

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 Webster County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	92	Median	95.07
Total Sales Price	\$3,317,705	Mean	102.58
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,317,530	Wgt. Mean	90.43
Total Assessed Value	\$3,000,170	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$39,081
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$36,060	Avg. Assessed Value	\$32,611

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.36 to 99.26
95% Mean C.I	86.05 to 94.82
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.13 to 112.03
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	13.44
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.94
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.95

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	102	97	97
2009	101	100	100
2008	129	99	99
2007	165	99	99

2011 Commission Summary for Webster County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	17	Median	96.40
Total Sales Price	\$1,018,985	Mean	99.03
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$917,280	Wgt. Mean	91.08
Total Assessed Value	\$835,450	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$71,382
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$53,958	Avg. Assessed Value	\$49,144

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	87.54 to 111.94
95% Mean C.I	89.44 to 108.62
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.11 to 103.04
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.64
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.39
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.09

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	12	95	95
2009	13	96	96
2008	15	100	100
2007	18	99	99

2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Webster 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	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	70	The qualitative measures calculated in the random include sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Special Valuation of Agricultural Land	70	The qualitative measures calculated in the random include sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.

Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator



2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Webster County

The Assessor performed a spreadsheet sales ratio study for all valuation groups.

New depreciation tables were done where needed.

The office scanned in old data cards, sheets and property record card file information into the computer. This project is 3/4 complete.

All of the city of Blue Hill was physically inspected, 387 parcels.

The office continued with the rural residential physical inspection. Eight townships, Guide Rock, Beaver Creek, Stillwater, Oak Creek, Garfield, Pleasant Hill/Cowles, Elm Creek and Postdam were physically inspected. 329 parcels.

All pickup work was completed timely. This included another 137 parcels.

2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Webster County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:
	Assessor and her staff
2.	List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:
<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
1	Bladen – Bedroom Community for both the city of Hastings to the north and Blue Hill, not much economic growth
5	Blue Hill – School, on highway, economic growth, new housing
10	Cowles – stagnant growth, no economic activity
15	Guide Rock – middle sized community, off highway, no school, little to no economic growth
20	
25	Inavale – very small community, on highway, no school, no economic growth
	Red Cloud – largest community, on two highways, school, currently experiencing economic decline
30	Rural – all residences not located inside a city limits, no city amenities
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.
	Sales comparison and cost approaches, the costing is in Terra Scan and the assessor performs spreadsheet analysis of each valuation grouping to identify comparables by quality and condition
4	When was the last lot value study completed?
	2010
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.
	Lots are valued by square footage and by the acre and calibrated to the market
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?
	2006
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?
	The Assessor develops her own.
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?
	Annually they are reviewed and updated if needed.
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.
	This is a case by case basis, no rule of thumb, generally a deck or new siding aren't a substantial change but an addition or a substantial remodel would be considered a substantial change.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.

**91 Webster
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 : 92
Total Sales Price : 3,317,705
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,317,530
Total Assessed Value : 3,000,170
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 36,060
Avg. Assessed Value : 32,611

MEDIAN : 95
WGT. MEAN : 90
MEAN : 103
COD : 24.54
PRD : 113.44

COV : 45.08
STD : 46.24
Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.33
MAX Sales Ratio : 406.63
MIN Sales Ratio : 41.84

95% Median C.I. : 93.36 to 99.26
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.05 to 94.82
95% Mean C.I. : 93.13 to 112.03

Printed:3/16/2011 12:59:27PM

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	10	99.43	98.03	94.16	16.89	104.11	68.15	162.96	71.03 to 105.17	34,180	32,185
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	9	94.27	93.66	94.48	14.59	99.13	58.33	125.00	67.74 to 110.57	29,478	27,851
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	12	88.80	89.54	81.70	17.71	109.60	57.70	133.56	75.76 to 104.00	36,158	29,543
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	18	97.89	98.35	93.91	13.55	104.73	71.21	125.35	87.95 to 113.44	51,917	48,756
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	13	92.90	92.78	81.55	17.10	113.77	59.49	133.50	70.27 to 116.08	31,140	25,393
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	14	95.69	116.13	95.12	41.79	122.09	41.84	406.63	71.40 to 127.83	25,279	24,044
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	93.19	121.94	87.76	58.65	138.95	48.30	253.08	N/A	68,625	60,225
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	12	99.54	120.77	93.24	34.52	129.53	65.86	234.33	82.98 to 134.30	25,733	23,993
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	49	97.22	95.27	91.35	15.37	104.29	57.70	162.96	93.17 to 101.35	40,316	36,829
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	43	94.88	110.91	89.09	34.54	124.49	41.84	406.63	90.00 to 102.11	31,210	27,803
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	57	94.23	99.59	89.27	22.49	111.56	41.84	406.63	90.00 to 98.67	37,318	33,313
<u>ALL</u>	92	95.07	102.58	90.43	24.54	113.44	41.84	406.63	93.36 to 99.26	36,060	32,611

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	5	98.00	151.33	127.32	72.92	118.86	58.33	406.63	N/A	1,501	1,911
05	17	94.10	93.51	90.64	09.76	103.17	70.27	113.44	83.88 to 103.44	66,350	60,142
10	2	98.20	98.20	73.46	27.29	133.68	71.40	125.00	N/A	2,600	1,910
15	18	97.14	108.65	95.94	32.06	113.25	41.84	234.33	76.25 to 122.45	19,122	18,347
20	2	95.07	95.07	95.04	00.18	100.03	94.90	95.24	N/A	8,575	8,150
25	41	97.14	101.37	91.07	22.96	111.31	48.30	253.08	86.27 to 105.17	33,830	30,810
30	7	93.71	84.60	82.75	14.22	102.24	65.86	101.62	65.86 to 101.62	61,214	50,658
<u>ALL</u>	92	95.07	102.58	90.43	24.54	113.44	41.84	406.63	93.36 to 99.26	36,060	32,611

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	89	94.90	102.80	90.30	25.31	113.84	41.84	406.63	93.23 to 100.11	36,573	33,027
06											
07	3	97.14	96.05	97.17	02.17	98.85	92.33	98.67	N/A	20,833	20,243
<u>ALL</u>	92	95.07	102.58	90.43	24.54	113.44	41.84	406.63	93.36 to 99.26	36,060	32,611

**91 Webster
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 : 92
 Total Sales Price : 3,317,705
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,317,530
 Total Assessed Value : 3,000,170
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 36,060
 Avg. Assessed Value : 32,611

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 90
 MEAN : 103
 COD : 24.54
 PRD : 113.44

COV : 45.08
 STD : 46.24
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.33
 MAX Sales Ratio : 406.63
 MIN Sales Ratio : 41.84

95% Median C.I. : 93.36 to 99.26
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.05 to 94.82
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.13 to 112.03

Printed: 3/16/2011 12:59:27PM

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	18	105.92	135.13	132.37	40.90	102.09	58.33	406.63	98.00 to 130.00	2,400	3,177	
5000 TO 9999	9	95.24	113.97	114.38	36.01	99.64	69.06	253.08	71.40 to 134.30	7,033	8,045	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	27	104.11	128.07	121.68	39.50	105.25	58.33	406.63	94.17 to 130.00	3,945	4,800	
10000 TO 29999	22	93.97	94.57	89.57	21.41	105.58	41.84	162.96	75.76 to 116.08	20,606	18,457	
30000 TO 59999	25	94.27	92.12	91.48	14.60	100.70	48.30	124.73	90.29 to 100.01	43,016	39,353	
60000 TO 99999	12	90.19	89.00	88.71	12.01	100.33	65.86	103.44	80.52 to 101.62	77,608	68,847	
100000 TO 149999	6	93.95	87.91	87.16	10.51	100.86	69.00	100.11	69.00 to 100.11	125,167	109,090	
150000 TO 249999												
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	92	95.07	102.58	90.43	24.54	113.44	41.84	406.63	93.36 to 99.26	36,060	32,611	

**2011 Correlation Section
for Webster County**

A. Residential Real Property

Webster County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The county seat and largest town is Red Cloud, home of Willa Cather. The Republican River runs through the southern portion of the county. The county has two high schools; one in Red Cloud and one in Blue Hill. Most of the county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline, except for the town of Blue Hill which is located north closer to the city of Hastings where many residents are employed.

The statistical sampling of 92 qualified residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Webster County. The calculated median is 95%. All valuation groupings are within the acceptable range. The qualitative measures are above the acceptable range due to the fact that Webster County includes as many sales as possible causing some extreme outliers to remain in the file. The statistics reflect an influence on the COD and PRD due to low dollar sales. Eighteen of the 92 sales are under \$5000.

Webster County is diligent in their sales review process. A sales verification document is mailed to the buyer of each parcel sold. The questionnaire asks for details to assist the assessor in the discovery of information about the terms of the sale. The document asks how the selling price was established, whether any personal property was involved in the sale, how the property was listed for sale, if there was any prior association between the buyer and the seller and if there was any special consideration involved in the sale. If a discrepancy is perceived upon receipt of the verification document, the sale is physically inspected.

Webster County employs a six-year inspection cycle for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Webster County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have a website with online parcel search, transfer of sales electronically, complete spreadsheet analyses and use Agri-Data as part of their agland analysis.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 95% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Webster 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 Webster 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 Webster 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 Webster 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 Webster County

The Assessor performed a spreadsheet sales ratio study for all valuation groups.

Some changes with depreciation tables were made as small refinements, no new tables were created.

All pickup work was completed timely. This included another 11 parcels.

2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Webster County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:
	The Assessor, her staff and Bob Worman
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>
1	Bladen – Bedroom Community for both the city of Hastings to the north and Blue Hill not much economic growth
5	Blue Hill – School, on highway, economic growth, new housing
10	Cowles – stagnant growth, no economic activity
15	Guide Rock – middle sized community, off highway, no school, little to no economic growth
20	Inavale – very small community, on highway, no school, no economic growth
25	Red Cloud – largest community, on two highways, school, currently experiencing economic decline
30	Rural – all businesses not located inside a city limits, no city amenities
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.
	Sales comparison and cost approaches, the costing is in Terra Scan and the assessor performs spreadsheet analysis of each valuation grouping to identify comparables by quality and condition
4.	When was the last lot value study completed?
	2010
5.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.
	Lots are valued by square foot and by the acre and are calibrated to the market
6.	What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?
	2006
7.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?
	Webster County develops their own depreciation studies
8.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Physical depreciation is the same throughout the county. Then each valuation grouping has its own economic depreciation.
9.	How often does the County update the depreciation tables?
	Annually or as needed depending on the amount of commercial/industrial activity in the county.
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.
	This is a case by case basis, no rule of thumb, generally a deck or new siding aren't a substantial change but an addition or a substantial remodel would be considered a substantial change.
12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.

**91 Webster
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 : 17
Total Sales Price : 1,018,985
Total Adj. Sales Price : 917,280
Total Assessed Value : 835,450
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 53,958
Avg. Assessed Value : 49,144

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 91
MEAN : 99

COV : 18.84
STD : 18.66
Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.55

95% Median C.I. : 87.54 to 111.94
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.11 to 103.04
95% Mean C.I. : 89.44 to 108.62

COD : 13.02
PRD : 108.73

MAX Sales Ratio : 137.80
MIN Sales Ratio : 65.61

Printed:3/16/2011 12:59:31PM

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	91.42	91.42	91.07	04.66	100.38	87.16	95.67	N/A	23,130	21,065
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	2	92.33	92.33	90.97	04.41	101.49	88.26	96.40	N/A	18,750	17,058
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	82.27	82.27	75.04	20.25	109.63	65.61	98.93	N/A	118,398	88,840
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	97.71	97.71	97.71	00.00	100.00	97.71	97.71	N/A	235,000	229,610
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	137.80	137.80	137.80	00.00	100.00	137.80	137.80	N/A	5,000	6,890
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	95.27	90.66	87.48	07.38	103.64	72.11	100.00	N/A	25,819	22,586
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	121.29	121.92	121.92	05.66	100.00	111.94	132.53	N/A	8,500	10,363
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	93.77	93.77	98.09	06.64	95.60	87.54	100.00	N/A	113,975	111,795
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	6	91.97	88.67	79.21	09.06	111.94	65.61	98.93	65.61 to 98.93	53,426	42,321
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	2	117.76	117.76	98.54	17.03	119.50	97.71	137.80	N/A	120,000	118,250
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	9	100.00	101.77	96.72	12.84	105.22	72.11	132.53	87.54 to 121.29	39,636	38,336
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	6	97.06	97.45	87.17	14.45	111.79	65.61	137.80	65.61 to 137.80	85,716	74,716
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	100.00	104.06	94.30	14.73	110.35	72.11	132.53	72.11 to 132.53	18,396	17,348
<u>ALL</u>	17	96.40	99.03	91.08	13.02	108.73	65.61	137.80	87.54 to 111.94	53,958	49,144

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
05	3	95.67	93.64	96.34	03.54	97.20	87.54	97.71	N/A	97,087	93,530
15	3	100.00	108.69	99.53	16.51	109.20	88.26	137.80	N/A	74,317	73,968
25	8	95.89	98.83	91.88	11.87	107.56	72.11	132.53	72.11 to 132.53	19,722	18,121
30	3	98.93	95.28	76.64	18.76	124.32	65.61	121.29	N/A	81,765	62,663
<u>ALL</u>	17	96.40	99.03	91.08	13.02	108.73	65.61	137.80	87.54 to 111.94	53,958	49,144

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	17	96.40	99.03	91.08	13.02	108.73	65.61	137.80	87.54 to 111.94	53,958	49,144
04											
<u>ALL</u>	17	96.40	99.03	91.08	13.02	108.73	65.61	137.80	87.54 to 111.94	53,958	49,144

**91 Webster
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 : 17
 Total Sales Price : 1,018,985
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 917,280
 Total Assessed Value : 835,450
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 53,958
 Avg. Assessed Value : 49,144

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 91
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 13.02
 PRD : 108.73

COV : 18.84
 STD : 18.66
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.55
 MAX Sales Ratio : 137.80
 MIN Sales Ratio : 65.61

95% Median C.I. : 87.54 to 111.94
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.11 to 103.04
 95% Mean C.I. : 89.44 to 108.62

Printed:3/16/2011 12:59:31PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
_____Low \$_____												
1 TO 4999												
5000 TO 9999	4	116.62	117.76	115.84	10.11	101.66	100.00	137.80	N/A	7,444	8,623	
_____Total \$_____												
1 TO 9999	4	116.62	117.76	115.84	10.11	101.66	100.00	137.80	N/A	7,444	8,623	
10000 TO 29999	5	95.67	101.38	97.02	09.74	104.49	87.16	132.53	N/A	15,452	14,992	
30000 TO 59999	4	87.90	85.82	86.43	06.83	99.29	72.11	95.38	N/A	36,375	31,440	
60000 TO 99999	1	98.93	98.93	98.93	00.00	100.00	98.93	98.93	N/A	67,000	66,285	
100000 TO 149999												
150000 TO 249999	2	98.86	98.86	98.74	01.16	100.12	97.71	100.00	N/A	213,975	211,280	
250000 TO 499999	1	65.61	65.61	65.61	00.00	100.00	65.61	65.61	N/A	169,795	111,395	
500000 +												
_____ALL_____	17	96.40	99.03	91.08	13.02	108.73	65.61	137.80	87.54 to 111.94	53,958	49,144	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	121.29	121.29	121.29	00.00	100.00	121.29	121.29	N/A	8,500	10,310	
306	1	72.11	72.11	72.11	00.00	100.00	72.11	72.11	N/A	36,500	26,320	
343	1	97.71	97.71	97.71	00.00	100.00	97.71	97.71	N/A	235,000	229,610	
350	3	88.26	104.53	91.68	18.98	114.02	87.54	137.80	N/A	21,667	19,865	
353	4	96.04	94.54	95.79	03.26	98.70	87.16	98.93	N/A	31,440	30,116	
468	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	192,950	192,950	
470	1	132.53	132.53	132.53	00.00	100.00	132.53	132.53	N/A	8,500	11,265	
471	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	7,775	7,775	
528	2	103.55	103.55	102.86	08.11	100.67	95.15	111.94	N/A	9,250	9,515	
554	2	80.50	80.50	72.27	18.50	111.39	65.61	95.38	N/A	109,398	79,065	
_____ALL_____	17	96.40	99.03	91.08	13.02	108.73	65.61	137.80	87.54 to 111.94	53,958	49,144	

2011 Correlation Section for Webster County

A. Commerical Real Property

Webster County is located in south central Nebraska, along the Kansas border. The county seat and largest town is Red Cloud, home of Willa Cather. The Republican River runs through the southern portion of the county. The county has two high schools; one in Red Cloud and one in Blue Hill. Most of the county is experiencing decreasing population and economic decline, except for the town of Blue Hill which is located north closer to the city of Hastings where many residents are employed.

A review of the statistical analysis reveals only 17 qualified commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate the level of value is within the acceptable range, there are not a sufficient number of sales to have confidence in the calculated statistics. The calculated median is 96%. It will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Webster County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality.

The sample is not representative of the population as a whole even though the assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible without bias in the analysis of the commercial class; there is just not an active commercial market in Webster County. The largest number of sales occurred in the valuation grouping representing the town of Red Cloud.

Webster County is diligent in their sales review process. A sales verification document is mailed to the buyer of each parcel sold. The questionnaire asks for details to assist the assessor in the discovery of information about the terms of the sale. The document asks how the selling price was established, whether any personal property was involved in the sale, how the property was listed for sale, if there was any prior association between the buyer and the seller and if there was any special consideration involved in the sale. If a discrepancy is perceived upon receipt of the verification document, the sale is physically inspected.

Webster County employs a six-year inspection cycle for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Webster County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have a website with online parcel search, transfer of sales electronically, complete spreadsheet analyses and use Agri-Data as part of their agland analysis.

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

**2011 Correlation Section
for Webster 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 Webster 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 Webster 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 Webster 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 Webster County

The ongoing audit of agricultural parcels continued and 1105 parcels were audited and compared with the information in Agri-Data, discrepancies were researched and corrections were made if warranted

7 townships were audited by legal description against the Cadastral maps to account for all acres. All tracts were drawn in at scale.

A spreadsheet analysis was completed of all sales in the county and comparable sales in the surrounding counties. New values were determined.

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

Finished the project of proofing the current property record cards against the old data, all old information has been removed from the current records.

On-sight physical review and pickup work was completed on 26 parcels.

2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Webster County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor, staff and contract appraiser	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	No geographic or economic differences have been determined
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Annually sales are plotted, NRD restrictions are reviewed, sales are reviewed, geographic and market characteristics are reviewed for differences across the county	
4.	Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.	
	Agricultural land is designated when it is used for the production of livestock or crops, residential is designated when the primary use of the parcel is for the owner's home, no recreational parcels have been designated in Webster County.	
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?	
	Yes, no differences have been determined.	
6.	What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?	
	Usage, soils, topography	
7.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	Webster County is in the process of mapping out each section in the county. Confirming that all acres are accounted for. This is being compared to Agri Data and FSA maps.	
8.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Monitor any river sales, use sales verification and inspection to review possible recreation influences.	
9.	Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	Yes and currently there is no value difference for the special value parcels.	
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.	
	For agricultural land and substantial change would be the addition or removal of an improvement or a change in land usage.	

12.	Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.

91 Webster

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 48
 Total Sales Price : 14,835,381
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,835,381
 Total Assessed Value : 10,399,910
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 309,070
 Avg. Assessed Value : 216,665

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 20.94
 PRD : 105.65

COV : 32.35
 STD : 23.96
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.75
 MAX Sales Ratio : 194.76
 MIN Sales Ratio : 34.82

95% Median C.I. : 64.90 to 78.11
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.28 to 80.84

Printed:3/16/2011 12:59:34PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	4	77.25	103.54	91.29	49.02	113.42	64.90	194.76	N/A	164,538	150,208
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	81.55	77.15	73.78	14.73	104.57	51.03	94.48	N/A	164,789	121,586
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	6	73.04	74.61	71.87	11.99	103.81	57.66	94.36	57.66 to 94.36	305,583	219,623
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	73.80	73.80	68.83	10.09	107.22	66.35	81.25	N/A	345,600	237,875
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	67.42	67.42	67.42	00.00	100.00	67.42	67.42	N/A	29,952	20,195
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	70.75	70.75	70.75	00.00	100.00	70.75	70.75	N/A	264,000	186,780
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	8	77.86	79.04	76.63	18.11	103.14	53.02	109.86	53.02 to 109.86	137,026	104,999
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	71.09	71.09	71.09	00.00	100.00	71.09	71.09	N/A	164,500	116,945
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	72.67	78.22	67.47	16.46	115.93	63.06	98.93	N/A	712,000	480,393
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	64.60	73.75	72.00	24.27	102.43	55.14	110.80	55.14 to 110.80	182,140	131,139
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	56.88	57.27	66.45	20.59	86.19	34.82	78.11	34.82 to 78.11	608,247	404,153
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	59.93	60.82	65.94	12.06	92.24	53.32	70.11	N/A	442,500	291,778
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	16	77.63	82.37	74.98	22.01	109.86	51.03	194.76	66.35 to 88.06	240,126	180,041
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	11	71.09	76.51	74.87	15.35	102.19	53.02	109.86	63.31 to 94.50	141,333	105,810
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	21	63.60	66.43	67.33	20.47	98.66	34.82	110.80	55.14 to 72.67	449,462	302,635
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	70.42	73.34	70.97	10.05	103.34	57.66	94.36	66.35 to 81.25	281,865	200,046
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	19	72.67	76.54	70.98	19.42	107.83	53.02	110.80	63.06 to 90.24	245,879	174,531
<u>ALL</u>	48	70.43	74.06	70.10	20.94	105.65	34.82	194.76	64.90 to 78.11	309,070	216,665

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	70.43	74.06	70.10	20.94	105.65	34.82	194.76	64.90 to 78.11	309,070	216,665
<u>ALL</u>	48	70.43	74.06	70.10	20.94	105.65	34.82	194.76	64.90 to 78.11	309,070	216,665

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	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
1	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
<u>Grass</u>											
County	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
1	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
<u>ALL</u>	48	70.43	74.06	70.10	20.94	105.65	34.82	194.76	64.90 to 78.11	309,070	216,665

91 Webster
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 : 48
 Total Sales Price : 14,835,381
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,835,381
 Total Assessed Value : 10,399,910
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 309,070
 Avg. Assessed Value : 216,665

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 70
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 20.94
 PRD : 105.65

COV : 32.35
 STD : 23.96
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.75
 MAX Sales Ratio : 194.76
 MIN Sales Ratio : 34.82

95% Median C.I. : 64.90 to 78.11
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.28 to 80.84

Printed: 3/16/2011 12:59:34PM

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	5	70.11	75.78	69.37	15.82	109.24	63.06	110.80	N/A	1,330,178	922,792
1	5	70.11	75.78	69.37	15.82	109.24	63.06	110.80	N/A	1,330,178	922,792
_____ Dry _____											
County	7	70.08	73.21	72.77	13.50	100.60	55.78	94.48	55.78 to 94.48	224,158	163,112
1	7	70.08	73.21	72.77	13.50	100.60	55.78	94.48	55.78 to 94.48	224,158	163,112
_____ Grass _____											
County	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
1	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
_____ ALL _____	48	70.43	74.06	70.10	20.94	105.65	34.82	194.76	64.90 to 78.11	309,070	216,665

91 Webster

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 53
 Total Sales Price : 16,189,956
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,189,956
 Total Assessed Value : 11,172,285
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 305,471
 Avg. Assessed Value : 210,798

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 69
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 22.89
 PRD : 107.03

COV : 34.59
 STD : 25.55
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.04
 MAX Sales Ratio : 194.76
 MIN Sales Ratio : 34.82

95% Median C.I. : 63.60 to 76.00
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.98 to 80.74

Printed:3/16/2011 12:59:38PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	4	77.25	103.54	91.29	49.02	113.42	64.90	194.76	N/A	164,538	150,208
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	81.55	77.15	73.78	14.73	104.57	51.03	94.48	N/A	164,789	121,586
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	6	73.04	74.61	71.87	11.99	103.81	57.66	94.36	57.66 to 94.36	305,583	219,623
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	73.80	73.80	68.83	10.09	107.22	66.35	81.25	N/A	345,600	237,875
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	67.42	67.42	67.42	00.00	100.00	67.42	67.42	N/A	29,952	20,195
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	53.12	57.73	54.61	13.44	105.71	49.32	70.75	N/A	389,362	212,614
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	11	72.67	80.89	75.08	27.52	107.74	49.07	146.00	53.02 to 109.86	140,609	105,573
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	71.09	71.09	71.09	00.00	100.00	71.09	71.09	N/A	164,500	116,945
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	72.67	78.22	67.47	16.46	115.93	63.06	98.93	N/A	712,000	480,393
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	64.60	73.75	72.00	24.27	102.43	55.14	110.80	55.14 to 110.80	182,140	131,139
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	56.88	57.27	66.45	20.59	86.19	34.82	78.11	34.82 to 78.11	608,247	404,153
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	59.93	60.82	65.94	12.06	92.24	53.32	70.11	N/A	442,500	291,778
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	16	77.63	82.37	74.98	22.01	109.86	51.03	194.76	66.35 to 88.06	240,126	180,041
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	16	70.76	75.10	66.56	23.37	112.83	49.07	146.00	53.12 to 85.18	181,827	121,018
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	21	63.60	66.43	67.33	20.47	98.66	34.82	110.80	55.14 to 72.67	449,462	302,635
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	69.94	69.65	65.85	12.93	105.77	49.32	94.36	57.66 to 79.74	310,228	204,294
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	71.88	77.81	71.01	23.73	109.58	49.07	146.00	62.42 to 90.24	232,826	165,337
<u>ALL</u>	53	70.08	73.86	69.01	22.89	107.03	34.82	194.76	63.60 to 76.00	305,471	210,798

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	53	70.08	73.86	69.01	22.89	107.03	34.82	194.76	63.60 to 76.00	305,471	210,798
<u>ALL</u>	53	70.08	73.86	69.01	22.89	107.03	34.82	194.76	63.60 to 76.00	305,471	210,798

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	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
1	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
<u>Grass</u>											
County	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
1	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
<u>ALL</u>	53	70.08	73.86	69.01	22.89	107.03	34.82	194.76	63.60 to 76.00	305,471	210,798

91 Webster
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 : 53
 Total Sales Price : 16,189,956
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,189,956
 Total Assessed Value : 11,172,285
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 305,471
 Avg. Assessed Value : 210,798

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 69
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 22.89
 PRD : 107.03

COV : 34.59
 STD : 25.55
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.04
 MAX Sales Ratio : 194.76
 MIN Sales Ratio : 34.82

95% Median C.I. : 63.60 to 76.00
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.98 to 80.74

Printed: 3/16/2011 12:59:38PM

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	5	70.11	75.78	69.37	15.82	109.24	63.06	110.80	N/A	1,330,178	922,792
1	5	70.11	75.78	69.37	15.82	109.24	63.06	110.80	N/A	1,330,178	922,792
_____Dry_____											
County	7	70.08	73.21	72.77	13.50	100.60	55.78	94.48	55.78 to 94.48	224,158	163,112
1	7	70.08	73.21	72.77	13.50	100.60	55.78	94.48	55.78 to 94.48	224,158	163,112
_____Grass_____											
County	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
1	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
_____ALL_____											
	53	70.08	73.86	69.01	22.89	107.03	34.82	194.76	63.60 to 76.00	305,471	210,798

91 Webster
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 : 77
 Total Sales Price : 22,992,266
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,927,266
 Total Assessed Value : 15,757,695
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 297,757
 Avg. Assessed Value : 204,645

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 69
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 23.97
 PRD : 106.69

COV : 34.27
 STD : 25.13
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.73
 MAX Sales Ratio : 194.76
 MIN Sales Ratio : 34.82

95% Median C.I. : 63.31 to 72.67
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.72 to 78.94

Printed:3/16/2011 12:59:41PM

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	6	80.10	95.73	85.00	31.79	112.62	64.90	194.76	64.90 to 194.76	260,692	221,584
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	10	76.54	76.65	77.49	18.59	98.92	51.03	118.17	51.12 to 94.48	182,544	141,459
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	9	76.00	83.28	76.28	19.53	109.18	57.66	124.21	69.79 to 105.21	282,056	215,146
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	66.35	69.78	65.90	09.80	105.89	61.75	81.25	N/A	392,733	258,823
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	64.62	64.62	62.60	04.33	103.23	61.82	67.42	N/A	107,451	67,264
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	53.12	56.26	54.16	10.45	103.88	48.54	70.75	N/A	331,617	179,610
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	12	76.05	80.77	75.88	24.85	106.44	49.07	146.00	62.42 to 94.50	158,058	119,942
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	55.93	55.93	51.80	27.11	107.97	40.77	71.09	N/A	226,250	117,188
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	67.87	74.18	66.94	17.12	110.82	62.06	98.93	N/A	592,500	396,602
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	64.60	73.75	72.00	24.27	102.43	55.14	110.80	55.14 to 110.80	182,140	131,139
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	9	50.72	55.57	63.74	19.81	87.18	34.82	78.11	48.06 to 71.31	560,933	357,523
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	8	61.06	67.78	64.45	26.15	105.17	43.95	129.10	43.95 to 129.10	363,175	234,060
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	28	77.34	82.13	76.79	21.46	106.95	51.03	194.76	69.79 to 81.25	253,796	194,888
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	21	67.42	71.03	64.10	24.18	110.81	40.77	146.00	53.12 to 79.43	201,057	128,869
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	28	62.56	66.26	65.48	22.87	101.19	34.82	129.10	55.14 to 70.11	414,242	271,235
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	19	69.79	72.07	67.00	18.74	107.57	48.54	124.21	57.66 to 79.74	294,194	197,124
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	25	71.09	75.76	69.70	23.80	108.69	40.77	146.00	62.42 to 83.04	239,767	167,122
<u>ALL</u>	77	69.79	73.33	68.73	23.97	106.69	34.82	194.76	63.31 to 72.67	297,757	204,645

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	77	69.79	73.33	68.73	23.97	106.69	34.82	194.76	63.31 to 72.67	297,757	204,645
<u>ALL</u>	77	69.79	73.33	68.73	23.97	106.69	34.82	194.76	63.31 to 72.67	297,757	204,645

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	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
1	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
<u>Grass</u>											
County	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
1	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
<u>ALL</u>	77	69.79	73.33	68.73	23.97	106.69	34.82	194.76	63.31 to 72.67	297,757	204,645

91 Webster
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 : 77
 Total Sales Price : 22,992,266
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,927,266
 Total Assessed Value : 15,757,695
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 297,757
 Avg. Assessed Value : 204,645

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 69
 MEAN : 73
 COD : 23.97
 PRD : 106.69

COV : 34.27
 STD : 25.13
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.73
 MAX Sales Ratio : 194.76
 MIN Sales Ratio : 34.82

95% Median C.I. : 63.31 to 72.67
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.72 to 78.94

Printed: 3/16/2011 12:59:41PM

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	71.87	78.34	71.17	21.27	110.07	48.47	118.17	63.06 to 105.21	805,971	573,608
1	12	71.87	78.34	71.17	21.27	110.07	48.47	118.17	63.06 to 105.21	805,971	573,608
_____ Dry _____											
County	8	68.75	70.52	69.81	15.39	101.02	51.68	94.48	51.68 to 94.48	228,138	159,261
1	8	68.75	70.52	69.81	15.39	101.02	51.68	94.48	51.68 to 94.48	228,138	159,261
_____ Grass _____											
County	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
1	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
_____ ALL _____											
	77	69.79	73.33	68.73	23.97	106.69	34.82	194.76	63.31 to 72.67	297,757	204,645



Webster County Assessor

Sonja L. Krueger,
Assessor
621 N. Cedar St.
Red Cloud, NE 68970

March 1, 2011

Property Assessment & Taxation
Attention: Ruth Sorensen
1033 "O" Street, Suite 600
Lincoln NE 68508

2011 METHODOLOGY FOR SPECIAL VALUE

Webster County implements greenbelt through the conservation and preservation easement act for parcels located within city/village limits. We figure the special valuation just as we do for all agricultural land. Greenbelt properties are looked at periodically to determine the current use of them.

Sonja L. Krueger,
Webster County Assessor

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2010 Posted Before : 02/17/2011

Number of Sales :	48	Median :	70	COV :	32.35	95% Median C.I. :	64.90 to 78.11
Total Sales Price :	14,835,381	Wgt. Mean :	70	STD :	23.96	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	
Total Adj. Sales Price :	14,835,381	Mean :	74	Avg.Abs.Dev :	14.75	95% Mean C.I. :	67.28 to 80.84
Total Assessed Value :	10,399,910						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	309,070	COD :	20.94	MAX Sales Ratio :	194.76		
Avg. Assessed Value :	216,665	PRD :	105.65	MIN Sales Ratio :	34.82		

Printed : 03/28/2011

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007	4	77.25	103.54	91.29	49.02	113.42	64.90	194.76	N/A	164,538	150,208
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	4	81.55	77.15	73.78	14.73	104.57	51.03	94.48	N/A	164,789	121,586
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008	6	73.04	74.61	71.87	11.99	103.81	57.66	94.36	57.66 to 94.36	305,583	219,623
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	2	73.80	73.80	68.83	10.09	107.22	66.35	81.25	N/A	345,600	237,875
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	1	67.42	67.42	67.42		100.00	67.42	67.42	N/A	29,952	20,195
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	1	70.75	70.75	70.75		100.00	70.75	70.75	N/A	264,000	186,780
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009	8	77.86	79.04	76.63	18.11	103.14	53.02	109.86	53.02 to 109.86	137,026	104,999
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009	1	71.09	71.09	71.09		100.00	71.09	71.09	N/A	164,500	116,945
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009	3	72.67	78.22	67.47	16.46	115.93	63.06	98.93	N/A	712,000	480,393
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	7	64.60	73.75	72.00	24.27	102.43	55.14	110.80	55.14 to 110.80	182,140	131,139
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	7	56.88	57.27	66.45	20.59	86.19	34.82	78.11	34.82 to 78.11	608,247	404,153
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	4	59.93	60.82	65.94	12.06	92.24	53.32	70.11	N/A	442,500	291,778
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	16	77.63	82.37	74.98	22.01	109.86	51.03	194.76	66.35 to 88.06	240,126	180,041
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	11	71.09	76.51	74.87	15.35	102.19	53.02	109.86	63.31 to 94.50	141,333	105,810
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	21	63.60	66.43	67.33	20.47	98.66	34.82	110.80	55.14 to 72.67	449,462	302,635
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	10	70.42	73.34	70.97	10.05	103.34	57.66	94.36	66.35 to 81.25	281,865	200,046
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	19	72.67	76.54	70.98	19.42	107.83	53.02	110.80	63.06 to 90.24	245,879	174,531
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	48	70.43	74.06	70.10	20.94	105.65	34.82	194.76	64.90 to 78.11	309,070	216,665

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2010 Posted Before : 02/17/2011

Number of Sales :	48	Median :	70	COV :	32.35	95% Median C.I. :	64.90 to 78.11
Total Sales Price :	14,835,381	Wgt. Mean :	70	STD :	23.96	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	
Total Adj. Sales Price :	14,835,381	Mean :	74	Avg.Abs.Dev :	14.75	95% Mean C.I. :	67.28 to 80.84
Total Assessed Value :	10,399,910						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	309,070	COD :	20.94	MAX Sales Ratio :	194.76		
Avg. Assessed Value :	216,665	PRD :	105.65	MIN Sales Ratio :	34.82		

Printed : 03/28/2011

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
1	48	70.43	74.06	70.10	20.94	105.65	34.82	194.76	64.90 to 78.11	309,070	216,665
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	48	70.43	74.06	70.10	20.94	105.65	34.82	194.76	64.90 to 78.11	309,070	216,665

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Dry</u>											
County	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
1	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
<u>Grass</u>											
County	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
1	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	48	70.43	74.06	70.10	20.94	105.65	34.82	194.76	64.90 to 78.11	309,070	216,665

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Irrigated</u>											
County	5	70.11	75.78	69.37	15.82	109.24	63.06	110.80	N/A	1,330,178	922,792
1	5	70.11	75.78	69.37	15.82	109.24	63.06	110.80	N/A	1,330,178	922,792
<u>Dry</u>											
County	7	70.08	73.21	72.77	13.50	100.60	55.78	94.48	55.78 to 94.48	224,158	163,112
1	7	70.08	73.21	72.77	13.50	100.60	55.78	94.48	55.78 to 94.48	224,158	163,112
<u>Grass</u>											
County	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
1	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
<u>ALL</u>											

07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010

48

70.43

74.06

70.10

20.94

105.65

34.82

194.76

64.90 to 78.11

309,070

216,665

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM INCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	53	Median :	70	COV :	34.59	95% Median C.I. :	63.60 to 76.00
Total Sales Price :	16,189,956	Wgt. Mean :	69	STD :	25.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	
Total Adj. Sales Price :	16,189,956	Mean :	74	Avg. Abs. Dev :	16.04	95% Mean C.I. :	66.98 to 80.74
Total Assessed Value :	11,172,285						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	305,471	COD :	22.89	MAX Sales Ratio :	194.76		
Avg. Assessed Value :	210,798	PRD :	107.03	MIN Sales Ratio :	34.82		

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007	4	77.25	103.54	91.29	49.02	113.42	64.90	194.76	N/A	164,538	150,208
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	4	81.55	77.15	73.78	14.73	104.57	51.03	94.48	N/A	164,789	121,586
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008	6	73.04	74.61	71.87	11.99	103.81	57.66	94.36	57.66 to 94.36	305,583	219,623
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	2	73.80	73.80	68.83	10.09	107.22	66.35	81.25	N/A	345,600	237,875
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	1	67.42	67.42	67.42		100.00	67.42	67.42	N/A	29,952	20,195
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	3	53.12	57.73	54.61	13.44	105.71	49.32	70.75	N/A	389,362	212,614
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009	11	72.67	80.89	75.08	27.52	107.74	49.07	146.00	53.02 to 109.86	140,609	105,573
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009	1	71.09	71.09	71.09		100.00	71.09	71.09	N/A	164,500	116,945
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009	3	72.67	78.22	67.47	16.46	115.93	63.06	98.93	N/A	712,000	480,393
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	7	64.60	73.75	72.00	24.27	102.43	55.14	110.80	55.14 to 110.80	182,140	131,139
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	7	56.88	57.27	66.45	20.59	86.19	34.82	78.11	34.82 to 78.11	608,247	404,153
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	4	59.93	60.82	65.94	12.06	92.24	53.32	70.11	N/A	442,500	291,778
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	16	77.63	82.37	74.98	22.01	109.86	51.03	194.76	66.35 to 88.06	240,126	180,041
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	16	70.76	75.10	66.56	23.37	112.83	49.07	146.00	53.12 to 85.18	181,827	121,018
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	21	63.60	66.43	67.33	20.47	98.66	34.82	110.80	55.14 to 72.67	449,462	302,635
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	12	69.94	69.65	65.85	12.93	105.77	49.32	94.36	57.66 to 79.74	310,228	204,294
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	22	71.88	77.81	71.01	23.73	109.58	49.07	146.00	62.42 to 90.24	232,826	165,337

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
1	53	70.08	73.86	69.01	22.89	107.03	34.82	194.76	63.60 to 76.00	305,471	210,798

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM INCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	53	Median :	70	COV :	34.59	95% Median C.I. :	63.60 to 76.00
Total Sales Price :	16,189,956	Wgt. Mean :	69	STD :	25.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	
Total Adj. Sales Price :	16,189,956	Mean :	74	Avg. Abs. Dev :	16.04	95% Mean C.I. :	66.98 to 80.74
Total Assessed Value :	11,172,285						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	305,471	COD :	22.89	MAX Sales Ratio :	194.76		
Avg. Assessed Value :	210,798	PRD :	107.03	MIN Sales Ratio :	34.82		

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>_____Dry_____</u>											
County	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
1	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
<u>_____Grass_____</u>											
County	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
1	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
<u>_____ALL_____</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	53	70.08	73.86	69.01	22.89	107.03	34.82	194.76	63.60 to 76.00	305,471	210,798

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>_____Irrigated_____</u>											
County	5	70.11	75.78	69.37	15.82	109.24	63.06	110.80	N/A	1,330,178	922,792
1	5	70.11	75.78	69.37	15.82	109.24	63.06	110.80	N/A	1,330,178	922,792
<u>_____Dry_____</u>											
County	7	70.08	73.21	72.77	13.50	100.60	55.78	94.48	55.78 to 94.48	224,158	163,112
1	7	70.08	73.21	72.77	13.50	100.60	55.78	94.48	55.78 to 94.48	224,158	163,112
<u>_____Grass_____</u>											
County	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
1	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
<u>_____ALL_____</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	53	70.08	73.86	69.01	22.89	107.03	34.82	194.76	63.60 to 76.00	305,471	210,798

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM EXCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	77	Median :	70	COV :	34.27	95% Median C.I. :	63.31 to 72.67
Total Sales Price :	22,992,266	Wgt. Mean :	69	STD :	25.13	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	
Total Adj. Sales Price :	22,927,266	Mean :	73	Avg. Abs. Dev :	16.73	95% Mean C.I. :	67.72 to 78.94
Total Assessed Value :	15,757,695						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	297,757	COD :	23.97	MAX Sales Ratio :	194.76		
Avg. Assessed Value :	204,645	PRD :	106.69	MIN Sales Ratio :	34.82		

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007	6	80.10	95.73	85.00	31.79	112.62	64.90	194.76	64.90 to 194.76	260,692	221,584
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	10	76.54	76.65	77.49	18.59	98.92	51.03	118.17	51.12 to 94.48	182,544	141,459
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008	9	76.00	83.28	76.28	19.53	109.18	57.66	124.21	69.79 to 105.21	282,056	215,146
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	3	66.35	69.78	65.90	09.80	105.89	61.75	81.25	N/A	392,733	258,823
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	2	64.62	64.62	62.60	04.33	103.23	61.82	67.42	N/A	107,451	67,264
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	5	53.12	56.26	54.16	10.45	103.88	48.54	70.75	N/A	331,617	179,610
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009	12	76.05	80.77	75.88	24.85	106.44	49.07	146.00	62.42 to 94.50	158,058	119,942
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009	2	55.93	55.93	51.80	27.11	107.97	40.77	71.09	N/A	226,250	117,188
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009	4	67.87	74.18	66.94	17.12	110.82	62.06	98.93	N/A	592,500	396,602
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	7	64.60	73.75	72.00	24.27	102.43	55.14	110.80	55.14 to 110.80	182,140	131,139
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	9	50.72	55.57	63.74	19.81	87.18	34.82	78.11	48.06 to 71.31	560,933	357,523
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	8	61.06	67.78	64.45	26.15	105.17	43.95	129.10	43.95 to 129.10	363,175	234,060
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	28	77.34	82.13	76.79	21.46	106.95	51.03	194.76	69.79 to 81.25	253,796	194,888
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	21	67.42	71.03	64.10	24.18	110.81	40.77	146.00	53.12 to 79.43	201,057	128,869
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	28	62.56	66.26	65.48	22.87	101.19	34.82	129.10	55.14 to 70.11	414,242	271,235
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	19	69.79	72.07	67.00	18.74	107.57	48.54	124.21	57.66 to 79.74	294,194	197,124
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	25	71.09	75.76	69.70	23.80	108.69	40.77	146.00	62.42 to 83.04	239,767	167,122

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
1	77	69.79	73.33	68.73	23.97	106.69	34.82	194.76	63.31 to 72.67	297,757	204,645

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM EXCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	77	Median :	70	COV :	34.27	95% Median C.I. :	63.31 to 72.67
Total Sales Price :	22,992,266	Wgt. Mean :	69	STD :	25.13	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	
Total Adj. Sales Price :	22,927,266	Mean :	73	Avg. Abs. Dev :	16.73	95% Mean C.I. :	67.72 to 78.94
Total Assessed Value :	15,757,695						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	297,757	COD :	23.97	MAX Sales Ratio :	194.76		
Avg. Assessed Value :	204,645	PRD :	106.69	MIN Sales Ratio :	34.82		

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u> Dry </u>											
County	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
1	5	76.00	75.50	77.39	14.50	97.56	55.78	94.48	N/A	144,910	112,150
<u> Grass </u>											
County	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
1	16	70.27	69.44	67.77	13.39	102.46	48.14	94.50	57.66 to 81.25	183,800	124,564
<u> ALL </u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	77	69.79	73.33	68.73	23.97	106.69	34.82	194.76	63.31 to 72.67	297,757	204,645

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u> Irrigated </u>											
County	12	71.87	78.34	71.17	21.27	110.07	48.47	118.17	63.06 to 105.21	805,971	573,608
1	12	71.87	78.34	71.17	21.27	110.07	48.47	118.17	63.06 to 105.21	805,971	573,608
<u> Dry </u>											
County	8	68.75	70.52	69.81	15.39	101.02	51.68	94.48	51.68 to 94.48	228,138	159,261
1	8	68.75	70.52	69.81	15.39	101.02	51.68	94.48	51.68 to 94.48	228,138	159,261
<u> Grass </u>											
County	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
1	17	69.79	68.48	66.85	14.10	102.44	48.14	94.50	55.14 to 81.25	184,518	123,349
<u> ALL </u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	77	69.79	73.33	68.73	23.97	106.69	34.82	194.76	63.31 to 72.67	297,757	204,645

2011 Correlation Section for Webster County

A. Agricultural Land

Webster County is comprised of approximately 19% irrigated land, 32% dry crop land and 47% grass/pasture land. Webster County has one market area. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the one market area determination.

Webster County has 48 qualified agricultural sales in the three year study period. The sales are not proportionately spread across the three years of the study period, as there are significantly fewer sales in the middle year of the study. The sales appear to be representative of the county, with the sales file containing sales that are approximately 24% irrigated, 27% dry and 48% grass. The Base statistics show the calculated median to be 70%. The qualitative statistics are slightly above the range. Although the sales appear to be representative, there does not appear to be a proportionate distribution of sales across the three year time period. When reviewing the majority land usage, all 80% MLU are within the range while the 95% MLU shows that no irrigated sales contained 95% irrigated acres and that dry is slightly above the range, although with only 5 sales the statistics are not reliable.

The second test, random inclusion, added 5 sales to the middle year to meet an acceptable threshold. The sample now had a better distribution of sales across the three years and was still representative of the land in the county. The Random Inclusion statistics show the calculated median to be 70%. The qualitative statistics are slightly above the range. When reviewing the majority land usage, as with the base statistic, all 80% MLU are within the range while the 95% MLU shows that no irrigated sales contained 95% irrigated acres and that dry is slightly above the range, although with only 5 sales the statistics are not reliable.

The third test, random exclusion, was to bring in as many sales from a six mile radius as possible to maintain a proportionate and representative sample and to meet the 10% threshold between study years. From the neighboring counties, 29 sales were deemed comparable and brought in to the analysis; 12 sales in the oldest year, 10 in the middle year and 7 in the newest year. The sales file was not distorted with the inclusion of the sales, there is a proportionate distribution of sales among each year of the study period, the sample is considered adequate to be statistically reliable, and there continues to be a reasonable representation of the land use in Webster County. The random exclusion statistics show the calculated median to be 70%. The qualitative statistics are again above the acceptable range. When reviewing the majority land usage, as with the base statistic and the second test, all 80%% MLU are within or round to within the range while the 95% MLU shows that no irrigated sales contained 95% irrigated acres and that dry is slightly above the range, although with only 5 sales the statistics are not reliable.

A review of the neighboring counties show that the 2011 values in Webster County appear to blend by class sufficiently with Nuckolls and Franklin Counties for all classes of land achieving inter-county equalization, although their values are much closer to the values in Franklin County. Values in Webster County were substantially increased for 2011. Irrigated values increased 21% - 41%%, Dry was increased 10% - 18% and grass was increased 4% for all LCGs. The Assessor has worked hard at narrowing the difference between her top and bottom LCGs as indicated by the market in Webster County and has achieved good

**2011 Correlation Section
for Webster County**

intra-county equalization.

There is a close correlation of all three tests, because the second and third analyses have a more proportionate distribution of sales, the calculated median for these two approaches will be used for the determination of the level of value. Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 70% of market value for the agricultural class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

A1. Correlation for Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

A review of Webster County indicates applications for special valuation have been filed and approved, however the influences have been determined to be only those typical in the agricultural market. As a result, the assessed values for agricultural land and special value land are the same. Therefore, it is the opinion of Property Tax Administrator that the level of value for special value parcels is 70% of market value, as indicated by the level of value for agricultural land.

**2011 Correlation Section
for Webster 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 Webster 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 Webster 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 Webster County**

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

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

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

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 4,343	Value : 450,593,650	Growth 906,680	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	137	163,620	3	3,835	14	10,625	154	178,080	
02. Res Improve Land	1,166	1,887,405	46	692,920	158	2,091,805	1,370	4,672,130	
03. Res Improvements	1,181	44,770,215	46	2,977,130	165	7,880,780	1,392	55,628,125	
04. Res Total	1,318	46,821,240	49	3,673,885	179	9,983,210	1,546	60,478,335	188,465
% of Res Total	85.25	77.42	3.17	6.07	11.58	16.51	35.60	13.42	20.79
05. Com UnImp Land	22	52,305	1	0	7	57,680	30	109,985	
06. Com Improve Land	155	489,885	4	39,515	27	604,930	186	1,134,330	
07. Com Improvements	168	7,237,135	4	427,465	28	7,508,885	200	15,173,485	
08. Com Total	190	7,779,325	5	466,980	35	8,171,495	230	16,417,800	50,705
% of Com Total	82.61	47.38	2.17	2.84	15.22	49.77	5.30	3.64	5.59
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	4	57,300	4	57,300	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	4	39,715	4	39,715	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	4	97,015	4	97,015	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.09	0.02	0.00
Res & Rec Total	1,318	46,821,240	49	3,673,885	183	10,080,225	1,550	60,575,350	188,465
% of Res & Rec Total	85.03	77.29	3.16	6.06	11.81	16.64	35.69	13.44	20.79
Com & Ind Total	190	7,779,325	5	466,980	35	8,171,495	230	16,417,800	50,705
% of Com & Ind Total	82.61	47.38	2.17	2.84	15.22	49.77	5.30	3.64	5.59
17. Taxable Total	1,508	54,600,565	54	4,140,865	218	18,251,720	1,780	76,993,150	239,170
% of Taxable Total	84.72	70.92	3.03	5.38	12.25	23.71	40.99	17.09	26.38

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	2	346,100	316,885	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	2	346,100	316,885
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				2	346,100	316,885

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	118	2	112	232

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	57	242,035	8	8,840	1,889	253,831,340	1,954	254,082,215
28. Ag-Improved Land	10	159,100	5	78,175	569	86,253,360	584	86,490,635
29. Ag Improvements	10	83,860	5	395,490	594	32,548,300	609	33,027,650
30. Ag Total							2,563	373,600,500

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	4	4.00	40,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	7	0.00	51,530	4	4.00	344,825	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	8	6.93	21,600	4	3.60	10,800	
37. FarmSite Improvements	3	0.00	32,330	5	0.00	50,665	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	2.02	0	0	0.48	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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	406	417.47	4,075,515	410	421.47	4,115,515	
33. HomeSite Improvements	436	413.47	25,931,830	447	417.47	26,328,185	667,510
34. HomeSite Total				447	421.47	30,443,700	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	18	47.40	51,130	18	47.40	51,130	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	498	554.00	1,395,620	510	564.53	1,428,020	
37. FarmSite Improvements	506	0.00	6,616,470	514	0.00	6,699,465	0
38. FarmSite Total				532	611.93	8,178,615	
39. Road & Ditches	0	8,644.00	0	0	8,646.50	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	476.63	2,190	0	476.63	2,190	
41. Total Section VI				979	10,156.53	38,624,505	667,510

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	3	453.39	231,585	3	453.39	231,585

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	67	492.34	379,535	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	67	492.34	379,535	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	2	2.01	1,205	69	494.35	380,740
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	4,062.19	6.15%	8,104,105	6.22%	1,995.01
46. 1A	22,691.86	34.36%	45,270,415	34.73%	1,995.01
47. 2A1	4,645.22	7.03%	9,267,275	7.11%	1,995.01
48. 2A	3,030.50	4.59%	6,045,905	4.64%	1,995.02
49. 3A1	2,055.05	3.11%	4,007,350	3.07%	1,950.00
50. 3A	8,954.14	13.56%	17,460,580	13.40%	1,950.00
51. 4A1	5,934.26	8.99%	11,571,810	8.88%	1,950.00
52. 4A	14,671.51	22.21%	28,609,455	21.95%	1,950.00
53. Total	66,044.73	100.00%	130,336,895	100.00%	1,973.46
Dry					
54. 1D1	2,516.85	2.22%	2,630,135	2.47%	1,045.01
55. 1D	55,038.68	48.64%	57,515,670	54.07%	1,045.00
56. 2D1	5,184.70	4.58%	5,418,045	5.09%	1,045.01
57. 2D	2,045.94	1.81%	1,688,070	1.59%	825.08
58. 3D1	7,326.58	6.47%	6,044,590	5.68%	825.02
59. 3D	18,511.42	16.36%	15,272,295	14.36%	825.02
60. 4D1	9,119.08	8.06%	7,204,095	6.77%	790.00
61. 4D	13,414.11	11.85%	10,597,185	9.96%	790.00
62. Total	113,157.36	100.00%	106,370,085	100.00%	940.02
Grass					
63. 1G1	521.98	0.32%	313,190	0.32%	600.00
64. 1G	12,993.62	7.98%	7,796,165	7.98%	600.00
65. 2G1	8,791.73	5.40%	5,275,035	5.40%	600.00
66. 2G	10,117.45	6.21%	6,070,480	6.21%	600.00
67. 3G1	3,432.09	2.11%	2,059,245	2.11%	600.00
68. 3G	24,131.25	14.81%	14,478,750	14.81%	600.00
69. 4G1	22,467.05	13.79%	13,480,225	13.79%	600.00
70. 4G	80,472.76	49.39%	48,283,635	49.39%	600.00
71. Total	162,927.93	100.00%	97,756,725	100.00%	600.00
Irrigated Total					
	66,044.73	18.85%	130,336,895	38.91%	1,973.46
Dry Total					
	113,157.36	32.30%	106,370,085	31.75%	940.02
Grass Total					
	162,927.93	46.50%	97,756,725	29.18%	600.00
72. Waste	8,127.72	2.32%	514,035	0.15%	63.24
73. Other	95.00	0.03%	300	0.00%	3.16
74. Exempt	6.78	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	350,352.74	100.00%	334,978,040	100.00%	956.12

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	4.05	8,080	5.00	9,975	66,035.68	130,318,840	66,044.73	130,336,895
77. Dry Land	249.84	238,625	0.00	0	112,907.52	106,131,460	113,157.36	106,370,085
78. Grass	219.70	131,830	43.41	26,045	162,664.82	97,598,850	162,927.93	97,756,725
79. Waste	16.73	1,000	0.78	195	8,110.21	512,840	8,127.72	514,035
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	95.00	300	95.00	300
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	6.78	0	6.78	0
82. Total	490.32	379,535	49.19	36,215	349,813.23	334,562,290	350,352.74	334,978,040

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	66,044.73	18.85%	130,336,895	38.91%	1,973.46
Dry Land	113,157.36	32.30%	106,370,085	31.75%	940.02
Grass	162,927.93	46.50%	97,756,725	29.18%	600.00
Waste	8,127.72	2.32%	514,035	0.15%	63.24
Other	95.00	0.03%	300	0.00%	3.16
Exempt	6.78	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	350,352.74	100.00%	334,978,040	100.00%	956.12

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

91 Webster

	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	59,650,525	60,478,335	827,810	1.39%	188,465	1.07%
02. Recreational	93,770	97,015	3,245	3.46%	0	3.46%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	30,056,250	30,443,700	387,450	1.29%	667,510	-0.93%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	89,800,545	91,019,050	1,218,505	1.36%	855,975	0.40%
05. Commercial	16,447,400	16,417,800	-29,600	-0.18%	50,705	-0.49%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	7,685,700	8,178,615	492,915	6.41%	0	6.41%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	24,133,100	24,596,415	463,315	1.92%	50,705	1.71%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	113,933,645	115,617,655	1,684,010	1.48%	906,680	0.68%
11. Irrigated	98,305,810	130,336,895	32,031,085	32.58%		
12. Dryland	92,428,610	106,370,085	13,941,475	15.08%		
13. Grassland	95,682,865	97,756,725	2,073,860	2.17%		
14. Wasteland	496,245	514,035	17,790	3.58%		
15. Other Agland	70	300	230	328.57%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	286,913,600	334,978,040	48,064,440	16.75%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	400,847,245	450,593,650	49,746,405	12.41%	906,680	12.18%

**2011 Plan of Assessment for Webster County
Assessment Years 2011, 2012, and 2013
June 15, 2010**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. State. §77-112 (Reissue 2003)

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; for the 2008 value year and;
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R.S. Supp 2004)

General Description of Real Property in Webster County:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	1555	34%	.1633%
Commercial	226	5%	.0476%
Industrial	0	0%	0%
Recreational	0	0%	0%
Agricultural	2450	54%	.7879%
Special Valuation	87	2%	.0012%
Exempt	250	5%	0%

Agricultural land is our most predominant property. They make up nearly 79% of our tax base.

Current Resources:

A. Staff / Budget / Training

Elected Assessor:

Continuing Education requirements are to obtain 60 hours of approved continuing education within the four-year period.

Deputy Assessor:

Continuing Education requirements are to obtain 60 hours of approved continuing education within the four-year period.

Nature of Responsibility:

Number of employees supervised by this position: All clerks

Nature and extent of instructions given this position regarding work: Take over all responsibilities when the Assessor is not present. As with every position within this office you will be expected to handle any issue that arises or do any work that is needed.

Some degree of initiative will be necessary to accomplish goals. You will be expected to go out into the field and do reviews of property.

The general public: Extensive contact with the general public in the field while working maintenance, building permits, and homestead exemption applications, etc. Also contact with the general public during business hours and via the telephone.

To what extent is a high degree of precision demanded in this position: Accuracy in cadastral mapping, calculation, data entry, transferring figures and listing of property in accordance with prescribed guides is always expected and demanded.

You will be expected to understand and perform all aspects of the work done within the Assessor's office.

Clerk:

There are no Continuing Education requirements for this position.

Nature of Responsibility:

Number of employees supervised by this position: None

Nature and extent of instructions given this position regarding work: As with every position within this office you will be expected to handle any issue that arises or do any work that is needed. Some degree of initiative will be necessary to accomplish goals. You will be expected to go out into the field and do reviews of property.

The general public: Extensive contact with the general public in the field while working maintenance, building permits, and homestead exemption applications, etc. Also contact with the general public during business hours and via the telephone.

To what extent is a high degree of precision demanded in this position: Accuracy in calculation, data entry, transferring figures and listing of property in accordance with prescribed guides is always expected and demanded.

You will be expected to understand and perform all aspects of the work done within the Assessor's office.

Clerk, part-time:

There are no Continuing Education requirements for this position.

Number of employees supervised by this position: None

Nature and extent of instructions given this position regarding work: As with every position within this office you will be expected to handle any issue that arises or do any work that is needed. Some degree of initiative will be necessary to accomplish goals. You will be expected to go out into the field and do reviews of property.

The general public: Extensive contact with the general public in the field while working maintenance, building permits, and homestead exemption applications, etc. Also contact with the general public during business hours and via the telephone.

To what extent is a high degree of precision demanded in this position: Accuracy in calculation, data entry, transferring figures and listing of property in accordance with prescribed guides is always expected and demanded.

You will be expected to understand and perform all aspects of the work done within the Assessor's office.

Appraiser (Contracted):

Job description is to do whatever pick-up work we have not completed in office. Also watch for changes in the agricultural land year round. Continuing Education requirements for this position is to obtain 28 hours of approved continuing education every two years.

Budget

For the 2008/2009 budget year the office budgeted \$100,654.00 and spent \$92,907.13. The County Appraiser office budget was \$8,000 and we spent \$7,999.67. For the 2009/2010 budget year the office budgeted \$103,700.00 and spent **\$92,907.13 as of this date**. We still have one more pay period and expenses to come out of this. The County Appraiser office budget is \$7840.00 and we spent **\$7,999.67**.

Due to budgeting problems within the county GIS mapping within the Assessors Office has also been suspended.

Training

We continue to train the clerks on statutory dates and pertinent information that may not be understood or has not been performed. Any new information obtained at schooling or meetings is brought back to the office and the remaining staff is updated.

B. Cadastral Maps

The Cadastral maps for the towns have been completely proofed and we feel, except for a few problems, are in good condition. In the rural area only one precinct (4-9) has been proofed and is in good condition. As deeds come in we update ownership and make any splits that need to be done.

C. Property Record Cards

These records are maintained and updated by office staff. They are in good condition. We have successfully moved all data from old property cards onto new property cards in the Residential files. We are continuing, as time allows, moving the information on the Agricultural property cards. We have completed moving and proofing the data on the Residential and Commercial property cards. Within the Residential files we are one removing all the old cards and pricing sheets to the historical files. We are in the process of removing all the old cards and pricing sheets to the historical files on Commercial and Agricultural files. Information on all files includes the following:

Filing ID number, Parcel ID number (computer ID number), Cadastral number, Glide number (the cadastral pages hang from glides), Ownership, Legal description, Deed information, Utilities, Offsite improvements, Zoning, Neighborhood analysis, Land size computations, School district, Situs address, Map number, Class code, House data, Building data, Picture of house, Sketch of house, Ground plan sketch (on some – work in progress), Annual valuations, Remarks sheet, Deed sheet, and Valuation worksheets

We have started preparing and scanning in the old property record cards and data sheets into the computer.

D. Software

We use Terra-Scan for our property pricing. I use Microsoft Excel to run my sales ration studies.

E. Web based

We have our own web page at websterne.taxesifter.com the Treasurer has a webpage at www.nebraskataxesonline.us and Webster county has a website at www.co.webster.ne.us where we have placed the sales used to determine the 2009 values. We have had a tremendous amount of positive feedback on this and hope to be able to continue to budget for it.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

A. Discover, List & Inventory all Property

Real estate transfers are brought over to the Assessors office from the Register of Deeds office. Within a few days, the Deputy Assessor processes the deed. This consists of pulling the property record cards confirming information on deed matches property record information. If anything does not match, we do a deed research then contact the person that prepared the deed. They then file a corrective deed. If everything on the deed matches our property record card we change Terra-Scan, update the record card with new owner, and update the Deed card within the property record card. The cadastral book is then changed; the sale is entered into Excel for the

sales ratio study, and also put in the “Sales Book” for appraisers. We do the supplemental sheet through the mail to the PA&T Department. Then we mail a “Sales Review” sheet to the buyer and the seller. The information off of the sales review is used to determine “arms-length” sales.

Sales reviews are done on each and every sale as they come through the office. A sales verification letter is sent out to both the buyer and the seller of each transaction. We get back about 60% of the letters. If we do not receive the sales verification back within two weeks, we will attempt to contact the person(s) to verify the sale. The individual, who processes the sale, also updates the sales book for the appraiser’s use and maintains data entry for both Terra-Scan and the Excel program used for the Sales Ratio Study.

Building permits are filed in the Clerks office, during the month of November, we make copies of all building permits. We contact Bladen, Blue Hill, and Red Cloud for their building permits during this month also.

B. Data Collection

From November until the March 20 cut-off date, we inspect every property with a building permit. We are currently reviewing all rural properties so if we are out on a permit, we do a full review of the property. Sales information is updated in Excel every time we process a Real Estate Transfer and when we receive the Sales Review back.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment action

Internally a sales ratio study is done annually for each class of property: residential, commercial and agricultural. Residential is then broke down by each market area. It is then broke down within each sub-class in that market area that is deemed necessary. Commercial is broke down by each market area. Agricultural is broke down by use, area of the county where it is located, and by school districts. We try to keep our Field Liaison updated on what we are doing usually just over the phone.

D. Approaches to Value

We are using Marshall and Swift 06/99 pricing. Each year when we do the sales ratio studies if needed we update the depreciation worksheets. The most recent depreciation study being used was done in 2008 for the 2009 valuation year. Sales ratio studies are also run on agricultural land as a whole. Then it is broke out and studied by predominant use, school district, and location within the county.

E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation

The final values are checked against the sales ratio studies. Any corrections are made and then the rest of the property within the county is changed.

F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions

If needed the sales ratio studies are reviewed again to determine where we need to make additional changes.

G. Notices and Public Relations

Notice of Valuation change is sent along with a letter of explanation and all printouts on their properties, on June 1.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2009:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	97%	21.78%	108.36%
Commercial	95%	19.78%	100.98%
Agricultural Land	70%	14.61%	104.42%
Special Value Agland	70%	14.61%	104.42%

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2009 Reports & Opinions.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010/2011:

For 2011

The Terra-Scan has not been updating sketches as it should so we will have to go into every sketch, move something, save, go out, then check if the changes have been saved corrected to all files within the record. We will also finish making appraisal files for all exempt properties.

Agricultural: Within the office we will finish comparing all agricultural land to Agri-Data, any discrepancies we will request new FSA maps and certifications from the property owner. Finish cards: remark sheets, deed sheets, mark sure all data is done on cards, check that all well information is on card, attach sketches, and insert valuation card. We will copy all soil maps and make sure that all cards reflect the new soils. All splits that have been done over the years, we will draw them correctly on the cadastral maps. As of now most of these are just boxes drawn in the general vicinity. Bob Worman, contracted appraiser, will start reviewing all rural residential properties. The Assessor and/or deputy will drive the county to check for any land use changes.

Residential: We will review Blue Hill town. Finish cards: remark sheets, deed sheets, mark sure all data is done on cards, attach sketches, and insert valuation card. All splits that have been done over the years, we will draw them correctly on the cadastral maps. As of now most of these are just boxes drawn in the general vicinity.

Commercial: Bob Worman has finished the commercial reviews for this cycle. We will finish cards: remark sheets, deed sheets, mark sure all data is done on cards, attach sketches, and insert valuation card. All splits that have been done over the years, we will draw them correctly on the cadastral maps. As of now most of these are just boxes drawn in the general vicinity.

Special Value - Agland: Bob Worman will review each special value parcel physically to determine if they should be Special Valuation. We will work with Becky Anderson on these properties to determine any changes needed with the new laws.

For 2012

Agricultural: Bob Worman, contracted appraiser, will continue reviewing all rural residential properties. The Assessor and/or deputy will drive the county to check for any land use changes.

Residential: We will review Red Cloud City residential properties.

Commercial: We have finished the 6 year cycle for commercial properties.

Special Value - Agland: Assessor and/or deputy will review each special value parcel

For 2013

Agricultural: Bob Worman, contracted appraiser, will continue reviewing all rural residential properties. The Assessor and/or deputy will drive the county to check for any land use changes.

Residential: We have finished the 6 year cycle for residential properties.

Commercial: We have finished the 6 year cycle for commercial properties.

Special Value - Agland: Assessor and/or deputy will review each special value parcel.

Plan of Review

When we review a property, we compare the property record card to the physical site. If anything appears to be wrong, we contact the owner to obtain entrance and do an interior inspection and re-measurement. If not allowed inside, we attempt to review the information with the owner and do a review of the outside. Digital photos are taken of all homes and some outbuildings. The rural ground plan sketches are drawn at this time also. Aerial photographs are unrealistic due to budget constraints.

Work done for the 6 year cycle of 2008/2013

Agricultural: Any parcel with irrigation has been reviewed, checked against Agri-Data, new maps and certification requested from NRD and FSA office. All other agricultural properties are being checked against Agri-Data, new maps and certification requested from FSA office.

Agricultural Improvements: Guide Rock, Oak Creek, and Stillwater precincts have all been done at this time for the 2011 value year.

Residential: Guide Rock, Cowles, Bladen, Inavale, Rosemont, and Amboy have been done.

Commercial: Bladen, Cowles, Inavale, Rosemont, Blue Hill, Guide Rock, Red Cloud, and Rural.

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

1. Record Maintenance, mapping updates, & ownership changes were discussed in previous sections.

2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts
 - 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 (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Land & Funds
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
 - k. Certify Trusts owning Agland to Secretary of State
3. Personal Property: administer annual filings of approximately 582 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file, and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property: annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax and follow through this process with any protests and a review of those properties.
6. Homestead Exemptions: administer approximately 264 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, taxpayer assistance, and sending applications onto the state department.
7. 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.
8. Tax Increment Financing: management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates: management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information, input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections: prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization: attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.
13. TERC Appeals: prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.

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

15. Education: Assessor, Deputy Assessor, and/or Appraisal Education: attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license. Always send new help to an educational workshop.

AMENDMENTS:

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor Signature: _____ Date: _____

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

2011 Assessment Survey for Webster County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	1
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$109,701.00
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$109,000.00
8.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$0
9.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:
	\$10,000.00
10.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$12,735.00
11.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$1,500.00
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	None
13.	Amount of last year's budget not used:
	\$3.52

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Terra Scan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Primarily – Deputy Assessor, but also the Assessor and Clerk
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes, but only for 911 addressing

6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	No
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All towns except Bladen
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	July 2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Bob Worman does some contract appraisal but most appraisal is done by the Assessor and her staff.
2.	Other services:
	None

2011 Certification for Webster 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 Webster 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

