

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 Perkins County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	54	Median	100.00
Total Sales Price	\$3,414,450	Mean	103.54
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,414,450	Wgt. Mean	95.52
Total Assessed Value	\$3,261,450	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$53,348
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$63,231	Avg. Assessed Value	\$60,397

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	100.00 to 104.17
95% Mean C.I	89.48 to 101.55
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	97.29 to 109.79
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	11.91
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.47
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.06

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	57	97	97
2009	80	99	99
2008	109	98	98
2007	103	99	99

2011 Commission Summary for Perkins County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	12	Median	99.45
Total Sales Price	\$399,105	Mean	99.50
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$405,105	Wgt. Mean	95.97
Total Assessed Value	\$388,795	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$167,378
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$33,759	Avg. Assessed Value	\$32,400

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.86 to 102.04
95% Mean C.I	71.41 to 127.59
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.21 to 102.74
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	7.89
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.71
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.91

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	12	100	99
2009	10	100	94
2008	13	93	93
2007	16	94	94

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Perkins 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	100	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	71	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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Perkins County

Perkins County completed new residential appraisals for properties within the Villages of Madrid, Grinton, Elsie, Venango and Brandon. June of 2010 Marshall and Swift costing tables were used with local market derived depreciation tables. This reappraisal includes all of the Villages in Perkins County except the town of Grant. Physical inspections were conducted of the properties with assessor's staff completing the appraisal work. All pickup work was timely completed throughout the County.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Perkins County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and staff	
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	The main grouping includes Grant, the County seat which has medical facilities, school and grocery store. This serves as the main source of all services for residents within Perkins County.
	02	Madrid is located east of Grant on Hwy 23 where the school has merged with Grant, but still operates a bank and fuel station.
	03	Elsie is unincorporated and is similar to rural areas although no development is occurring.
	04	Venango is on the western edge of Perkins County near Colorado and this small Village does not offer many community needs.
	05	These include all of the rural acreages outside of any Village and are within the county boundaries.
	06	Kenton Heights is a neighborhood that is north of Grant and has unique characteristics. It serves as a corridor to Ogallala and has a stronger residential market and includes higher quality homes.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Cost Approach and Sales Comparison Approach	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	Grant- 2009; Rural- 2008; Villages- 2011	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	Market data; per square foot and lot value	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	Grant and Rural- 06/2007; Madrid, Elsie and Venango- 06/2009	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The county uses depreciation tables based on local market information.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	These are different for Grant and rural; but the same for Madrid, Elsie and Venango.	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	At the same time new costing is applied.	
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.
	The physical changes of the structures, complete renovation of living space, any changes of use or occupancy codes.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.
	See attached; full policies are available in the office for review.

68 Perkins
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 : 54	MEDIAN : 100	COV : 22.64	95% Median C.I. : 100.00 to 104.17
Total Sales Price : 3,414,450	WGT. MEAN : 96	STD : 23.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.48 to 101.55
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,414,450	MEAN : 104	Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.25	95% Mean C.I. : 97.29 to 109.79
Total Assessed Value : 3,261,450			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 63,231	COD : 13.25	MAX Sales Ratio : 216.00	
Avg. Assessed Value : 60,397	PRD : 108.40	MIN Sales Ratio : 57.62	

Printed:3/29/2011 4:02:57PM

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	4	89.45	85.38	77.39	19.85	110.32	57.62	105.00	N/A	111,875	86,584
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	96.70	100.86	98.41	05.52	102.49	94.29	123.33	94.29 to 123.33	61,000	60,029
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	8	98.37	97.05	94.42	06.03	102.79	79.38	106.06	79.38 to 106.06	86,938	82,088
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	107.55	116.43	100.89	23.66	115.40	77.58	216.00	77.58 to 216.00	47,963	48,391
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	8	100.00	104.49	93.48	13.39	111.78	75.07	161.00	75.07 to 161.00	48,063	44,928
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	109.09	114.84	116.01	11.98	98.99	93.33	153.49	93.33 to 153.49	43,036	49,927
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	12	100.00	99.69	95.76	09.50	104.10	68.46	125.00	91.30 to 110.26	64,583	61,848
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	27	100.00	102.05	92.66	13.96	110.13	57.62	216.00	95.00 to 105.84	72,359	67,050
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	27	100.00	105.04	99.34	12.53	105.74	68.46	161.00	100.00 to 110.26	54,102	53,744
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	24	100.00	105.99	95.87	15.52	110.56	75.07	216.00	95.05 to 106.77	60,988	58,469
<u>ALL</u>	54	100.00	103.54	95.52	13.25	108.40	57.62	216.00	100.00 to 104.17	63,231	60,397

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	32	100.00	105.74	98.46	15.28	107.39	68.46	216.00	95.00 to 110.26	60,313	59,385
02	10	100.00	108.57	103.67	10.04	104.73	93.33	161.00	99.32 to 123.33	25,590	26,530
03	3	95.05	87.25	72.41	18.05	120.49	57.62	109.09	N/A	94,750	68,612
04	1	96.67	96.67	96.67	00.00	100.00	96.67	96.67	N/A	30,000	29,000
05	6	98.35	93.36	93.29	09.55	100.08	77.58	105.84	77.58 to 105.84	115,750	107,980
06	2	101.76	101.76	96.96	04.93	104.95	96.74	106.77	N/A	109,900	106,563
<u>ALL</u>	54	100.00	103.54	95.52	13.25	108.40	57.62	216.00	100.00 to 104.17	63,231	60,397

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	54	100.00	103.54	95.52	13.25	108.40	57.62	216.00	100.00 to 104.17	63,231	60,397
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	54	100.00	103.54	95.52	13.25	108.40	57.62	216.00	100.00 to 104.17	63,231	60,397

68 Perkins
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 : 54	MEDIAN : 100	COV : 22.64	95% Median C.I. : 100.00 to 104.17
Total Sales Price : 3,414,450	WGT. MEAN : 96	STD : 23.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.48 to 101.55
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,414,450	MEAN : 104	Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.25	95% Mean C.I. : 97.29 to 109.79
Total Assessed Value : 3,261,450			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 63,231	COD : 13.25	MAX Sales Ratio : 216.00	
Avg. Assessed Value : 60,397	PRD : 108.40	MIN Sales Ratio : 57.62	

Printed:3/29/2011 4:02:57PM

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	5	100.00	112.22	104.10	14.89	107.80	93.33	161.00	N/A	3,100	3,227	
5000 TO 9999	2	104.55	104.55	104.62	04.35	99.93	100.00	109.09	N/A	8,125	8,500	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	7	100.00	110.03	104.36	11.93	105.43	93.33	161.00	93.33 to 161.00	4,536	4,734	
10000 TO 29999	7	100.40	122.77	123.21	25.10	99.64	91.30	216.00	91.30 to 216.00	20,986	25,857	
30000 TO 59999	20	102.72	106.83	106.77	09.86	100.06	81.40	153.49	100.00 to 110.53	41,700	44,525	
60000 TO 99999	9	100.00	97.46	96.84	10.36	100.64	75.07	116.00	77.58 to 108.33	78,000	75,534	
100000 TO 149999	5	79.17	83.06	81.82	11.10	101.52	68.46	95.05	N/A	118,800	97,200	
150000 TO 249999	6	96.72	88.81	89.62	11.28	99.10	57.62	102.41	57.62 to 102.41	184,300	165,169	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	54	100.00	103.54	95.52	13.25	108.40	57.62	216.00	100.00 to 104.17	63,231	60,397	

2011 Correlation Section for Perkins County

A. Residential Real Property

Perkins County is located against the western boundary near Colorado and directly south of Keith County. Within the smaller Villages, rural residential properties and the City of Grant these make the residential base within Perkins County. The residential valuation base represents only 17% of the total value of all real property in the county. The minor valuation base of residential property is reviewed by the assessor in conjunction of the Three Year Plan of Assessment and also the cyclical inspection and review process. The county annually reports actions that have kept the quality of assessments in a proportionate and uniform manner in Perkins County.

The statistical sampling of 54 qualified residential sales is only lower by 3 sales from 2010 and is evenly split for each study year. This sample is determined to be adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential statistics. The Perkins County Assessor follows a thorough sales review process beginning with specific residential related questions to the buyer and the seller. Their return rate on these is approximately 80%. The office follows with an inspection of the property when necessary to ensure sold and unsold properties remain equalized and treated in a uniform manner.

For 2011 all new residential appraisals were completed in the Villages of Perkins County excluding Grant. These included the towns of Madrid, Elsie, Grinton, Venango and Brandon. June of 2010 costing tables were used with new depreciation tables derived from the local market. Every year Perkins County completes assessment actions that keep the properties in a cyclical review pattern so every location is current with the most current market value. Based on the known assessment practices and the qualitative statistic of the COD at 13.25 it is determined that Perkins County has achieved uniform and proportionate assessments for 2011.

The qualified residential sample is considered an adequate and reliable for the measurement of residential property. The median and weighted mean both are within acceptable ranges for this class of property. Although the PRD is 108.40 it is affected by the 32 sales within Grant or valuation grouping 01 with a PRD of 107.39. This location will be reviewed in line with the next market area according to the assessor's review pattern. There is no indication that the quality of assessments has not been met.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 100% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Perkins 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 Perkins 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 Perkins 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 Perkins 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 Perkins County

After Perkins County applied new commercial values in 2010 for the County, excluding 37 properties completed in 2009 the assessor did not make any valuation changes for 2011. The appraisal work in 2010 was completed by Stanard Appraisal Services, Inc. This most recent reappraisal is within acceptable statistical measurements and no further commercial changes are required. New pickup work was timely completed with a review of the entire property class.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Perkins County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Stanard Appraisal Services	
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	Grant is the primary commercial base for residents with retail, grocery, medical and school facilities.
	02	Madrid is a small Village with fuel for the rural farms and one bank and the new Ethanol Plant is located in Madrid.
	03	Elsie is unincorporated and is similar to rural areas but no recent commercial development.
	04	Venango is located on the far west edge of the county near Colorado with no commercial base.
	05	Rural commercials are all outside the Village boundaries countywide.
	06	Kenton Heights is located north of Grant and serves as a corridor to the Ogallala services on the south.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Cost, market and income when data is available	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	2010	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Market data	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June/2009	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The county uses local market information to develop the depreciation studies.	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No; they are utilized countywide	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	As new costing tables are applied	
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.	
	The physical changes of the structures, complete renovation of business, any	

	changes of use or occupancy codes.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.
	The County contracts for outside appraisal services.

68 Perkins
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 : 12
Total Sales Price : 399,105
Total Adj. Sales Price : 405,105
Total Assessed Value : 388,795
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 33,759
Avg. Assessed Value : 32,400

MEDIAN : 99
WGT. MEAN : 96
MEAN : 100
COD : 21.93
PRD : 103.68

COV : 44.43
STD : 44.21
Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.81
MAX Sales Ratio : 216.67
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.40

95% Median C.I. : 93.86 to 102.04
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.21 to 102.74
95% Mean C.I. : 71.41 to 127.59

Printed:3/29/2011 4:02:59PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	1	102.00	102.00	102.00	00.00	100.00	102.00	102.00	N/A	14,005	14,285
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	1	96.77	96.77	96.77	00.00	100.00	96.77	96.77	N/A	31,000	30,000
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	64,500	64,500
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	104.59	104.59	102.99	02.44	101.55	102.04	107.14	N/A	30,100	31,000
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	98.89	98.89	98.89	00.00	100.00	98.89	98.89	N/A	90,000	89,000
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	58.13	58.13	90.86	61.47	63.98	22.40	93.86	N/A	29,750	27,030
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	98.00	98.00	99.13	02.04	98.86	96.00	100.00	N/A	28,750	28,500
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	216.67	216.67	216.67	00.00	100.00	216.67	216.67	N/A	900	1,950
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	58.18	58.18	58.18	00.00	100.00	58.18	58.18	N/A	27,500	16,000
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	3	100.00	99.59	99.34	01.74	100.25	96.77	102.00	N/A	36,502	36,262
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	5	98.89	84.87	97.79	18.79	86.79	22.40	107.14	N/A	41,940	41,012
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	4	98.00	117.71	87.25	41.45	134.91	58.18	216.67	N/A	21,475	18,738
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	101.02	102.02	100.37	02.54	101.64	98.89	107.14	N/A	53,675	53,875
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	94.93	78.07	94.92	21.00	82.25	22.40	100.00	N/A	29,250	27,765
<u>ALL</u>	12	99.45	99.50	95.97	21.93	103.68	22.40	216.67	93.86 to 102.04	33,759	32,400

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	9	100.00	95.35	96.11	07.14	99.21	58.18	107.14	93.86 to 102.04	41,189	39,587
03	1	216.67	216.67	216.67	00.00	100.00	216.67	216.67	N/A	900	1,950
04	1	22.40	22.40	22.40	00.00	100.00	22.40	22.40	N/A	2,500	560
05	1	96.77	96.77	96.77	00.00	100.00	96.77	96.77	N/A	31,000	30,000
<u>ALL</u>	12	99.45	99.50	95.97	21.93	103.68	22.40	216.67	93.86 to 102.04	33,759	32,400

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	12	99.45	99.50	95.97	21.93	103.68	22.40	216.67	93.86 to 102.04	33,759	32,400
04											
<u>ALL</u>	12	99.45	99.50	95.97	21.93	103.68	22.40	216.67	93.86 to 102.04	33,759	32,400

68 Perkins
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 : 12
Total Sales Price : 399,105
Total Adj. Sales Price : 405,105
Total Assessed Value : 388,795
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 33,759
Avg. Assessed Value : 32,400

MEDIAN : 99
WGT. MEAN : 96
MEAN : 100
COD : 21.93
PRD : 103.68

COV : 44.43
STD : 44.21
Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.81
MAX Sales Ratio : 216.67
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.40

95% Median C.I. : 93.86 to 102.04
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 89.21 to 102.74
95% Mean C.I. : 71.41 to 127.59

Printed:3/29/2011 4:02:59PM

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	2	119.54	119.54	73.82	81.26	161.93	22.40	216.67	N/A	1,700	1,255	
5000 TO 9999												
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	2	119.54	119.54	73.82	81.26	161.93	22.40	216.67	N/A	1,700	1,255	
10000 TO 29999	5	96.77	92.02	87.61	11.36	105.03	58.18	107.14	N/A	19,241	16,857	
30000 TO 59999	3	100.00	98.63	98.34	02.73	100.29	93.86	102.04	N/A	50,333	49,500	
60000 TO 99999	2	99.45	99.45	99.35	00.56	100.10	98.89	100.00	N/A	77,250	76,750	
100000 TO 149999												
150000 TO 249999												
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	12	99.45	99.50	95.97	21.93	103.68	22.40	216.67	93.86 to 102.04	33,759	32,400	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	22.40	22.40	22.40	00.00	100.00	22.40	22.40	N/A	2,500	560	
338	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	64,500	64,500	
341	1	102.04	102.04	102.04	00.00	100.00	102.04	102.04	N/A	49,000	50,000	
344	2	101.57	101.57	101.27	05.48	100.30	96.00	107.14	N/A	11,850	12,000	
353	2	99.45	99.45	99.26	00.56	100.19	98.89	100.00	N/A	67,500	67,000	
406	4	99.39	127.33	96.92	32.21	131.38	93.86	216.67	N/A	25,726	24,934	
528	1	58.18	58.18	58.18	00.00	100.00	58.18	58.18	N/A	27,500	16,000	
<u>ALL</u>	12	99.45	99.50	95.97	21.93	103.68	22.40	216.67	93.86 to 102.04	33,759	32,400	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Perkins County**

A. Commerical Real Property

The Perkins County Assessor continually monitors commercial property in the same manner as residential and agricultural. Each review cycle includes a type of commercial within the same occupancy codes throughout the county for uniform and proportionate values. New commercial values were completed in 2010 through Stanard Appraisal Services, Inc. The updated appraisal work supported no further actions to the commercial values in 2011.

Only 7.6% of Perkins County is based from commercial property. Twelve sold properties make up the sample for measurement purposes in four different valuation groupings. The total assessed value of the 12 sales is less than one percent of the total commercial valuation.

Although the calculated median from 12 sales is 99%; the sample of sold properties are not in proportionate to the County population of commercial property. The makeup of the 12 sales is not reliable for measurement purposes.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is undetermined for the commercial class of property and there is no non-binding recommendation for Perkins County.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Perkins 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 Perkins 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 Perkins 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 Perkins 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 Perkins County

The Perkins County Assessor increased the agricultural land values for each subclass to equalize the increasing market within the county and surrounding areas. The largest increases for 2011 are the irrigated subclasses. The Assessor increased the lower LCG's in the irrigated subclasses as much as \$380 to narrow the difference between 1A and 4A. In 2010 there was a \$290 spread in the irrigated subclasses and for 2011 the spread is only \$70. The market is not reflecting a large difference between the soil types or slope. 1A through 3A1 is currently \$1450 and the lower three LCG's are \$1380.

Dry land values were also increased from \$70-\$95 for each LCG. The strong market has supported the increases in dry land but not as large of increases compared to the irrigated land in this Upper Republican River County.

The grass values remain the same in 2011 at \$300 in Perkins County similar to the unchanged grass values in Chase County at \$295.

Stanard Appraisal Service conducted new appraisals for the rural feedlots in Perkins County. These improved parcels received the 2011 values.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Perkins County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	The entire county is one market area. There are no identifiable characteristics that separate the county.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	N/A	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	Market data of actual rural acreages are reviewed and valued; 1 st acre \$10,000; 2-5 acres \$1000; additional acres \$640	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	Farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	It is the policy of the Perkins County Assessor to assess land in accordance with NE Revised Statute 77-1359	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	FSA maps, physical inspection of flagged parcels and GIS imagery	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	The actual use of the parcel	
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 physical changes of the structures, complete renovation of structures, any changes of use or occupancy codes.	
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.	
	Policy manuals were reviewed and available at the County Assessor's office	

68 Perkins
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 : 96
 Total Sales Price : 21,881,982
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,582,367
 Total Assessed Value : 14,691,727
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 214,400
 Avg. Assessed Value : 153,039

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 15.78
 PRD : 101.79

COV : 20.67
 STD : 15.02
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.95
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.97
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.87

95% Median C.I. : 66.82 to 74.55
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.57 to 75.19
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.66 to 75.66

Printed:3/29/2011 4:03:03PM

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>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	3	91.05	95.24	91.66	09.75	103.91	84.02	110.65	N/A	104,645	95,921
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	11	87.10	90.62	94.41	18.52	95.99	63.44	125.97	65.51 to 122.34	171,091	161,524
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	16	77.01	78.76	78.90	12.38	99.82	63.03	105.47	68.41 to 90.39	269,283	212,466
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	6	74.67	76.37	75.37	09.56	101.33	66.13	87.37	66.13 to 87.37	244,383	184,181
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	78.83	79.06	78.96	02.64	100.13	76.05	82.30	N/A	111,233	87,830
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	71.79	69.63	67.10	09.33	103.77	57.62	80.16	57.62 to 80.16	252,125	169,170
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	12	65.15	63.77	64.13	09.09	99.44	40.87	76.87	60.47 to 68.15	169,469	108,674
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	59.47	63.33	63.84	12.86	99.20	51.66	90.13	51.66 to 90.13	336,375	214,729
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	70.67	69.45	71.00	10.05	97.82	57.19	82.11	57.19 to 82.11	182,501	129,581
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	72.09	70.30	71.56	06.06	98.24	62.92	77.42	N/A	111,800	80,003
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	17	65.47	62.96	58.84	12.08	107.00	41.93	83.06	57.69 to 70.09	217,633	128,048
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	36	79.96	83.36	82.41	15.62	101.15	63.03	125.97	72.04 to 87.37	221,410	182,474
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	31	66.65	66.65	65.56	11.78	101.66	40.87	90.13	62.16 to 73.13	228,236	149,637
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	29	66.72	65.79	62.93	11.23	104.54	41.93	83.06	58.97 to 72.09	190,906	120,134
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	33	75.96	76.14	75.34	10.56	101.06	57.62	105.47	69.08 to 79.62	246,228	185,497
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	27	65.79	65.11	65.46	11.31	99.47	40.87	90.13	59.25 to 68.15	222,301	145,518
<u>ALL</u>	96	69.38	72.66	71.38	15.78	101.79	40.87	125.97	66.82 to 74.55	214,400	153,039

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	96	69.38	72.66	71.38	15.78	101.79	40.87	125.97	66.82 to 74.55	214,400	153,039
<u>ALL</u>	96	69.38	72.66	71.38	15.78	101.79	40.87	125.97	66.82 to 74.55	214,400	153,039

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
<u>Dry</u>											
County	60	69.59	74.35	72.84	15.61	102.07	41.93	122.34	66.80 to 77.42	166,908	121,579
1	60	69.59	74.35	72.84	15.61	102.07	41.93	122.34	66.80 to 77.42	166,908	121,579
<u>Grass</u>											
County	7	65.86	62.53	55.90	13.74	111.86	40.87	74.55	40.87 to 74.55	108,927	60,894
1	7	65.86	62.53	55.90	13.74	111.86	40.87	74.55	40.87 to 74.55	108,927	60,894
<u>ALL</u>	96	69.38	72.66	71.38	15.78	101.79	40.87	125.97	66.82 to 74.55	214,400	153,039

68 Perkins
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 : 96
 Total Sales Price : 21,881,982
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,582,367
 Total Assessed Value : 14,691,727
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 214,400
 Avg. Assessed Value : 153,039

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 15.78
 PRD : 101.79

COV : 20.67
 STD : 15.02
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.95
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.97
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.87

95% Median C.I. : 66.82 to 74.55
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.57 to 75.19
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.66 to 75.66

Printed:3/29/2011 4:03:03PM

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	69.25	67.67	67.08	13.88	100.88	49.42	90.49	54.44 to 76.50	340,261	228,248
1	17	69.25	67.67	67.08	13.88	100.88	49.42	90.49	54.44 to 76.50	340,261	228,248
_____Dry_____											
County	60	69.59	74.35	72.84	15.61	102.07	41.93	122.34	66.80 to 77.42	166,908	121,579
1	60	69.59	74.35	72.84	15.61	102.07	41.93	122.34	66.80 to 77.42	166,908	121,579
_____Grass_____											
County	7	65.86	62.53	55.90	13.74	111.86	40.87	74.55	40.87 to 74.55	108,927	60,894
1	7	65.86	62.53	55.90	13.74	111.86	40.87	74.55	40.87 to 74.55	108,927	60,894
_____ALL_____											
	96	69.38	72.66	71.38	15.78	101.79	40.87	125.97	66.82 to 74.55	214,400	153,039

68 Perkins
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 : 102
 Total Sales Price : 22,989,244
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,689,629
 Total Assessed Value : 15,647,166
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 212,643
 Avg. Assessed Value : 153,404

MEDIAN : 71
 WGT. MEAN : 72
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 15.81
 PRD : 101.75

COV : 20.52
 STD : 15.06
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.20
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.97
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.87

95% Median C.I. : 67.15 to 75.01
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 68.39 to 75.89
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.48 to 76.32

Printed:3/29/2011 4:03:05PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	3	91.05	95.24	91.66	09.75	103.91	84.02	110.65	N/A	104,645	95,921
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	11	87.10	90.62	94.41	18.52	95.99	63.44	125.97	65.51 to 122.34	171,091	161,524
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	16	77.01	78.76	78.90	12.38	99.82	63.03	105.47	68.41 to 90.39	269,283	212,466
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	6	74.67	76.37	75.37	09.56	101.33	66.13	87.37	66.13 to 87.37	244,383	184,181
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	78.83	79.06	78.96	02.64	100.13	76.05	82.30	N/A	111,233	87,830
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	71.79	69.63	67.10	09.33	103.77	57.62	80.16	57.62 to 80.16	252,125	169,170
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	13	65.79	66.75	69.52	12.60	96.02	40.87	102.54	60.47 to 73.13	182,010	126,539
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	59.47	63.33	63.84	12.86	99.20	51.66	90.13	51.66 to 90.13	336,375	214,729
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	73.66	72.32	73.93	09.57	97.82	57.19	82.81	58.97 to 82.11	200,601	148,305
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	72.09	70.30	71.56	06.06	98.24	62.92	77.42	N/A	111,800	80,003
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	19	66.46	65.38	59.14	13.81	110.55	41.93	93.99	58.44 to 72.17	197,159	116,597
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	36	79.96	83.36	82.41	15.62	101.15	63.03	125.97	72.04 to 87.37	221,410	182,474
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	32	66.82	67.77	67.22	13.06	100.82	40.87	102.54	62.16 to 74.55	231,495	155,615
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	34	68.10	68.14	64.94	12.60	104.93	41.93	93.99	62.92 to 73.23	185,619	120,541
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	33	75.96	76.14	75.34	10.56	101.06	57.62	105.47	69.08 to 79.62	246,228	185,497
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	31	66.72	67.67	68.61	13.28	98.63	40.87	102.54	60.47 to 72.78	227,843	156,319
<u>ALL</u>	102	70.82	73.40	72.14	15.81	101.75	40.87	125.97	67.15 to 75.01	212,643	153,404

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	102	70.82	73.40	72.14	15.81	101.75	40.87	125.97	67.15 to 75.01	212,643	153,404
<u>ALL</u>	102	70.82	73.40	72.14	15.81	101.75	40.87	125.97	67.15 to 75.01	212,643	153,404

68 Perkins
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 : 102
 Total Sales Price : 22,989,244
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,689,629
 Total Assessed Value : 15,647,166
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 212,643
 Avg. Assessed Value : 153,404

MEDIAN : 71
 WGT. MEAN : 72
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 15.81
 PRD : 101.75

COV : 20.52
 STD : 15.06
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.20
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.97
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.87

95% Median C.I. : 67.15 to 75.01
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 68.39 to 75.89
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.48 to 76.32

Printed:3/29/2011 4:03:05PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	1	102.54	102.54	102.54	00.00	100.00	102.54	102.54	N/A	332,500	340,929
1	1	102.54	102.54	102.54	00.00	100.00	102.54	102.54	N/A	332,500	340,929
_____Dry_____											
County	60	69.59	74.35	72.84	15.61	102.07	41.93	122.34	66.80 to 77.42	166,908	121,579
1	60	69.59	74.35	72.84	15.61	102.07	41.93	122.34	66.80 to 77.42	166,908	121,579
_____Grass_____											
County	10	71.53	68.42	61.57	14.26	111.13	40.87	93.99	55.70 to 77.91	106,475	65,558
1	10	71.53	68.42	61.57	14.26	111.13	40.87	93.99	55.70 to 77.91	106,475	65,558
_____ALL_____	102	70.82	73.40	72.14	15.81	101.75	40.87	125.97	67.15 to 75.01	212,643	153,404

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	19	69.50	70.14	69.34	15.67	101.15	49.42	102.54	59.25 to 77.51	332,207	230,343
1	19	69.50	70.14	69.34	15.67	101.15	49.42	102.54	59.25 to 77.51	332,207	230,343
_____Dry_____											
County	60	69.59	74.35	72.84	15.61	102.07	41.93	122.34	66.80 to 77.42	166,908	121,579
1	60	69.59	74.35	72.84	15.61	102.07	41.93	122.34	66.80 to 77.42	166,908	121,579
_____Grass_____											
County	11	72.09	69.72	65.96	14.22	105.70	40.87	93.99	55.70 to 82.81	122,023	80,490
1	11	72.09	69.72	65.96	14.22	105.70	40.87	93.99	55.70 to 82.81	122,023	80,490
_____ALL_____	102	70.82	73.40	72.14	15.81	101.75	40.87	125.97	67.15 to 75.01	212,643	153,404

68 Perkins
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 : 120
 Total Sales Price : 29,253,855
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,658,740
 Total Assessed Value : 19,600,533
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 230,490
 Avg. Assessed Value : 163,338

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 72
 COD : 16.41
 PRD : 102.26

COV : 21.53
 STD : 15.60
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.35
 MAX Sales Ratio : 130.36
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.92

95% Median C.I. : 66.82 to 73.13
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.79 to 73.94
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.68 to 75.26

Printed:3/29/2011 4:03:08PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	4	90.41	93.87	90.86	07.72	103.31	84.02	110.65	N/A	135,984	123,561
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	12	87.13	90.33	94.02	16.97	96.08	63.44	125.97	70.96 to 104.91	165,608	155,710
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	18	77.01	78.44	78.74	12.00	99.62	63.03	105.47	68.93 to 85.02	285,196	224,555
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	9	72.04	74.37	70.89	10.65	104.91	57.04	87.37	66.13 to 85.86	293,164	207,811
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	77.44	75.20	71.70	06.93	104.88	63.61	82.30	N/A	158,425	113,584
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	13	64.37	68.47	66.58	11.09	102.84	57.62	84.96	61.21 to 75.57	254,231	169,269
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	13	65.79	68.89	67.29	15.85	102.38	40.87	130.36	60.47 to 73.13	164,279	110,543
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	11	66.98	67.40	67.12	14.89	100.42	51.66	90.13	54.44 to 88.16	335,364	225,084
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	58.82	58.82	58.82	00.00	100.00	58.82	58.82	N/A	348,000	204,682
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	70.67	70.35	71.54	10.75	98.34	57.19	82.81	58.97 to 82.11	209,445	149,840
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	67.05	65.50	64.20	11.51	102.02	39.92	77.42	39.92 to 77.42	172,771	110,915
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	19	59.55	61.94	58.51	13.52	105.86	41.93	83.06	57.21 to 69.25	218,409	127,790
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	43	80.16	82.34	80.32	14.92	102.51	57.04	125.97	72.04 to 87.10	239,610	192,443
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	41	66.65	68.97	67.27	13.97	102.53	40.87	130.36	62.20 to 73.13	238,130	160,191
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	36	66.16	64.65	62.67	12.47	103.16	39.92	83.06	58.82 to 70.09	210,894	132,157
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	44	74.78	74.37	73.16	11.65	101.65	57.04	105.47	68.93 to 78.83	266,152	194,707
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	34	66.69	68.50	67.84	14.41	100.97	40.87	130.36	60.47 to 70.67	236,989	160,771
<u>ALL</u>	120	69.17	72.47	70.87	16.41	102.26	39.92	130.36	66.82 to 73.13	230,490	163,338

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	120	69.17	72.47	70.87	16.41	102.26	39.92	130.36	66.82 to 73.13	230,490	163,338
<u>ALL</u>	120	69.17	72.47	70.87	16.41	102.26	39.92	130.36	66.82 to 73.13	230,490	163,338

68 Perkins
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 : 120
 Total Sales Price : 29,253,855
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,658,740
 Total Assessed Value : 19,600,533
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 230,490
 Avg. Assessed Value : 163,338

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 72
 COD : 16.41
 PRD : 102.26

COV : 21.53
 STD : 15.60
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.35
 MAX Sales Ratio : 130.36
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.92

95% Median C.I. : 66.82 to 73.13
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.79 to 73.94
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.68 to 75.26

Printed:3/29/2011 4:03:08PM

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	3	64.37	66.78	68.79	09.49	97.08	58.82	77.15	N/A	432,667	297,629
1	3	64.37	66.78	68.79	09.49	97.08	58.82	77.15	N/A	432,667	297,629
Dry											
County	68	70.38	74.78	73.08	17.43	102.33	39.92	130.36	66.82 to 77.72	164,411	120,147
1	68	70.38	74.78	73.08	17.43	102.33	39.92	130.36	66.82 to 77.72	164,411	120,147
Grass											
County	7	65.86	62.53	55.90	13.74	111.86	40.87	74.55	40.87 to 74.55	108,927	60,894
1	7	65.86	62.53	55.90	13.74	111.86	40.87	74.55	40.87 to 74.55	108,927	60,894
ALL	120	69.17	72.47	70.87	16.41	102.26	39.92	130.36	66.82 to 73.13	230,490	163,338

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	27	69.25	68.81	68.73	12.71	100.12	49.42	90.49	63.03 to 73.23	345,868	237,699
1	27	69.25	68.81	68.73	12.71	100.12	49.42	90.49	63.03 to 73.23	345,868	237,699
Dry											
County	68	70.38	74.78	73.08	17.43	102.33	39.92	130.36	66.82 to 77.72	164,411	120,147
1	68	70.38	74.78	73.08	17.43	102.33	39.92	130.36	66.82 to 77.72	164,411	120,147
Grass											
County	8	68.41	65.07	63.08	14.68	103.15	40.87	82.81	40.87 to 82.81	129,999	82,007
1	8	68.41	65.07	63.08	14.68	103.15	40.87	82.81	40.87 to 82.81	129,999	82,007
ALL	120	69.17	72.47	70.87	16.41	102.26	39.92	130.36	66.82 to 73.13	230,490	163,338

**2011 Correlation Section
for Perkins County**

A. Agricultural Land

Perkins County sits at the top tier of the Upper Republican River Natural Resource District of the three counties in this area where irrigable lands are policed and restricted for water usage and transfers. 73% of the total value of all real property comes from agricultural land values and the assessor achieves equalization each year by setting land values within market value.

The current market has been focused on dry land uses with nearly 60% of the makeup of the agricultural land being dry. The irrigated population represents approximately 25% and grass only 16%. The base sample of sales in Perkins County reflects what type of activity is happening in the county. The majority land use of dry acres in the base sample represent 71% compared to the 59% in the population. This puts the irrigated and grass under the county average but they are within the acceptable threshold amounts. This analysis includes 96 sales which are distributed over the three year period at acceptable percentages by time.

The second analysis or random inclusion of comparable sales was completed using six borrowed sales from Chase County. This sample balanced the proportionality for the land use. Dry is now within 10% of the population and irrigated and grass remained at acceptable representative thresholds. Chase County was the only neighboring county utilized for comparable sales in this analysis due to the major marketing differences in the irrigated NRD areas. Results of the additional six sales improved the median from 69 in the base stat to 71 in the random inclusion. The COD and PRD did not change with this sample.

The random elimination analysis added 18 sales from the first six miles of neighboring counties. This included 9 from Keith County, 7 from Chase, 1 from Hayes and 1 from Lincoln. Perkins County borders Colorado on the west boundary line and cannot be used for expansion. Although the sample is proportionate and representative by majority land use the sales are reflecting the affects from the different market influences from the irrigated borrowed sales. The 9 sales from Keith County all have major acres of irrigated land uses which are not comparable to the different NRD in Perkins County. The statistics reflect less acceptable measures with the median falling to 69 and the weighted mean and mean falling one point also. The COD and PRD increase by nearly one point. This test was completed to support the second analysis of the random inclusion of comparable sales and it defines the market differences between comparable sales and all of the sales within the first six miles.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 71% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Perkins 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 Perkins 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 Perkins 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 Perkins 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 : 4,511	Value : 541,077,892	Growth 2,543,849	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	163	526,733	7	42,199	13	48,887	183	617,819	
02. Res Improve Land	785	3,820,082	39	492,199	162	2,448,551	986	6,760,832	
03. Res Improvements	800	38,878,778	40	3,696,816	185	14,490,468	1,025	57,066,062	
04. Res Total	963	43,225,593	47	4,231,214	198	16,987,906	1,208	64,444,713	941,475
% of Res Total	79.72	67.07	3.89	6.57	16.39	26.36	26.78	11.91	37.01
05. Com UnImp Land	17	92,185	9	91,056	25	190,788	51	374,029	
06. Com Improve Land	121	1,056,792	21	364,276	42	5,226,450	184	6,647,518	
07. Com Improvements	133	14,928,999	23	3,517,037	47	17,146,849	203	35,592,885	
08. Com Total	150	16,077,976	32	3,972,369	72	22,564,087	254	42,614,432	676,437
% of Com Total	59.06	37.73	12.60	9.32	28.35	52.95	5.63	7.88	26.59
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	1	48,638	0	0	0	0	1	48,638	
11. Ind Improvements	1	18,360	0	0	0	0	1	18,360	
12. Ind Total	1	66,998	0	0	0	0	1	66,998	0
% of Ind Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	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	963	43,225,593	47	4,231,214	198	16,987,906	1,208	64,444,713	941,475
% of Res & Rec Total	79.72	67.07	3.89	6.57	16.39	26.36	26.78	11.91	37.01
Com & Ind Total	151	16,144,974	32	3,972,369	72	22,564,087	255	42,681,430	676,437
% of Com & Ind Total	59.22	37.83	12.55	9.31	28.24	52.87	5.65	7.89	26.59
17. Taxable Total	1,114	59,370,567	79	8,203,583	270	39,551,993	1,463	107,126,143	1,617,912
% of Taxable Total	76.14	55.42	5.40	7.66	18.46	36.92	32.43	19.80	63.60

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	1	66,998	15,511,684	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	1	66,998	15,511,684
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	66,998	15,511,684

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	14	7,000	14	7,000	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	39	11,208	39	11,208	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	53	18,208	53	18,208	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	77	1	155	233

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	5	22,602	10	31,793	2,392	305,990,931	2,407	306,045,326
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	2	22,179	551	93,750,050	553	93,772,229
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	2	43,419	586	34,072,567	588	34,115,986
30. Ag Total							2,995	433,933,541

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	1	1.00	10,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	3,200	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	1.00	7,500	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	2	6.63	6,630	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	40,219	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.27	0	0	1.44	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	11	11.00	110,000	11	11.00	110,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	323	327.00	3,168,000	324	328.00	3,178,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	324	322.00	23,908,088	325	323.00	23,911,288	925,937
34. HomeSite Total				336	339.00	27,199,288	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	64	342.49	162,485	65	343.49	169,985	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	537	2,330.71	2,262,844	539	2,337.34	2,269,474	
37. FarmSite Improvements	562	0.00	10,164,479	563	0.00	10,204,698	0
38. FarmSite Total				628	2,680.83	12,644,157	
39. Road & Ditches	0	9,058.46	0	0	9,060.17	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				964	12,080.00	39,843,445	925,937

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	41,737.68	30.33%	59,715,844	30.78%	1,430.74
47. 2A1	22,256.11	16.18%	31,719,625	16.35%	1,425.21
48. 2A	19,312.50	14.04%	27,529,310	14.19%	1,425.47
49. 3A1	18,102.89	13.16%	25,888,431	13.34%	1,430.07
50. 3A	7,043.33	5.12%	9,526,591	4.91%	1,352.57
51. 4A1	28,914.50	21.01%	39,331,899	20.27%	1,360.28
52. 4A	223.47	0.16%	306,196	0.16%	1,370.19
53. Total	137,590.48	100.00%	194,017,896	100.00%	1,410.11
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	139,235.53	43.18%	78,668,201	45.23%	565.00
56. 2D1	41,432.10	12.85%	23,409,195	13.46%	565.00
57. 2D	50,063.11	15.53%	27,535,167	15.83%	550.01
58. 3D1	40,821.56	12.66%	22,452,202	12.91%	550.01
59. 3D	15,494.62	4.81%	6,662,745	3.83%	430.00
60. 4D1	31,617.31	9.81%	13,595,534	7.82%	430.00
61. 4D	3,778.56	1.17%	1,624,783	0.93%	430.00
62. Total	322,442.79	100.00%	173,947,827	100.00%	539.47
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	3,177.12	3.74%	953,136	3.74%	300.00
65. 2G1	3,121.75	3.67%	936,525	3.67%	300.00
66. 2G	3,038.10	3.58%	911,430	3.58%	300.00
67. 3G1	5,442.57	6.41%	1,632,771	6.41%	300.00
68. 3G	5,066.03	5.96%	1,519,809	5.96%	300.00
69. 4G1	52,363.09	61.63%	15,708,928	61.63%	300.00
70. 4G	12,756.30	15.01%	3,826,890	15.01%	300.00
71. Total	84,964.96	100.00%	25,489,489	100.00%	300.00
Irrigated Total					
	137,590.48	25.09%	194,017,896	49.23%	1,410.11
Dry Total					
	322,442.79	58.80%	173,947,827	44.14%	539.47
Grass Total					
	84,964.96	15.49%	25,489,489	6.47%	300.00
72. Waste	1,689.49	0.31%	135,162	0.03%	80.00
73. Other	1,665.74	0.30%	499,722	0.13%	300.00
74. Exempt	284.49	0.05%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	548,353.46	100.00%	394,090,096	100.00%	718.68

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	137,590.48	194,017,896	137,590.48	194,017,896
77. Dry Land	22.41	10,539	49.06	24,109	322,371.32	173,913,179	322,442.79	173,947,827
78. Grass	14.44	4,332	43.24	12,972	84,907.28	25,472,185	84,964.96	25,489,489
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,689.49	135,162	1,689.49	135,162
80. Other	0.77	231	0.87	261	1,664.10	499,230	1,665.74	499,722
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	284.49	0	284.49	0
82. Total	37.62	15,102	93.17	37,342	548,222.67	394,037,652	548,353.46	394,090,096

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	137,590.48	25.09%	194,017,896	49.23%	1,410.11
Dry Land	322,442.79	58.80%	173,947,827	44.14%	539.47
Grass	84,964.96	15.49%	25,489,489	6.47%	300.00
Waste	1,689.49	0.31%	135,162	0.03%	80.00
Other	1,665.74	0.30%	499,722	0.13%	300.00
Exempt	284.49	0.05%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	548,353.46	100.00%	394,090,096	100.00%	718.68

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

68 Perkins

	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	62,661,462	64,444,713	1,783,251	2.85%	941,475	1.34%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	27,115,929	27,199,288	83,359	0.31%	925,937	-3.11%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	89,777,391	91,644,001	1,866,610	2.08%	1,867,412	0.00%
05. Commercial	43,298,271	42,614,432	-683,839	-1.58%	676,437	-3.14%
06. Industrial	66,998	66,998	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	11,436,668	12,644,157	1,207,489	10.56%	0	10.56%
08. Minerals	72,318	18,208	-54,110	-74.82	0	-74.82
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	54,874,255	55,343,795	469,540	0.86%	676,437	-0.38%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	144,651,646	146,987,796	2,336,150	1.62%	2,543,849	-0.14%
11. Irrigated	163,391,975	194,017,896	30,625,921	18.74%		
12. Dryland	144,998,603	173,947,827	28,949,224	19.97%		
13. Grassland	25,545,109	25,489,489	-55,620	-0.22%		
14. Wasteland	134,988	135,162	174	0.13%		
15. Other Agland	501,432	499,722	-1,710	-0.34%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	334,572,107	394,090,096	59,517,989	17.79%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	479,223,753	541,077,892	61,854,139	12.91%	2,543,849	12.38%

**2010 Plan of Assessment for Perkins County
Assessment Years 2011, 2012, and 2013
Date: June 15, 2010**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, 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 the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the 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 the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-112(Reissue 2006).

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 value for agricultural land and horticultural land.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-5023(2), 77-1344.

General Description of Real Property in Perkins County*

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	Total Value	% of Taxable Value Base		
Residential	1205	26.8%	\$101,109,913	21.1%		
Commercial & Industrial	253	5.6%	\$43,370,019	9.05%		
Agricultural	2990	66.5%	\$334,572,135	69.83%		
Tax Exempt	233		0			
TIF	1		\$15,511,684	0		
Mineral	51	1.1%	\$72,318	.02%		
Total	4500	100%	\$479,124,385	100%		

*2010 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property

Agricultural land – taxable acres – 548,395 acres

Other pertinent facts: 69.83% of Perkins County Valuation is agricultural and of that 69.83%, the primary land use is dry but the greatest amount of valuation is in irrigated land with \$163.4 million of value.

For more information see 2010 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources

A. Staff/Budget/Training

Staff

1 Assessor

1 Deputy Assessor

Temporary or Seasonal employees as needed and budget allows

Contract Appraiser

Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. will be contracted for 2011 to reappraise all livestock feeding facilities over 1,000 head (per DEQ), including the two hog confinements in the county. The ethanol plant and the landfill will also be reappraised. All other commercial and industrial properties were reappraised by Stanard Appraisal in 2009 and 2010. Pritchett & Abbott of Fort Worth, Texas will be contracted to value our mineral interests in Perkins County.

Budget Request

2010-11 Assessor = \$93,237

2010-11 Reappraisal = \$7,500

The \$7,500 in the reappraisal fund will be used to revalue commercial facilities along with the appraisal of the mineral interests in the county. All other work is done in office by the staff available and the budget available in the Assessor's budget.

Training

The Assessor holds a current Assessor Certification dated September 21, 1995. The Deputy Assessor holds a current Assessor Certification dated February 7, 2002.

B. Cadastral Maps - Cadastral maps of agricultural land used in the Assessor's office have been scanned by GIS Workshop as part of the upgrade to a GIS system. The new soil conversion was implemented during the summer and fall of 2008 for the 2009 assessment year.

C. Property Record Cards – Hard copies and electronic copies of the property record cards are maintained. The information contained within these property record cards meets the requirements of the law. Property record cards are available to the public on our website, perkins.gisworkshop.com.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS- Computer services are contracted through ASI/Terra Scan. The Assessor's office has both the administrative and CAMA package in operation. We have been with Terra Scan since June, 1998. GIS was implemented in summer, 2006 and our website came on line February, 2007. The website is kept updated by GIS Workshop.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

- A. Discover, List & Inventory all property – Building permits are provided from the city of Grant on a monthly basis, and by the village of Madrid at the end of each year. No building permits are provided to the assessor’s office from Elsie or Venango. Zoning permits are provided to the assessor’s office by the Zoning Administrator. These building and zoning permits help us to list new construction in the incorporated areas. Zoning permits are not required for agricultural buildings. Improvement statements are filed by the office personnel whenever new construction is observed or reported. Notice is published at the end of each year to remind the taxpayers that an improvement statement must be filed with the County Assessor on all improvements to real property amounting to a value of two thousand five hundred dollars or more.
- B. Data Collection – Data collection is done yearly on different parts of the county.
- C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions. Assessment sales ratios are reviewed yearly to determine what areas need to be adjusted.
- D. Approaches to Value
 - 1) Market Approach; sales comparisons- Residential and Commercial sales books are kept updated when new sales are processed.
 - 2) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study. – The 06/07 Marshall and Swift costs were used for the rural residential revaluation done in 2008 and the Grant revaluation in 2009. A current depreciation study is done yearly and implemented on whatever part of the county that is being revalued.
 - 3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market. – An income approach to value was done by Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. on the commercial parcels that they appraised for 2009 and 2010.
 - 4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas- Sales Books are kept updated on all vacant land sales. Agricultural sales books are kept updated as are maps of sales of specific land use.
 - 5) Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation
- E. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions-A complete review of sales ratios is done after the yearly assessment actions to determine the new ratios.

F. Notices and Public Relations – Notices are published timely to notify the public.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	97.0	17.76	104.81
Commercial	99.0	9.31	95.15
Agricultural	72.0	20.58	104.58

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011

Residential

For 2011, all residential property in Madrid, Elsie, Venango, Brandon and Grainton including lot values will be updated and revalued. This review will include an exterior physical inspection of the property along with verifying information located on the property record card. New digital pictures will be taken and new measurements will be taken if needed. There are approximately 180 parcels in Madrid, 85 in Elsie, 115 in Venango and 20 in Brandon and Grainton. These properties will be valued using the most current M & S cost tables and a market derived depreciation table and sales approach to value. The county also plans to review all single-wide manufactured homes in Perkins County. There are approximately 70 single-wide manufactured homes in Perkins County. These properties will be valued using the cost approach with a market derived depreciation table and the sales approach to value. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed for residential properties. . Sales Review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sale books will be updated as sales are received.

Commercial

Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. will be contracted for 2011 to reappraise all livestock feeding facilities over 1,000 head (per DEQ), including the two hog confinements in the county. The ethanol plant and the landfill will also be reappraised. All other commercial and industrial properties were reappraised by Stanard Appraisal in 2009 and 2010. Pritchett & Abbott of Fort Worth, Texas will be contracted to value our mineral interests in Perkins County. Appraisal maintenance will be done on all remaining

commercial property. This appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of commercial lots and sites will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on maps for the 3 year sales period, by land classification group. A review of sales will be done to determine if the adjustment on irrigated parcels with a low pumping well or a satellite pivot is still justified. A sales review on all sales that are deemed to be arms length transactions, and pick-up work which is physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits and improvement statements, is completed. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and interview with the buyer if necessary. Sales books will be updated as sales are received. Satellite pivot sale books will continue to be updated, along with a sale book of pivots in irrigated land sales.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012

Residential

Rural residential property will be updated and revalued for 2012, including land values. There are approximately 500 rural parcels in Perkins County. This review will include an exterior physical inspection of the property along with verifying information located on the property record card. New digital pictures will be taken and new measurements will be taken if needed. These properties will be valued using the most recent M & S cost tables available and a market derived depreciation and sales approach to value. Appraisal maintenance will be done on all other residential property, which includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales Review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sale books will be updated as sales are received.

Commercial

Appraisal maintenance will be done on commercial property. This appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of commercial lots and sites will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on maps for the 3 year sales period, by land classification group. A review of sales will be done to determine if the adjustment on irrigated parcels with a low pumping well or a satellite pivot is still justified. A sales review on all sales that are deemed to be arms length transactions, and pick-up work which is physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits and improvement statements, is completed. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and interview with the buyer if necessary. Sales books will be updated as sales are received. Satellite pivot sale books will continue to be updated, along with a sale book of pivots in irrigated land sales.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013

Residential

For 2013, all residential property in Grant, Grant suburbs and Kenton Heights, including lot values, will be updated and revalued. This review will include an exterior physical inspection of the property along with verifying information located on the property record card. New digital pictures will be taken. There are approximately 500 parcels in Grant. These properties will be valued using the most recent M & S cost tables with a market derived depreciation table and sales approach to value. Appraisal maintenance will be done on all other residential property, which includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales Review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of lots in towns, and sales of rural properties will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

Commercial

Appraisal maintenance will be done on commercial property. This appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and a physical inspection and interview with the buyer if necessary. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits, and information statements. Sales of commercial lots and sites will continue to be mapped and sales books will be updated as sales are received.

Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on maps for the 3 year sales period, by land classification group. A review of sales will be done to determine if the adjustment on irrigated parcels with a low pumping well or a satellite pivot is still justified. A sales review on all sales that are deemed to be arms length transactions, and pick-up work which is physical inspection of all building permits, zoning permits and improvement statements, is completed. Sales review includes a questionnaire sent to both buyer and seller, and interview with the buyer if necessary. Sales books will be updated as sales are received. Satellite pivot sale books will continue to be updated, along with a sale book of pivots in irrigated land sales.

The following is a time line table to give an overview of the narrative portion of the plan.

Class		2011	2012	2013	
Residential		Review of Madrid(180) Elsie(85) Venango(115) Brandon/ Granton(20) Manufactured Homes(70)	Review of all Rural Residential (500)	Review of Grant, Grant suburbs and Kenton Hts Residential Property(500)	
Commercial		Reappraisal Livestock Facilities, ethanol plant, landfill(9)	Appraisal Maintenance Of all Commercial	Appraisal Maintenance Of all Commercial	
Agricultural		Market analysis by land classification	Market analysis by land classification	Market analysis by land classification	

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

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to Nebraska Department of Revenue, rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
 - i. Annual Plan of Assessment Report

3. Personal Property - administer annual filing of approximately 730 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 approximately 130 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by Property Assessment Division for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. 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.
9. Tax Lists - prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
10. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list corrections documents for county board approval.
11. County Board of Equalization – attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests, assemble and provide information.
12. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearing before TERC, defend valuation.
13. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
14. Education/Assessor Education – attend meeting, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.
15. Update and maintain GIS.

Conclusion:

The market value for agricultural land continues to increase and consequently, our assessed real property values are up on all classifications of agricultural land for 2010. We continue to lose valuation on personal property due Mid America Agri Products' personal property filing. In 2008, the valuation for Mid America Agri Products was placed on the tax roll at \$26.2 million. In 2009 it depreciated to \$18.8 million for a \$7.4 million dollars loss. In 2010, the valuation dropped to \$13.1 million. The personal property valuation will continue to go down until 2013 when it will be gone. We will gain some of this value back when the Tax Increment Financing Project on Wheatland Industries is completed.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor Signature: _____ Date: _____

Copy distribution: Submit the plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year.

Mail a copy of the plan and any amendments to Dept. of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31 of each year.

2011 Assessment Survey for Perkins 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
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$93,237
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same as above
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	See no. 9
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	\$7,500
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$14,800
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$700
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$77,737
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	\$1,055.26 of the assessor's budget was unused. 100% of the reappraisal budget was used.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	TerraScan
2.	CAMA software:
	TerraScan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes, electronic
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Deputy Assessor
5.	Does the county have GIS software?

	Yes; it was implemented in 2006
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Deputy Assessor
7.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Grant and Madrid
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Stanard Appraisal Services
2.	Other services:
	TerraScan

2011 Certification for Perkins 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 Perkins 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

