.19	53.16	96.57	N/A	433,741	296,186
8300	17	72.77	67.22	63.12	16.15	106.50	27.73	84.20	56.57 to 79.60	328,388	207,276
Grass											
County	4	65.38	65.36	65.10	15.36	100.40	47.11	83.55	N/A	111,377	72,506
8100	1	47.11	47.11	47.11	00.00	100.00	47.11	47.11	N/A	160,000	75,375
8300	3	67.23	71.44	75.18	09.92	95.03	63.53	83.55	N/A	95,170	71,550
ALL	81	69.12	67.19	63.40	18.91	105.98	05.92	128.82	61.09 to 71.59	284,712	180,495

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
8100	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
Dry											
County	50	70.57	68.78	64.76	19.34	106.21	21.64	128.82	60.66 to 74.97	327,461	212,077
8100	10	65.49	62.59	59.58	24.89	105.05	21.64	96.57	40.13 to 83.53	355,757	211,975
8300	40	71.70	70.33	66.20	18.02	106.24	27.73	128.82	60.67 to 77.90	320,387	212,102
Grass											
County	6	60.06	62.13	62.13	15.50	100.00	47.11	83.55	47.11 to 83.55	108,302	67,290
8100	2	51.85	51.85	50.76	09.14	102.15	47.11	56.58	N/A	130,150	66,060
8300	4	65.38	67.27	69.73	12.42	96.47	54.78	83.55	N/A	97,377	67,905
ALL	81	69.12	67.19	63.40	18.91	105.98	05.92	128.82	61.09 to 71.59	284,712	180,495

64 Nemaha
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 : 98
 Total Sales Price : 26,252,339
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,252,339
 Total Assessed Value : 17,366,236
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 267,881
 Avg. Assessed Value : 177,206

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 71
 COD : 20.30
 PRD : 107.45

COV : 28.00
 STD : 19.90
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.28
 MAX Sales Ratio : 144.41
 MIN Sales Ratio : 05.45

95% Median C.I. : 66.27 to 74.43
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.76 to 73.55
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.14 to 75.02

Printed:3/24/2011 3:45:29PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	4	72.29	70.97	67.75	06.16	104.75	61.23	78.05	N/A	425,207	288,073
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	11	70.50	65.83	62.52	19.87	105.29	21.58	90.67	38.82 to 86.00	348,494	217,888
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	14	74.85	74.83	70.73	16.31	105.80	53.08	113.64	57.34 to 83.53	234,833	166,106
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	70.78	68.31	68.04	13.61	100.40	54.78	81.36	N/A	144,539	98,337
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	9	70.31	77.58	70.32	20.49	110.32	57.34	144.41	60.66 to 84.20	167,772	117,981
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	69.10	66.49	65.58	11.65	101.39	47.11	79.12	47.11 to 79.12	265,940	174,397
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	8	68.30	67.47	67.50	09.03	99.96	56.74	79.60	56.74 to 79.60	151,728	102,424
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	10	76.45	75.95	76.57	17.85	99.19	55.94	96.57	57.85 to 95.16	220,469	168,804
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	94.74	96.77	78.09	22.33	123.92	60.67	128.82	N/A	371,467	290,087
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	61.29	65.62	56.39	28.57	116.37	27.73	103.54	47.67 to 86.83	412,792	232,768
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	72.27	66.54	66.93	29.57	99.42	05.45	91.80	05.45 to 91.80	247,406	165,592
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	52.81	58.84	54.22	16.40	108.52	49.65	80.09	N/A	215,413	116,793
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	34	71.70	70.51	66.70	16.39	105.71	21.58	113.64	62.75 to 78.05	280,724	187,242
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	35	70.29	72.27	70.36	15.45	102.71	47.11	144.41	63.53 to 74.43	201,600	141,841
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	29	61.73	70.31	62.53	33.92	112.44	05.45	128.82	55.23 to 86.10	332,818	208,123
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	36	70.55	72.76	68.96	16.64	105.51	47.11	144.41	62.86 to 75.56	212,440	146,505
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	35	70.33	73.44	66.00	22.96	111.27	27.73	128.82	61.09 to 81.00	292,267	192,888
<u>ALL</u>	98	70.35	71.08	66.15	20.30	107.45	05.45	144.41	66.27 to 74.43	267,881	177,206

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
8100	26	69.79	66.01	61.95	23.71	106.55	05.45	103.54	55.94 to 75.56	242,290	150,105
8300	72	71.05	72.91	67.48	18.93	108.05	27.73	144.41	66.27 to 74.97	277,122	186,993
<u>ALL</u>	98	70.35	71.08	66.15	20.30	107.45	05.45	144.41	66.27 to 74.43	267,881	177,206

64 Nemaha
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 : 98
 Total Sales Price : 26,252,339
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,252,339
 Total Assessed Value : 17,366,236
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 267,881
 Avg. Assessed Value : 177,206

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 71
 COD : 20.30
 PRD : 107.45

COV : 28.00
 STD : 19.90
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.28
 MAX Sales Ratio : 144.41
 MIN Sales Ratio : 05.45

95% Median C.I. : 66.27 to 74.43
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.76 to 73.55
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.14 to 75.02

Printed:3/24/2011 3:45:29PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
8100	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
Dry											
County	25	73.96	70.89	67.03	17.82	105.76	27.73	97.49	61.09 to 81.00	330,222	221,349
8100	7	81.00	76.01	73.40	17.26	103.56	51.46	96.57	51.46 to 96.57	353,280	259,292
8300	18	73.37	68.90	64.31	17.01	107.14	27.73	97.49	58.67 to 79.60	321,255	206,593
Grass											
County	7	67.23	77.00	72.00	26.51	106.94	47.11	144.41	47.11 to 144.41	114,044	82,106
8100	1	47.11	47.11	47.11	00.00	100.00	47.11	47.11	N/A	160,000	75,375
8300	6	68.76	81.98	78.23	25.36	104.79	62.86	144.41	62.86 to 144.41	106,385	83,228
ALL	98	70.35	71.08	66.15	20.30	107.45	05.45	144.41	66.27 to 74.43	267,881	177,206

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	2	87.29	87.29	95.06	35.91	91.83	55.94	118.64	N/A	207,386	197,133
8100	1	55.94	55.94	55.94	00.00	100.00	55.94	55.94	N/A	156,000	87,260
8300	1	118.64	118.64	118.64	00.00	100.00	118.64	118.64	N/A	258,772	307,006
Dry											
County	59	72.77	70.77	66.60	18.29	106.26	21.58	128.82	62.01 to 78.05	312,544	208,149
8100	14	70.55	68.00	64.16	21.87	105.99	21.58	96.57	51.46 to 86.10	318,970	204,662
8300	45	73.96	71.63	67.38	16.94	106.31	27.73	128.82	61.23 to 78.12	310,544	209,233
Grass											
County	9	63.53	72.26	68.67	25.22	105.23	47.11	144.41	54.78 to 83.55	111,401	76,495
8100	2	51.85	51.85	50.76	09.14	102.15	47.11	56.58	N/A	130,150	66,060
8300	7	67.23	78.09	74.95	24.88	104.19	54.78	144.41	54.78 to 144.41	106,044	79,477
ALL	98	70.35	71.08	66.15	20.30	107.45	05.45	144.41	66.27 to 74.43	267,881	177,206

2011 Correlation Section for Nemaha County

A. Agricultural Land

Nemaha County is comprised of approximately 3% irrigated land, 76% dry crop land and 19% grass/pasture land. Nemaha County has two market areas for 2011. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the market area determination. The county contends that topography and soils as well as the percentage of better soils in a parcel.

The majority land use for area 8100 shows more of an influence of irrigation and grass than the total county makeup. The market area totals, 5% irrigated, 68% dry and 24% grass. Nemaha County has 13 qualified agricultural sales in area 8100 for the three year study period. The sales are not proportionately spread across the three years of the study period there are 3 sales in the oldest year, 9 sales in the middle year and 1 sale in the newest year. In looking at the majority land use of the sales in area 1 they are not representative of the county, with the sales file containing sales that are approximately 3% irrigated, 63% dry and 34% grass. The Base statistics show the calculated median to be 70% for area 1.

The majority land use for area 8300 shows more dry land and less irrigated and grass. There are 50 sales in area 8300 for the three year study period. The sales are not proportionately spread across the three years of the study period there are 23 sales in the oldest year, 15 sales in the middle year and 12 sales in the newest year. The market area totals are, 0% irrigated, 78% dry and 22% grass. The sales file is relatively balanced for majority land use in area 2. The timing of the sales shows the fewest sales in the most recent year. The base statistics show an overall calculated median of 69% for area two.

The second test, random inclusion, for area 8100, 4 sales were added to the first year to meet an acceptable threshold and 6 sales were added to the most recent year. The sales came from Otoe and Richardson County all sales were randomly selected. The majority land use was balanced as well as the date of sale. The Random Inclusion statistics show the calculated median to be 66%.

For the random inclusion for area 8300, 6 sales were added to the last year of the study period and 2 sales were added to the middle year they were from Johnson, Otoe, and Richardson County. The majority land use remained balanced. The overall calculated median was 69%.

The third test, random exclusion, was to bring in as many sales from a six mile radius as possible to maintain a proportionate and representative sample and to meet the 10% threshold between study years. For area 8100 13 sales that were deemed comparable were brought in from the neighboring counties; 8 sales in the oldest year, 1 in the middle year and 4 in the newest year. The sales file was not distorted with the inclusion of the sales, there is a proportionate distribution of sales among each year of the study period, the sample is considered adequate to be statistically reliable, and there continues to be a reasonable representation of the land use in Nemaha County. The random exclusion statistics show the calculated median to be 70% for Area 8100.

For area 8300 with the third test, 5 sales were added to the first year of the study period and 9 to the middle year, and 8 sales were added to the last year. The sales came from Richardson, Otoe, Pawnee, and Johnson County. The overall calculated median was below the range at 71%. The file was balanced to time of sale and majority land use.

The Nemaha County valuation structure based on soils was difficult to replicate in both the second and the third analysis. Averages were used to apply Nemaha counties values to the borrowed sales. Within the LCG structure there are some substantial differences of values. This may have had more of an impact on the second approach where there were fewer sales.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Nemaha County**

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 70% of market value for the agricultural class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha County**

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

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

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

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 6,109	Value : 633,689,725	Growth 2,495,150	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	350	1,374,765	67	402,645	51	215,225	468	1,992,635	
02. Res Improve Land	2,037	10,659,540	121	1,550,425	368	5,406,675	2,526	17,616,640	
03. Res Improvements	2,080	114,264,185	128	9,737,970	389	32,319,060	2,597	156,321,215	
04. Res Total	2,430	126,298,490	195	11,691,040	440	37,940,960	3,065	175,930,490	1,350,485
% of Res Total	79.28	71.79	6.36	6.65	14.36	21.57	50.17	27.76	54.12
05. Com UnImp Land	78	386,885	3	27,380	2	14,335	83	428,600	
06. Com Improve Land	328	2,436,325	16	210,235	15	135,630	359	2,782,190	
07. Com Improvements	338	17,286,900	21	1,005,150	18	650,895	377	18,942,945	
08. Com Total	416	20,110,110	24	1,242,765	20	800,860	460	22,153,735	76,445
% of Com Total	90.43	90.78	5.22	5.61	4.35	3.62	7.53	3.50	3.06
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	1	26,650	4	105,760	0	0	5	132,410	
11. Ind Improvements	1	1,605,670	4	3,723,065	0	0	5	5,328,735	
12. Ind Total	1	1,632,320	4	3,828,825	0	0	5	5,461,145	0
% of Ind Total	20.00	29.89	80.00	70.11	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.86	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	8	611,545	40	2,036,385	48	2,647,930	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	3	162,415	2	185,375	5	347,790	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	3	36,170	2	4,040	5	40,210	
16. Rec Total	0	0	11	810,130	42	2,225,800	53	3,035,930	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	20.75	26.68	79.25	73.32	0.87	0.48	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,430	126,298,490	206	12,501,170	482	40,166,760	3,118	178,966,420	1,350,485
% of Res & Rec Total	77.93	70.57	6.61	6.99	15.46	22.44	51.04	28.24	54.12
Com & Ind Total	417	21,742,430	28	5,071,590	20	800,860	465	27,614,880	76,445
% of Com & Ind Total	89.68	78.73	6.02	18.37	4.30	2.90	7.61	4.36	3.06
17. Taxable Total	2,847	148,040,920	234	17,572,760	502	40,967,620	3,583	206,581,300	1,426,930
% of Taxable Total	79.46	71.66	6.53	8.51	14.01	19.83	58.65	32.60	57.19

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	269	8,084,085	2,698,600	0	0	0
19. Commercial	215	9,967,185	7,127,785	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	269	8,084,085	2,698,600
19. Commercial	0	0	0	215	9,967,185	7,127,785
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				484	18,051,270	9,826,385

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	250	52	92	394

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	59	650,370	136	15,180,465	1,422	209,550,015	1,617	225,380,850
28. Ag-Improved Land	7	325,870	74	12,017,935	801	158,845,515	882	171,189,320
29. Ag Improvements	7	447,225	76	2,571,100	826	27,519,930	909	30,538,255
30. Ag Total							2,526	427,108,425

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.96	4,900	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	4	4.58	11,895	44	44.01	117,025	
33. HomeSite Improvements	5	4.58	402,780	48	44.01	1,897,330	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	2.26	4,315	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	2	1.46	3,485	55	108.28	113,270	
37. FarmSite Improvements	4	0.00	44,445	74	0.00	673,770	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	8.84	0	0	266.33	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	3	13.57	34,175	4	15.53	39,075	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	457	485.89	1,286,635	505	534.48	1,415,555	
33. HomeSite Improvements	471	468.80	19,830,335	524	517.39	22,130,445	1,068,220
34. HomeSite Total				528	550.01	23,585,075	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	25	385.85	137,040	27	388.11	141,355	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	595	1,125.92	1,227,740	652	1,235.66	1,344,495	
37. FarmSite Improvements	796	0.00	7,689,595	874	0.00	8,407,810	0
38. FarmSite Total				901	1,623.77	9,893,660	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,457.29	0	0	4,732.46	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,429	6,906.24	33,478,735	1,068,220

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	3	272.74	296,010
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	10	728.46	784,555	13	1,001.20	1,080,565

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	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	14.79	9.61%	35,695	11.15%	2,413.46
55. 1D	29.22	18.99%	75,370	23.55%	2,579.40
56. 2D1	15.25	9.91%	33,025	10.32%	2,165.57
57. 2D	12.58	8.18%	31,880	9.96%	2,534.18
58. 3D1	4.14	2.69%	9,065	2.83%	2,189.61
59. 3D	73.94	48.06%	131,195	40.99%	1,774.34
60. 4D1	3.82	2.48%	3,775	1.18%	988.22
61. 4D	0.10	0.07%	85	0.03%	850.00
62. Total	153.84	100.00%	320,090	100.00%	2,080.67
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.76	0.73%	1,235	1.05%	1,625.00
64. 1G	7.13	6.81%	14,015	11.90%	1,965.64
65. 2G1	10.34	9.87%	17,120	14.54%	1,655.71
66. 2G	0.33	0.32%	250	0.21%	757.58
67. 3G1	0.54	0.52%	410	0.35%	759.26
68. 3G	71.79	68.53%	73,040	62.03%	1,017.41
69. 4G1	3.77	3.60%	2,935	2.49%	778.51
70. 4G	10.09	9.63%	8,735	7.42%	865.71
71. Total	104.75	100.00%	117,740	100.00%	1,124.01
Irrigated Total					
	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry Total					
	153.84	59.45%	320,090	73.11%	2,080.67
Grass Total					
	104.75	40.48%	117,740	26.89%	1,124.01
72. Waste	0.19	0.07%	10	0.00%	52.63
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	258.78	100.00%	437,840	100.00%	1,691.94

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 8100

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	168.11	5.75%	396,700	8.28%	2,359.76
46. 1A	62.83	2.15%	151,465	3.16%	2,410.71
47. 2A1	1,732.84	59.23%	2,817,845	58.82%	1,626.14
48. 2A	21.77	0.74%	34,050	0.71%	1,564.08
49. 3A1	704.34	24.07%	957,760	19.99%	1,359.80
50. 3A	173.64	5.93%	381,250	7.96%	2,195.63
51. 4A1	36.89	1.26%	29,105	0.61%	788.97
52. 4A	25.41	0.87%	22,340	0.47%	879.18
53. Total	2,925.83	100.00%	4,790,515	100.00%	1,637.32
Dry					
54. 1D1	408.76	1.11%	926,370	1.25%	2,266.29
55. 1D	3,001.88	8.15%	6,900,110	9.28%	2,298.60
56. 2D1	11,396.59	30.92%	22,281,880	29.98%	1,955.14
57. 2D	1,098.28	2.98%	2,993,895	4.03%	2,725.99
58. 3D1	4,114.51	11.16%	5,228,130	7.03%	1,270.66
59. 3D	10,686.67	29.00%	27,729,030	37.31%	2,594.73
60. 4D1	4,778.62	12.97%	7,079,780	9.53%	1,481.55
61. 4D	1,369.70	3.72%	1,179,585	1.59%	861.20
62. Total	36,855.01	100.00%	74,318,780	100.00%	2,016.52
Grass					
63. 1G1	28.06	0.22%	57,155	0.44%	2,036.89
64. 1G	553.43	4.26%	1,113,430	8.53%	2,011.87
65. 2G1	1,487.93	11.44%	2,593,755	19.86%	1,743.20
66. 2G	130.60	1.00%	127,950	0.98%	979.71
67. 3G1	257.99	1.98%	230,275	1.76%	892.57
68. 3G	1,264.57	9.72%	1,256,675	9.62%	993.76
69. 4G1	1,805.32	13.88%	1,374,480	10.52%	761.35
70. 4G	7,478.21	57.50%	6,305,900	48.29%	843.24
71. Total	13,006.11	100.00%	13,059,620	100.00%	1,004.11
Irrigated Total					
	2,925.83	5.47%	4,790,515	5.20%	1,637.32
Dry Total					
	36,855.01	68.94%	74,318,780	80.61%	2,016.52
Grass Total					
	13,006.11	24.33%	13,059,620	14.16%	1,004.11
72. Waste	324.85	0.61%	16,280	0.02%	50.12
73. Other	350.69	0.66%	11,985	0.01%	34.18
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	53,462.49	100.00%	92,197,180	100.00%	1,724.52

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 8300

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	184.43	3.98%	481,500	4.82%	2,610.75
46. 1A	540.17	11.65%	1,386,380	13.86%	2,566.56
47. 2A1	1,138.10	24.54%	2,815,550	28.16%	2,473.90
48. 2A	904.83	19.51%	2,095,930	20.96%	2,316.38
49. 3A1	1,294.02	27.90%	2,392,160	23.92%	1,848.63
50. 3A	226.31	4.88%	444,490	4.45%	1,964.08
51. 4A1	328.94	7.09%	370,625	3.71%	1,126.73
52. 4A	20.84	0.45%	12,670	0.13%	607.97
53. Total	4,637.64	100.00%	9,999,305	100.00%	2,156.12
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,877.38	1.30%	4,608,400	1.80%	2,454.70
55. 1D	13,185.65	9.12%	32,760,475	12.78%	2,484.56
56. 2D1	27,577.32	19.08%	62,599,930	24.41%	2,269.98
57. 2D	15,025.87	10.40%	24,964,975	9.74%	1,661.47
58. 3D1	33,241.49	23.00%	47,828,755	18.65%	1,438.83
59. 3D	32,151.72	22.25%	59,516,640	23.21%	1,851.12
60. 4D1	19,104.31	13.22%	22,117,970	8.63%	1,157.75
61. 4D	2,347.59	1.62%	2,031,495	0.79%	865.35
62. Total	144,511.33	100.00%	256,428,640	100.00%	1,774.45
Grass					
63. 1G1	277.06	0.86%	472,620	1.37%	1,705.84
64. 1G	2,051.19	6.36%	3,973,630	11.53%	1,937.23
65. 2G1	4,794.85	14.87%	8,306,390	24.11%	1,732.36
66. 2G	4,087.34	12.68%	3,980,850	11.55%	973.95
67. 3G1	2,451.11	7.60%	2,496,055	7.25%	1,018.34
68. 3G	3,208.32	9.95%	3,117,120	9.05%	971.57
69. 4G1	6,990.04	21.68%	5,292,585	15.36%	757.16
70. 4G	8,385.13	26.00%	6,812,115	19.77%	812.40
71. Total	32,245.04	100.00%	34,451,365	100.00%	1,068.42
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	4,637.64	2.52%	9,999,305	3.32%	2,156.12
Dry Total					
Dry Total	144,511.33	78.64%	256,428,640	85.19%	1,774.45
Grass Total					
Grass Total	32,245.04	17.55%	34,451,365	11.45%	1,068.42
72. Waste	2,085.81	1.13%	104,485	0.03%	50.09
73. Other	293.99	0.16%	10,875	0.00%	36.99
74. Exempt	74.58	0.04%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	183,773.81	100.00%	300,994,670	100.00%	1,637.85

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	906.36	1,916,205	6,657.11	12,873,615	7,563.47	14,789,820
77. Dry Land	432.70	794,455	11,321.57	21,527,025	169,765.91	308,746,030	181,520.18	331,067,510
78. Grass	155.17	166,370	3,519.19	3,499,655	41,681.54	43,962,700	45,355.90	47,628,725
79. Waste	0.69	35	294.97	14,750	2,115.19	105,990	2,410.85	120,775
80. Other	0.00	0	74.85	1,255	569.83	21,605	644.68	22,860
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.07	0	74.51	0	74.58	0
82. Total	588.56	960,860	16,116.94	26,958,890	220,789.58	365,709,940	237,495.08	393,629,690

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	7,563.47	3.18%	14,789,820	3.76%	1,955.43
Dry Land	181,520.18	76.43%	331,067,510	84.11%	1,823.86
Grass	45,355.90	19.10%	47,628,725	12.10%	1,050.11
Waste	2,410.85	1.02%	120,775	0.03%	50.10
Other	644.68	0.27%	22,860	0.01%	35.46
Exempt	74.58	0.03%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	237,495.08	100.00%	393,629,690	100.00%	1,657.42

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

64 Nemaha

	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	175,064,515	175,930,490	865,975	0.49%	1,350,485	-0.28%
02. Recreational	3,035,930	3,035,930	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	22,738,235	23,585,075	846,840	3.72%	1,068,220	-0.97%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	200,838,680	202,551,495	1,712,815	0.85%	2,418,705	-0.35%
05. Commercial	22,111,595	22,153,735	42,140	0.19%	76,445	-0.16%
06. Industrial	6,201,575	5,461,145	-740,430	-11.94%	0	-11.94%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	9,617,885	9,893,660	275,775	2.87%	0	2.87%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	37,931,055	37,508,540	-422,515	-1.11%	76,445	-1.32%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	238,769,735	240,060,035	1,290,300	0.54%	2,495,150	-0.50%
11. Irrigated	14,374,105	14,789,820	415,715	2.89%		
12. Dryland	326,962,960	331,067,510	4,104,550	1.26%		
13. Grassland	47,275,210	47,628,725	353,515	0.75%		
14. Wasteland	120,790	120,775	-15	-0.01%		
15. Other Agland	15,375	22,860	7,485	48.68%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	388,748,440	393,629,690	4,881,250	1.26%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	627,518,175	633,689,725	6,171,550	0.98%	2,495,150	0.59%

2010 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR NEMAHA COUNTY
ASSESSMENT YEARS 2011, 2012, 2013
June 15, 2010

TO: Nemaha County Board of Equalization

CC: Department of Property Assessment & Taxation

From: Lila Gottula, Nemaha County Assessor

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 205, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the (“plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the county board approves the budget. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for 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.” Nebr. Rev. Stat. # 77-112 (Reissue 2003)

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual land for agricultural and horticultural land for 2007 and each year thereafter until such time the legislature changes it.
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under # 77-1344 and 75% of its recapture value as defined in #77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under # 77-1347.
Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. # 77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

General Description of Real Property in Nemaha County:

Per the 2010 Nemaha County Abstract, we consist of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	3,065	50.0%	28%
Commercial	463	7.8%	4%
Industrial	9	.1%	1%
Recreational	53	.8%	<1%
Agricultural	2,516	41.3%	67%

depreciation study done and used. Rural residential properties were reviewed, new depreciation study done and applied to all rural residential properties for 2009.

- 3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis is collected from the market with our Appraiser Ron Elliott doing this as he has the credentials to do so.
 - 4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas: All unimproved agricultural land sales are broke down by township, range, soils and use to determine if they are in the right land valuation area. Adjustments to the areas are sometimes required to make sure the ratios and statistical report is as close to market as can be established.
- E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation: After all classes or subclasses are revalued they are compared to the sales studies to make sure the ratios and statistics are within the guidelines. The documentation is the sales analysis and any other information used to verify that the values are as correct as can be.
- F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment action: Once all values are finalized new ratio reports are ran to verify that the values are within the guidelines.
- G. Notices and Public Relations: About a week prior to the notices being sent a article is published in the local newspaper stating what properties were revalued, why they were revalued and our level of values for all types of property. When the notices are received, they have some idea what was done and why. All taxpayers are invited into the office to review their property record card to make sure we have it correct.

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

Property Class	Median	COD*	PRD*
Residential	97	7.78	102.56
Commercial	95	19.99	99.62
Agricultural Land	72	13.85	101.81
Special Value Agland	00	00	00

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

Assessment Actions Report for the county for the 2010 year: For 2010 residential properties in Auburn (main town) were reviewed to make sure the listing was correct with new pictures taken, making sure the sketches were correct using the June 2007 pricing with new depreciation set from the current sales. Also, a sales analysis was done on the small towns and rural residential property sales to make sure we are in compliance with state requirements. Recreational properties were reviewed and revalued for 2010.

The county builds the depreciation schedule by style of house, age and condition. The county completed a sales review for all residential property and completed all new construction for the rest of the county.

For commercial property a sales review was completed for each sale so statistics could be analyzed to make sure they were in compliance and used the 2007 cost tables. The county completed all pick-up work.

For agricultural property a complete sales analysis was done and new values set for all agricultural land in the county. The GIS mapping system was implemented with the new soils numbers. Listing and measuring of all new construction work was completed with new values set for all of those that had changes, also all buildings that were removed had the values adjusted to indict such action.

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2011: Residential (and/or subclasses): A sales analysis will be done on all residential property sales to make sure we are in compliance with state requirements. All new construction will be listed, measured and valued. The small towns' properties sales will need to be scrutinized to make sure they are in compliance. Only 6 sales in Brownville and no sales in Julian so no conclusion can be determined to make a change in these villages. The city of Peru and the village of Johnson median are in compliance. Brock, Nemaha and mobile homes on leased real estate will need to be reviewed. Recreational properties are in compliance. All new constructions will be listed and valued.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): All commercials sales will be reviewed. A sales analysis will be completed to

make sure those properties are in compliance as it appears they are at this time. We will be checking to make sure the different occupancy codes are in compliance. All new construction will be listed measured and valued.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): We are using the GIS system to do land use and physical inspection where necessary. Will be checking areas to make sure they are in compliance. New rural buildings will be listed, measured and valued. Beginning in 2011 we will begin reviewing agricultural outbuilding and rural homes. This will be a two year process with new values established and put in use for 2012 or if not complete then in 2013.

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

Residential (and/or subclasses): A sales analysis will be completed for all residential properties to make sure we are in compliance and establish new values where necessary. All new construction will be listed, measured and valued.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): A sales analysis will be completed to make sure all commercials meet the state guidelines. The review of commercials properties will be done to make sure the listings are correct and values adjusted as needed. All new construction will be listed, measured and valued.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): A sales analysis will be completed to make sure all agricultural land is valued within the state guidelines making adjustment where necessary. The review of rural homes and buildings will begin, making sure the listings are correct with new pictures and correction of sketches as necessary. List, measure and value all new construction in the rural area.

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Residential (and/or subclasses): A sales analysis will be completed for the whole county to make sure the values are in compliance with the state requirements. All new construction will be listed, measured and valued. Any buildings that have been removed will be taken off the listing. Should a class or subclass be out of compliance it will be corrected.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): A sales analysis will be completed of all commercial sales, making sure the commercial properties are in compliance with state guidelines. All new construction will be listed, measured and valued. Should some of the occupancy codes not meet the guidelines they will be reviewed and revalued. All new construction will be listed, measured and valued.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): A complete land sales analysis will be completed to make sure we are in compliance with the state guidelines. Should the analysis indicate that an area is out of compliance or area lines need to be changed we will react to the information the sales dictate. If not completed for 2012 we will continue the review of the rural homes and outbuildings to be completed for 2013 with new values established. All new construction will be listed, measured and valued in the rural area.

During each of these years we will look at our sales and determine which type of property needs attention the most and focus on bringing our properties to the required market value. So these plans could change or be altered from year to year.

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

1. Record maintenance, mapping updates, keeping the GIS system current, and ownership changes are an on-going duty as deeds or surveys are filed.
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulations:
 - a. Abstracts (Real Property on March 19th, Personal Property on June 15): This is an accumulation of all values.
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value Update with abstract.
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivision by August 20th.
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report to the PA&T and to all the schools by August 25th.

- f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer) also collect all the homestead application and verify ownership and value to the Department of Revenue.
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report-This report lists all the values for each political subdivision, their levy and the amount of taxes to be collected.
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds.
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owner Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report.
3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 635 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
 4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
 5. Taxable Government Owned Property - annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
 6. Homestead Exemptions; administer 300 annual filings of applications, approval /denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
 7. Centrally Assessed - review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for the tax list.
 8. Tax Increment Financing - management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
 9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates - management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
 10. Tax List; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed property.
 11. Tax List Corrections - prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
 12. County Board of Equalization - attends the county board of equalization meetings for valuation protest - assemble and provide information.
 13. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
 14. TERC Statewide Equalization - Attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
 15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education - attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required 60 hours in a four-year term, unless changed by the PA&T of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license.

Conclusion:

The budget for this year will probably see a four percent increase to cover salary increases of the assessor, deputy assessor, office clerk, and health insurance cost. Operating expense will be similar to the previous year. The amount for contracted appraiser will increase approximately 1.025%. The requested amount to be added to the general fund for all data processing and the GIS System is \$13,060 for yearly maintenance.

Respectfully submitted:

Lila Gottula, Nemaha County Assessor

Date: July 15, 2010

Copy distribution: Copy to the county board of equalization on or before July 31 of each year. A copy of the plan and any amendments to Department of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31 of each year.

2011 Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	1-This employee is scheduled to be the deputy assessor on acquiring an assessors certificate she was hired when the Assessor took office this year.
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1 on call person.
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	123,172.23
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	23,325
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	It is part of the County General Budget
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	1445
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	0
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	None

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

	Yes
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Office staff, with aid of GIS workshop
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terrascan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	No
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	N/A
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All towns have zoning
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	The county is unsure as to the implementation, for Auburn probably 30 years

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Ron Elliot
2.	Other services:
	ASI(Terra Scan) and GIS Workshop

2011 Certification for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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

