

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 Nuckolls County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	120	Median	97.07
Total Sales Price	\$3,747,331	Mean	100.11
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,745,331	Wgt. Mean	96.38
Total Assessed Value	\$3,609,875	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$27,137
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$31,211	Avg. Assessed Value	\$30,082

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.31 to 97.77
95% Mean C.I	93.35 to 99.41
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	95.02 to 105.20
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	9.32
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.93
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.57

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	136	97	97
2009	147	98	98
2008	166	98	98
2007	176	98	98

2011 Commission Summary for Nuckolls County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	14	Median	97.18
Total Sales Price	\$334,606	Mean	98.91
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$332,806	Wgt. Mean	95.94
Total Assessed Value	\$319,280	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$71,002
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$23,772	Avg. Assessed Value	\$22,806

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	81.94 to 106.50
95% Mean C.I	75.92 to 121.90
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.69 to 112.18
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.65
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.63
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.16

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	13	96	96
2009	16	93	93
2008	24	96	96
2007	24	96	96

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Nuckolls 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	73	The qualitative measures calculated in the random include sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Nuckolls County

A total revaluation of the city of Superior was completed. Preliminary protest hearings were held, 34 parcels protested, 9 received adjustments.

The assessor received approval from the county board for the remaining small towns to be revalued in 2011.

The Assessor and her staff reviewed all sales and completed a market study on the sales.

Sales ratio studies were conducted on all valuation groups, new depreciation tables were developed if needed.

All pick up work was completed timely.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor, Staff and 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	Nelson - is the county seat, has high school, on the highway
	02	Hardy - no school, limited infrastructure
	03	Lawrence - elementary school, some economic development
	04	Nora - no school, limited infrastructure
	05	Oak - no school, limited infrastructure
	06	Ruskin - no school, limited infrastructure
	07	Superior - largest community, unique market, K -12 school system
	08	Rural - Acreage located throughout the county, own market
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	<p>Cost Approach – is entered in to the CAMA system and depreciation tables developed</p> <p>Sale Comparison/Market Analysis – Sales are verified, reviewed for accuracy, statistics are run comparable properties are identified.</p>	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	Superior – 2004/2005; Lawrence and Nelson – 2005/2006; Hardy, Nora, Oak, Ruskin – 2006/2007; acreages and farm home – west half in 2007 and east half in 2008	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	Front foot	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2003	
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 their own depreciation tables along with contract appraiser, Darrel Stanard	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes, if needed	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	Whenever the costing is updated the depreciation tables are also developed	

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.
	Individual determination, but generally not small improvements or maintenance, usually in order to be a substantial change it would need to be a new house, additions, complete remodel, new structures.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.

65 Nuckolls

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 : 120
 Total Sales Price : 3,747,331
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,745,331
 Total Assessed Value : 3,609,875
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 31,211
 Avg. Assessed Value : 30,082

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 96
 MEAN : 100
 COD : 13.36
 PRD : 103.87

COV : 28.41
 STD : 28.44
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.97
 MAX Sales Ratio : 281.23
 MIN Sales Ratio : 27.30

95% Median C.I. : 96.31 to 97.77
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.35 to 99.41
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.02 to 105.20

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:01PM

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	23	95.69	95.68	94.37	11.91	101.39	66.33	168.50	92.74 to 98.61	29,988	28,300
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	95.91	88.43	91.94	10.04	96.18	61.09	99.75	69.30 to 98.64	33,271	30,588
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	12	96.93	93.96	91.71	05.12	102.45	61.44	100.83	94.33 to 99.26	37,458	34,353
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	15	98.89	111.18	94.11	18.82	118.14	67.59	281.23	95.82 to 101.00	30,240	28,459
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	13	96.38	105.21	99.19	11.45	106.07	90.34	203.13	93.85 to 100.44	47,177	46,795
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	97.50	99.37	106.14	18.89	93.62	51.45	155.52	76.40 to 100.00	24,713	26,230
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	14	97.94	103.30	97.41	08.91	106.05	79.76	153.68	97.06 to 110.06	27,627	26,910
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	19	96.42	102.61	99.20	18.40	103.44	27.30	199.70	94.08 to 100.00	24,033	23,839
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	62	96.93	97.70	93.22	12.09	104.81	61.09	281.23	95.51 to 98.17	32,130	29,953
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	58	97.20	102.69	99.97	14.71	102.72	27.30	203.13	96.38 to 98.15	30,228	30,221
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	52	97.11	102.99	97.20	14.07	105.96	51.45	281.23	96.33 to 98.50	34,864	33,889
<u>ALL</u>	120	97.07	100.11	96.38	13.36	103.87	27.30	281.23	96.31 to 97.77	31,211	30,082

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	22	96.60	95.41	91.99	12.24	103.72	66.33	135.13	82.45 to 100.00	13,910	12,795
02	8	96.45	86.66	94.84	16.19	91.37	27.30	111.77	27.30 to 111.77	11,650	11,049
03	12	97.97	107.30	94.46	20.61	113.59	61.44	155.52	90.34 to 147.20	41,310	39,023
04	1	75.11	75.11	75.11	00.00	100.00	75.11	75.11	N/A	17,500	13,145
05	2	57.46	57.46	54.73	10.46	104.99	51.45	63.47	N/A	6,875	3,763
06	1	100.44	100.44	100.44	00.00	100.00	100.44	100.44	N/A	85,000	85,370
07	69	97.18	104.12	99.05	11.66	105.12	61.09	281.23	96.33 to 98.02	32,401	32,094
08	5	95.86	91.65	90.50	08.29	101.27	67.59	102.60	N/A	99,700	90,233
<u>ALL</u>	120	97.07	100.11	96.38	13.36	103.87	27.30	281.23	96.31 to 97.77	31,211	30,082

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	120	97.07	100.11	96.38	13.36	103.87	27.30	281.23	96.31 to 97.77	31,211	30,082
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	120	97.07	100.11	96.38	13.36	103.87	27.30	281.23	96.31 to 97.77	31,211	30,082

**65 Nuckolls
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 : 120
 Total Sales Price : 3,747,331
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,745,331
 Total Assessed Value : 3,609,875
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 31,211
 Avg. Assessed Value : 30,082

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 96
 MEAN : 100
 COD : 13.36
 PRD : 103.87

COV : 28.41
 STD : 28.44
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.97
 MAX Sales Ratio : 281.23
 MIN Sales Ratio : 27.30

95% Median C.I. : 96.31 to 97.77
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.35 to 99.41
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.02 to 105.20

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:01PM

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	12	96.65	93.85	96.31	12.12	97.45	63.47	135.13	76.40 to 100.00	2,182	2,102	
5000 TO 9999	22	97.33	113.04	111.60	27.66	101.29	27.30	281.23	94.70 to 122.67	7,132	7,959	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	34	97.33	106.27	109.41	22.14	97.13	27.30	281.23	95.08 to 100.00	5,385	5,892	
10000 TO 29999	44	97.08	100.64	102.24	14.34	98.44	51.45	203.13	95.69 to 98.70	17,551	17,944	
30000 TO 59999	20	97.12	96.70	96.63	04.43	100.07	69.30	112.78	94.33 to 98.47	41,550	40,151	
60000 TO 99999	17	97.01	92.42	92.20	06.14	100.24	61.44	100.44	90.34 to 98.61	78,559	72,433	
100000 TO 149999	4	94.95	92.04	92.43	05.57	99.58	79.76	98.50	N/A	117,129	108,258	
150000 TO 249999	1	98.46	98.46	98.46	00.00	100.00	98.46	98.46	N/A	155,000	152,615	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	120	97.07	100.11	96.38	13.36	103.87	27.30	281.23	96.31 to 97.77	31,211	30,082	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Nuckolls County**

A. Residential Real Property

Nuckolls County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The largest town is Superior and the county seat is Nelson. The county has two high schools; one in Superior and one consolidated high school, Lawrence-Nelson. Most of the county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline. Nuckolls County has a new Assessor, Susan Rogers.

The statistical sampling of 120 qualified residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Nuckolls County. The measures of central tendency offer support for each other and all fall within the acceptable range. The calculated median is 97%. All but two valuation groupings are within the acceptable range, the two valuation groupings that are low represent the assessor locations of Nora and Oak but a reliable statistical inference would be difficult with the small number of sales in these two villages. It is possible the county should look toward combining some of the valuation groupings for 2012.

Nuckolls County has in place a procedure with their sales verification. When a sale occurs, the information on the 521 is checked against the records for accuracy and a sales verification questionnaire is started. The contract appraiser completes the form with telephone calls to the knowledgeable parties and a physical inspection of the property.

Nuckolls County employs a four-year inspection cycle for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Nuckolls County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have continued to develop their GIS system, transfer of sales electronically, complete spreadsheet analyses and are currently taking bids to update their MIPS system.

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County

All new sales are reviewed by the Assessor and her staff

Nuckolls County has a maintenance contract with Stanard Appraisal for their commercial properties which were reappraised in 2009.

On-sight inspections were completed if there was a new sale, or remodeling or new construction on a parcel.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor, Staff and 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	Nelson is the county seat, has high school, on the highway
	02	Hardy no school, limited infrastructure
	03	Lawrence elementary school, some economic development
	04	Nora no school, limited infrastructure
	05	Oak no school, limited infrastructure
	06	Ruskin no school, limited infrastructure
	07	Superior largest community, unique market, K -12 school system
	08	Rural Acreage located throughout the county, own market
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	<p>Cost Approach – is entered in to the CAMA system and depreciation tables developed</p> <p>Sale Comparison/Market Analysis – Sales are verified, reviewed for accuracy, statistics are run comparable properties are identified.</p> <p>Income – at various times the contract appraiser uses the income approach to value when information is available.</p>	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2010	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Market Analysis/Sales Comparison	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2006	
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 their own depreciation tables with the help of the contract appraiser	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes, if needed by the contract appraiser	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	The depreciation tables are updated whenever the cost tables are updated.	
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.
	Individual determination, but generally not small improvements or maintenance, usually in order to be a substantial change it would need to be a new building, additions, complete remodel, new structures.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.

**65 Nuckolls
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 : 14
Total Sales Price : 334,606
Total Adj. Sales Price : 332,806
Total Assessed Value : 319,280
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 23,772
Avg. Assessed Value : 22,806

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 96
MEAN : 99
COD : 20.35
PRD : 103.10

COV : 40.26
STD : 39.82
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.78
MAX Sales Ratio : 222.82
MIN Sales Ratio : 42.00

95% Median C.I. : 81.94 to 106.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.69 to 112.18
95% Mean C.I. : 75.92 to 121.90

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:03PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	88.47	88.47	93.01	07.38	95.12	81.94	95.00	N/A	5,900	5,488
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	1	96.18	96.18	96.18	00.00	100.00	96.18	96.18	N/A	1,700	1,635
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	93.45	93.45	93.45	00.00	100.00	93.45	93.45	N/A	55,000	51,400
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	222.82	222.82	222.82	00.00	100.00	222.82	222.82	N/A	14,406	32,100
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	106.50	106.50	106.50	00.00	100.00	106.50	106.50	N/A	2,000	2,130
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	98.17	86.48	98.13	11.98	88.13	63.00	98.27	N/A	47,733	46,838
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	106.50	106.50	106.50	00.00	100.00	106.50	106.50	N/A	2,000	2,130
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	70.28	70.28	51.74	40.24	135.83	42.00	98.56	N/A	15,100	7,813
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	91.16	91.16	86.58	09.71	105.29	82.31	100.00	N/A	36,250	31,385
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	4	94.23	91.64	93.45	04.19	98.06	81.94	96.18	N/A	17,125	16,003
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	5	98.27	117.75	109.49	34.22	107.54	63.00	222.82	N/A	31,921	34,949
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	5	98.56	85.87	76.91	16.68	111.65	42.00	106.50	N/A	20,940	16,105
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	158.14	158.14	120.31	40.91	131.44	93.45	222.82	N/A	34,703	41,750
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	98.27	94.49	98.35	10.55	96.08	63.00	106.50	N/A	29,440	28,955
<u>ALL</u>	14	97.18	98.91	95.94	20.35	103.10	42.00	222.82	81.94 to 106.50	23,772	22,806

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	17,500	17,500
03	2	89.06	89.06	88.86	07.99	100.23	81.94	96.18	N/A	1,750	1,555
06	2	80.78	80.78	95.44	22.01	84.64	63.00	98.56	N/A	2,850	2,720
07	6	96.64	88.43	87.07	15.86	101.56	42.00	106.50	42.00 to 106.50	34,000	29,605
08	3	98.17	138.15	113.22	43.92	122.02	93.45	222.82	N/A	34,035	38,533
<u>ALL</u>	14	97.18	98.91	95.94	20.35	103.10	42.00	222.82	81.94 to 106.50	23,772	22,806

**65 Nuckolls
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 : 14
 Total Sales Price : 334,606
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 332,806
 Total Assessed Value : 319,280
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 23,772
 Avg. Assessed Value : 22,806

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 96
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 20.35
 PRD : 103.10

COV : 40.26
 STD : 39.82
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.78
 MAX Sales Ratio : 222.82
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.00

95% Median C.I. : 81.94 to 106.50
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.69 to 112.18
 95% Mean C.I. : 75.92 to 121.90

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:03PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	14	97.18	98.91	95.94	20.35	103.10	42.00	222.82	81.94 to 106.50	23,772	22,806
04											
<u>ALL</u>	14	97.18	98.91	95.94	20.35	103.10	42.00	222.82	81.94 to 106.50	23,772	22,806

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	5	96.18	90.82	96.06	14.15	94.55	63.00	106.50	N/A	1,600	1,537
5000 TO 9999	1	98.56	98.56	98.56	00.00	100.00	98.56	98.56	N/A	5,200	5,125
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	6	97.37	92.11	97.05	12.06	94.91	63.00	106.50	63.00 to 106.50	2,200	2,135
10000 TO 29999	4	97.50	114.96	104.03	47.65	110.51	42.00	222.82	N/A	16,727	17,400
30000 TO 59999	3	93.45	91.31	90.24	05.66	101.19	82.31	98.17	N/A	47,567	42,923
60000 TO 99999											
100000 TO 149999	1	98.27	98.27	98.27	00.00	100.00	98.27	98.27	N/A	110,000	108,100
150000 TO 249999											
250000 TO 499999											
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	14	97.18	98.91	95.94	20.35	103.10	42.00	222.82	81.94 to 106.50	23,772	22,806

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
344	1	106.50	106.50	106.50	00.00	100.00	106.50	106.50	N/A	2,000	2,130
350	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	17,500	17,500
353	1	98.27	98.27	98.27	00.00	100.00	98.27	98.27	N/A	110,000	108,100
384	1	95.00	95.00	95.00	00.00	100.00	95.00	95.00	N/A	10,000	9,500
389	1	98.17	98.17	98.17	00.00	100.00	98.17	98.17	N/A	32,700	32,100
406	8	87.88	98.53	93.19	35.51	105.73	42.00	222.82	42.00 to 222.82	19,426	18,103
437	1	98.56	98.56	98.56	00.00	100.00	98.56	98.56	N/A	5,200	5,125
<u>ALL</u>	14	97.18	98.91	95.94	20.35	103.10	42.00	222.82	81.94 to 106.50	23,772	22,806

**2011 Correlation Section
for Nuckolls County**

A. Commerical Real Property

Nuckolls County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The largest town is Superior and the county seat is Nelson. The county has two high schools; one in Superior and one consolidated high school, Lawrence-Nelson. Most of the county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline. Nuckolls County has a new Assessor, Susan Rogers.

A review of the statistical analysis reveals only 14 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate the level of value is within the acceptable range, there are not a sufficient number of sales to have confidence in the calculated statistics. The calculated median is 97%. It will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Nuckolls County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

The sample is not representative of the population as a whole even though the assessor, with the assistance of the contracted appraisal company (Stanard Appraisal Services), has tried to utilize as many sales as possible without bias in the analysis of the commercial class; there is just not an active commercial market in Nuckolls County.

Nuckolls County has in place a procedure with their sales verification. When a sale occurs, the information on the 521 is checked against the records for accuracy and a sales verification questionnaire is started. The contract appraiser completes the form with telephone calls to the knowledgeable parties and a physical inspection of the property.

Nuckolls County employs a four-year inspection cycle for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Nuckolls County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have continued to develop their GIS system, transfer of sales electronically, complete spreadsheet analyses and are currently taking bids to update their MIPS system.

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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County

The Assessor and her staff are working toward finalizing the agland use layer in their GIS system, once completed they are planning on converting to the GIS deeded acres.

Continued the audit of acres for land usage through their GIS imagery

All sales were plotted and geographic and economic characteristics were reviewed and a determination was made for one market area across all of Nuckolls County.

A spreadsheet analysis was completed using current sales from Nuckolls County and surrounding comparable counties.

Nuckolls County completed on-sight inspections and measurement of new construction (bins, buildings, structures). Stanard Appraisal was contracted for assistance with this.

All sales were reviewed by the staff

All pick up work was completed timely

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor, Staff and Contract Appraiser	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	No geographic or economic differences have been determined
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Annually sales are plotted, NRD restrictions are reviewed, sales are reviewed.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	No differences have been determined in the county, review land usage annually, review hunting leases when available	
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?	
	Same value, the county monitors sales to determine if there is an influence or premium paid due to the location of the rural home.	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	Land usage	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	GIS, FSA maps	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	The county monitors and reviews sales, they identify any sales along the river and review them for land usage	
9.	Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
10.	Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?	
	Yes	
11.	Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.	
	A substantial change would involve land usage changes or changes to improvements	
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.	

65 Nuckolls
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 : 52
Total Sales Price : 16,329,545
Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,329,545
Total Assessed Value : 11,683,689
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 314,030
Avg. Assessed Value : 224,686

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 72
MEAN : 76
COD : 21.01
PRD : 106.02

COV : 27.02
STD : 20.50
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.14
MAX Sales Ratio : 137.16
MIN Sales Ratio : 50.53

95% Median C.I. : 66.18 to 80.02
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.57 to 78.53
95% Mean C.I. : 70.29 to 81.43

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:06PM

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	87.17	88.24	88.38	17.04	99.84	66.69	111.94	N/A	190,750	168,576
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	89.43	92.52	90.71	09.55	102.00	83.17	108.06	N/A	331,630	300,816
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	74.97	68.08	61.74	12.30	110.27	50.81	78.47	N/A	389,333	240,388
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	103.28	103.28	110.64	17.79	93.35	84.91	121.65	N/A	332,000	367,330
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	80.02	80.02	80.02	00.00	100.00	80.02	80.02	N/A	600,000	480,105
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	66.08	64.27	64.66	08.28	99.40	54.76	70.91	N/A	295,800	191,270
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	72.36	72.18	62.68	17.37	115.16	50.53	102.03	51.45 to 87.05	313,150	196,268
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	5	83.50	74.94	72.25	16.62	103.72	53.49	91.36	N/A	335,380	242,326
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	67.23	67.98	63.87	15.66	106.43	52.87	83.38	N/A	236,400	150,996
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	63.09	63.09	55.36	15.14	113.96	53.54	72.63	N/A	419,750	232,373
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	65.46	63.60	62.20	06.11	102.25	55.12	69.14	55.12 to 69.14	312,589	194,435
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	104.84	100.40	88.39	34.80	113.59	54.75	137.16	N/A	327,750	289,690
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	13	84.80	87.22	85.00	16.39	102.61	50.81	121.65	74.97 to 108.06	301,655	256,415
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	21	70.91	71.32	66.94	16.87	106.54	50.53	102.03	59.19 to 83.50	327,971	219,560
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	18	66.71	72.94	67.74	21.75	107.68	52.87	137.16	57.13 to 73.08	306,701	207,752
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	11	70.91	73.83	73.95	17.80	99.84	50.81	121.65	54.76 to 84.91	355,545	262,935
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	72.07	71.02	64.34	17.86	110.38	50.53	102.03	57.13 to 83.50	310,450	199,729
<u>ALL</u>	52	72.07	75.86	71.55	21.01	106.02	50.53	137.16	66.18 to 80.02	314,030	224,686

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	52	72.07	75.86	71.55	21.01	106.02	50.53	137.16	66.18 to 80.02	314,030	224,686
<u>ALL</u>	52	72.07	75.86	71.55	21.01	106.02	50.53	137.16	66.18 to 80.02	314,030	224,686

65 Nuckolls
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 : 52
 Total Sales Price : 16,329,545
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,329,545
 Total Assessed Value : 11,683,689
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 314,030
 Avg. Assessed Value : 224,686

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 72
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 21.01
 PRD : 106.02

COV : 27.02
 STD : 20.50
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.14
 MAX Sales Ratio : 137.16
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.53

95% Median C.I. : 66.18 to 80.02
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.57 to 78.53
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.29 to 81.43

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:06PM

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	53.54	53.54	53.54	00.00	100.00	53.54	53.54	N/A	759,500	406,640
1	1	53.54	53.54	53.54	00.00	100.00	53.54	53.54	N/A	759,500	406,640
Dry											
County	7	72.63	74.34	69.69	18.26	106.67	52.87	111.94	52.87 to 111.94	167,714	116,874
1	7	72.63	74.34	69.69	18.26	106.67	52.87	111.94	52.87 to 111.94	167,714	116,874
Grass											
County	2	70.03	70.03	69.99	02.10	100.06	68.56	71.50	N/A	165,000	115,480
1	2	70.03	70.03	69.99	02.10	100.06	68.56	71.50	N/A	165,000	115,480
ALL	52	72.07	75.86	71.55	21.01	106.02	50.53	137.16	66.18 to 80.02	314,030	224,686

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	6	54.94	61.41	58.82	14.85	104.40	51.45	83.17	51.45 to 83.17	731,133	430,081
1	6	54.94	61.41	58.82	14.85	104.40	51.45	83.17	51.45 to 83.17	731,133	430,081
Dry											
County	12	69.93	72.58	70.33	16.10	103.20	52.87	111.94	60.43 to 80.10	232,267	163,343
1	12	69.93	72.58	70.33	16.10	103.20	52.87	111.94	60.43 to 80.10	232,267	163,343
Grass											
County	4	72.36	74.52	74.10	06.21	100.57	68.56	84.79	N/A	179,250	132,824
1	4	72.36	74.52	74.10	06.21	100.57	68.56	84.79	N/A	179,250	132,824
ALL	52	72.07	75.86	71.55	21.01	106.02	50.53	137.16	66.18 to 80.02	314,030	224,686

65 Nuckolls

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 3/12/2011

Number of Sales : 55	MEDIAN : 73	COV : 26.49	95% Median C.I. : 66.69 to 80.10
Total Sales Price : 17,026,707	WGT. MEAN : 72	STD : 20.25	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.24 to 78.90
Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,026,707	MEAN : 76	Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.08	95% Mean C.I. : 71.10 to 81.80
Total Assessed Value : 12,271,010			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 309,576	COD : 20.63	MAX Sales Ratio : 137.16	
Avg. Assessed Value : 223,109	PRD : 106.08	MIN Sales Ratio : 50.53	

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:08PM

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	5	80.10	85.64	86.69	16.05	98.79	66.69	111.94	N/A	175,000	151,708
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	94.06	94.38	91.37	08.91	103.29	83.17	108.06	N/A	282,215	257,872
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	74.97	68.08	61.74	12.30	110.27	50.81	78.47	N/A	389,333	240,388
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	84.91	96.62	98.89	15.05	97.70	83.30	121.65	N/A	388,202	383,884
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	80.02	80.02	80.02	00.00	100.00	80.02	80.02	N/A	600,000	480,105
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	66.08	64.27	64.66	08.28	99.40	54.76	70.91	N/A	295,800	191,270
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	72.36	72.18	62.68	17.37	115.16	50.53	102.03	51.45 to 87.05	313,150	196,268
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	5	83.50	74.94	72.25	16.62	103.72	53.49	91.36	N/A	335,380	242,326
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	67.23	67.98	63.87	15.66	106.43	52.87	83.38	N/A	236,400	150,996
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	63.09	63.09	55.36	15.14	113.96	53.54	72.63	N/A	419,750	232,373
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	65.46	63.60	62.20	06.11	102.25	55.12	69.14	55.12 to 69.14	312,589	194,435
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	104.84	100.40	88.39	34.80	113.59	54.75	137.16	N/A	327,750	289,690
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	16	84.05	87.14	84.89	15.53	102.65	50.81	121.65	75.21 to 101.82	288,668	245,045
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	21	70.91	71.32	66.94	16.87	106.54	50.53	102.03	59.19 to 83.50	327,971	219,560
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	18	66.71	72.94	67.74	21.75	107.68	52.87	137.16	57.13 to 73.08	306,701	207,752
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	72.94	74.62	75.01	17.27	99.48	50.81	121.65	59.19 to 83.30	367,634	275,773
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	72.07	71.02	64.34	17.86	110.38	50.53	102.03	57.13 to 83.50	310,450	199,729
<u>ALL</u>	55	73.08	76.45	72.07	20.63	106.08	50.53	137.16	66.69 to 80.10	309,576	223,109

AREA (MARKET)	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	55	73.08	76.45	72.07	20.63	106.08	50.53	137.16	66.69 to 80.10	309,576	223,109
<u>ALL</u>	55	73.08	76.45	72.07	20.63	106.08	50.53	137.16	66.69 to 80.10	309,576	223,109

65 Nuckolls
AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 3/12/2011

Number of Sales : 55
 Total Sales Price : 17,026,707
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,026,707
 Total Assessed Value : 12,271,010
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 309,576
 Avg. Assessed Value : 223,109

MEDIAN : 73
 WGT. MEAN : 72
 MEAN : 76
 COD : 20.63
 PRD : 106.08

COV : 26.49
 STD : 20.25
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.08
 MAX Sales Ratio : 137.16
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.53

95% Median C.I. : 66.69 to 80.10
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.24 to 78.90
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.10 to 81.80

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:08PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	2	64.38	64.38	56.33	16.84	114.29	53.54	75.21	N/A	435,750	245,438
1	2	64.38	64.38	56.33	16.84	114.29	53.54	75.21	N/A	435,750	245,438
Dry											
County	7	72.63	74.34	69.69	18.26	106.67	52.87	111.94	52.87 to 111.94	167,714	116,874
1	7	72.63	74.34	69.69	18.26	106.67	52.87	111.94	52.87 to 111.94	167,714	116,874
Grass											
County	2	70.03	70.03	69.99	02.10	100.06	68.56	71.50	N/A	165,000	115,480
1	2	70.03	70.03	69.99	02.10	100.06	68.56	71.50	N/A	165,000	115,480
ALL	55	73.08	76.45	72.07	20.63	106.08	50.53	137.16	66.69 to 80.10	309,576	223,109

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	8	62.76	65.87	61.64	19.36	106.86	51.45	83.30	51.45 to 83.30	624,925	385,214
1	8	62.76	65.87	61.64	19.36	106.86	51.45	83.30	51.45 to 83.30	624,925	385,214
Dry											
County	12	69.93	72.58	70.33	16.10	103.20	52.87	111.94	60.43 to 80.10	232,267	163,343
1	12	69.93	72.58	70.33	16.10	103.20	52.87	111.94	60.43 to 80.10	232,267	163,343
Grass											
County	4	72.36	74.52	74.10	06.21	100.57	68.56	84.79	N/A	179,250	132,824
1	4	72.36	74.52	74.10	06.21	100.57	68.56	84.79	N/A	179,250	132,824
ALL	55	73.08	76.45	72.07	20.63	106.08	50.53	137.16	66.69 to 80.10	309,576	223,109

65 Nuckolls
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 : 90
 Total Sales Price : 28,598,630
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 28,567,630
 Total Assessed Value : 20,415,966
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 317,418
 Avg. Assessed Value : 226,844

MEDIAN : 75
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 77
 COD : 21.09
 PRD : 107.99

COV : 27.44
 STD : 21.18
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.84
 MAX Sales Ratio : 142.83
 MIN Sales Ratio : 31.73

95% Median C.I. : 69.14 to 80.02
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.94 to 76.99
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.80 to 81.56

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:11PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	7	94.24	92.72	91.49	16.80	101.34	66.69	111.94	66.69 to 111.94	156,357	143,047
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	12	83.99	84.97	83.60	12.01	101.64	60.58	108.06	77.79 to 95.53	258,648	216,222
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	6	77.38	80.21	72.81	16.62	110.16	50.81	120.02	50.81 to 120.02	457,569	333,174
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	4	84.08	89.40	91.67	16.52	97.52	67.78	121.65	N/A	378,776	347,234
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	80.45	93.27	101.62	23.11	91.78	69.34	142.83	N/A	311,476	316,510
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	62.64	63.07	61.45	14.21	102.64	48.95	80.47	48.95 to 80.47	432,395	265,701
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	12	72.36	72.17	62.23	17.80	115.97	50.53	102.03	57.74 to 86.60	356,275	221,694
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	83.50	76.32	74.08	14.43	103.02	53.49	91.36	53.49 to 91.36	281,700	208,690
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	67.23	67.98	63.87	15.66	106.43	52.87	83.38	N/A	236,400	150,996
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	72.63	78.94	64.33	21.31	122.71	53.54	120.47	N/A	303,890	195,505
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	13	62.94	60.94	56.78	15.20	107.33	31.73	90.89	50.90 to 68.56	334,433	189,892
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	78.65	90.59	81.52	30.76	111.13	54.75	137.16	54.75 to 137.16	301,071	245,440
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	29	83.17	86.47	82.56	16.17	104.74	50.81	121.65	77.79 to 94.24	291,683	240,827
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	31	71.50	73.48	68.60	19.37	107.11	48.95	142.83	60.43 to 80.88	353,299	242,349
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	30	66.91	72.03	64.64	23.26	111.43	31.73	137.16	57.83 to 73.08	305,219	197,306
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	22	75.63	78.02	75.62	20.59	103.17	48.95	142.83	66.08 to 80.88	407,526	308,165
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	29	72.63	73.62	65.41	18.28	112.55	50.53	120.47	60.43 to 83.50	308,574	201,851
<u>ALL</u>	90	75.09	77.18	71.47	21.09	107.99	31.73	142.83	69.14 to 80.02	317,418	226,844

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	90	75.09	77.18	71.47	21.09	107.99	31.73	142.83	69.14 to 80.02	317,418	226,844
<u>ALL</u>	90	75.09	77.18	71.47	21.09	107.99	31.73	142.83	69.14 to 80.02	317,418	226,844

65 Nuckolls
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 : 90
 Total Sales Price : 28,598,630
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 28,567,630
 Total Assessed Value : 20,415,966
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 317,418
 Avg. Assessed Value : 226,844

MEDIAN : 75
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 77
 COD : 21.09
 PRD : 107.99

COV : 27.44
 STD : 21.18
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.84
 MAX Sales Ratio : 142.83
 MIN Sales Ratio : 31.73

95% Median C.I. : 69.14 to 80.02
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.94 to 76.99
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.80 to 81.56

Printed:3/13/2011 3:56:11PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	6	78.38	85.93	81.49	22.44	105.45	53.54	142.83	53.54 to 142.83	514,831	419,539
1	6	78.38	85.93	81.49	22.44	105.45	53.54	142.83	53.54 to 142.83	514,831	419,539
Dry											
County	10	73.80	77.92	71.51	19.02	108.96	52.87	111.94	60.43 to 110.21	137,945	98,651
1	10	73.80	77.92	71.51	19.02	108.96	52.87	111.94	60.43 to 110.21	137,945	98,651
Grass											
County	5	71.50	72.53	70.13	11.01	103.42	57.32	86.60	N/A	139,160	97,591
1	5	71.50	72.53	70.13	11.01	103.42	57.32	86.60	N/A	139,160	97,591
ALL	90	75.09	77.18	71.47	21.09	107.99	31.73	142.83	69.14 to 80.02	317,418	226,844

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	17	70.39	71.44	67.47	22.46	105.88	48.95	142.83	53.54 to 83.17	634,846	428,311
1	17	70.39	71.44	67.47	22.46	105.88	48.95	142.83	53.54 to 83.17	634,846	428,311
Dry											
County	15	72.63	75.32	71.12	16.77	105.91	52.87	111.94	64.14 to 80.10	199,510	141,901
1	15	72.63	75.32	71.12	16.77	105.91	52.87	111.94	64.14 to 80.10	199,510	141,901
Grass											
County	7	73.21	74.38	72.80	10.27	102.17	57.32	86.60	57.32 to 86.60	154,686	112,613
1	7	73.21	74.38	72.80	10.27	102.17	57.32	86.60	57.32 to 86.60	154,686	112,613
ALL	90	75.09	77.18	71.47	21.09	107.99	31.73	142.83	69.14 to 80.02	317,418	226,844

2011 Correlation Section for Nuckolls County

A. Agricultural Land

Nuckolls County is comprised of approximately 18% irrigated land, 46% dry crop land and 36% grass/pasture land. Nuckolls County has one market area. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the one market area determination.

Nuckolls County has 52 qualified agricultural sales in the three year study period. The sales are not proportionately spread across the three years of the study period, there are 13 sales in the oldest year, 21 sales in the middle year and 18 sales in the newest year. The sales appear to be representative of the county, with the sales file containing sales that are approximately 21% irrigated, 49% dry and 28% grass. The Base statistics show the calculated median to be 72%. The qualitative statistics are above the acceptable range, but not extremely high. Although the sales appear to be representative, there does not appear to be a proportionate distribution of sales across the three year time period. When reviewing the majority land usage, both the dry and grass calculate within the acceptable range, while irrigated calculates much lower, however with the disproportionate distribution of sales these statistics are not reliable.

The second test, random inclusion, added three sales to the oldest year to meet an acceptable threshold. Two of the sales randomly selected were irrigated sales, one from Thayer County and one from Fillmore County. The third sale was approximately 64% dry from Webster County. The overall median went up slightly and the irrigated statistics significantly improved, although there are still very few sales over 80% majority land use. The Random Inclusion statistics show the calculated median to be 73%. The qualitative statistics are again above the acceptable range, but not extremely high.

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. From the neighboring counties, 38 sales were deemed comparable and brought in to the analysis; sixteen sales in the oldest year, ten in the middle year and twelve 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 Nuckolls County. The random exclusion statistics show the calculated median to be 75%. The qualitative statistics are again above the acceptable range, but not extremely high. A review of the majority land usage shows 95% MLU to be slightly high for irrigated, although there are only 6 sales; and within the range for dry and grass. All 80% MLU uses calculate to within the range.

A review, of the neighboring counties, shows that the 2011 values in Nuckolls County are higher than their neighbor to the west, Webster County. Thayer County borders on the East and the values between Thayer and Nuckolls are much closer for all three classes of agricultural land. The Nuckolls County Assessor when reviewing the neighboring counties made the determination that she needed to narrow the valuations in each class between the top and bottom land capability groupings to better blend across county lines and to address the market in Nuckolls County. Irrigated values were increased 7% to 40%, dry values were

**2011 Correlation Section
for Nuckolls County**

increased 13% to 126% and gross values were all increased 6%. Indications support that Nuckolls County has achieved both inter- and intra-county equalization.

Due to the disproportionate distribution of sales across the three years of the sales file as displayed in the base statistic, the last two approaches using borrowed sales more accurately reflect the market in Nuckolls County. Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 73% 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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 : 5,537	Value : 589,543,650	Growth 4,447,835	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	265	156,830	0	0	19	2,120	284	158,950	
02. Res Improve Land	1,711	2,006,650	0	0	13	2,675	1,724	2,009,325	
03. Res Improvements	1,722	52,686,330	0	0	18	70,470	1,740	52,756,800	
04. Res Total	1,987	54,849,810	0	0	37	75,265	2,024	54,925,075	536,520
% of Res Total	98.17	99.86	0.00	0.00	1.83	0.14	36.55	9.32	12.06
05. Com UnImp Land	68	116,575	0	0	8	61,230	76	177,805	
06. Com Improve Land	278	588,660	0	0	14	50,950	292	639,610	
07. Com Improvements	284	19,670,360	0	0	19	5,838,180	303	25,508,540	
08. Com Total	352	20,375,595	0	0	27	5,950,360	379	26,325,955	2,062,595
% of Com Total	92.88	77.40	0.00	0.00	7.12	22.60	6.84	4.47	46.37
09. Ind UnImp Land	2	47,710	0	0	2	4,770	4	52,480	
10. Ind Improve Land	1	32,030	0	0	2	35,970	3	68,000	
11. Ind Improvements	1	145,295	0	0	2	814,980	3	960,275	
12. Ind Total	3	225,035	0	0	4	855,720	7	1,080,755	0
% of Ind Total	42.86	20.82	0.00	0.00	57.14	79.18	0.13	0.18	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	1,987	54,849,810	0	0	37	75,265	2,024	54,925,075	536,520
% of Res & Rec Total	98.17	99.86	0.00	0.00	1.83	0.14	36.55	9.32	12.06
Com & Ind Total	355	20,600,630	0	0	31	6,806,080	386	27,406,710	2,062,595
% of Com & Ind Total	91.97	75.17	0.00	0.00	8.03	24.83	6.97	4.65	46.37
17. Taxable Total	2,342	75,450,440	0	0	68	6,881,345	2,410	82,331,785	2,599,115
% of Taxable Total	97.18	91.64	0.00	0.00	2.82	8.36	43.53	13.97	58.44

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	244	0	637	881

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	85	726,235	0	0	1,937	294,673,105	2,022	295,399,340
28. Ag-Improved Land	15	204,260	0	0	1,041	158,808,525	1,056	159,012,785
29. Ag Improvements	11	121,095	0	0	1,094	52,678,645	1,105	52,799,740
30. Ag Total							3,127	507,211,865

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	3.40	1,700	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	11	0.00	121,095	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	9.43	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	12	12.00	48,000	12	12.00	48,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	658	662.80	2,651,285	658	662.80	2,651,285	
33. HomeSite Improvements	658	0.00	36,743,590	658	0.00	36,743,590	311,900
34. HomeSite Total				670	674.80	39,442,875	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	162	246.53	91,745	162	246.53	91,745	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	886	2,899.92	1,428,785	887	2,903.32	1,430,485	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,037	0.00	15,935,055	1,048	0.00	16,056,150	1,536,820
38. FarmSite Total				1,210	3,149.85	17,578,380	
39. Road & Ditches	0	8,722.57	0	0	8,732.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,880	12,556.65	57,021,255	1,848,720

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	2	118.56	186,345	2	118.56	186,345

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 10

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	12,717.17	20.49%	38,787,490	23.96%	3,050.01
46. 1A	30,005.84	48.34%	91,518,280	56.54%	3,050.02
47. 2A1	6,119.84	9.86%	12,729,300	7.86%	2,080.01
48. 2A	7,917.55	12.76%	12,470,625	7.70%	1,575.06
49. 3A1	1,441.88	2.32%	2,242,275	1.39%	1,555.11
50. 3A	656.00	1.06%	760,960	0.47%	1,160.00
51. 4A1	1,305.65	2.10%	1,410,105	0.87%	1,080.00
52. 4A	1,909.71	3.08%	1,957,655	1.21%	1,025.11
53. Total	62,073.64	100.00%	161,876,690	100.00%	2,607.82
Dry					
54. 1D1	24,298.52	15.28%	36,084,330	17.92%	1,485.04
55. 1D	71,636.09	45.04%	106,383,005	52.84%	1,485.05
56. 2D1	5,580.86	3.51%	5,488,810	2.73%	983.51
57. 2D	39,358.37	24.75%	38,751,985	19.25%	984.59
58. 3D1	3,321.20	2.09%	2,906,525	1.44%	875.14
59. 3D	607.38	0.38%	482,900	0.24%	795.05
60. 4D1	10,160.74	6.39%	8,026,990	3.99%	790.00
61. 4D	4,073.36	2.56%	3,217,985	1.60%	790.01
62. Total	159,036.52	100.00%	201,342,530	100.00%	1,266.01
Grass					
63. 1G1	3,338.98	2.63%	2,320,575	2.67%	695.00
64. 1G	12,294.76	9.68%	8,712,455	10.02%	708.63
65. 2G1	6,556.03	5.16%	3,974,675	4.57%	606.26
66. 2G	34,112.19	26.86%	24,158,225	27.79%	708.20
67. 3G1	1,176.74	0.93%	841,275	0.97%	714.92
68. 3G	828.44	0.65%	188,250	0.22%	227.23
69. 4G1	14,860.30	11.70%	10,600,860	12.19%	713.37
70. 4G	53,832.06	42.39%	36,134,565	41.57%	671.25
71. Total	126,999.50	100.00%	86,930,880	100.00%	684.50
Irrigated Total					
	62,073.64	17.79%	161,876,690	35.96%	2,607.82
Dry Total					
	159,036.52	45.58%	201,342,530	44.72%	1,266.01
Grass Total					
	126,999.50	36.40%	86,930,880	19.31%	684.50
72. Waste	771.11	0.22%	40,510	0.01%	52.53
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	1,460.54	0.42%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	348,880.77	100.00%	450,190,610	100.00%	1,290.39

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	25.57	77,990	0.00	0	62,048.07	161,798,700	62,073.64	161,876,690
77. Dry Land	438.34	607,990	0.00	0	158,598.18	200,734,540	159,036.52	201,342,530
78. Grass	339.20	242,610	0.00	0	126,660.30	86,688,270	126,999.50	86,930,880
79. Waste	4.13	205	0.00	0	766.98	40,305	771.11	40,510
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	91.57	0	0.00	0	1,368.97	0	1,460.54	0
82. Total	807.24	928,795	0.00	0	348,073.53	449,261,815	348,880.77	450,190,610

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	62,073.64	17.79%	161,876,690	35.96%	2,607.82
Dry Land	159,036.52	45.58%	201,342,530	44.72%	1,266.01
Grass	126,999.50	36.40%	86,930,880	19.31%	684.50
Waste	771.11	0.22%	40,510	0.01%	52.53
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	1,460.54	0.42%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	348,880.77	100.00%	450,190,610	100.00%	1,290.39

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

65 Nuckolls

	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	53,335,615	54,925,075	1,589,460	2.98%	536,520	1.97%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	39,163,985	39,442,875	278,890	0.71%	311,900	-0.08%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	92,499,600	94,367,950	1,868,350	2.02%	848,420	1.10%
05. Commercial	24,481,895	26,325,955	1,844,060	7.53%	2,062,595	-0.89%
06. Industrial	998,455	1,080,755	82,300	8.24%	0	8.24%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	16,040,365	17,578,380	1,538,015	9.59%	1,536,820	0.01%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	41,520,715	44,985,090	3,464,375	8.34%	3,599,415	-0.33%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	134,020,315	139,353,040	5,332,725	3.98%	4,447,835	0.66%
11. Irrigated	150,289,190	161,876,690	11,587,500	7.71%		
12. Dryland	167,832,980	201,342,530	33,509,550	19.97%		
13. Grassland	82,045,425	86,930,880	4,885,455	5.95%		
14. Wasteland	30,545	40,510	9,965	32.62%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	400,198,140	450,190,610	49,992,470	12.49%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	534,218,455	589,543,650	55,325,195	10.36%	4,447,835	9.52%

June 15, 2010
September 15, 2010
Nuckolls County

3 Year Plan of Assessment- Nuckolls County

Pursuant to section 77-1311.02 as amended by 2005 Neb. Laws LB263, section 9 and LB 334, section 64. Operative date July 1, 2007

The purpose of three-year plan is to inform the County Board of Equalization on or before June 15 each year and the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year. Every three years and to update the plan between the adoption of each three-year plan.

Nuckolls County population base is 5,057.

The Assessor's office staff consists of the assessor, deputy assessor and a part-time clerk who works two days a week. All the staff works in every area, real estate, and personal property and homesteads exemptions. The Assessor and Deputy Assessor attend continuing education classes as required to remain certified.

The assessor is responsible for filing the reports as follows:

Abstract- due on or before March 19

Notice of Valuation Change- June 1

Certification of Values- due on or before August 20

School District Taxable Value Report- due on or before August 25

Three-year Plan of Assessment- July 31 and October 31

Certifies Trusts Owning Aglan to the Secretary of State- October 1

Generate Tax Roll and deliver to Treasurer on or before November 22

Certificate of Taxes Levied- due on or before December 1

Tax list corrections- reasons

The assessor maintains the Cadastral maps as needed due to any recorded property splits, etc. They are in good condition, kept current with ownership changes and descriptions. The property record cards are in good condition; include the required legal, ownership, classification codes, and valuation by year as required by regulation.

The assessor also completes the 521's as they are brought from the Clerk's Office. Procedure is to change name owner on property record cards, lots and lands books, plat books, computer generated records, trustee list, treasurers books, sales file and to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. Also list is made for the County Weed Office. The City of Superior requested data as changes are made, now we can do this with computer generated information from the CAMA program. The assessor verifies sales by telephone or questionnaire. Also the information that is provided by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation's reviewer is helpful.

Computers- IBM AS400, 3 Dell 4600 P C's

Mips/County Solutions LLC is the current software vendors for Nuckolls County

Assessment Actions Year 2010–

CAMA system data has been entered on all improvements.

Digital pictures are being taken as a review is done and added to the CAMA system.

The assessor, staff and Stanard Appraisal Services do all the pick-up work, usually in September through February, so entry of data and pricing can be completed before March deadline. The Cities of Superior and Nelson submit building permits to the Assessor's office on a regular basis. Use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property. Nuckolls County has a maintenance contract with Darrel Stanard of Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. GIS Workshop developed a web site for Nuckolls County, data updated once a month by GIS Workshop. Aerial photography for Nuckolls County rural sites has been completed.

Residential

Nuckolls County Assessor, Stanard Appraisal Services inc. and staff completed all pick-up work in a timely manner. The Assessor and Darrel Stanard of Stanard Appraisal Services Inc are in the continuing process of verifying all residential sales.

Commercial

Nuckolls County Assessor, Stanard Appraisal Services Inc and staff assessed, priced and entered. Reappraisal of all Commercial property completed. Cama 2000 Commercial software data has been entered by Nuckolls County staff and Stanard Appraisal. Stanard Appraisal Services Inc and the Assessor are in the continuing process of verifying all the sales.

Agricultural

Nuckolls County Assessor and staff reviewed some rural property, listing any new construction. All pick-up work was completed. After spreadsheet analysis and plotting sales on a map, no potential market areas were identified. After market analysis, all irrigated values were increased 30%, dryland values increased 10% and grassland values were increased 35 % and other increased 20%. New rural property record cards were completed. Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable level of value, quality and uniformity countywide. Nuckolls County staff continues to work on GIS Data. Parcels entered, working on land use. The aerial photography was done by GIS Workshop, Inc. New soil conversion is in place.

2011

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with Stanard Appraisal Services Inc.

Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property. The County Board has a fund for GIS, continue to add to fund for maintenance of the GIS program. GIS data is being entered, aerial photography is complete .

Do an analysis based on the RCN and sales to determine the valuation of residential properties.

Utilize the CAMA system for sales analysis; continue to update programs each year.

Review commercial sales, analysis for acceptable levels of quality and uniformity. Continue to correlate information for sales comparison of all properties.

GIS is not in place. Utilize FSA or NRD's information.

Continue good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity in all classes and subclasses of property countywide.

Do all pick-up work to be implemented by March 19, deadline.

Continue to do sales analysis of commercial sales.

Stanard Appraisal Services awarded contract for Re-appraisal of all Superior Nebraska residential properties to be completed by January 1, 2011.

Take new digital photos, list and measure as necessary. Continue to do an analysis of the RCN and sales to determine the valuations and if any need for location factors to be applied. Continue with the review and pick-up work. Continue work on GIS mapping. Analysis of the ag land sales. Continue good assessment practices to insure acceptable level of value, quality and uniformity countywide.

2012

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property.

Complete all pick-up work, data entry in timely manner. Continue to request to add to fund for GIS maintenance. Continue to review all property as required by statute. Request County Board to budget for reappraisal of the residential properties to be done. Need to start in Superior and continue on to the other towns as 2004 was the start previously, completed for the 2005 tax year.

2013

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with Stanard Appraisal Inc. Use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property.

Complete all pick-up work, data entry in a timely manner. Continue to fund GIS maintenance. Request continuing funding for all residential property in Nuckolls, towns of Nelson, Lawrence would be next in order.

Nuckolls County Assessor

Janice E Murray

2011 Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	0
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1 (4/5)
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$161,675
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$161,675
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$20,700
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	0 – reappraisal finished in 2010
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$4,000 for data processing, all other computer funds are in the general fund
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,500
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	0
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	Estimates \$5,000+ (\$4,000 was data processing)

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS AS 400
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes, they are currently finishing up the land usage codes and will roll acreages to

	MIPS in 2011
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor and staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	No
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Superior and Nelson
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	Unknown

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Stanard Appraisal
2.	Other services:
	MIPS and GIS Workshop

2011 Certification for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

