

# 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 Thurston County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	67	Median	98.94
Total Sales Price	\$3,320,555	Mean	112.11
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,339,555	Wgt. Mean	91.37
Total Assessed Value	\$3,051,335	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$42,942
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$49,844	Avg. Assessed Value	\$45,542

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.59 to 109.43
95% Mean C.I	83.22 to 99.51
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	99.97 to 124.25
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	14.52
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.27
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.53

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	66	95	95
2009	66	94	94
2008	68	96	96
2007	94	93	93

## 2011 Commission Summary for Thurston County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	4	Median	96.21
Total Sales Price	\$243,500	Mean	84.53
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$243,500	Wgt. Mean	73.03
Total Assessed Value	\$177,825	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$44,751
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$60,875	Avg. Assessed Value	\$44,456

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	39.52 to 129.54
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.71
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.42
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.41

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	8	100	96
2009	10	98	98
2008	12	99	99
2007	12	97	97



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

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>99</b>	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>71</b>	The qualitative measures calculated in the base stat sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



*Ruth A. Sorensen*

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



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

Pick up work – valuation of new homes, additions, decks, etc.. Review work for rural residential, in Pender and Thayer townships.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Thurston County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Pender
	5	Emerson and Thurston
	10	The villages of Rosalie, Walthill and Winnebago
	15	All rural residential properties
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Cost and sales	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	2010 on small towns, 2008 for Pender	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	Sales	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2008	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Depreciation is calculated based on local market information	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	Six to ten years	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>	
	Additional structure to parcel after the sale.	
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>	
	Follow the statutes.	

**87 Thurston  
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 : 67  
Total Sales Price : 3,320,555  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,339,555  
Total Assessed Value : 3,051,335  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 49,844  
Avg. Assessed Value : 45,542

MEDIAN : 99  
WGT. MEAN : 91  
MEAN : 112  
COD : 33.54  
PRD : 122.70

COV : 45.22  
STD : 50.70  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.18  
MAX Sales Ratio : 349.40  
MIN Sales Ratio : 42.94

95% Median C.I. : 90.59 to 109.43  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 83.22 to 99.51  
95% Mean C.I. : 99.97 to 124.25

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:13PM

**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	5	90.59	96.89	95.13	27.12	101.85	54.24	157.06	N/A	70,200	66,781
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	94.79	117.05	103.94	29.30	112.61	80.97	239.88	80.97 to 239.88	32,214	33,483
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	111.50	101.59	85.81	21.61	118.39	51.23	134.41	51.23 to 134.41	29,377	25,208
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	106.98	112.56	92.16	24.62	122.14	64.64	171.29	64.64 to 171.29	43,688	40,264
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	11	96.73	117.57	99.18	40.67	118.54	62.13	212.21	69.71 to 200.42	54,945	54,495
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	101.13	128.83	105.79	39.07	121.78	79.85	349.40	87.81 to 134.59	39,437	41,721
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	118.96	132.46	86.06	44.04	153.92	76.25	215.67	N/A	69,625	59,916
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	14	91.29	94.91	76.03	31.66	124.83	42.94	200.82	67.65 to 112.35	62,939	47,851
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	26	99.20	108.22	94.50	27.12	114.52	51.23	239.88	90.59 to 120.65	42,395	40,063
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	41	96.73	114.58	89.83	38.35	127.55	42.94	349.40	83.88 to 112.35	54,568	49,017
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	37	104.09	117.55	98.13	33.05	119.79	51.23	349.40	93.22 to 126.16	43,335	42,526
<u>ALL</u>	67	98.94	112.11	91.37	33.54	122.70	42.94	349.40	90.59 to 109.43	49,844	45,542

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	33	96.73	115.03	94.02	36.59	122.35	51.98	349.40	83.88 to 109.43	59,004	55,473
05	6	120.66	110.83	96.26	21.13	115.14	54.24	137.20	54.24 to 137.20	18,667	17,969
10	19	105.65	115.04	105.90	28.07	108.63	51.23	215.67	87.81 to 148.17	22,574	23,905
15	9	76.25	96.08	77.36	41.78	124.20	42.94	212.21	64.64 to 129.55	94,611	73,189
<u>ALL</u>	67	98.94	112.11	91.37	33.54	122.70	42.94	349.40	90.59 to 109.43	49,844	45,542

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	65	98.94	108.94	91.22	30.39	119.43	42.94	239.88	90.77 to 107.22	51,109	46,622
06											
07	2	215.19	215.19	119.31	62.37	180.36	80.97	349.40	N/A	8,750	10,440
<u>ALL</u>	67	98.94	112.11	91.37	33.54	122.70	42.94	349.40	90.59 to 109.43	49,844	45,542

**87 Thurston  
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 : 67  
 Total Sales Price : 3,320,555  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,339,555  
 Total Assessed Value : 3,051,335  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 49,844  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 45,542

MEDIAN : 99  
 WGT. MEAN : 91  
 MEAN : 112  
 COD : 33.54  
 PRD : 122.70

COV : 45.22  
 STD : 50.70  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 33.18  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 349.40  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.94

95% Median C.I. : 90.59 to 109.43  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 83.22 to 99.51  
 95% Mean C.I. : 99.97 to 124.25

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:13PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	3	171.29	215.33	218.96	43.61	98.34	125.29	349.40	N/A	2,567	5,620	
5000 TO 9999	4	176.44	182.49	192.49	25.67	94.80	137.20	239.88	N/A	6,375	12,271	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	7	171.29	196.56	198.63	33.80	98.96	125.29	349.40	125.29 to 349.40	4,743	9,421	
10000 TO 29999	19	117.35	119.91	119.38	25.29	100.44	51.23	212.21	95.04 to 148.17	20,516	24,491	
30000 TO 59999	19	93.33	99.42	100.72	19.82	98.71	54.24	200.42	85.93 to 107.22	37,882	38,154	
60000 TO 99999	9	99.46	100.17	100.70	11.94	99.47	81.28	129.55	83.45 to 114.49	72,389	72,897	
100000 TO 149999	8	67.73	65.03	64.89	12.14	100.22	42.94	79.85	42.94 to 79.85	124,188	80,581	
150000 TO 249999	3	83.28	86.94	86.72	10.03	100.25	76.25	101.30	N/A	177,600	154,012	
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	67	98.94	112.11	91.37	33.54	122.70	42.94	349.40	90.59 to 109.43	49,844	45,542	



## 2011 Correlation Section for Thurston County

---

### A. Residential Real Property

The residential statistical sample for Thurston County includes 67 qualified sales. The sample is considered reliable for the measurement of the county. The relationship between the median, weighted mean and mean are not closely related, the median is the only level within the acceptable parameters. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are also far outside the acceptable parameters.

The sales verification is weak in Thurston County. The personal knowledge of the assessor and staff are the main decisions for the qualification of a sale. If there is a concern in the validity of a sale, the county may contact persons involved in the transaction including the realtor, buyer or seller.

The assessor reported that a rural review has been started. No other major review efforts have been conducted to present.

Review of the statistical measures of Thurston County reveals several concerns in the quality of assessment. Each coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are substantially outside the acceptable parameters for the residential class of property. Each of the valuation groupings was reviewed and in most cases there are low dollar sales that are affecting the quality of assessment. These sales are arm's length transactions but tend to skew the information.

The valuation group of 01-Pender is the only one within the acceptable range. All other subclasses do not have sufficient information to deem them out of compliance with the level of value. The valuation group of 10 has grouped the villages of Rosalie, Walthill and Winnebago together. The group is located on the east side of Thurston County. There are four sales under \$10,000 in this valuation group that distort the quality of assessment. If those were not used in the measurement of the valuation group the median level would be 99.12% and the coefficient of dispersion would be 23.30, the price related differential would be 102.13%. Based on the consideration of all the available information, the level of value is determined to be 99% of market value for the residential class of real property.

Based on the knowledge of the county the level of value is determined to be 99%. There will not be a non-binding recommendation to the residential class of property as there is nothing that would improve the quality of assessment.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Thurston 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 Thurston 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 Thurston 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 Thurston 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 Thurston County**

Reviewed pick up work, not much activity in commercial sales.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Thurston County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Pender
	5	Emerson and Thurston
	10	The villages of Rosalie, Walthill and Winnebago
	15	All rural residential properties
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Sales	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	Unknown	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Sales	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Unknown	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Depreciation based on local market	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	No	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	Unknown	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>	
	Structural change to parcel after the time of sale.	
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>	
	Follow the statutes.	

**87 Thurston  
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 : 4  
Total Sales Price : 243,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 243,500  
Total Assessed Value : 177,825  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 60,875  
Avg. Assessed Value : 44,456

MEDIAN : 96  
WGT. MEAN : 73  
MEAN : 85

COV : 33.47  
STD : 28.29  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.78

95% Median C.I. : N/A  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A  
95% Mean C.I. : 39.52 to 129.54

COD : 16.40  
PRD : 115.75

MAX Sales Ratio : 103.29  
MIN Sales Ratio : 42.41

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:16PM

**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											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	96.21	96.21	95.71	01.16	100.52	95.09	97.33	N/A	24,250	23,210
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	103.29	103.29	103.29	00.00	100.00	103.29	103.29	N/A	80,000	82,635
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	1	42.41	42.41	42.41	00.00	100.00	42.41	42.41	N/A	115,000	48,770
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	4	96.21	84.53	73.03	16.40	115.75	42.41	103.29	N/A	60,875	44,456
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10											
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	72.85	72.85	67.39	41.78	108.10	42.41	103.29	N/A	97,500	65,703
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09											
<u>ALL</u>	4	96.21	84.53	73.03	16.40	115.75	42.41	103.29	N/A	60,875	44,456

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	4	96.21	84.53	73.03	16.40	115.75	42.41	103.29	N/A	60,875	44,456
<u>ALL</u>	4	96.21	84.53	73.03	16.40	115.75	42.41	103.29	N/A	60,875	44,456

**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	4	96.21	84.53	73.03	16.40	115.75	42.41	103.29	N/A	60,875	44,456
04											
<u>ALL</u>	4	96.21	84.53	73.03	16.40	115.75	42.41	103.29	N/A	60,875	44,456

**87 Thurston  
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 : 4  
 Total Sales Price : 243,500  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 243,500  
 Total Assessed Value : 177,825  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 60,875  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 44,456

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 73  
 MEAN : 85  
 COD : 16.40  
 PRD : 115.75

COV : 33.47  
 STD : 28.29  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.78  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 103.29  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 42.41

95% Median C.I. : N/A  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : N/A  
 95% Mean C.I. : 39.52 to 129.54

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:16PM

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											
5000 TO 9999											
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999											
10000 TO 29999	1	97.33	97.33	97.33	00.00	100.00	97.33	97.33	N/A	13,500	13,140
30000 TO 59999	1	95.09	95.09	95.09	00.00	100.00	95.09	95.09	N/A	35,000	33,280
60000 TO 99999	1	103.29	103.29	103.29	00.00	100.00	103.29	103.29	N/A	80,000	82,635
100000 TO 149999	1	42.41	42.41	42.41	00.00	100.00	42.41	42.41	N/A	115,000	48,770
150000 TO 249999											
250000 TO 499999											
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>4</u>	96.21	84.53	73.03	16.40	115.75	42.41	103.29	N/A	60,875	44,456

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
350	1	97.33	97.33	97.33	00.00	100.00	97.33	97.33	N/A	13,500	13,140
410	1	42.41	42.41	42.41	00.00	100.00	42.41	42.41	N/A	115,000	48,770
442	1	95.09	95.09	95.09	00.00	100.00	95.09	95.09	N/A	35,000	33,280
531	1	103.29	103.29	103.29	00.00	100.00	103.29	103.29	N/A	80,000	82,635
<u>ALL</u>	<u>4</u>	96.21	84.53	73.03	16.40	115.75	42.41	103.29	N/A	60,875	44,456



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Thurston County**

---

**A. Commerical Real Property**

The commercial statistical sample for Thurston County includes four qualified sales. The diversity of the sample to the population is not reliable. The calculated median for the sample will not be determined as the level of value due to the lack reliable information.

The sales verification is weak in Thurston County. The personal knowledge of the assessor and staff are the main decisions for the qualification of a sale. If there is a concern in the validity of a sale, the county may contact persons involved in the transaction including the realtor, buyer or seller.

The county reported minimal valuation changes to the commercial class.

Based on the consideration of all available information, there is not enough information to determine a reliable level of value the commercial class of real property.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Thurston 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 Thurston 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 Thurston 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 Thurston 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 Thurston County**

Conduct market analysis of agricultural sales. Increased agricultural land. Review work and land use changes. Pick up work, measured quite a few new grain bins that were not reported. Expect to see an increase in agricultural for 2012.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Thurston County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Western portion of the county
	2	Eastern portion of the county includes the Winnebago and Omaha Indian reservations. The east border is the Missouri River
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Sales, topography	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	Non at this time	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?</b>	
	Yes	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	Classification and land use	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	Physical inspection and FSA maps	
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	None	
9.	<b>Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	None	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?</b>	
	Yes	
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>	
	Yes	
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>	
	Follow the statutes.	

**87 Thurston**  
**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 : 67  
 Total Sales Price : 16,674,936  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,674,936  
 Total Assessed Value : 11,403,850  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 248,880  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 170,207

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 68  
 MEAN : 72  
 COD : 21.51  
 PRD : 105.54

COV : 28.82  
 STD : 20.80  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.30  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.77  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 06.76

95% Median C.I. : 63.67 to 75.73  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.41 to 73.37  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.20 to 77.16

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:18PM

**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	93.50	93.50	93.50	00.00	100.00	93.50	93.50	N/A	35,100	32,820
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	9	74.72	78.04	83.30	20.28	93.69	49.47	125.77	58.84 to 99.46	203,043	169,138
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	12	79.25	78.31	70.40	18.41	111.24	49.25	109.24	60.31 to 94.56	230,424	162,210
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	114.50	95.47	95.38	22.18	100.09	57.73	124.13	N/A	108,815	103,792
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	60.68	60.38	55.06	11.88	109.66	49.41	71.04	N/A	419,533	230,975
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	64.22	64.23	64.18	12.10	100.08	49.53	77.86	51.67 to 73.38	249,844	160,353
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	7	75.73	65.69	72.62	23.62	90.46	06.76	91.78	06.76 to 91.78	246,015	178,664
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	69.45	67.63	64.85	20.35	104.29	43.37	85.06	43.37 to 85.06	400,914	259,983
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	88.82	83.76	77.89	08.38	107.54	70.07	92.39	N/A	149,194	116,207
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	66.21	57.46	62.44	18.15	92.02	35.06	71.12	N/A	153,583	95,900
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	60.50	61.27	57.98	08.41	105.67	49.96	70.94	N/A	357,698	207,397
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	69.20	69.20	69.20	00.00	100.00	69.20	69.20	N/A	120,000	83,035
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	27	77.13	81.96	77.74	23.92	105.43	49.25	125.77	63.67 to 94.56	191,543	148,909
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	28	67.95	65.15	64.78	19.32	100.57	06.76	91.78	58.29 to 75.73	310,231	200,963
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	12	67.71	66.60	62.35	15.49	106.82	35.06	92.39	60.25 to 71.12	234,735	146,362
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	30	71.15	74.68	67.39	22.49	110.82	49.25	124.13	60.68 to 77.86	235,540	158,731
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	21	72.38	67.83	67.95	21.39	99.82	06.76	92.39	58.29 to 82.08	277,988	188,897
<u>ALL</u>	67	71.12	72.18	68.39	21.51	105.54	06.76	125.77	63.67 to 75.73	248,880	170,207

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	41	71.12	71.56	68.81	16.51	104.00	49.25	125.77	63.67 to 75.36	277,667	191,059
2	26	72.88	73.17	67.49	28.69	108.42	06.76	124.13	60.18 to 88.82	203,484	137,325
<u>ALL</u>	67	71.12	72.18	68.39	21.51	105.54	06.76	125.77	63.67 to 75.73	248,880	170,207

**87 Thurston**  
**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 : 67  
 Total Sales Price : 16,674,936  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,674,936  
 Total Assessed Value : 11,403,850  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 248,880  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 170,207

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 68  
 MEAN : 72  
 COD : 21.51  
 PRD : 105.54

COV : 28.82  
 STD : 20.80  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.30  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.77  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 06.76

95% Median C.I. : 63.67 to 75.73  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.41 to 73.37  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.20 to 77.16

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:18PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	48	71.19	73.50	69.39	18.29	105.92	43.37	125.77	63.67 to 75.73	241,741	167,735
1	32	71.35	73.13	70.27	16.30	104.07	49.25	125.77	63.67 to 76.68	262,210	184,252
2	16	70.56	74.22	67.08	22.35	110.64	43.37	124.13	60.18 to 88.82	200,805	134,701
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	1	57.73	57.73	57.73	00.00	100.00	57.73	57.73	N/A	35,000	20,205
1	1	57.73	57.73	57.73	00.00	100.00	57.73	57.73	N/A	35,000	20,205
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>71.12</b>	<b>72.18</b>	<b>68.39</b>	<b>21.51</b>	<b>105.54</b>	<b>06.76</b>	<b>125.77</b>	<b>63.67 to 75.73</b>	<b>248,880</b>	<b>170,207</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	1	49.96	49.96	49.96	00.00	100.00	49.96	49.96	N/A	746,900	373,180
1	1	49.96	49.96	49.96	00.00	100.00	49.96	49.96	N/A	746,900	373,180
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	53	72.38	74.95	70.94	18.55	105.65	43.37	125.77	65.65 to 77.13	242,777	172,233
1	33	71.43	73.14	70.39	15.88	103.91	49.25	125.77	64.86 to 75.73	264,373	186,087
2	20	76.29	77.95	72.11	21.77	108.10	43.37	124.13	60.50 to 88.82	207,144	149,374
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	2	32.25	32.25	22.27	79.04	144.81	06.76	57.73	N/A	57,500	12,808
1	1	57.73	57.73	57.73	00.00	100.00	57.73	57.73	N/A	35,000	20,205
2	1	06.76	06.76	06.76	00.00	100.00	06.76	06.76	N/A	80,000	5,410
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>71.12</b>	<b>72.18</b>	<b>68.39</b>	<b>21.51</b>	<b>105.54</b>	<b>06.76</b>	<b>125.77</b>	<b>63.67 to 75.73</b>	<b>248,880</b>	<b>170,207</b>

**87 Thurston**  
**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 : 77  
 Total Sales Price : 20,286,976  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,286,976  
 Total Assessed Value : 13,561,535  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 263,467  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 176,124

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 67  
 MEAN : 70  
 COD : 21.60  
 PRD : 105.34

COV : 28.36  
 STD : 19.97  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.82  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.77  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 06.76

95% Median C.I. : 61.21 to 72.45  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.74 to 70.96  
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.96 to 74.88

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:21PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	1	93.50	93.50	93.50	00.00	100.00	93.50	93.50	N/A	35,100	32,820	
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	9	74.72	78.04	83.30	20.28	93.69	49.47	125.77	58.84 to 99.46	203,043	169,138	
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	12	79.25	78.31	70.40	18.41	111.24	49.25	109.24	60.31 to 94.56	230,424	162,210	
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	114.50	95.47	95.38	22.18	100.09	57.73	124.13	N/A	108,815	103,792	
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	60.68	60.38	55.06	11.88	109.66	49.41	71.04	N/A	419,533	230,975	
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	64.22	64.23	64.18	12.10	100.08	49.53	77.86	51.67 to 73.38	249,844	160,353	
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	7	75.73	65.69	72.62	23.62	90.46	06.76	91.78	06.76 to 91.78	246,015	178,664	
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	69.45	67.63	64.85	20.35	104.29	43.37	85.06	43.37 to 85.06	400,914	259,983	
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	79.45	76.37	65.38	17.92	116.81	54.18	92.39	N/A	236,896	154,885	
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	59.11	58.01	59.07	10.71	98.21	35.06	71.12	54.53 to 66.21	236,921	139,953	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	60.38	61.04	60.45	08.55	100.98	49.96	70.94	49.96 to 70.94	403,624	243,984	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	69.20	69.20	69.20	00.00	100.00	69.20	69.20	N/A	120,000	83,035	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	27	77.13	81.96	77.74	23.92	105.43	49.25	125.77	63.67 to 94.56	191,543	148,909	
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	28	67.95	65.15	64.78	19.32	100.57	06.76	91.78	58.29 to 75.73	310,231	200,963	
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	22	60.86	62.96	60.88	13.77	103.42	35.06	92.39	56.63 to 69.20	292,221	177,910	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	30	71.15	74.68	67.39	22.49	110.82	49.25	124.13	60.68 to 77.86	235,540	158,731	
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	28	63.82	65.30	65.04	22.86	100.40	06.76	92.39	56.81 to 76.68	286,046	186,058	
<u>ALL</u>	77	68.62	70.42	66.85	21.60	105.34	06.76	125.77	61.21 to 72.45	263,467	176,124	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
1	49	66.21	69.61	67.44	17.23	103.22	49.25	125.77	61.21 to 72.38	287,069	193,585	
2	28	70.56	71.83	65.52	29.21	109.63	06.76	124.13	59.39 to 83.89	222,164	145,566	
<u>ALL</u>	77	68.62	70.42	66.85	21.60	105.34	06.76	125.77	61.21 to 72.45	263,467	176,124	

**87 Thurston**  
**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 : 77  
 Total Sales Price : 20,286,976  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,286,976  
 Total Assessed Value : 13,561,535  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 263,467  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 176,124

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 67  
 MEAN : 70  
 COD : 21.60  
 PRD : 105.34

COV : 28.36  
 STD : 19.97  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.82  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.77  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 06.76

95% Median C.I. : 61.21 to 72.45  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.74 to 70.96  
 95% Mean C.I. : 65.96 to 74.88

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:21PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	57	69.20	71.22	67.53	18.48	105.46	43.37	125.77	61.21 to 72.45	258,169	174,352
1	40	68.91	70.43	68.17	16.69	103.32	49.25	125.77	61.21 to 72.45	276,819	188,708
2	17	70.07	73.06	65.60	22.49	111.37	43.37	124.13	59.39 to 88.82	214,287	140,571
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	1	57.73	57.73	57.73	00.00	100.00	57.73	57.73	N/A	35,000	20,205
1	1	57.73	57.73	57.73	00.00	100.00	57.73	57.73	N/A	35,000	20,205
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>68.62</b>	<b>70.42</b>	<b>66.85</b>	<b>21.60</b>	<b>105.34</b>	<b>06.76</b>	<b>125.77</b>	<b>61.21 to 72.45</b>	<b>263,467</b>	<b>176,124</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	1	49.96	49.96	49.96	00.00	100.00	49.96	49.96	N/A	746,900	373,180
1	1	49.96	49.96	49.96	00.00	100.00	49.96	49.96	N/A	746,900	373,180
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	62	70.99	72.65	68.93	18.68	105.40	43.37	125.77	63.55 to 74.72	257,729	177,663
1	41	69.20	70.51	68.32	16.36	103.21	49.25	125.77	61.21 to 73.38	278,204	190,077
2	21	74.72	76.83	70.46	22.46	109.04	43.37	124.13	60.25 to 88.82	217,756	153,427
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	2	32.25	32.25	22.27	79.04	144.81	06.76	57.73	N/A	57,500	12,808
1	1	57.73	57.73	57.73	00.00	100.00	57.73	57.73	N/A	35,000	20,205
2	1	06.76	06.76	06.76	00.00	100.00	06.76	06.76	N/A	80,000	5,410
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>68.62</b>	<b>70.42</b>	<b>66.85</b>	<b>21.60</b>	<b>105.34</b>	<b>06.76</b>	<b>125.77</b>	<b>61.21 to 72.45</b>	<b>263,467</b>	<b>176,124</b>

**87 Thurston**  
**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 : 83  
 Total Sales Price : 21,826,663  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,826,663  
 Total Assessed Value : 14,154,710  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 262,972  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 170,539

MEDIAN : 65  
 WGT. MEAN : 65  
 MEAN : 69  
 COD : 23.77  
 PRD : 105.72

COV : 30.29  
 STD : 20.77  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.42  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.77  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 06.76

95% Median C.I. : 60.31 to 71.43  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.92 to 68.78  
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.09 to 73.03

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:24PM

**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	2	83.51	83.51	76.71	11.97	108.86	73.51	93.50	N/A	109,550	84,035
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	9	74.72	78.04	83.30	20.28	93.69	49.47	125.77	58.84 to 99.46	203,043	169,138
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	13	77.13	76.61	67.17	19.54	114.05	49.25	109.24	58.73 to 94.56	275,232	184,883
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	6	87.34	88.22	76.63	36.17	115.12	51.98	124.13	51.98 to 124.13	159,679	122,362
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	60.68	60.38	55.06	11.88	109.66	49.41	71.04	N/A	419,533	230,975
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	64.22	64.23	64.18	12.10	100.08	49.53	77.86	51.67 to 73.38	249,844	160,353
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	65.71	59.19	64.94	32.52	91.15	06.76	91.78	27.78 to 86.18	235,125	152,700
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	69.45	67.63	64.85	20.35	104.29	43.37	85.06	43.37 to 85.06	400,914	259,983
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	79.45	76.37	65.39	17.92	116.79	54.20	92.39	N/A	236,896	154,908
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	59.11	58.01	59.07	10.71	98.21	35.06	71.12	54.53 to 66.21	236,921	139,953
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	58.89	55.38	53.55	14.82	103.42	23.31	70.94	23.31 to 70.94	341,077	182,649
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	69.20	69.20	69.20	00.00	100.00	69.20	69.20	N/A	120,000	83,035
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	30	75.04	79.82	73.34	24.17	108.84	49.25	125.77	63.67 to 91.76	219,419	160,932
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	31	63.58	63.11	63.37	21.75	99.59	06.76	91.78	54.00 to 73.38	300,503	190,429
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	22	60.38	60.90	57.75	16.06	105.45	23.31	92.39	55.80 to 69.20	269,477	155,611
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	32	68.35	73.40	65.53	23.50	112.01	49.25	124.13	60.18 to 77.86	259,160	169,816
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	31	61.21	63.24	63.51	24.26	99.57	06.76	92.39	56.63 to 75.73	278,659	176,970
<u>ALL</u>	83	64.86	68.56	64.85	23.77	105.72	06.76	125.77	60.31 to 71.43	262,972	170,539

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	48	65.93	69.63	67.36	17.59	103.37	49.25	125.77	60.68 to 72.45	275,852	185,817
2	35	60.50	67.09	60.98	33.75	110.02	06.76	124.13	54.53 to 77.86	245,308	149,586
<u>ALL</u>	83	64.86	68.56	64.85	23.77	105.72	06.76	125.77	60.31 to 71.43	262,972	170,539

**87 Thurston**  
**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 : 83  
 Total Sales Price : 21,826,663  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 21,826,663  
 Total Assessed Value : 14,154,710  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 262,972  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 170,539

MEDIAN : 65  
 WGT. MEAN : 65  
 MEAN : 69  
 COD : 23.77  
 PRD : 105.72

COV : 30.29  
 STD : 20.77  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.42  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 125.77  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 06.76

95% Median C.I. : 60.31 to 71.43  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.92 to 68.78  
 95% Mean C.I. : 64.09 to 73.03

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:24PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	59	69.20	70.72	66.52	18.68	106.31	43.37	125.77	60.68 to 72.45	259,340	172,525
1	39	69.20	70.48	68.13	17.02	103.45	49.25	125.77	60.68 to 73.68	262,750	179,022
2	20	66.81	71.19	63.26	22.71	112.54	43.37	124.13	59.39 to 81.38	252,690	159,856
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	3	27.78	36.27	27.08	41.29	133.94	23.31	57.73	N/A	192,651	52,167
1	1	57.73	57.73	57.73	00.00	100.00	57.73	57.73	N/A	35,000	20,205
2	2	25.55	25.55	25.10	08.77	101.79	23.31	27.78	N/A	271,477	68,148
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>64.86</b>	<b>68.56</b>	<b>64.85</b>	<b>23.77</b>	<b>105.72</b>	<b>06.76</b>	<b>125.77</b>	<b>60.31 to 71.43</b>	<b>262,972</b>	<b>170,539</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	1	49.96	49.96	49.96	00.00	100.00	49.96	49.96	N/A	746,900	373,180
1	1	49.96	49.96	49.96	00.00	100.00	49.96	49.96	N/A	746,900	373,180
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	66	70.51	71.54	67.58	19.20	105.86	43.37	125.77	61.21 to 73.51	257,212	173,817
1	40	70.07	70.55	68.30	16.54	103.29	49.25	125.77	61.21 to 73.38	264,521	180,667
2	26	70.56	73.06	66.38	23.46	110.06	43.37	124.13	59.39 to 81.38	245,966	163,278
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	4	25.55	28.90	24.61	54.25	117.43	06.76	57.73	N/A	164,488	40,478
1	1	57.73	57.73	57.73	00.00	100.00	57.73	57.73	N/A	35,000	20,205
2	3	23.31	19.28	22.75	30.07	84.75	06.76	27.78	N/A	207,651	47,235
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>64.86</b>	<b>68.56</b>	<b>64.85</b>	<b>23.77</b>	<b>105.72</b>	<b>06.76</b>	<b>125.77</b>	<b>60.31 to 71.43</b>	<b>262,972</b>	<b>170,539</b>



## 2011 Correlation Section for Thurston County

---

### **A. Agricultural Land**

Thurston County is divided into two market areas. Market area one is the western area of the county. There are 41 sales in this area and the land use is defined as 9% irrigated, 83% dry land, 6% grass and 2% considered other. There are 26 sales in market area two and the land use is defined as 3% irrigated, 85% dry land, 7% grass and 5% other. Market area two is bordered on the east by the Missouri River, the north by Dakota County and the south by Burt County.

The analyses of the base statistics reveal that the county is slightly out of proportion in the distribution of time and lacks sales in during the time frame of 7/2009-6/2010 in each of the market areas. The land use meets the minimum threshold difference between the sales file and the base of the county.

The base statistic was expanded to include and exclude comparable sales from common market areas adjoining Thurston County. The inclusion of sales brought seven sales into market area one and two sales into market area two and proportionately represents the time frame and land use. All thresholds were met when expanding the sample. The third analysis included a total of 83 sales when expanding the sample. Thurston County has 84% dry land use in the county. Comparison of the weighted average as indicated in the Abstract Average Acre Value provides information that the values for Thurston County are comparable with surrounding areas for the dry and irrigated land use. There are not sufficient sales in either the irrigated or grass land use to draw the same conclusion, however Thurston County is considerably lower in the grass values compared to the surrounding counties.

Thurston County analyzed the sales within the county and applied increases to various land classification groups.

Based on the analysis of all available information, the level of value of the agricultural land in Wayne County has been determined to be 71%.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Thurston 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 Thurston 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 Thurston 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 Thurston County**

---

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

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

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



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 4,150</b>	<b>Value : 463,715,715</b>	<b>Growth 2,423,050</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	239	1,021,495	15	94,545	5	34,040	259	1,150,080	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	974	4,971,655	80	1,001,455	195	3,310,395	1,249	9,283,505	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	984	39,126,980	82	5,629,160	210	11,693,490	1,276	56,449,630	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,223	45,120,130	97	6,725,160	215	15,037,925	1,535	66,883,215	790,235
<b>% of Res Total</b>	79.67	67.46	6.32	10.06	14.01	22.48	36.99	14.42	32.61
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	42	61,745	11	183,765	1	9,835	54	255,345	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	177	483,320	34	212,770	4	19,600	215	715,690	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	177	6,260,175	34	2,993,925	4	371,395	215	9,625,495	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	219	6,805,240	45	3,390,460	5	400,830	269	10,596,530	126,435
<b>% of Com Total</b>	81.41	64.22	16.73	32.00	1.86	3.78	6.48	2.29	5.22
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	2	9,640	0	0	0	0	2	9,640	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	8	52,070	2	23,135	0	0	10	75,205	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	8	1,397,920	2	495,785	0	0	10	1,893,705	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	10	1,459,630	2	518,920	0	0	12	1,978,550	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	83.33	73.77	16.67	26.23	0.00	0.00	0.29	0.43	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	30	423,225	30	423,225	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	3	24,560	3	24,560	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	3	1,790	3	1,790	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	33	449,575	33	449,575	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.80	0.10	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,223	45,120,130	97	6,725,160	248	15,487,500	1,568	67,332,790	790,235
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	78.00	67.01	6.19	9.99	15.82	23.00	37.78	14.52	32.61
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	229	8,264,870	47	3,909,380	5	400,830	281	12,575,080	126,435
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	81.49	65.72	16.73	31.09	1.78	3.19	6.77	2.71	5.22
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	1,452	53,385,000	144	10,634,540	253	15,888,330	1,849	79,907,870	916,670
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	78.53	66.81	7.79	13.31	13.68	19.88	44.55	17.23	37.83

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	218	181	869	1,268

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	212	23,851,950	1,404	205,625,605	1,616	229,477,555
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	77	12,920,300	608	112,010,740	685	124,931,040
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	77	2,913,275	608	26,485,975	685	29,399,250
30. Ag Total							2,301	383,807,845

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	8,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	34	36.00	274,750	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	36	0.00	1,333,950	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	3	3.57	7,140	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	64	235.21	470,420	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	75	0.00	1,579,325	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	187	310.03	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	6	6.00	48,000	7	7.00	56,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	288	302.85	2,359,275	322	338.85	2,634,025	
33. HomeSite Improvements	293	0.00	14,231,985	329	0.00	15,565,935	0
34. HomeSite Total				<b>336</b>	<b>345.85</b>	<b>18,255,960</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	18	46.04	92,080	21	49.61	99,220	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	520	2,081.71	4,112,700	584	2,316.92	4,583,120	
37. FarmSite Improvements	603	0.00	12,253,990	678	0.00	13,833,315	1,506,380
38. FarmSite Total				<b>699</b>	<b>2,366.53</b>	<b>18,515,655</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	1,534	3,170.21	0	1,721	3,480.24	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,035</b>	<b>6,192.62</b>	<b>36,771,615</b>	<b>1,506,380</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	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	3,657.35	41.31%	9,874,845	44.81%	2,700.00
46. 1A	763.66	8.63%	1,985,515	9.01%	2,600.00
47. 2A1	248.10	2.80%	595,440	2.70%	2,400.00
48. 2A	1,335.13	15.08%	3,137,560	14.24%	2,350.00
49. 3A1	1,314.33	14.85%	3,022,960	13.72%	2,300.00
50. 3A	1,122.11	12.67%	2,580,855	11.71%	2,300.00
51. 4A1	279.60	3.16%	587,160	2.66%	2,100.00
52. 4A	133.10	1.50%	252,890	1.15%	1,900.00
53. Total	8,853.38	100.00%	22,037,225	100.00%	2,489.13
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	6,947.54	8.83%	18,063,600	10.12%	2,600.00
55. 1D	15,139.24	19.23%	37,848,100	21.20%	2,500.00
56. 2D1	3,088.99	3.92%	7,027,920	3.94%	2,275.15
57. 2D	4,075.74	5.18%	9,333,475	5.23%	2,290.01
58. 3D1	16,871.22	21.44%	37,960,360	21.26%	2,250.01
59. 3D	16,281.75	20.69%	35,982,655	20.15%	2,210.00
60. 4D1	15,317.11	19.46%	30,634,215	17.16%	2,000.00
61. 4D	986.74	1.25%	1,712,110	0.96%	1,735.12
62. Total	78,708.33	100.00%	178,562,435	100.00%	2,268.66
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	476.11	7.88%	295,945	9.07%	621.59
64. 1G	955.35	15.82%	581,040	17.80%	608.20
65. 2G1	537.65	8.90%	304,830	9.34%	566.97
66. 2G	1,352.54	22.40%	773,815	23.71%	572.12
67. 3G1	833.96	13.81%	411,860	12.62%	493.86
68. 3G	390.64	6.47%	191,820	5.88%	491.04
69. 4G1	1,051.50	17.41%	507,735	15.56%	482.87
70. 4G	441.06	7.30%	196,455	6.02%	445.42
71. Total	6,038.81	100.00%	3,263,500	100.00%	540.42
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	8,853.38	9.30%	22,037,225	10.81%	2,489.13
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	78,708.33	82.65%	178,562,435	87.55%	2,268.66
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	6,038.81	6.34%	3,263,500	1.60%	540.42
72. Waste	1,627.42	1.71%	81,410	0.04%	50.02
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	10,898.32	11.44%	22,089,465	10.83%	2,026.87
75. Market Area Total	95,227.94	100.00%	203,944,570	100.00%	2,141.65

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	437.10	18.13%	1,180,170	20.53%	2,700.00
46. 1A	174.20	7.23%	452,920	7.88%	2,600.00
47. 2A1	107.90	4.48%	258,960	4.51%	2,400.00
48. 2A	179.60	7.45%	422,060	7.34%	2,350.00
49. 3A1	1,210.84	50.22%	2,784,930	48.45%	2,300.00
50. 3A	147.33	6.11%	331,495	5.77%	2,250.02
51. 4A1	133.30	5.53%	279,930	4.87%	2,100.00
52. 4A	20.60	0.85%	37,080	0.65%	1,800.00
53. Total	2,410.87	100.00%	5,747,545	100.00%	2,384.01
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	3,531.63	4.75%	7,769,590	5.77%	2,200.00
55. 1D	12,767.69	17.17%	27,450,535	20.39%	2,150.00
56. 2D1	4,322.97	5.81%	8,754,560	6.50%	2,025.13
57. 2D	1,633.43	2.20%	2,940,175	2.18%	1,800.00
58. 3D1	11,849.26	15.94%	20,736,320	15.40%	1,750.01
59. 3D	6,899.88	9.28%	12,074,880	8.97%	1,750.01
60. 4D1	26,913.87	36.20%	44,407,950	32.98%	1,650.00
61. 4D	6,423.09	8.64%	10,502,075	7.80%	1,635.05
62. Total	74,341.82	100.00%	134,636,085	100.00%	1,811.04
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	121.02	1.93%	69,800	2.80%	576.76
64. 1G	860.59	13.70%	472,755	18.98%	549.34
65. 2G1	387.62	6.17%	184,645	7.41%	476.36
66. 2G	130.91	2.08%	68,075	2.73%	520.01
67. 3G1	528.09	8.40%	205,975	8.27%	390.04
68. 3G	173.64	2.76%	68,310	2.74%	393.40
69. 4G1	2,095.76	33.36%	798,430	32.06%	380.97
70. 4G	1,985.45	31.60%	622,705	25.00%	313.63
71. Total	6,283.08	100.00%	2,490,695	100.00%	396.41
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	2,410.87	2.76%	5,747,545	4.02%	2,384.01
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	74,341.82	85.08%	134,636,085	94.09%	1,811.04
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	6,283.08	7.19%	2,490,695	1.74%	396.41
72. Waste	4,345.42	4.97%	217,335	0.15%	50.01
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	45,081.26	51.59%	48,897,115	34.17%	1,084.64
75. Market Area Total	87,381.19	100.00%	143,091,660	100.00%	1,637.56

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	863.10	2,190,270	10,401.15	25,594,500	11,264.25	27,784,770
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	16,290.04	33,134,035	136,760.11	280,064,485	153,050.15	313,198,520
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	1,369.32	652,730	10,952.57	5,101,465	12,321.89	5,754,195
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	697.50	34,905	5,275.34	263,840	5,972.84	298,745
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	3.00	4,700	6,730.16	9,556,875	49,246.42	61,425,005	55,979.58	70,986,580
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19,219.96</b>	<b>36,011,940</b>	<b>163,389.17</b>	<b>311,024,290</b>	<b>182,609.13</b>	<b>347,036,230</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	11,264.25	6.17%	27,784,770	8.01%	2,466.63
<b>Dry Land</b>	153,050.15	83.81%	313,198,520	90.25%	2,046.38
<b>Grass</b>	12,321.89	6.75%	5,754,195	1.66%	466.99
<b>Waste</b>	5,972.84	3.27%	298,745	0.09%	50.02
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	55,979.58	30.66%	70,986,580	20.46%	1,268.08
<b>Total</b>	<b>182,609.13</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>347,036,230</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,900.43</b>

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

87 Thurston

	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	65,527,515	66,883,215	1,355,700	2.07%	790,235	0.86%
02. Recreational	376,225	449,575	73,350	19.50%	0	19.50%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	18,282,950	18,255,960	-26,990	-0.15%	0	-0.15%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>84,186,690</b>	<b>85,588,750</b>	<b>1,402,060</b>	<b>1.67%</b>	<b>790,235</b>	<b>0.73%</b>
05. Commercial	10,503,770	10,596,530	92,760	0.88%	126,435	-0.32%
06. Industrial	1,978,550	1,978,550	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	17,752,970	18,515,655	762,685	4.30%	1,506,380	-4.19%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>30,235,290</b>	<b>31,090,735</b>	<b>855,445</b>	<b>2.83%</b>	<b>1,632,815</b>	<b>-2.57%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>114,421,980</b>	<b>116,679,485</b>	<b>2,257,505</b>	<b>1.97%</b>	<b>2,423,050</b>	<b>-0.14%</b>
11. Irrigated	26,117,440	27,784,770	1,667,330	6.38%		
12. Dryland	293,046,765	313,198,520	20,151,755	6.88%		
13. Grassland	5,128,010	5,754,195	626,185	12.21%		
14. Wasteland	298,530	298,745	215	0.07%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>324,590,745</b>	<b>347,036,230</b>	<b>22,445,485</b>	<b>6.92%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>439,012,725</b>	<b>463,715,715</b>	<b>24,702,990</b>	<b>5.63%</b>	<b>2,423,050</b>	<b>5.08%</b>

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

**General Description of Real Property in Thurston County:**

Thurston County is located in Northeast Nebraska. The county is irregular in shape with the Missouri River forming the eastern boundary. Pender is the county seat and largest community. Pender is located in the southwestern part. Other communities include Macy, Rosalie, Thurston, Walthill, Winnebago, and part of the community of Emerson. Thurston County was organized in 1889. It was originally part of the acreage selected by the Omaha Indians as their reservation. The Omaha tribe sold part of the land to the Winnebago Reservation also includes part of Dixon County. The county has a checker board type of ownership. Approximately 55,667 acres of the land in Thurston County is exempt. This property is exempt because it is U.S.A. in Trust for the Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska or the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska and Allotment land. Complicating the process, a large number of HUD houses, mobile homes, and commercial buildings located on the above described exempt land. Native American's are exempt from taxation on Improvements on leased land. Some of the properties are co-owned by non-Indian people. That portion is taxable; the discovery process is very difficult in these situations.

Thurston County had a total count of 4,150 taxable parcels on the 2010 County Abstract.

Per the 2010 County Abstract, Thurston County consists of the following real property types.

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	1540	38	17
Commercial	271	7	3
Industrial	12	0	1
Recreational	34	0	1
Agricultural	2293	56	78
Special Value	0		

**Agricultural land – Taxable acres 182,471.480**

For Assessment year 2010, an estimated 150 building permits, information statements and others means of assessing were valued as new property construction/additions.

**Current Resources**

The staff of the Thurston County Assessor's office consists of the Assessor , one part time and one full time Clerk. With limited funds in Thurston County there is little money available for registration, motels and travel. The General Assessors budget was cut for 2009. However, the mileage allowance, fuel, office equipment and repair, office supplies, dues, registration, training and data processing fees, printing and publishing are all increasing. MIPS/County Solutions contract costs have really put the office in a budget bind.

**Discover, List & Inventory all property. Real Estate Transfers along with a photocopy of the deeds are filed timely by the Clerks office. A clerk processes the Real Estate Transfers, followed by a double check by a second clerk. The Assessor reviews the transfer and forwards the information to P.A.T.**

**The property record cards contain all information required by regulation 10-004, which included the legal description property owner, classification codes, and supporting documentation. The supporting documentation includes any field notes, a sketch of the property. A photograph of the property, and if agricultural land is involved an inventory of the soil types by land use. The new and old aerial photographs of the buildings are included. The cards are in good condition and updated and or replaced as needed. Allotment land cards are kept in a separate file. Because of the reservations located in Thurston County, the historical information is kept in the Assessor's office.**

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for Assessment year 2010**

<b>Property Class</b>	<b>Median %</b>	<b>C.O.D. %</b>	<b>P.R.D. %</b>
Residential	95	20.50	110.45
Commercial	100	26.86	111.89
Agricultural Land	70	22.52	104.42
Special Value	0		

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment year 2011:**

**Residential /All Rural Residential :** begin inspection process with the townships of Pender & Thayer. This will include comparison of the current property record card, inspection of the house , list outbuildings & new photos.

**Commercial:** no current plans with the current market situation

**Agricultural:** review land use changes by questionnaire. Conduct market analysis of agricultural sales. rural residential as described above.

**Special Value:** None

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment year 2012:**

**Residential:** All rural residential : begin inspection process with townships of Bryan, Perry, Flournoy, Merry, This will include comparison of the current property record card, inspection of the house, list outbuildings & new photos.

**Commercial:** no current plans with the current market situation

**Agricultural:** review land use changes by questionnaire. Conduct market analysis of agricultural sales. rural residential as described above.

**Special Value:** none

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment year 2013:**

**Residential :** All rural residential : begin inspection process with townships of Dawes, Omaha, Anderson, Blackbird, east & west Winnebago (reservation land). This will include comparison of the current property record card, inspection of the house, list outbuildings & new photos.

**Commercial:** no current plans with the current market situation

**Agricultural Land:** review land use changes by questionnaire. Conduct market analysis of agricultural sales. rural residential as described above.

**Special Value:** none

The Cadastral Maps in Thurston County are old. The maps are current with parcel identification according to regulation 10-004.03. The Assessor would like to implement a GIS system. Funds are not available for this project.

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

Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes

Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:

- a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
- b. Assessor Survey
- c. Sales information to PA & T 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
- g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
- h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
- i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
- j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report

**Personal Property:** administer annual filing of 505 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.

**Permissive Exemption:** Administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.

**Taxable Government Owned Property-**annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax.

**Homestead exemptions:** administer 162 annual filings of applications approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.

**Centrally Assessed-**Review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

**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.

**Tax Lists:** prepare and certify tax list correction documents for county board approval.

**County Board of Equalization –** attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protest- assemble and provide information.

**TERC Appeals-**prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.

**TERC Statewide Equalization-**attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.

**Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education-** attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

**Conclusion:**

This document is a description of the various duties and three year plan of assessment in the Assessors office. Without proper funding the tasks described will be difficult to complete. The current budget request is \$62,855 for the General Fund, 49,854 reappraisal fund.( Last years reappraisal was 54,400. ) Most of the budget increase is the cost of the computer vendor.

**Respectfully submitted:**

Assessor  
signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Thurston County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	2
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$64,475
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
9.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	\$51,300
10.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$11,000
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,600
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	\$2,500

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS/County Solutions
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS/County Solutions
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yers
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No

6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS/County Solutions

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	No
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	N/A
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	N/A
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	N/A

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Part Time – Craig Bachtell, list new construction and commercial properties
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None



## 2011 Certification for Thurston 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 Thurston 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



