

Table of Contents

2012 Commission Summary

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

Residential Correlation

- 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
- Commercial Statistics

Commercial Correlation

- I. Correlation
- II. Analysis of Sales Verification
- III. Measure of Central Tendency
- IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Special Valuation Methodology, if applicable
- Special Valuation Statistics, if applicable

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

- I. Correlation
- II. Analysis of Sales Verification
- III. Measure of Central Tendency
- IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

County Reports

- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2012 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2011 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

Valuation History Charts

2012 Commission Summary for Deuel County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	37	Median	93.25
Total Sales Price	\$1,883,624	Mean	96.87
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,880,624	Wgt. Mean	96.74
Total Assessed Value	\$1,819,387	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$43,867
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$50,828	Avg. Assessed Value	\$49,173

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.15 to 103.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.03 to 103.46
95% Mean C.I	91.42 to 102.32
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	18.68
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.58
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.13

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	42	95	95
2010	41	95	95
2009	52	94	94
2008	58	93	93

2012 Commission Summary for Deuel County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	8	Median	95.90
Total Sales Price	\$227,500	Mean	95.34
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$227,500	Wgt. Mean	94.46
Total Assessed Value	\$214,889	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$137,340
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$28,438	Avg. Assessed Value	\$26,861

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	87.88 to 100.03
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.44 to 98.48
95% Mean C.I	92.07 to 98.61
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	10.64
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.44
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.06

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	14		97
2010	14	100	71
2009	11	100	79
2008	8	92	79

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Deuel 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 (2011). 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 these 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	93	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	70	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 9th day of April, 2012.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Deuel County

Deuel County implemented June of 2007 CAMA pricing for Big Springs as indicated by the market. Valuations experienced increases and decreases after the new costing and depreciation in Big Springs. Overall the valuation differences were minimal. Minor changes in Chappell were completed through review work. Deuel County is continuing with the reappraisal of rural residential properties and complying with the six year inspection and review cycle.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Deuel County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Deputy Assessor and Clerk	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Chappell is the larger of the 2 towns in Deuel County. Chappell includes three times more residential properties, more paved streets and amenities.
	02	Big Springs is located along I-80 near the junction of I-76. The main employer is the Flying J Truck Stop (formerly Bosselman's).
	03	The rural area includes all properties not located within the Village of Big Springs or the City of Chappell. These properties are located on acreages with characteristics of county living.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Cost Approach	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June 2007	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The County uses the CAMA/MIPS tables.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	No, they are the same countywide.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	The tables were updated in 2007. They will be reviewed for the rural residential properties in 2012.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	Market or current sales data	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	By looking at the building permit, completing a physical inspection of the property and all self-reported changes by the property owners.	

25 Deuel
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 37
Total Sales Price : 1,883,624
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,880,624
Total Assessed Value : 1,819,387
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 50,828
Avg. Assessed Value : 49,173

MEDIAN : 93
WGT. MEAN : 97
MEAN : 97
COD : 14.86
PRD : 100.13

COV : 17.47
STD : 16.92
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.86
MAX Sales Ratio : 126.69
MIN Sales Ratio : 64.65

95% Median C.I. : 89.15 to 103.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.03 to 103.46
95% Mean C.I. : 91.42 to 102.32

Printed:3/29/2012 3:03:30PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	9	91.08	91.38	91.83	11.30	99.51	64.65	119.97	81.44 to 107.28	59,111	54,281
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	89.96	94.11	90.57	18.61	103.91	71.86	120.80	71.86 to 120.80	64,432	58,355
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	86.66	93.36	90.72	16.72	102.91	76.70	123.41	N/A	59,250	53,753
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	112.66	104.22	115.41	13.41	90.30	70.97	120.59	N/A	79,875	92,185
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	103.50	103.24	103.23	09.68	100.01	81.05	117.02	N/A	27,006	27,877
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	97.18	96.57	95.92	05.68	100.68	89.15	102.79	N/A	31,125	29,854
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	93.91	100.86	94.64	14.63	106.57	78.50	126.69	N/A	29,200	27,636
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	23	91.48	94.67	96.43	16.32	98.17	64.65	123.41	81.44 to 107.28	64,135	61,844
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	14	100.83	100.49	97.89	10.66	102.66	78.50	126.69	89.15 to 114.37	28,966	28,356
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	17	101.39	99.58	103.25	12.91	96.45	70.97	123.41	81.05 to 117.02	48,002	49,562
<u>ALL</u>	37	93.25	96.87	96.74	14.86	100.13	64.65	126.69	89.15 to 103.50	50,828	49,173

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	25	94.07	97.77	97.83	17.64	99.94	64.65	126.69	85.85 to 117.02	58,205	56,939
02	10	93.58	95.55	93.20	10.17	102.52	74.40	114.37	81.05 to 112.87	35,300	32,900
03	2	92.22	92.22	92.30	00.80	99.91	91.48	92.96	N/A	36,250	33,458
<u>ALL</u>	37	93.25	96.87	96.74	14.86	100.13	64.65	126.69	89.15 to 103.50	50,828	49,173

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	37	93.25	96.87	96.74	14.86	100.13	64.65	126.69	89.15 to 103.50	50,828	49,173
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	37	93.25	96.87	96.74	14.86	100.13	64.65	126.69	89.15 to 103.50	50,828	49,173

25 Deuel
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 37	MEDIAN : 93	COV : 17.47	95% Median C.I. : 89.15 to 103.50
Total Sales Price : 1,883,624	WGT. MEAN : 97	STD : 16.92	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.03 to 103.46
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,880,624	MEAN : 97	Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.86	95% Mean C.I. : 91.42 to 102.32
Total Assessed Value : 1,819,387			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 50,828	COD : 14.86	MAX Sales Ratio : 126.69	
Avg. Assessed Value : 49,173	PRD : 100.13	MIN Sales Ratio : 64.65	

Printed:3/29/2012 3:03:30PM

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 \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	3	101.39	99.68	98.69	18.32	101.00	70.97	126.69	N/A	13,833	13,652	
Less Than 30,000	9	112.87	104.17	105.66	13.10	98.59	70.97	126.69	81.05 to 120.80	20,226	21,371	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	37	93.25	96.87	96.74	14.86	100.13	64.65	126.69	89.15 to 103.50	50,828	49,173	
Greater Than 14,999	34	93.11	96.62	96.70	14.19	99.92	64.65	123.41	87.08 to 107.26	54,092	52,307	
Greater Than 29,999	28	92.63	94.53	95.79	13.24	98.68	64.65	123.41	86.23 to 102.79	60,664	58,109	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	3	101.39	99.68	98.69	18.32	101.00	70.97	126.69	N/A	13,833	13,652	
15,000 TO 29,999	6	113.62	106.41	107.72	09.67	98.78	81.05	120.80	81.05 to 120.80	23,422	25,231	
30,000 TO 59,999	19	92.96	94.79	93.69	12.23	101.17	71.86	123.41	81.44 to 103.50	41,352	38,743	
60,000 TO 99,999	6	86.04	87.30	87.49	13.44	99.78	64.65	118.06	64.65 to 118.06	77,983	68,231	
100,000 TO 149,999	2	100.68	100.68	100.55	06.57	100.13	94.07	107.28	N/A	137,500	138,262	
150,000 TO 249,999	1	120.59	120.59	120.59	00.00	100.00	120.59	120.59	N/A	170,000	205,010	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	37	93.25	96.87	96.74	14.86	100.13	64.65	126.69	89.15 to 103.50	50,828	49,173	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

A. Residential Real Property

The residential sample for Deuel County contains 37 qualified improved sales and the market appears to be declining in this agricultural county. The majority of the residential base lies in the County Seat of Chappell where I-80 and Highway 30 serves as the main east and west corridors. In review of the 25 Chappell sales, they display statistics of a median of 94.07, weighted mean of 97.83 and mean of 97.77 and will be considered reliable for this measurement. All three are acceptable and represent the class of property in Deuel County. The qualitative statistics are; COD 17.64 and PRD 99.94.

When reviewing the 10 sales within Big Springs, valuation grouping 02, it would typically be difficult to consider the limited number of sales reliable for measuring this valuation grouping, although the 2012 assessment actions support the reliability of the qualitative statistics. The assessment actions taken by the assessor reports June of 2007 Marshall and Swift costing tables were updated to the residential properties within Big Springs. Each parcel within Big Springs was reviewed and inspected for accurate quality and conditions. From the local market countywide, depreciation tables were built using the effective age of the home. New values were implemented with the updates and changes resulted in some increases and also decreases. The current property record card data supports the actions taken by the proactive assessor.

The assessor is very thorough in documenting sales review data that is available from questionnaire forms. In some instances the assessor will follow up with additional requests from attorneys, real estate brokers, buyers and sellers. The assessor and staff continually strive for a large amount of review and inspection work to be completed in the county. This keeps the cycle of property reviews on an active rotation and completed schedule.

Based on all information available and the recent 2012 assessment actions of the assessor, the level of value of the residential property in Deuel County is 93% and it is believed the assessment actions are uniform and proportionate.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) 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 (2010), 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel 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 of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel 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 IAAO 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 on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

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. 239.

2012 Commercial Assessment Actions for Deuel County

No major changes were made to the assessments in the commercial property class after a complete Appraisal was implemented in 2011 through a contracted appraiser, Darrel Stanard.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Deuel County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Chappell has a larger commercial base with downtown retail businesses and a bowling alley
	02	Big Springs is a smaller community with a Flying J Truck Stop (formerly Bossleman's) in the annex along I-80. This market is weaker due to limited amenities.
	03	The rural area includes all commercial properties outside the Village of Big Springs and the City of Chappell. They are located in the rural locations.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Cost Approach, Sales Comparison and Income when available	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	Deuel County contracts with Stanard Appraisals for all of the commercial appraisals	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June 2007	
5.	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?	
	In 2011, the assessor used depreciation table developed by the contract appraiser.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Market or current sales data	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	Through the requirements of the building permits, physical inspection by the assessor's office and self-reported changes by the property owner.	

25 Deuel
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 8
Total Sales Price : 227,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 227,500
Total Assessed Value : 214,889
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 28,438
Avg. Assessed Value : 26,861

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 95
COD : 02.95
PRD : 100.93

COV : 04.10
STD : 03.91
Avg. Abs. Dev : 02.83
MAX Sales Ratio : 100.03
MIN Sales Ratio : 87.88

95% Median C.I. : 87.88 to 100.03
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.44 to 98.48
95% Mean C.I. : 92.07 to 98.61

Printed:3/29/2012 3:03:31PM

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-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	96.08	96.08	96.08	00.00	100.00	96.08	96.08	N/A	75,000	72,057
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	92.30	92.30	92.30	00.00	100.00	92.30	92.30	N/A	20,000	18,460
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	99.39	99.39	99.60	00.65	99.79	98.74	100.03	N/A	12,000	11,952
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	95.72	95.72	95.72	00.00	100.00	95.72	95.72	N/A	26,000	24,888
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	95.99	95.99	96.67	01.93	99.30	94.14	97.83	N/A	17,500	16,918
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	87.88	87.88	87.88	00.00	100.00	87.88	87.88	N/A	47,500	41,745
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	97.41	96.79	96.15	02.67	100.67	92.30	100.03	N/A	29,750	28,605
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	3	95.72	95.90	96.27	01.28	99.62	94.14	97.83	N/A	20,333	19,574
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	1	87.88	87.88	87.88	00.00	100.00	87.88	87.88	N/A	47,500	41,745
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	98.74	98.16	97.58	01.46	100.59	95.72	100.03	N/A	16,667	16,264
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	95.99	95.99	96.67	01.93	99.30	94.14	97.83	N/A	17,500	16,918
<u>ALL</u>	8	95.90	95.34	94.46	02.95	100.93	87.88	100.03	87.88 to 100.03	28,438	26,861

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	4	97.41	97.64	96.68	01.79	100.99	95.72	100.03	N/A	31,250	30,212
02	3	94.14	94.76	95.08	01.95	99.66	92.30	97.83	N/A	18,333	17,432
03	1	87.88	87.88	87.88	00.00	100.00	87.88	87.88	N/A	47,500	41,745
<u>ALL</u>	8	95.90	95.34	94.46	02.95	100.93	87.88	100.03	87.88 to 100.03	28,438	26,861

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	8	95.90	95.34	94.46	02.95	100.93	87.88	100.03	87.88 to 100.03	28,438	26,861
04											
<u>ALL</u>	8	95.90	95.34	94.46	02.95	100.93	87.88	100.03	87.88 to 100.03	28,438	26,861

25 Deuel
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 8
Total Sales Price : 227,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 227,500
Total Assessed Value : 214,889
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 28,438
Avg. Assessed Value : 26,861

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 94
MEAN : 95
COD : 02.95
PRD : 100.93

COV : 04.10
STD : 03.91
Avg. Abs. Dev : 02.88
MAX Sales Ratio : 100.03
MIN Sales Ratio : 87.88

95% Median C.I. : 87.88 to 100.03
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.44 to 98.48
95% Mean C.I. : 92.07 to 98.61

Printed:3/29/2012 3:03:31PM

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 \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	2	96.44	96.44	96.07	02.38	100.39	94.14	98.74	N/A	9,500	9,127	
Less Than 30,000	6	96.78	96.46	96.27	02.49	100.20	92.30	100.03	92.30 to 100.03	17,500	16,848	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	8	95.90	95.34	94.46	02.95	100.93	87.88	100.03	87.88 to 100.03	28,438	26,861	
Greater Than 14,999	6	95.90	94.97	94.31	03.14	100.70	87.88	100.03	87.88 to 100.03	34,750	32,773	
Greater Than 29,999	2	91.98	91.98	92.90	04.46	99.01	87.88	96.08	N/A	61,250	56,901	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	2	96.44	96.44	96.07	02.38	100.39	94.14	98.74	N/A	9,500	9,127	
15,000 TO 29,999	4	96.78	96.47	96.32	02.54	100.16	92.30	100.03	N/A	21,500	20,708	
30,000 TO 59,999	1	87.88	87.88	87.88	00.00	100.00	87.88	87.88	N/A	47,500	41,745	
60,000 TO 99,999	1	96.08	96.08	96.08	00.00	100.00	96.08	96.08	N/A	75,000	72,057	
100,000 TO 149,999												
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	8	95.90	95.34	94.46	02.95	100.93	87.88	100.03	87.88 to 100.03	28,438	26,861	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	7	96.08	96.41	96.19	02.14	100.23	92.30	100.03	92.30 to 100.03	25,714	24,735	
471	1	87.88	87.88	87.88	00.00	100.00	87.88	87.88	N/A	47,500	41,745	
<u>ALL</u>	8	95.90	95.34	94.46	02.95	100.93	87.88	100.03	87.88 to 100.03	28,438	26,861	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

A. Commercial Real Property

There were a total of eight improved commercial sales in the qualified statistics within the three year study period in Deuel County. Four of the improved sales were located in Chappell, three in Big Springs and one in the rural location. Although 50% of the sales were located in the largest location, the commercial value base contributes to only approximately 8% of the county total. The lack of sales for a number of years supports the inactive commercial market within the county. There has not been any reported growth activity in the commercial base for many years. The largest commercial property remains to be Bosselman's Truck Stop along I-80 in Chappell.

A review of the eight sales includes; one bowling alley, one beauty shop, one bar/tavern, one storage building, one office and machine shop, one jumble/thrift store, one utility building and one office building. These wide varieties of occupancy codes reflect the unorganized market in an agricultural based community.

The County had completed the physical review of all improvements in 2011 and revalued these through new costing and depreciation schedules with a licensed appraiser, Darrel Stanard. The assessor completes a sales review process on a monthly basis with questionnaires and telephone inquiries when needed to collect market information. The extremely low COD, 2.95 is not a measurement of the quality of assessment but may be an indication of the new appraisal implemented in 2011.

Due to the lack of any organized sales data and large variance of 8 improved sales, it is believed that the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial property class.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) 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 (2010), 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel 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 of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel 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 IAAO 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 on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

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. 239.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Deuel County

The Deuel County Assessor reviewed the most current market data for each subclass within the county and surrounding comparable areas. New 2012 agricultural values were set accordingly to meet acceptable market values.

Irrigated subclasses were increased 25%.

Dry land subclasses increased between 10% to 13% (\$35 to \$55 per acre.) Dry land subclasses represent 66% of the county.

Grass land values increased 2% to 4% (\$5 to \$10 per acre)

The county is in the process of fully implementing the GIS system through GIS Workshop. The soil layers are currently being processed for agricultural land.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Deuel County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	County Assessor and staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	One countywide market area; there are no identifiable differences.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	N/A	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	By the actual use of the parcel after inspection and review of all data inspection	
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	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	FSA Maps, inspection and GIS data	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Review work and the actual use of the property	
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	Through the questionnaire and inspection process; structural changes, land use change or reporting of personal property.	

25 Deuel
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 32
Total Sales Price : 4,230,385
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,192,001
Total Assessed Value : 2,993,012
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 131,000
Avg. Assessed Value : 93,532

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 71
MEAN : 74
COD : 18.46
PRD : 103.11

COV : 23.12
STD : 17.02
Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.88
MAX Sales Ratio : 115.78
MIN Sales Ratio : 43.78

95% Median C.I. : 64.08 to 81.01
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.06 to 77.73
95% Mean C.I. : 67.72 to 79.52

Printed:3/29/2012 3:03:32PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	5	69.56	80.62	66.53	32.68	121.18	43.78	115.78	N/A	169,766	112,938
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	64.75	65.88	65.85	02.41	100.05	64.08	69.96	N/A	106,229	69,948
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	75.48	72.66	70.40	09.39	103.21	58.04	81.64	N/A	115,918	81,606
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	83.97	83.60	79.71	12.59	104.88	64.44	102.00	N/A	214,500	170,978
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	78.33	77.92	75.18	13.70	103.64	61.63	93.81	N/A	119,715	89,998
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	8	64.30	69.60	70.63	15.43	98.54	49.03	104.31	49.03 to 104.31	115,767	81,766
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	81.01	81.01	81.01	00.00	100.00	81.01	81.01	N/A	140,000	113,410
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	81.39	81.39	81.39	00.00	100.00	81.39	81.39	N/A	9,000	7,325
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	55.54	55.54	57.51	07.42	96.57	51.42	59.66	N/A	81,150	46,670
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	9	66.17	74.07	66.30	21.13	111.72	43.78	115.78	64.08 to 107.83	141,527	93,831
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	11	78.33	78.07	76.17	12.80	102.49	58.04	102.00	61.63 to 93.81	152,802	116,394
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	12	64.30	69.19	70.16	16.94	98.62	49.03	104.31	59.66 to 81.01	103,120	72,350
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	71.53	74.05	73.87	13.57	100.24	58.04	102.00	64.44 to 81.64	145,549	107,511
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	12	67.43	72.63	72.79	17.48	99.78	49.03	104.31	62.73 to 81.01	118,774	86,461
<u>ALL</u>	32	69.76	73.62	71.40	18.46	103.11	43.78	115.78	64.08 to 81.01	131,000	93,532

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
1	32	69.76	73.62	71.40	18.46	103.11	43.78	115.78	64.08 to 81.01	131,000	93,532
<u>ALL</u>	32	69.76	73.62	71.40	18.46	103.11	43.78	115.78	64.08 to 81.01	131,000	93,532

25 Deuel
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 32
Total Sales Price : 4,230,385
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,192,001
Total Assessed Value : 2,993,012
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 131,000
Avg. Assessed Value : 93,532

MEDIAN : 70
WGT. MEAN : 71
MEAN : 74
COD : 18.46
PRD : 103.11

COV : 23.12
STD : 17.02
Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.88
MAX Sales Ratio : 115.78
MIN Sales Ratio : 43.78

95% Median C.I. : 64.08 to 81.01
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.06 to 77.73
95% Mean C.I. : 67.72 to 79.52

Printed:3/29/2012 3:03:32PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	3	58.04	60.05	55.37	19.85	108.45	43.78	78.33	N/A	192,439	106,558
1	3	58.04	60.05	55.37	19.85	108.45	43.78	78.33	N/A	192,439	106,558
_____Dry_____											
County	22	69.86	77.36	75.00	18.64	103.15	59.66	115.78	64.44 to 86.33	125,245	93,934
1	22	69.86	77.36	75.00	18.64	103.15	59.66	115.78	64.44 to 86.33	125,245	93,934
_____Grass_____											
County	5	69.96	68.70	72.32	13.56	94.99	51.42	81.61	N/A	120,846	87,395
1	5	69.96	68.70	72.32	13.56	94.99	51.42	81.61	N/A	120,846	87,395
_____ALL_____	32	69.76	73.62	71.40	18.46	103.11	43.78	115.78	64.08 to 81.01	131,000	93,532

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	3	58.04	60.05	55.37	19.85	108.45	43.78	78.33	N/A	192,439	106,558
1	3	58.04	60.05	55.37	19.85	108.45	43.78	78.33	N/A	192,439	106,558
_____Dry_____											
County	22	69.86	77.36	75.00	18.64	103.15	59.66	115.78	64.44 to 86.33	125,245	93,934
1	22	69.86	77.36	75.00	18.64	103.15	59.66	115.78	64.44 to 86.33	125,245	93,934
_____Grass_____											
County	5	69.96	68.70	72.32	13.56	94.99	51.42	81.61	N/A	120,846	87,395
1	5	69.96	68.70	72.32	13.56	94.99	51.42	81.61	N/A	120,846	87,395
_____ALL_____	32	69.76	73.62	71.40	18.46	103.11	43.78	115.78	64.08 to 81.01	131,000	93,532

Deuel County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
25.10	Deuel	1	#DIV/0!	855	850	845	730	670	590	500	811
35.10	Garden	1	#DIV/0!	975	850	750	650	650	650	650	702
51.20	Keith	2	#DIV/0!	930	#DIV/0!	890	855	855	825	825	887
51.30	Keith	3	1,785	1,785	1,700	1,700	1,645	1,645	1,585	1,585	1,730
17.20	Cheyenne	2	#DIV/0!	1,135	1,118	1,091	1,028	987	970	910	1,096
17.30	Cheyenne	3	#DIV/0!	1,250	1,225	1,190	1,055	1,040	1,000	975	1,213

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Deuel	1	#DIV/0!	475	375	375	375	300	300	300	442
	Garden	1	#DIV/0!	505	445	400	400	400	400	400	466
	Keith	2	#DIV/0!	550	550	539	485	488	446	445	535
	Keith	3	1,317	578	609	579	486	583	446	516	562
	Cheyenne	2	#DIV/0!	410	400	395	375	370	270	265	392
	Cheyenne	3	#DIV/0!	395	385	385	370	350	340	320	387

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Deuel	1	#DIV/0!	235	237	235	230	229	230	230	232
	Garden	1	#DIV/0!	297	250	249	243	249	233	230	232
	Keith	2	#DIV/0!	367	344	386	331	334	312	306	314
	Keith	3	424	379	358	366	345	333	316	308	332
	Cheyenne	2	#DIV/0!	276	273	243	246	231	236	205	233
	Cheyenne	3	#DIV/0!	337	374	332	341	299	299	179	283

*Land capability grouping averages calculated using data reported on the 2012 Form 45, Abstract of Assessment

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

A. Agricultural Land

Deuel County is located in the southeast corner of the Panhandle and is mainly an agricultural based county. Nearly 60% of the total value of all real property in Deuel County is attributed to the agricultural land. The assessor uses every available sale for the process of setting land values each year. The county completes sales reviews, physical inspections and personal contacts with the real estate agents to ensure the transactions are arm's length.

The first analysis included 31 minimally improved agricultural sales within Deuel County. These were reviewed and the assessor has properly identified arm's length sales for the base sample. In reviewing the 31 sales, they were distributed by 8 in the oldest study year, 11 in the middle and 12 in the newest year. It is weighted by newer sales. When the sample is reviewed for the majority land use in the population and in the sales file; there is a close representation of irrigated, dry and grass uses. The makeup of the county is primarily dry; 66% and the beginning sample is also 66%. Only three percent is the difference in the irrigated and grass subclasses. The majority land use is acceptable for determination of the level of value although the lack of older sales may be skewing the overall statistical measures and further testing is required for reliability of the sampling.

Secondly, comparable areas with similar market characteristics were reviewed for this analysis. Garden, Cheyenne, Keith counties. One sale was chosen at random to use with the Deuel County sales within the oldest study year. A Garden County dry land sale was added in the analysis to balance the time skew between the three years. This sample produced a reliable set of statistics for the determination of the level of value and quality of assessments in Deuel County.

The assessment actions for agricultural property included increased values set by the assessor in 2012. Historically, the county has not increased irrigated values due to the lack of market data. The recent increasing agricultural land market has no signs of movement difference between the dry and irrigated farmland prices. The Deuel County Assessor took actions to increase the irrigated land capability groups by 25%, dry categories by an average of 13% and grass increased 2-4%. This brought the values within similar movements of adjoining neighboring counties that share comparable market characteristics.

The final sampling of 32 qualified agricultural sales is determined to be reliable and proportionate by the majority land uses and also the time distribution. Based on the representative statistical measures and the 2012 assessment actions taken by the assessor it is determined the level of value for agricultural land in Deuel County is 70. Both qualitative measures; COD- 18.46 and the PRD- 103.11 are the calculated representation of the uniform and proportionate assessments in Deuel County.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) 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 (2010), 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (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.

2012 Correlation Section for Deuel 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 of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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.

2012 Correlation Section for Deuel 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 IAAO 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 on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Deuel County**

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. 239.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 2,314	Value : 189,724,773	Growth 563,036	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	48	87,651	0	0	3	16,050	51	103,701	
02. Res Improve Land	657	2,479,250	0	0	78	930,374	735	3,409,624	
03. Res Improvements	665	27,718,316	0	0	92	4,212,842	757	31,931,158	
04. Res Total	713	30,285,217	0	0	95	5,159,266	808	35,444,483	163,901
% of Res Total	88.24	85.44	0.00	0.00	11.76	14.56	34.92	18.68	29.11
05. Com UnImp Land	7	33,504	0	0	5	45,695	12	79,199	
06. Com Improve Land	101	917,444	0	0	24	402,390	125	1,319,834	
07. Com Improvements	108	15,185,667	0	0	27	3,604,268	135	18,789,935	
08. Com Total	115	16,136,615	0	0	32	4,052,353	147	20,188,968	0
% of Com Total	78.23	79.93	0.00	0.00	21.77	20.07	6.35	10.64	0.00
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	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	713	30,285,217	0	0	95	5,159,266	808	35,444,483	163,901
% of Res & Rec Total	88.24	85.44	0.00	0.00	11.76	14.56	34.92	18.68	29.11
Com & Ind Total	115	16,136,615	0	0	32	4,052,353	147	20,188,968	0
% of Com & Ind Total	78.23	79.93	0.00	0.00	21.77	20.07	6.35	10.64	0.00
17. Taxable Total	828	46,421,832	0	0	127	9,211,619	955	55,633,451	163,901
% of Taxable Total	86.70	83.44	0.00	0.00	13.30	16.56	41.27	29.32	29.11

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	75	3,815,920	75	3,815,920	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	75	3,815,920	75	3,815,920	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	71	0	41	112

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	1,690	0	0	921	81,850,505	922	81,852,195
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	359	32,497,715	359	32,497,715
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	362	15,925,492	362	15,925,492
30. Ag Total							1,284	130,275,402

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	7	12.62	65,425	7	12.62	65,425	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	221	257.49	2,078,775	221	257.49	2,078,775	
33. HomeSite Improvements	226	0.00	10,492,522	226	0.00	10,492,522	0
34. HomeSite Total				233	270.11	12,636,722	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	16	21.92	27,250	16	21.92	27,250	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	126	123.60	308,800	126	123.60	308,800	
37. FarmSite Improvements	342	0.00	5,432,970	342	0.00	5,432,970	399,135
38. FarmSite Total				358	145.52	5,769,020	
39. Road & Ditches	987	3,717.64	0	987	3,717.64	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	3	10.49	30,485	3	10.49	30,485	
41. Total Section VI				591	4,143.76	18,436,227	399,135

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	10,031.81	48.49%	8,577,210	51.15%	855.00
47. 2A1	1,669.98	8.07%	1,419,485	8.46%	850.00
48. 2A	5,499.02	26.58%	4,646,680	27.71%	845.00
49. 3A1	898.55	4.34%	655,940	3.91%	730.00
50. 3A	322.50	1.56%	216,075	1.29%	670.00
51. 4A1	1,344.76	6.50%	793,410	4.73%	590.00
52. 4A	921.50	4.45%	460,750	2.75%	500.00
53. Total	20,688.12	100.00%	16,769,550	100.00%	810.59
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	131,030.90	73.60%	62,239,745	79.12%	475.00
56. 2D1	4,082.42	2.29%	1,530,920	1.95%	375.00
57. 2D	12,077.60	6.78%	4,529,130	5.76%	375.00
58. 3D1	14,822.66	8.33%	5,558,520	7.07%	375.00
59. 3D	933.45	0.52%	280,035	0.36%	300.00
60. 4D1	11,498.84	6.46%	3,449,655	4.39%	300.00
61. 4D	3,594.70	2.02%	1,078,415	1.37%	300.00
62. Total	178,040.57	100.00%	78,666,420	100.00%	441.85
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	9,406.40	13.28%	2,214,440	13.50%	235.42
65. 2G1	1,567.15	2.21%	371,600	2.27%	237.12
66. 2G	9,873.64	13.94%	2,325,230	14.18%	235.50
67. 3G1	2,891.19	4.08%	664,900	4.05%	229.97
68. 3G	1,186.91	1.68%	272,145	1.66%	229.29
69. 4G1	21,105.51	29.79%	4,851,950	29.58%	229.89
70. 4G	24,806.69	35.02%	5,700,735	34.76%	229.81
71. Total	70,837.49	100.00%	16,401,000	100.00%	231.53
Irrigated Total					
	20,688.12	7.67%	16,769,550	14.99%	810.59
Dry Total					
	178,040.57	65.99%	78,666,420	70.34%	441.85
Grass Total					
	70,837.49	26.26%	16,401,000	14.66%	231.53
72. Waste	220.52	0.08%	2,205	0.00%	10.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	269,786.70	100.00%	111,839,175	100.00%	414.55

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	2.00	1,690	0.00	0	20,686.12	16,767,860	20,688.12	16,769,550
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	178,040.57	78,666,420	178,040.57	78,666,420
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	70,837.49	16,401,000	70,837.49	16,401,000
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	220.52	2,205	220.52	2,205
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	2.00	1,690	0.00	0	269,784.70	111,837,485	269,786.70	111,839,175

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	20,688.12	7.67%	16,769,550	14.99%	810.59
Dry Land	178,040.57	65.99%	78,666,420	70.34%	441.85
Grass	70,837.49	26.26%	16,401,000	14.66%	231.53
Waste	220.52	0.08%	2,205	0.00%	10.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	269,786.70	100.00%	111,839,175	100.00%	414.55

2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2011 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

25 Deuel

	2011 CTL County Total	2012 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2012 form 45 - 2011 CTL)	Percent Change	2012 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	35,251,448	35,444,483	193,035	0.55%	163,901	0.08%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	12,494,202	12,636,722	142,520	1.14%	0	1.14%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	47,745,650	48,081,205	335,555	0.70%	163,901	0.36%
05. Commercial	20,234,005	20,188,968	-45,037	-0.22%	0	-0.22%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	5,531,223	5,769,020	237,797	4.30%	399,135	-2.92%
08. Minerals	3,655,290	3,815,920	160,630	4.39	0	4.39
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	29,420,518	29,773,908	353,390	1.20%	399,135	-0.16%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	77,166,168	77,885,598	719,430	0.93%	563,036	0.20%
11. Irrigated	13,419,430	16,769,550	3,350,120	24.96%		
12. Dryland	69,865,300	78,666,420	8,801,120	12.60%		
13. Grassland	15,993,245	16,401,000	407,755	2.55%		
14. Wasteland	2,205	2,205	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	23,000	0	-23,000	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	99,303,180	111,839,175	12,535,995	12.62%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	176,469,348	189,724,773	13,255,425	7.51%	563,036	7.19%

2011 Plan of Assessment for Deuel County Assessor's Office
Assessment Years 2012, 2013 and 2014
Dated: October 15, 2011

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the "plan"), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the County Board of Equalization and the Assessor may amend the plan, if necessary after the budget is approved by the County Board. A copy of the plan and any amendments 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 the Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as "the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade." Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-112 (Reissue 2003)

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 92-100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 68-75% of actual value for agricultural and horticultural land; and
- 3) 68-75% of actual value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 750% of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when special valuation is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

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

General Description of Real Property in Deuel County:

Per the 2011 County Abstract, Deuel County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	808	34.70%	19.95%
Commercial	149	6.40%	11.48%
Mineral	74	3.18%	2.07%
Agricultural	1297	55.72%	66.50%
Total	2328	100.00%	100.00%

Agricultural land taxable acres – 269,777.78

New property: For assessment year 2011, 370 building permits and/or information statements were file for new property construction/additions in the county. The total growth was \$777,295.

Current Resources:

- A) The Deuel County Assessor’s office has a staff of 3 that includes Assessor Jean Timm, Deputy Marjorie Radke and Clerk Marica Schievelbein. This office has an adopted budget for 2011-2012 of \$106,335. The cost for required training for the assessor and deputy has been incorporated into the budget. The assessor and the deputy have sufficient hours to date to meet the 60-hour requirement.
- B) The cadastral map was redone in 1997 and is updated monthly by the staff. All rural improved records contain an aerial photo taken in 1987. It is unknown what year the overlays were created.
- C) We have signed a contract with GIS Workshop and are working to verify the information in the cadastral books. We plan to have the GIS program in operation by July 1, 2012.
- D) We converted to the new MIPS PC-ADMIN program in September 2012.
- E) The property record cards are current and exceed the standards set by the department. Each record contains all required information, an index, current valuation sheet, CAMA worksheet and sketch and color photos of improvements.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

- A) The Assessor processes the Real Estate Transfers. The clerk assists with updating the records and is responsible for maintaining the Sales Reference Book and the Land Sales Map. These steps are followed:
 - 1) Fill out Sales Worksheets, using the “Real Estate – Form 521 Electronic tab on PC-Admin.
 - 2) Save updates to Sales file and Property Record.

- 3) File copy of 521, worksheet and updated breakdown with photo in the appropriate section of sales file book
 - 4) Send out questionnaire, add returned questionnaires to Sales File
 - 5) Add the sale to the sales spreadsheet to update projected sales ratios
 - 6) File update property breakdown sheet in record card.
 - 7) Update rolodex
 - 8) Update record label
 - 9) Update the Ag Sales Map
 - 10) Update the Cadastral Map
 - 11) Update GIS, if necessary
 - 12) Mail 521's to PAT by the 15th of the following month
- B) Data collection is completed by the Deputy and clerk. Improvements are priced by the Deputy using the current CAMA program (Cost Approach). We are currently using a 2007 pricing table.
 - C) The Assessor reviews the sales ratios to determine if any assessment action is needed.
 - D) The Assessor reviews assessment/sale ratios with the liaison after assessment actions are completed and discusses areas of concern.
 - E) The Assessor is responsible for Public Notices and maintains a file of all publications.

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

1. The Assessor makes all ownership changes. Record maintenance and mapping updates are the responsibility of the entire staff.
2. The Assessor is responsible for the filing of all Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real and Personal)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters and annual Assessed Value Update with the 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 all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - i. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property - The entire staff administers the annual filings of schedules. The assessor and the deputy prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions – The assessor administers the annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, reviews and makes recommendations to the county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property – the annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose and the sending of notices of intent to tax is the responsibility of the assessor.

6. Homestead Exemptions – The entire staff assists the taxpayer with the annual filings of application. The assessor approves or denies each application based on the value of the property and sends out taxpayer notifications.
7. Centrally Assessed – The assessor reviews the valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establishes assessment records and tax billing for the tax list.
8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – The assessor prepares the tax lists and certifies it to the County Treasurer for real property, personal property and centrally assessed property.
9. Tax List Corrections - The assessor prepares and presents the tax list correction documents for county board approval and delivers the corrections to the Treasurer.
10. County Board of Equalizations – The assessor provides information regarding protest and attends the county board of equalization meetings for these protests.
11. TERC Appeals – The assessor prepares information and attends taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC. It is the assessor’s duty to defend the valuation established by the assessor’s office.
12. Education – The Assessor and the Deputy Assessor will attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain the required 60 hours of continuing education to maintain their assessor certification.

Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2011:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	95%	12.74	100.34
Commercial	97%	5.54	99.80
Agricultural	73%	18.14	102.76

Assessment Action Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

Residential:

We will continue to monitor Residential properties for changes and sales.

We will complete the reappraisal of all rural residences and agricultural improvements and are using a spreadsheet created by the Deputy to assure uniformity in the assessment of all improvements.

Commercial and Agricultural Land:

We will continue to monitor Commercial/Agricultural land sales.

Action Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Residential:

We will continue to monitor Residential properties for changes and sales.

We are using a spreadsheet created by the Deputy to assure uniformity in the assessment of all rural improvements. Valuations of all rural properties will be updated by March 19, 2013.

Commercial and Agricultural Land:

We will continue to monitor Commercial/Agricultural land sales. We will be working with GIS Workshop to complete the mapping and implementation of the program.

We plan to have the county website (Nebraska Taxes Online) completed and accessible to the public by December 31, 2013.

Action Planned for Assessment Year 2014:

Residential:

We will continue to monitor Residential properties for changes and sales. 2014 is the beginning of the 2nd cycle of the 6-year property review. Valuations of all properties reviewed by December 31, 2013 will be updated by March 19, 2014.

Commercial and Agricultural Land:

We will continue to monitor Commercial/Agricultural land sales.

Respectfully submitted,
Jean M. Timm, Deuel County Assessor
Dated: 10-15-2011

Signed and submitted to:
Deuel County Board of Equalization

2012 Assessment Survey for Deuel 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:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$111,000
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$106,335
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$9,035
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	0
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$8,500
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,750
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$3,150
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$1,638

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS (PC Admin)
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor & staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	The county is in the process of implementing a new GIS system. Deuel County is

	creating complete records for each parcel.
6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	No
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop/County Assessor & staff
8.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS (PC Admin)

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Big Springs & Chappell
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	The County and Big Springs were zoned in 1975 and Chappell in 2002

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Pritchard & Abbott is contracted for the Mineral Appraisal Valuations
2.	Other services:
	MIPS & GIS Workshop

2012 Certification for Deuel County

This is to certify that the 2012 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 Deuel County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

