

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 Wayne County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	195	Median	95.07
Total Sales Price	\$17,630,809	Mean	98.68
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$17,630,359	Wgt. Mean	95.16
Total Assessed Value	\$16,776,920	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$75,299
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$90,412	Avg. Assessed Value	\$86,035

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.11 to 97.32
95% Mean C.I	93.25 to 97.07
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	96.06 to 101.30
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	17.70
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.26
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	9.44

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	192	96	96
2009	192	96	96
2008	199	96	96
2007	212	93	93

2011 Commission Summary for Wayne County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	24	Median	96.95
Total Sales Price	\$3,912,109	Mean	108.28
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,912,109	Wgt. Mean	110.20
Total Assessed Value	\$4,311,135	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$137,622
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$163,005	Avg. Assessed Value	\$179,631

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	81.62 to 111.28
95% Mean C.I	83.97 to 132.59
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	87.15 to 133.25
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	6.25
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.26
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.87

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	26	95	95
2009	21	93	93
2008	22	93	93
2007	20	96	96

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Wayne 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	95	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	70	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
Property Tax Administrator

2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Wayne County

The residential sales in the county were reviewed and analyzed by the assessor. A thorough examination of the sales file was completed by the assessor. All sales in the sales file should be considered arms length transactions and have been verified as such.

I walked around and photographed all of the residential properties in Wakefield, Winside, Hoskins, Carroll and Wayne. I checked the CAMA sheet and the apex drawing. The clerks in the office have made the adjustments to the record card for all of Wakefield, Winside, Hoskins, and Carroll and are still working on Wayne.

After studying and reviewing the sales in subclasses I determined the lots in Hoskins were too low. I increased the value of lots in Hoskins by \$1000 each. The rural residential HSI acres all have a value of \$10,000 and the BSI acres have a value of \$1,700 per acre. For 2011 I raised the one acre site (HSI) to \$12,000 and the building site (BSI) to \$2,000 per acres.

The photographs and the walk around were conducted by me. I started on August 16, 2010 and worked every day the weather cooperated until October 28, 2010. The information in the folder and the photos with dates should be the necessary documentation to comply with statute 77-1311.03.

I have signed a contract with GIS to take photos of all of the rural properties in the county. They indicated on the contract this would be done either December 2010 or the spring of 2011. After contacting GIS in January 2011 it is determined the photos will be taken in the spring of 2011.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Wayne County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Clerks and Assessor	
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	Beverly Hills – Sub-division located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	02	Carroll
	03	Hoskins
	04	Muhs Acres – Sub-division located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	05	Rural and Sholes
	06	Wakefield – adjoins Dixon County
	07	Wayne – County seat, college, retail, schools, hospital
	08	Winside
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Sales comparison and Cost approach	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	Lot values are studied at the same time as the improvements	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.	
	Square foot method/frontage depth	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	Dec 2006	
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	We developed our own depreciation tables, based on the condition of the property	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	Whenever eh market values indicates the need, could be yearly.	
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.	
	If the value at the time of sale can be retrieved, the sale is used. If the value does not reflect the value at the time of the sale and cannot be retrieved, it is not used. Key here is the original value at the time of the sale is no longer available.	

12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.
	Photos were taken of all residential properties in Wayne, Winside, Wakefield, Hoskins and Carroll. Review of the photos is going on now by clerks and assessor. The process involved walking around each block and then through the alley to check on outbuildings and back yards. Sometimes more than one photo was taken of each parcel.

90 Wayne
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 : 195
Total Sales Price : 17,630,809
Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,630,359
Total Assessed Value : 16,776,920
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 90,412
Avg. Assessed Value : 86,035

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 95
MEAN : 99
COD : 12.61
PRD : 103.70

COV : 18.92
STD : 18.67
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.99
MAX Sales Ratio : 222.77
MIN Sales Ratio : 61.06

95% Median C.I. : 94.11 to 97.32
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.25 to 97.07
95% Mean C.I. : 96.06 to 101.30

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:52PM

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	33	94.63	98.15	94.53	13.36	103.83	61.06	166.54	90.50 to 99.55	86,438	81,708
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	20	97.56	100.26	93.86	14.42	106.82	64.38	162.54	91.88 to 102.61	92,194	86,529
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	8	92.84	96.70	95.55	07.77	101.20	87.93	113.28	87.93 to 113.28	85,875	82,053
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	32	96.42	105.26	99.11	17.69	106.21	79.78	222.77	88.80 to 109.77	86,270	85,507
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	31	94.11	97.18	96.58	08.47	100.62	76.93	142.31	92.15 to 99.95	94,740	91,496
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	29	97.95	98.37	96.62	11.28	101.81	77.14	122.26	88.61 to 106.93	82,345	79,559
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	94.61	94.28	94.13	06.52	100.16	83.15	102.92	83.15 to 102.92	115,257	108,490
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	35	94.43	95.18	91.05	12.32	104.54	63.44	132.31	88.61 to 98.94	95,847	87,266
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	93	95.11	100.93	96.02	14.77	105.11	61.06	222.77	93.56 to 98.64	87,570	84,082
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	102	94.99	96.63	94.42	10.64	102.34	63.44	142.31	93.08 to 97.95	93,004	87,817
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	100	95.69	100.07	97.31	12.36	102.84	76.93	222.77	93.42 to 99.78	87,726	85,362
<u>ALL</u>	195	95.07	98.68	95.16	12.61	103.70	61.06	222.77	94.11 to 97.32	90,412	86,035

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	1	94.91	94.91	94.91	00.00	100.00	94.91	94.91	N/A	116,900	110,955
02	11	93.98	99.42	95.95	14.17	103.62	64.38	129.49	87.54 to 120.92	59,655	57,240
03	8	91.88	89.71	87.64	08.21	102.36	70.89	100.56	70.89 to 100.56	80,494	70,544
05	18	92.82	95.35	92.03	16.10	103.61	61.06	146.90	83.73 to 104.35	118,639	109,185
06	7	93.80	89.10	91.95	11.49	96.90	73.13	110.38	73.13 to 110.38	103,857	95,499
07	139	95.77	99.34	96.44	10.82	103.01	72.29	166.54	94.58 to 98.16	91,256	88,008
08	11	93.50	108.04	90.82	32.10	118.96	71.72	222.77	72.39 to 162.54	60,568	55,010
<u>ALL</u>	195	95.07	98.68	95.16	12.61	103.70	61.06	222.77	94.11 to 97.32	90,412	86,035

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	194	95.09	98.72	95.17	12.65	103.73	61.06	222.77	94.11 to 97.58	90,724	86,339
06											
07	1	90.20	90.20	90.20	00.00	100.00	90.20	90.20	N/A	30,000	27,060
<u>ALL</u>	195	95.07	98.68	95.16	12.61	103.70	61.06	222.77	94.11 to 97.32	90,412	86,035

**90 Wayne
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 : 195
 Total Sales Price : 17,630,809
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,630,359
 Total Assessed Value : 16,776,920
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 90,412
 Avg. Assessed Value : 86,035

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 12.61
 PRD : 103.70

COV : 18.92
 STD : 18.67
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.99
 MAX Sales Ratio : 222.77
 MIN Sales Ratio : 61.06

95% Median C.I. : 94.11 to 97.32
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.25 to 97.07
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.06 to 101.30

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:52PM

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	1	73.13	73.13	73.13	00.00	100.00	73.13	73.13	N/A	8,000	5,850
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	1	73.13	73.13	73.13	00.00	100.00	73.13	73.13	N/A	8,000	5,850
10000 TO 29999	12	116.46	127.27	123.68	31.07	102.90	61.06	222.77	90.50 to 162.54	21,646	26,773
30000 TO 59999	38	100.20	104.21	103.80	12.86	100.39	77.14	146.90	93.98 to 109.81	45,229	46,948
60000 TO 99999	76	95.45	98.13	97.93	09.94	100.20	71.72	132.31	94.25 to 99.78	78,542	76,917
100000 TO 149999	44	94.27	92.25	92.30	09.36	99.95	64.38	119.50	87.26 to 97.95	119,738	110,514
150000 TO 249999	22	89.76	90.60	90.30	08.67	100.33	63.44	110.38	84.82 to 97.62	174,654	157,721
250000 TO 499999	2	86.37	86.37	86.48	01.23	99.87	85.31	87.43	N/A	281,910	243,783
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	195	95.07	98.68	95.16	12.61	103.70	61.06	222.77	94.11 to 97.32	90,412	86,035

**2011 Correlation Section
for Wayne County**

A. Residential Real Property

The residential statistical sample for Wayne County includes 195 qualified sales. The sample is considered reliable for the measurement of the county. The relationship between the median, weighted mean and mean are all within the acceptable level of 92-100 percent. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are also within the acceptable ranges.

The sales verification is primarily handled by the personal knowledge of the assessor and staff. If there is a concern in the validity of a sale, the county will contact persons involved in the transaction including the realtor, buyer or seller.

The assessor reported that a walk around of the residential properties has been completed during the recent year for towns of Carroll, Hoskins, Wakefield, Wayne and Winside. New photos were taken and comparison of the current information on the property record card was reviewed.

Based on the consideration of all the available information, the level of value is determined to be 95% of market value for the residential class of real property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne County

Commercial properties in Wayne County were reviewed August through September 2010. I walked around the properties front and back and took photos. At this time the office clerks have reviewed almost all the photos and made the necessary changes to the property record cards. A study of and analysis of the sales were reviewed by the assessor and a determination made that no increase or decrease to the class needed to occur for tax year 2011.

Rural commercials will be reviewed when GIS Workshop takes aerial photos of the county in the spring of 2011.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Wayne County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Clerks and Assessor	
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	Beverly Hills – Sub-division located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	02	Carroll
	03	Hoskins
	04	Muhs Acres – Sub-division located between Norfolk and Hoskins
	05	Rural and Sholes
	06	Wakefield – adjoins Dixon County
	07	Wayne – County seat, college, retail, schools, hospital
	08	Winside
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Sales comparison and cost approach. We do income on Section 42 properties	
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?	
	The lot value is studied at the same time the improvement value is studied.	
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Front foot method and square foot method	
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?	
	Not all commercial are in CAMA at this point. In order year is used but adjusted through economic depreciation and valuation groupings.	
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?	
	Local market	
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?	
	Yearly	
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.	
	Depending if the value at the time of sale is still available, the sale will be used. If the value is not available, sale is discarded.	

12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.
	Photos were taken of all commercial properties in Wayne, Carroll, Wakefield, Winside and Hoskins. The assessor walked all the towns and took photos even checking the backs of the buildings. In December 2010 or Spring 2011 aerial photos will be taken of rural commercial by GIS workshop.

90 Wayne
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 : 24
Total Sales Price : 3,912,109
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,912,109
Total Assessed Value : 4,311,135
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 163,005
Avg. Assessed Value : 179,631

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 110
MEAN : 108
COD : 31.72
PRD : 98.26

COV : 53.16
STD : 57.56
Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.75
MAX Sales Ratio : 346.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 43.74

95% Median C.I. : 81.62 to 111.28
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 87.15 to 133.25
95% Mean C.I. : 83.97 to 132.59

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:55PM

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	89.97	89.97	89.97	00.00	100.00	89.97	89.97	N/A	107,000	96,265
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	1	98.43	98.43	98.43	00.00	100.00	98.43	98.43	N/A	193,000	189,975
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	4	109.94	100.95	79.86	22.55	126.41	43.74	140.20	N/A	81,152	64,810
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	137.50	121.07	115.81	17.42	104.54	76.93	148.77	N/A	67,667	78,365
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	81.62	81.62	81.62	00.00	100.00	81.62	81.62	N/A	200,000	163,235
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	137.74	137.74	137.74	00.00	100.00	137.74	137.74	N/A	162,000	223,140
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	72.98	77.52	79.85	15.85	97.08	62.43	97.14	N/A	57,667	46,048
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	215.97	215.97	97.86	60.44	220.69	85.43	346.50	N/A	105,000	102,755
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	86.61	86.61	98.75	24.88	87.71	65.06	108.15	N/A	166,250	164,175
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	96.54	93.58	92.57	03.50	101.09	84.12	97.10	N/A	94,250	87,248
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	105.94	105.94	130.26	29.24	81.33	74.96	136.91	N/A	815,000	1,061,595
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	9	108.59	106.16	94.32	23.40	112.55	43.74	148.77	76.93 to 140.20	91,957	86,731
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	7	85.43	126.26	97.99	60.93	128.85	62.43	346.50	62.43 to 346.50	106,429	104,290
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	8	96.54	94.92	119.71	15.35	79.29	65.06	136.91	65.06 to 136.91	292,438	350,066
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	9	111.28	109.60	99.00	25.30	110.71	43.74	148.77	76.93 to 140.20	98,845	97,857
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	11	96.28	110.18	93.45	35.47	117.90	62.43	346.50	65.06 to 108.15	99,318	92,818
<u>ALL</u>	24	96.95	108.28	110.20	31.72	98.26	43.74	346.50	81.62 to 111.28	163,005	179,631

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
07	22	96.95	99.53	109.92	21.28	90.55	43.74	148.77	81.62 to 111.28	176,141	193,620
08	2	204.47	204.47	139.20	69.47	146.89	62.43	346.50	N/A	18,500	25,753
<u>ALL</u>	24	96.95	108.28	110.20	31.72	98.26	43.74	346.50	81.62 to 111.28	163,005	179,631

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	24	96.95	108.28	110.20	31.72	98.26	43.74	346.50	81.62 to 111.28	163,005	179,631
04											
<u>ALL</u>	24	96.95	108.28	110.20	31.72	98.26	43.74	346.50	81.62 to 111.28	163,005	179,631

90 Wayne
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 : 24
Total Sales Price : 3,912,109
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,912,109
Total Assessed Value : 4,311,135
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 163,005
Avg. Assessed Value : 179,631

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 110
MEAN : 108
COD : 31.72
PRD : 98.26

COV : 53.16
STD : 57.56
Avg. Abs. Dev : 30.75
MAX Sales Ratio : 346.50
MIN Sales Ratio : 43.74

95% Median C.I. : 81.62 to 111.28
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 87.15 to 133.25
95% Mean C.I. : 83.97 to 132.59

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:55PM

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	3	137.50	182.14	138.61	68.87	131.40	62.43	346.50	N/A	19,000	26,335
30000 TO 59999	4	104.19	111.22	109.39	13.95	101.67	96.28	140.20	N/A	44,277	48,436
60000 TO 99999	6	87.04	94.91	96.01	26.72	98.85	65.06	148.77	65.06 to 148.77	79,417	76,249
100000 TO 149999	2	87.05	87.05	86.82	03.37	100.26	84.12	89.97	N/A	116,000	100,708
150000 TO 249999	7	85.43	88.39	88.18	22.18	100.24	43.74	137.74	43.74 to 137.74	179,214	158,040
250000 TO 499999	1	108.15	108.15	108.15	00.00	100.00	108.15	108.15	N/A	260,000	281,180
500000 +	1	136.91	136.91	136.91	00.00	100.00	136.91	136.91	N/A	1,455,000	1,992,015
<u>ALL</u>	24	96.95	108.28	110.20	31.72	98.26	43.74	346.50	81.62 to 111.28	163,005	179,631

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
300	4	97.62	98.34	100.31	05.07	98.04	89.97	108.15	N/A	180,500	181,060
304	1	85.43	85.43	85.43	00.00	100.00	85.43	85.43	N/A	200,000	170,860
313	1	136.91	136.91	136.91	00.00	100.00	136.91	136.91	N/A	1,455,000	1,992,015
325	3	74.96	65.21	63.51	14.75	102.68	43.74	76.93	N/A	142,500	90,497
326	2	79.77	79.77	84.10	21.74	94.85	62.43	97.10	N/A	36,000	30,275
344	3	111.28	115.31	108.76	12.09	106.02	97.14	137.50	N/A	44,750	48,670
349	1	81.62	81.62	81.62	00.00	100.00	81.62	81.62	N/A	200,000	163,235
350	1	84.12	84.12	84.12	00.00	100.00	84.12	84.12	N/A	125,000	105,150
353	2	102.44	102.44	103.97	06.01	98.53	96.28	108.59	N/A	60,000	62,383
381	1	346.50	346.50	346.50	00.00	100.00	346.50	346.50	N/A	10,000	34,650
384	1	72.98	72.98	72.98	00.00	100.00	72.98	72.98	N/A	85,000	62,035
406	2	101.40	101.40	115.27	35.84	87.97	65.06	137.74	N/A	117,250	135,155
419	1	148.77	148.77	148.77	00.00	100.00	148.77	148.77	N/A	93,000	138,355
442	1	140.20	140.20	140.20	00.00	100.00	140.20	140.20	N/A	33,859	47,470
<u>ALL</u>	24	96.95	108.28	110.20	31.72	98.26	43.74	346.50	81.62 to 111.28	163,005	179,631

**2011 Correlation Section
for Wayne County**

A. Commerical Real Property

The commercial statistical sample for Wayne County includes 24 qualified sales. Of this sample the median measure is the only measure within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion is above the acceptable level and the price related differential is within the acceptable ranges. The town of Wayne has the majority of the commercial property in the county and is represented in the sales file with 22 sales. The 24 sales consist of 14 different occupancy codes

The sales verification is primarily handled by the personal knowledge of the assessor and staff. If there is a concern in the validity of a sale, the county will contact persons involved in the transaction including the realtor, buyer or seller.

The county reported that the commercial class was reviewed by comparing the property record card to the parcel and new photos taken. Based on the study conducted by the county there were no major valuation changes for the 2011 assessment year.

Based on the consideration of all the available information, the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the commercial class of real property.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne County

An increase across the board of 6% is required to maintain a level of 69-75% of market value for tax year 2011. I looked at all the ag sales in Wayne County and made the determination of arms length transactions. Using those sales an increase of 6% to each land class was the best option.

The 2010 GIS Workshop imagery was made available to our county in early December. We used the imagery to help determine land use and in the discovery of rural buildings and bins. After reviewing and analyzing the sales in Wayne County it is determined that only one market area is required.

The trend for the last six months of 2010 and early months of 2011 indicate sale prices are to up for all farm land in Wayne County. I'm expecting to see a larger increase in value for 2012.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Wayne County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Clerks and GIS – Aerial flights for 2010 are here.	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Wayne county has one market area	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	We have no recreational land. Residential land is identified and valued as building site around a home.	
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?	
	They carry the same value. \$10,000 for the 1 acre of homesite and \$1,700 for all building sites.	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	Soil types and uses	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	Filings of register of deeds. Physical inspection and GIS aerial photography	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	None in Wayne county. We have no rivers, no sand pits, no railroad and no recreational land.	
9.	Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	NA	
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 assessor determines this by phone calls or physical inspections. If the value at the time of sale is available the sale will remain in the sales file. If value is not available sale will be thrown out.	

12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.
	We entered into a contract with GIS to take photos of all rural parcels either in December 2010 or Spring 2011. Cost of the contract is \$17,000.

90 Wayne
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 : 72
Total Sales Price : 27,789,755
Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,789,755
Total Assessed Value : 18,552,160
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 385,969
Avg. Assessed Value : 257,669

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 67
MEAN : 71
COD : 15.52
PRD : 106.13

COV : 19.96
STD : 14.14
Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.91
MAX Sales Ratio : 116.42
MIN Sales Ratio : 38.24

95% Median C.I. : 65.23 to 72.37
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.29 to 71.23
95% Mean C.I. : 67.58 to 74.12

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:58PM

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	61.78	61.78	61.78	00.00	100.00	61.78	61.78	N/A	1,262,250	779,825
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	89.31	83.32	56.02	29.82	148.73	38.24	116.42	N/A	566,513	317,349
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	11	70.31	69.19	68.74	12.80	100.65	54.68	93.05	54.70 to 81.36	409,249	281,330
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	13	58.05	63.13	59.10	14.37	106.82	53.13	82.62	54.20 to 73.56	464,682	274,607
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	5	73.05	69.38	68.37	11.57	101.48	56.80	84.90	N/A	376,242	257,219
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	82.09	75.31	77.31	18.53	97.41	51.89	94.51	51.89 to 94.51	326,053	252,060
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	71.39	72.91	70.28	08.98	103.74	59.29	89.70	66.70 to 86.53	337,082	236,885
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	72.38	73.83	71.07	08.59	103.88	65.23	83.89	N/A	403,967	287,097
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	64.40	66.36	67.72	09.61	97.99	58.06	76.62	N/A	350,829	237,592
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	11	68.14	71.16	72.42	13.63	98.26	53.51	93.74	58.11 to 91.38	319,522	231,390
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	75.38	79.43	73.94	12.48	107.42	69.76	97.19	N/A	101,332	74,926
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	29	63.99	68.17	61.93	19.46	110.08	38.24	116.42	55.47 to 73.56	485,203	300,474
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	25	72.20	72.99	71.81	13.43	101.64	51.89	94.51	66.70 to 82.09	349,852	251,226
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	18	70.02	72.20	71.55	13.21	100.91	53.51	97.19	64.23 to 80.23	276,253	197,654
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	36	66.48	68.22	66.06	16.97	103.27	51.89	94.51	58.05 to 73.16	408,505	269,862
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	16	71.39	71.85	69.97	09.57	102.69	58.06	89.70	65.23 to 76.62	352,200	246,432
<u>ALL</u>	72	70.29	70.85	66.76	15.52	106.13	38.24	116.42	65.23 to 72.37	385,969	257,669

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	72	70.29	70.85	66.76	15.52	106.13	38.24	116.42	65.23 to 72.37	385,969	257,669
<u>ALL</u>	72	70.29	70.85	66.76	15.52	106.13	38.24	116.42	65.23 to 72.37	385,969	257,669

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	56	69.47	69.65	66.22	14.44	105.18	38.24	116.42	64.40 to 72.16	367,853	243,576
Blank	56	69.47	69.65	66.22	14.44	105.18	38.24	116.42	64.40 to 72.16	367,853	243,576
<u>Grass</u>											
County	4	81.43	79.79	76.64	12.43	104.11	59.10	97.19	N/A	69,417	53,199
Blank	4	81.43	79.79	76.64	12.43	104.11	59.10	97.19	N/A	69,417	53,199
<u>ALL</u>	72	70.29	70.85	66.76	15.52	106.13	38.24	116.42	65.23 to 72.37	385,969	257,669

90 Wayne
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 : 72
 Total Sales Price : 27,789,755
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 27,789,755
 Total Assessed Value : 18,552,160
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 385,969
 Avg. Assessed Value : 257,669

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 67
 MEAN : 71
 COD : 15.52
 PRD : 106.13

COV : 19.96
 STD : 14.14
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.91
 MAX Sales Ratio : 116.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.24

95% Median C.I. : 65.23 to 72.37
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 62.29 to 71.23
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.58 to 74.12

Printed:3/28/2011 5:19:58PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	6	62.89	64.77	63.67	12.40	101.73	54.00	81.36	54.00 to 81.36	761,932	485,088
Blank	6	62.89	64.77	63.67	12.40	101.73	54.00	81.36	54.00 to 81.36	761,932	485,088
_____Dry_____											
County	59	70.27	70.47	67.18	14.70	104.90	38.24	116.42	65.23 to 72.24	366,216	246,022
Blank	59	70.27	70.47	67.18	14.70	104.90	38.24	116.42	65.23 to 72.24	366,216	246,022
_____Grass_____											
County	4	81.43	79.79	76.64	12.43	104.11	59.10	97.19	N/A	69,417	53,199
Blank	4	81.43	79.79	76.64	12.43	104.11	59.10	97.19	N/A	69,417	53,199
_____ALL_____	72	70.29	70.85	66.76	15.52	106.13	38.24	116.42	65.23 to 72.37	385,969	257,669

90 Wayne
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 : 76
 Total Sales Price : 30,120,430
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 30,120,430
 Total Assessed Value : 19,812,715
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 396,321
 Avg. Assessed Value : 260,694

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 70
 COD : 16.64
 PRD : 105.76

COV : 21.82
 STD : 15.18
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.56
 MAX Sales Ratio : 116.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 23.01

95% Median C.I. : 64.08 to 72.24
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.58 to 69.98
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.16 to 72.98

Printed:3/28/2011 5:20:00PM

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	61.78	61.78	61.78	00.00	100.00	61.78	61.78	N/A	1,262,250	779,825
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	89.31	83.32	56.02	29.82	148.73	38.24	116.42	N/A	566,513	317,349
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	11	70.31	69.19	68.74	12.80	100.65	54.68	93.05	54.70 to 81.36	409,249	281,330
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	13	58.05	63.13	59.10	14.37	106.82	53.13	82.62	54.20 to 73.56	464,682	274,607
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	5	73.05	69.38	68.37	11.57	101.48	56.80	84.90	N/A	376,242	257,219
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	82.09	75.31	77.31	18.53	97.41	51.89	94.51	51.89 to 94.51	326,053	252,060
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	71.39	72.91	70.28	08.98	103.74	59.29	89.70	66.70 to 86.53	337,082	236,885
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	72.38	73.83	71.07	08.59	103.88	65.23	83.89	N/A	403,967	287,097
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	64.40	66.36	67.72	09.61	97.99	58.06	76.62	N/A	350,829	237,592
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	13	66.27	66.49	69.28	18.00	95.97	23.01	93.74	58.11 to 80.23	332,865	230,621
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	70.02	70.43	57.58	17.45	122.32	45.69	97.19	45.69 to 97.19	320,584	184,580
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	29	63.99	68.17	61.93	19.46	110.08	38.24	116.42	55.47 to 73.56	485,203	300,474
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	25	72.20	72.99	71.81	13.43	101.64	51.89	94.51	66.70 to 82.09	349,852	251,226
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	22	67.21	67.55	65.98	17.30	102.38	23.01	97.19	58.60 to 76.62	331,965	219,015
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	36	66.48	68.22	66.06	16.97	103.27	51.89	94.51	58.05 to 73.16	408,505	269,862
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	16	71.39	71.85	69.97	09.57	102.69	58.06	89.70	65.23 to 76.62	352,200	246,432
<u>ALL</u>	76	69.47	69.57	65.78	16.64	105.76	23.01	116.42	64.08 to 72.24	396,321	260,694

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	76	69.47	69.57	65.78	16.64	105.76	23.01	116.42	64.08 to 72.24	396,321	260,694
<u>ALL</u>	76	69.47	69.57	65.78	16.64	105.76	23.01	116.42	64.08 to 72.24	396,321	260,694

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	57	69.18	69.23	65.57	14.85	105.58	38.24	116.42	64.23 to 72.16	373,189	244,690
Blank	57	69.18	69.23	65.57	14.85	105.58	38.24	116.42	64.23 to 72.16	373,189	244,690
<u>Grass</u>											
County	4	81.43	79.79	76.64	12.43	104.11	59.10	97.19	N/A	69,417	53,199
Blank	4	81.43	79.79	76.64	12.43	104.11	59.10	97.19	N/A	69,417	53,199
<u>ALL</u>	76	69.47	69.57	65.78	16.64	105.76	23.01	116.42	64.08 to 72.24	396,321	260,694

90 Wayne
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 : 76
 Total Sales Price : 30,120,430
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 30,120,430
 Total Assessed Value : 19,812,715
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 396,321
 Avg. Assessed Value : 260,694

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 66
 MEAN : 70
 COD : 16.64
 PRD : 105.76

COV : 21.82
 STD : 15.18
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.56
 MAX Sales Ratio : 116.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 23.01

95% Median C.I. : 64.08 to 72.24
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 61.58 to 69.98
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.16 to 72.98

Printed:3/28/2011 5:20:00PM

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	7	61.78	63.89	62.95	11.56	101.49	54.00	81.36	54.00 to 81.36	759,785	478,316
Blank	7	61.78	63.89	62.95	11.56	101.49	54.00	81.36	54.00 to 81.36	759,785	478,316
_____Dry_____											
County	60	70.02	70.06	66.53	15.10	105.31	38.24	116.42	64.40 to 72.24	371,312	247,039
Blank	60	70.02	70.06	66.53	15.10	105.31	38.24	116.42	64.40 to 72.24	371,312	247,039
_____Grass_____											
County	4	81.43	79.79	76.64	12.43	104.11	59.10	97.19	N/A	69,417	53,199
Blank	4	81.43	79.79	76.64	12.43	104.11	59.10	97.19	N/A	69,417	53,199
_____ALL_____	76	69.47	69.57	65.78	16.64	105.76	23.01	116.42	64.08 to 72.24	396,321	260,694

90 Wayne
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 : 136
 Total Sales Price : 49,668,916
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 49,540,916
 Total Assessed Value : 34,759,760
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 364,271
 Avg. Assessed Value : 255,586

MEDIAN : 71
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 16.91
 PRD : 103.75

COV : 21.62
 STD : 15.74
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.95
 MAX Sales Ratio : 116.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 23.01

95% Median C.I. : 68.97 to 73.34
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.43 to 73.90
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.14 to 75.44

Printed:3/28/2011 5:20:03PM

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	2	70.99	70.99	65.08	12.97	109.08	61.78	80.20	N/A	769,125	500,583
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	10	71.29	79.91	62.15	29.58	128.58	38.24	116.42	60.85 to 112.44	429,495	266,946
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	21	70.31	73.18	70.87	17.41	103.26	34.27	109.18	63.99 to 80.16	348,327	246,871
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	16	62.23	65.12	60.28	15.46	108.03	53.13	88.94	55.13 to 73.56	417,418	251,601
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	8	73.11	76.30	75.34	16.35	101.27	56.80	109.94	56.80 to 109.94	358,876	270,364
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	15	75.36	75.37	76.70	16.99	98.27	51.89	101.62	60.44 to 89.72	347,460	266,497
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	21	70.61	72.68	70.81	12.87	102.64	48.71	100.22	66.73 to 78.70	303,275	214,739
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	76.91	76.26	72.79	08.13	104.77	65.23	85.64	65.23 to 85.64	258,024	187,822
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	69.97	69.97	80.99	23.50	86.39	53.53	86.40	N/A	230,788	186,920
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	76.62	74.69	73.51	09.74	101.61	58.06	94.93	64.40 to 81.33	266,657	196,028
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	18	69.50	69.17	76.08	16.62	90.92	23.01	93.74	62.58 to 80.23	469,212	356,982
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	70.27	74.51	61.93	20.75	120.31	45.69	99.04	45.69 to 99.04	307,001	190,116
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	49	68.97	71.83	64.97	19.43	110.56	34.27	116.42	63.99 to 73.56	404,628	262,868
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	51	72.20	74.53	73.72	14.54	101.10	48.71	109.94	69.18 to 76.94	318,781	234,993
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	36	71.55	71.63	73.53	16.37	97.42	23.01	99.04	64.40 to 78.46	373,786	274,850
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	60	70.15	71.99	69.62	17.32	103.40	34.27	109.94	66.11 to 75.36	367,941	256,171
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	39	72.20	73.65	72.15	12.41	102.08	48.71	100.22	68.97 to 78.46	282,985	204,163
<u>ALL</u>	136	70.68	72.79	70.16	16.91	103.75	23.01	116.42	68.97 to 73.34	364,271	255,586

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	72	70.29	70.85	66.76	15.52	106.13	38.24	116.42	65.23 to 72.37	385,969	257,669
1	64	73.37	74.98	74.51	17.73	100.63	23.01	112.44	68.56 to 78.70	339,862	253,244
<u>ALL</u>	136	70.68	72.79	70.16	16.91	103.75	23.01	116.42	68.97 to 73.34	364,271	255,586

90 Wayne
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 : 136
 Total Sales Price : 49,668,916
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 49,540,916
 Total Assessed Value : 34,759,760
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 364,271
 Avg. Assessed Value : 255,586

MEDIAN : 71
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 16.91
 PRD : 103.75

COV : 21.62
 STD : 15.74
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.95
 MAX Sales Ratio : 116.42
 MIN Sales Ratio : 23.01

95% Median C.I. : 68.97 to 73.34
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.43 to 73.90
 95% Mean C.I. : 70.14 to 75.44

Printed:3/28/2011 5:20:03PM

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
_____Dry_____											
County	90	70.37	72.51	68.71	14.76	105.53	38.24	116.42	68.14 to 72.38	335,105	230,255
Blank	56	69.47	69.65	66.22	14.44	105.18	38.24	116.42	64.40 to 72.16	367,853	243,576
1	34	74.85	77.23	74.09	14.18	104.24	45.69	112.44	68.34 to 80.20	281,167	208,313
_____Grass_____											
County	5	80.23	74.49	69.60	16.80	107.03	53.33	97.19	N/A	79,534	55,357
Blank	4	81.43	79.79	76.64	12.43	104.11	59.10	97.19	N/A	69,417	53,199
1	1	53.33	53.33	53.33	00.00	100.00	53.33	53.33	N/A	120,000	63,990
_____ALL_____	136	70.68	72.79	70.16	16.91	103.75	23.01	116.42	68.97 to 73.34	364,271	255,586

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	12	65.68	68.75	64.72	14.75	106.23	54.00	109.18	58.60 to 72.37	620,916	401,869
Blank	6	62.89	64.77	63.67	12.40	101.73	54.00	81.36	54.00 to 81.36	761,932	485,088
1	6	68.59	72.72	66.40	15.24	109.52	58.60	109.18	58.60 to 109.18	479,900	318,650
_____Dry_____											
County	99	70.75	73.02	69.61	14.59	104.90	38.24	116.42	68.97 to 73.40	335,320	233,425
Blank	59	70.27	70.47	67.18	14.70	104.90	38.24	116.42	65.23 to 72.24	366,216	246,022
1	40	74.85	76.79	74.15	13.24	103.56	45.69	112.44	68.97 to 80.00	289,747	214,844
_____Grass_____											
County	7	61.57	69.65	65.98	21.83	105.56	53.33	97.19	53.33 to 97.19	83,760	55,261
Blank	4	81.43	79.79	76.64	12.43	104.11	59.10	97.19	N/A	69,417	53,199
1	3	53.53	56.14	56.39	05.14	99.56	53.33	61.57	N/A	102,883	58,012
_____ALL_____	136	70.68	72.79	70.16	16.91	103.75	23.01	116.42	68.97 to 73.34	364,271	255,586

**2011 Correlation Section
for Wayne County**

A. Agricultural Land

Wayne County is considered as one market area. The agricultural land consists of approximately 17% irrigated, 73% dry land, 9% grass and the remaining 1% classified as other. The surrounding counties are comparable in topography and have similar soil classifications. All surrounding counties are comparable to Wayne County.

The analyses of the base statistics reveal that the county is slightly out of proportion in the distribution of time. The land use meets the minimum threshold of less than a 10% 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 Wayne County to proportionately represent the time frame and land use. All thresholds were met when expanding the sample. In the random inclusion a very small sample was needed to achieve the thresholds.

Wayne County analyzed the sales within the county and determined a six percent across the board increase would achieve an acceptable level of value.

Based on the analysis of all available information, the level of value of the agricultural land in Wayne County has been determined to be 70%.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne 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 Wayne County**

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

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

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

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 5,740	Value : 1,004,354,035	Growth 4,351,770	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	162	2,668,115	34	289,430	0	0	196	2,957,545	
02. Res Improve Land	1,957	16,875,035	103	1,742,805	0	0	2,060	18,617,840	
03. Res Improvements	2,037	145,019,185	107	10,757,355	21	427,905	2,165	156,204,445	
04. Res Total	2,199	164,562,335	141	12,789,590	21	427,905	2,361	177,779,830	1,090,290
% of Res Total	93.14	92.57	5.97	7.19	0.89	0.24	41.13	17.70	25.05
05. Com UnImp Land	52	742,070	6	35,920	6	173,255	64	951,245	
06. Com Improve Land	317	5,028,280	31	757,395	18	505,185	366	6,290,860	
07. Com Improvements	326	36,745,380	31	2,625,830	23	8,272,420	380	47,643,630	
08. Com Total	378	42,515,730	37	3,419,145	29	8,950,860	444	54,885,735	598,680
% of Com Total	85.14	77.46	8.33	6.23	6.53	16.31	7.74	5.46	13.76
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	1	36,600	0	0	1	36,600	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	9	380,885	1	27,825	10	408,710	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	9	7,266,835	2	157,975	11	7,424,810	
12. Ind Total	0	0	10	7,684,320	2	185,800	12	7,870,120	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	83.33	97.64	16.67	2.36	0.21	0.78	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	2,199	164,562,335	141	12,789,590	21	427,905	2,361	177,779,830	1,090,290
% of Res & Rec Total	93.14	92.57	5.97	7.19	0.89	0.24	41.13	17.70	25.05
Com & Ind Total	378	42,515,730	47	11,103,465	31	9,136,660	456	62,755,855	598,680
% of Com & Ind Total	82.89	67.75	10.31	17.69	6.80	14.56	7.94	6.25	13.76
17. Taxable Total	2,577	207,078,065	188	23,893,055	52	9,564,565	2,817	240,535,685	1,688,970
% of Taxable Total	91.48	86.09	6.67	9.93	1.85	3.98	49.08	23.95	38.81

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	19	182,985	1,594,760	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	42,870	328,635	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	19	182,985	1,594,760
19. Commercial	0	0	0	1	42,870	328,635
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				20	225,855	1,923,395

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	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	238	7	117	362

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,584	379,962,695	1,584	379,962,695
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	1,275	279,710,585	1,275	279,710,585
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,339	104,145,070	1,339	104,145,070
30. Ag Total							2,923	763,818,350

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	9.84	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	2	2.00	24,000	2	2.00	24,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	971	1,004.84	12,058,185	971	1,004.84	12,058,185	
33. HomeSite Improvements	978	0.00	79,971,500	978	0.00	79,971,500	1,161,285
34. HomeSite Total				980	1,006.84	92,053,685	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	66	192.15	384,300	66	192.15	384,300	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,217	8,017.10	16,034,305	1,217	8,017.10	16,034,305	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,256	0.00	24,173,570	1,256	0.00	24,173,570	1,501,515
38. FarmSite Total				1,322	8,209.25	40,592,175	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,148.67	0	0	6,158.51	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				2,302	15,374.60	132,645,860	2,662,800

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	1	160.00	235,140	1	160.00	235,140

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 10

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,503.29	5.50%	8,761,655	6.93%	3,500.06
46. 1A	9,412.40	20.67%	32,943,535	26.07%	3,500.01
47. 2A1	2,789.59	6.13%	9,679,870	7.66%	3,470.00
48. 2A	2,430.20	5.34%	8,432,860	6.67%	3,470.03
49. 3A1	12,872.11	28.27%	34,111,450	26.99%	2,650.03
50. 3A	11,135.14	24.46%	23,606,545	18.68%	2,120.00
51. 4A1	4,341.79	9.54%	8,748,710	6.92%	2,015.00
52. 4A	43.92	0.10%	83,445	0.07%	1,899.93
53. Total	45,528.44	100.00%	126,368,070	100.00%	2,775.59
Dry					
54. 1D1	13,150.26	6.91%	41,095,480	8.81%	3,125.07
55. 1D	39,011.24	20.49%	115,863,960	24.84%	2,970.01
56. 2D1	10,313.59	5.42%	28,414,130	6.09%	2,755.02
57. 2D	8,978.24	4.71%	22,804,795	4.89%	2,540.01
58. 3D1	58,261.27	30.59%	135,166,700	28.98%	2,320.01
59. 3D	39,086.73	20.53%	82,277,645	17.64%	2,105.00
60. 4D1	21,549.88	11.32%	40,621,920	8.71%	1,885.02
61. 4D	79.90	0.04%	133,440	0.03%	1,670.09
62. Total	190,431.11	100.00%	466,378,070	100.00%	2,449.06
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,270.96	5.17%	2,348,370	6.25%	1,847.71
64. 1G	2,831.89	11.52%	5,195,580	13.83%	1,834.67
65. 2G1	5,439.61	22.12%	8,767,115	23.34%	1,611.72
66. 2G	3,464.65	14.09%	5,307,835	14.13%	1,532.00
67. 3G1	4,030.90	16.39%	6,365,875	16.95%	1,579.27
68. 3G	3,113.34	12.66%	4,184,585	11.14%	1,344.08
69. 4G1	4,307.65	17.52%	5,275,105	14.04%	1,224.59
70. 4G	128.14	0.52%	122,380	0.33%	955.05
71. Total	24,587.14	100.00%	37,566,845	100.00%	1,527.91
Irrigated Total					
	45,528.44	17.33%	126,368,070	20.02%	2,775.59
Dry Total					
	190,431.11	72.49%	466,378,070	73.89%	2,449.06
Grass Total					
	24,587.14	9.36%	37,566,845	5.95%	1,527.91
72. Waste	2,148.79	0.82%	859,505	0.14%	399.99
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	871.07	0.33%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	262,695.48	100.00%	631,172,490	100.00%	2,402.68

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	45,528.44	126,368,070	45,528.44	126,368,070
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	190,431.11	466,378,070	190,431.11	466,378,070
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	24,587.14	37,566,845	24,587.14	37,566,845
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,148.79	859,505	2,148.79	859,505
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	215.71	0	5.28	0	650.08	0	871.07	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	262,695.48	631,172,490	262,695.48	631,172,490

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	45,528.44	17.33%	126,368,070	20.02%	2,775.59
Dry Land	190,431.11	72.49%	466,378,070	73.89%	2,449.06
Grass	24,587.14	9.36%	37,566,845	5.95%	1,527.91
Waste	2,148.79	0.82%	859,505	0.14%	399.99
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	871.07	0.33%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	262,695.48	100.00%	631,172,490	100.00%	2,402.68

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

90 Wayne

	2010 CTL County Total	2011 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2011 form 45 - 2010 CTL)	Percent Change	2011 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	175,289,100	177,779,830	2,490,730	1.42%	1,090,290	0.80%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	89,361,385	92,053,685	2,692,300	3.01%	1,161,285	1.71%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	264,650,485	269,833,515	5,183,030	1.96%	2,251,575	1.11%
05. Commercial	53,548,430	54,885,735	1,337,305	2.50%	598,680	1.38%
06. Industrial	7,870,120	7,870,120	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	36,838,185	40,592,175	3,753,990	10.19%	1,501,515	6.11%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	98,256,735	103,348,030	5,091,295	5.18%	2,100,195	3.04%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	362,907,220	373,181,545	10,274,325	2.83%	4,351,770	1.63%
11. Irrigated	117,551,520	126,368,070	8,816,550	7.50%		
12. Dryland	441,650,885	466,378,070	24,727,185	5.60%		
13. Grassland	35,137,415	37,566,845	2,429,430	6.91%		
14. Wasteland	643,575	859,505	215,930	33.55%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	594,983,395	631,172,490	36,189,095	6.08%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	957,890,615	1,004,354,035	46,463,420	4.85%	4,351,770	4.40%

2010 Plan of Assessment for Wayne County

County Assessor – Joyce Reeg

This Plan of assessment is required by law, pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, Chapter 77-1311.02. On or before June 15 each year the county assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment and shall present the plan of assessment to the county board of equalization on or before July 31. The plan of assessment prepared each year, shall describe the assessment actions the county assessor plans to make for the next assessment year and two years thereafter.

2011

Residential parcels will be reviewed by the assessor in the small towns. I have already reviewed Wakefield. I will be starting in Carroll this summer. I use the apex drawing to check the outside measurements of the property and determine the condition and quality of the property. Hopefully our records match what we already have on the parcel. I will also look at all the out buildings.

We have already started our review work for 2011. We will continue this through the summer and into the fall. The GIS specialist and the part time employee, the deputy of District Court, are completing the review work. A newer part of our review work is checking on line at realtor websites. We have picked up a lot of finished basements and decks using this method.

Of course we will monitor the sales using a market analysis.

RURAL RESIDENTIAL parcels will be photographed by me as the time allows. I will begin the process and if I find I don't have the time I will hire 3 college students to work for me next summer. The project can be completed in a summer with 3 students.

Commercials will be monitored using the sales/assessment ratio, building permits and drive by reviews. As I review the residential properties in the small villages I will also review the commercial properties.

Agricultural lands are being reviewed with the GIS program. The GIS system updates the aerial photos yearly therefore allowing us to review land use on a yearly basis. At this time the 2009 aerial maps are installed on the GIS.

2012

Rural residential properties will be photographed so that they can be reviewed in the office.

Residential parcels will be monitored by using the sales file in the county. When necessary we will go to the property and list the changes. The assessor will continue to walk the residential properties in the small villages. We will continue to take photos of the residential properties.

Commercials will be reviewed in the small communities. We will continue to monitor and adjust values using the sales assessment ratio. New construction will be monitored using building permits and realtor's web sites.

Agriculture land will be adjusted using the sales assessment ratio. Land use will be updated as it is every year using the GIS system and drive by review.

2013

Rural residential: We will review the rural photos taken the previous year and compare them to our record cards. This process takes quite a bit of time and along with the normal review process this will take all summer and fall to complete.

Residential and Commercial: The Assessor will be reviewing residential and commercial properties in the city of Wayne.

Agriculture land will be reviewed for use changes using GIS and drive by.

Staff, Budgeting and Training

The staff of the Wayne County Assessor's office consists of the assessor, who is a registered appraiser, the deputy and one clerk. The Deputy Clerk of the District Court works in our office 2

hours a day. At this time neither the assessor nor the deputy assessor are planning to upgrade their appraisers license. The clerk/lister has become the GIS specialist.

The deputy has been in the office about 18 years. The deeds and cadastral maps are her primary concern as well as making sure we meet deadlines throughout the year. The GIS specialist is a December 2002 graduate of WSC and has been employed in the office since January 2003. Dawn can do anything on GIS and she also does all the listing and pricing.

The assessor and deputy assessor will complete the required number of hours to remain certified. We have tried using the on line classes offered through the real estate commission. The deputy has successfully completed 3 hours of on line studies at the cost of \$29 through Larabee School of Real Estate.

The budget for the assessor's office has always been adequate to handle our needs. The Commissioners have supported the office both financially and through the use of their personnel and equipment. The Commissioners bought a new Ford Escape for use by everyone at the courthouse. When it is available we use it for pick up work.

The GIS system is installed in the office and completely paid for after three yearly payments. The maintenance payments to MIPS and GIS are taken out of the county's general budget. Because of the law suit against Platte Co. and MIPS I'm waiting to go on line with our data. When that law suit is resolved I will consider going on line with our information. The money has been set aside by the clerk to go on line with our information.

The assessor's budget pays for all continuing ed. The two employees in the office have taken advantage of the classes held in Wayne as have I. I would like the GIS specialist to have her certificate but because of the added cost of continuing ed. I will ask her to wait to become certified. My appraiser's license is renewed and paid for out of the assessor's budget. Travel to and from workshops and meetings as well as the registration fees are also paid for by the County.

All emails received by the assessor are shared with the office so that we can continue to follow state statutes and property tax directives at all times.

Definitions

Review – physically walking around the property. Taking notes on various aspects of the property so as to make pricing-out possible. Not necessarily an interior inspection.

Drive-by – We do not get out of the car unless we see a change. We take adequate notes so it is possible to price out the property. It is best to have a driver and a passenger but that is not always the case.

Conclusion

In **2011, 2012 & 2013** I will work to improve the quality of assessment to stay in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. It is my goal to follow the five subsystems of mass appraisal; data collection and maintenance, market analysis, the development of mass appraisal models and tables, quality control, and defense of values. All five subsystems are in place in Wayne County

The sales comparison approach to value is used in determining yearly adjustments to individual villages and neighborhoods. The cost approach to value is used in arriving at the assessed value of the individual properties and the income approach in the valuation system is used in the valuation process of the Section 42 properties. The Marshall & Swift manual is used for costing as well as the CAMA system we have in place and the market analysis statistics are used in the sales comparison approach. GIS is used in determining land use in the rural area but it is also used as a tool for solving many problems that come to us through the public.

If Wayne County continues with the plan of assessment that is outlined in this proposal, we should be able to accomplish better quality of value, better uniformity of value and consistency in valuations over the next three years.

2011 Assessment Survey for Wayne County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	1 (Assessor)
3.	Other full-time employees:
	1
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	1
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$122,300
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$122,300
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$0
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	\$25,000
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$0
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,300
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	Funds in miscellaneous general for aerial photos and to hire a full time employee
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	\$4,861.53

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS Inc.
2.	CAMA software:
	CAMA 2000 through MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Deputy
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop and clerks
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS Inc.

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	No
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	NA
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Wayne, Carroll, Winside, Hoskins and Wakefield
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	NA

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	In House
2.	Other services:
	Aerial photography of the County by GIS Workshop

2011 Certification for Wayne 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 Wayne 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

