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 Fillmore County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	130	Median	98.15
Total Sales Price	$7,550,150	Mean	109.32
Total Adj. Sales Price	$7,550,150	Wgt. Mean	97.94
Total Assessed Value	$7,394,545	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$56,542
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$58,078	Avg. Assessed Value	$56,881

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.42 to 98.80
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	95.04 to 100.84
95% Mean C.I	101.05 to 117.59
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	11.43
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.09
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.12

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	156	99	99
2010	164	99	99
2009	185	99	99
2008	199	99	99

2012 Commission Summary

for Fillmore County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	22	Median	98.05
Total Sales Price	$1,332,000	Mean	107.50
Total Adj. Sales Price	$1,326,500	Wgt. Mean	89.63
Total Assessed Value	$1,188,960	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$97,802
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$60,295	Avg. Assessed Value	$54,044

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	62.44 to 114.90
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	78.24 to 101.02
95% Mean C.I	78.06 to 136.94
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.21
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.05
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.24

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	19		100
2010	23	99	99
2009	28	99	99
2008	35	98	98

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Fillmore 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	**98**	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	***NEI**	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	**72**	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
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Fillmore County

For 2012, Fillmore County reports that they will complete all residential pickup work.

They have verified, reviewed and analyzed the residential sales throughout the county. The verification is done over the phone, followed by a drive-by inspection.

For 2012, Fillmore County inspected all rural residential Parcels, all agricultural residences and outbuildings across the entire county. Included in this inspection process was; the review of all non-residential sites and vacated sites to record the current condition of all buildings and the addition of new buildings as well as the removal of non-usable buildings. New photos were taken of the buildings and residences that were inspected. The inspection process was conducted on-site. The appraiser went to the door of each residence to contact the owner. The site was walked to inspect all buildings. Any updates to measurements or condition observations were documented. New record cards were prepared for each parcel.

Fillmore County reports that the first 6 year inspection and review of residential property has been completed during 2011 for use in 2012.

The next 6 year cycle will begin in 2012 as part of the 2013 assessment actions.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Fillmore County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Assessor and Contract Appraiser
2.	**In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
01	Geneva: (Including: Sub Geneva; Rural Geneva) Unique characteristics include: The primary host location for the K-12 school district (Fillmore Central) with part of the system in Fairmont; an active downtown commercial business district; a fairly broad selection of employment in the retail and service sectors; an organized residential market; the only hospital in the county.
02	Exeter: Unique characteristics include: A shared K-12 school district (Exeter Milligan) with parts of the system in both Exeter, and Milligan; a moderately active downtown commercial business district; a fairly limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
03	Fairmont: Unique characteristics include: A K-12 school district (Fillmore Central) with most of the system in Geneva and part in Fairmont; Little to no business district or available services;; a very limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
04	Grafton: Unique characteristics include: No school; minimal business district or available services.
05	Milligan: Unique characteristics include: A shared K-12 school district (Exeter Milligan) with parts of the system in both Exeter, and Milligan; minimal business district or available services.
06	Ohiowa: (Including: Sub Ohiowa) Unique characteristics include: Little to no business district or available services; no school, students from Ohiowa attend Fillmore Central, Meridian or Bruning Davenport.
07	Shickley: (Including: Sub Shickley) Unique characteristics include: A K-12 school district (Shickley) but affiliate with Bruning Davenport for sports activities; a moderately active downtown commercial business district; a fairly limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
08	Strang: Unique characteristics include: Little to no business district or available services; no school, students attend either Fillmore Central or Bruning Davenport.

	09	Rural: (Including: Rural Res) There are few unique characteristics common to all parcels in this valuation group. The parcels are located in the non-urban areas throughout the county.
3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.**	
	The cost and sales comparison approaches; both are rooted in the analysis of the local market.	
4	**What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?**	
	2008	
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 vendor provided depreciation tables in conjunction with the quality and condition observations made during the inspection and review process. Then, the local market is analyzed to develop a locational depreciation factor for each valuation group.	
6.	**Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?**	
	Yes; each valuation group is reviewed separately and the locational factors are developed independently for each valuation group.	
7.	**When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?**	
	Depreciation is developed when a class of property is reviewed and new cost tables are implemented.	
8.	**When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?**	
	1993 for all residential property. During the next inspection and review cycle, land values will be analyzed, and affirmed or updated as the inspection process is done.	
9.	**Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?**	
	Sales Comparison (by square foot)	
10.	**How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?**	
	Following are some of the circumstances that are considered: -The construction of a new structure on a previously vacant or minimally improved lot. -A major addition or alteration to the structure, usually results in a change in square footage. -A dramatic increase in the depreciation, usually due to something like fire damage, vandalism or demolition of a structure. -Extensive rehabilitation and remodeling (change to the interior finish, mechanical systems or fixtures) of an existing structure causing a significant reduction of depreciation.	

30 Fillmore

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 :	130	MEDIAN :	98	COV :	43.98	95% Median C.I. :	97.42 to 98.80
Total Sales Price :	7,550,150	WGT. MEAN :	98	STD :	48.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	95.04 to 100.84
Total Adj. Sales Price :	7,550,150	MEAN :	109	Avg. Abs. Dev :	21.12	95% Mean C.I. :	101.05 to 117.59
Total Assessed Value :	7,394,545						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	58,078	COD :	21.52	MAX Sales Ratio :	448.75		
Avg. Assessed Value :	56,881	PRD :	111.62	MIN Sales Ratio :	59.07	*Printed:3/29/2012 3:05:36PM*	

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	24	98.51	111.10	103.92	13.94	106.91	94.73	264.59	97.86 to 100.30	57,192	59,433
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	16	98.63	99.66	98.73	02.65	100.94	94.73	114.00	96.98 to 100.94	60,719	59,947
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	13	98.30	107.42	101.22	17.42	106.13	59.07	189.59	94.22 to 113.48	43,458	43,986
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	19	93.17	89.71	91.70	12.11	97.83	63.20	118.22	77.50 to 100.04	73,947	67,809
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	21	96.44	123.26	95.95	38.73	128.46	74.30	448.75	90.22 to 135.33	52,914	50,770
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	14	96.49	132.14	101.34	46.59	130.39	76.35	308.88	86.12 to 233.87	49,036	49,692
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	9	99.32	116.86	97.16	34.54	120.28	65.64	210.60	67.43 to 172.96	72,444	70,384
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	14	91.88	97.10	95.82	14.65	101.34	77.77	122.88	78.29 to 119.19	56,171	53,822
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	72	98.29	102.25	98.42	11.57	103.89	59.07	264.59	97.86 to 99.45	59,917	58,968
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	58	96.74	118.09	97.30	34.30	121.37	65.64	448.75	91.43 to 101.41	55,795	54,290
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	67	97.38	112.53	96.14	28.55	117.05	59.07	448.75	93.17 to 99.61	56,234	54,060
_____ALL_____	130	98.15	109.32	97.94	21.52	111.62	59.07	448.75	97.42 to 98.80	58,078	56,881

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	62	97.46	110.54	96.57	24.95	114.47	65.64	308.88	93.84 to 98.78	67,863	65,535
02	12	99.49	103.47	103.46	15.12	100.01	67.85	153.90	90.77 to 119.19	48,867	50,560
03	18	98.26	110.22	99.96	18.63	110.26	70.08	189.59	94.73 to 115.44	41,111	41,097
04	7	97.93	159.16	116.51	64.24	136.61	94.73	448.75	94.73 to 448.75	14,607	17,019
05	6	99.33	104.01	94.20	17.43	110.41	63.20	135.33	63.20 to 135.33	33,583	31,636
06	7	98.76	93.67	91.22	07.09	102.69	59.07	102.40	59.07 to 102.40	15,871	14,479
07	10	92.19	93.13	90.95	09.72	102.40	76.35	114.00	77.77 to 107.49	44,950	40,880
09	8	99.06	100.92	101.21	02.70	99.71	97.86	113.72	97.86 to 113.72	143,988	145,724
_____ALL_____	130	98.15	109.32	97.94	21.52	111.62	59.07	448.75	97.42 to 98.80	58,078	56,881

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	129	98.09	109.28	97.93	21.57	111.59	59.07	448.75	97.38 to 98.80	58,509	57,300
06											
07	1	114.00	114.00	114.00	00.00	100.00	114.00	114.00	N/A	2,500	2,850
_____ALL_____	130	98.15	109.32	97.94	21.52	111.62	59.07	448.75	97.42 to 98.80	58,078	56,881

30 Fillmore

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 :	130	MEDIAN :	98	COV :	43.98	95% Median C.I. :	97.42 to 98.80
Total Sales Price :	7,550,150	WGT. MEAN :	98	STD :	48.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	95.04 to 100.84
Total Adj. Sales Price :	7,550,150	MEAN :	109	Avg. Abs. Dev :	21.12	95% Mean C.I. :	101.05 to 117.59
Total Assessed Value :	7,394,545						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	58,078	COD :	21.52	MAX Sales Ratio :	448.75		
Avg. Assessed Value :	56,881	PRD :	111.62	MIN Sales Ratio :	59.07		*Printed:3/29/2012 3:05:36PM*

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Low $ Ranges_____											
Less Than 5,000	7	128.13	194.75	203.18	63.05	95.85	97.93	448.75	97.93 to 448.75	3,236	6,574
Less Than 15,000	22	125.51	152.45	144.88	45.33	105.23	67.85	448.75	97.93 to 172.96	7,666	11,106
Less Than 30,000	55	99.47	127.32	115.01	38.76	110.70	59.07	448.75	97.93 to 115.44	15,859	18,240
__Ranges Excl. Low $__											
Greater Than 4,999	123	97.97	104.45	97.62	17.17	107.00	59.07	272.88	96.98 to 98.76	61,199	59,744
Greater Than 14,999	108	97.91	100.53	96.87	13.27	103.78	59.07	272.88	96.78 to 98.48	68,347	66,206
Greater Than 29,999	75	97.86	96.12	95.71	08.36	100.43	63.20	157.41	96.12 to 98.25	89,039	85,218
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999	7	128.13	194.75	203.18	63.05	95.85	97.93	448.75	97.93 to 448.75	3,236	6,574
5,000 TO 14,999	15	101.10	132.71	135.84	43.46	97.70	67.85	233.87	95.78 to 172.96	9,733	13,221
15,000 TO 29,999	33	98.76	110.56	107.85	24.12	102.51	59.07	272.88	94.73 to 100.71	21,321	22,995
30,000 TO 59,999	25	96.65	97.62	97.67	11.21	99.95	74.35	157.41	90.77 to 97.94	45,724	44,658
60,000 TO 99,999	28	98.26	96.89	97.05	06.34	99.84	63.20	119.19	97.04 to 100.30	75,046	72,836
100,000 TO 149,999	9	93.84	88.87	88.92	09.18	99.94	67.43	99.32	74.30 to 98.31	125,000	111,150
150,000 TO 249,999	12	98.16	96.34	96.47	06.49	99.87	77.50	113.72	92.03 to 101.18	169,875	163,875
250,000 TO 499,999	1	99.50	99.50	99.50	00.00	100.00	99.50	99.50	N/A	270,000	268,655
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
_____ALL_____	130	98.15	109.32	97.94	21.52	111.62	59.07	448.75	97.42 to 98.80	58,078	56,881

A. Residential Real Property

Fillmore County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. Geneva is the largest town and the county seat. Most of the residential properties in the county are in the towns and villages but there are some houses on acreages and houses on agricultural parcels. Fillmore County is bordered on the north by York County, on the south by Thayer County, on the east by Saline County and on the west by Clay County. The county has divided the residential analysis and valuation work into 9 Valuation Groupings, 8 Valuation Groupings are represented in the 2012 statistics. Most of the groups are centered on individual towns plus one for rural residential parcels. In the Residential Survey and Residential Assessment Actions section of the R&O, the characteristics of the Valuation Groupings and the assessment process are described in detail. The county believes that each grouping is unique with differing combinations of population, schools, available commercial services, healthcare services and employment outside the agricultural sector. During the past few years there have been no significant economic events that have impacted the value of residential property. Some locations have shown some positive residential growth and some have been stable or declining. In all, the residential class is stable.

The key statistics considered for measurement are as follows: there are 130 qualified sales; the median ratio is 98%; the weighted mean ratio is 98%; the mean ratio is 109%; the COD is 21.52; the PRD is 111.62 and the 95% median confidence interval is 97.42 to 98.80. The analysis of the assessment process in the county goes beyond the statistics that are produced from the sales that have occurred in the current study period. The actions taken during the assessment process are of considerable importance when determining the quality of assessment. The assessor annually reports their assessment intentions in their 3 Year Plan; they verify their accomplishments during the interview for the Assessment Actions section of the R&O; and explain many of the other details and valuation procedures or policies during the preparation of the Survey. The discussion of their 6 Year Inspection process further reveals steps in any inspection, review or revaluation process and supports the thoroughness and the consistency of their actions.

The Department does not depend solely on the assessment statistics to evaluate equalization in the county. The best basis to evaluate intra-county equalization is to determine that the valuation process is current, accurate, and applied consistently. The assessment actions narratives prepared this year and in prior years describe a process that likely to produce equalized results.

The Department believes that the quality of assessment of residential property in the county is good. There are numerous reasons, but the most relevant are the Departments ongoing interaction with the assessor, and the annual reporting of their actions with regard to residential property. The county has built thorough, high quality and current records by the regular inspection of all parcels. While perfect valuation of residential property is unlikely, the county has done a consistent and uniform job of valuation. They verify all sales, are in regular contact with many property owners and apply their valuation processes even handedly. The costs used are universal across the county and the land values and depreciation are consistent within each valuation group. During 2011, the Department conducted a review of the values sent into the sales file using the 2011 AVU. This process was done to make sure that the data that had been used for the measurement process was in fact the 2011 assessed

values of the parcels in the sales file. This test of the assessment practices demonstrated no irregularities. Those practices are expected to continue for 2012.

The Department is confident that Fillmore County has conducted a high quality assessment process for residential property. They are thorough and timely in their work, and consistent in the application of the results of the analysis variables that they work with. The Department is confident that the current R&O Statistics are meaningful to measure the entire class partly because the sample is adequate and partly because the assessment actions are good. The measurement of any subclass of residential property is considered less reliable in most cases. For 2012, the median ratio is 98% for the residential property. The median confidence interval indicates a level of value within the range of 92 to 100% even though the PRD and COD are not within the desired ranges. The quality statistics are strongly impacted by the low dollar sales in Fillmore County. There are 55 sales with a price below $30,000 in this sample. A review of the Sales Price stratification in the R&O Statistics indicates that as low dollar sales are removed, the statistics improve. The 123 sales above $4,999 show a dramatically improved COD and PRD; the 108 sales above $15,000 show a good COD and a slightly high PRD. The 75 sales above $30,000 have very good quality statistics. Considering all of the factors, the level of value is 98%. There are no recommendations for the adjustment of the class or for any subclasses of the residential class. The quality of assessment based on the assessment actions of the assessor for the residential class is acceptable.

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.

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.

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

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 Fillmore County

For 2011, Fillmore County reports that they will complete all commercial pickup work.

They have verified, reviewed and analyzed the commercial sales throughout the county.

Since the inspection and update of all commercial was conducted during 2009 and 2010, the county did not schedule or undertake any additional inspections for 2012.

Fillmore County reports that the first 6 year inspection and review of commercial property was completed prior to 2011 and has been in use since then. They are now preparing for the next 6 year inspection process.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Fillmore County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Contract Appraiser
2.	**In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
01	Geneva: (Including: Sub Geneva; Rural Geneva) Unique characteristics include: The primary host location for the K-12 school district (Fillmore Central) with part of the system in Fairmont; an active downtown commercial business district; a fairly broad selection of employment in the retail and service sectors; an organized residential market; the only hospital in the county.
02	Exeter: Unique characteristics include: A shared K-12 school district (Exeter Milligan) with parts of the system in both Exeter, and Milligan; a moderately active downtown commercial business district; a fairly limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
03	Fairmont: Unique characteristics include: A K-12 school district (Fillmore Central) with most of the system in Geneva and part in Fairmont; Little to no business district or available services;; a very limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
04	Grafton: Unique characteristics include: No school; minimal business district or available services.
05	Milligan: Unique characteristics include: A shared K-12 school district (Exeter Milligan) with parts of the system in both Exeter, and Milligan; minimal business district or available services.
06	Ohiowa: (Including: Sub Ohiowa) Unique characteristics include: Little to no business district or available services; no school, students attend either Fillmore Central, Meridian or Bruning Davenport.
07	Shickley: (Including: Sub Shickley) Unique characteristics include: A K-12 school district (Shickley) but affiliate with Bruning Davenport for sports activities; a moderately active downtown commercial business district; a fairly limited selection of employment in the retail and service sectors.
08	Strang: Unique characteristics include: Little to no business district or available services; no school, students attend either Fillmore Central or Bruning Davenport.

	09	Rural: (Including: Rural Res) There are few unique characteristics common to all parcels in this valuation group. The parcels are located in the non-urban areas throughout the county.
3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.**	
	The cost and sales comparison approaches.	
3a.	**Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.**	
	Unique commercial property is appraised exclusively by the contract appraiser. He uses the cost approach on all parcels, does additional sales research beyond Fillmore County, and studies the methodologies, approaches to values and values of similar parcels in other counties. All of this is done to address uniformity as well as develop the best estimate of market value that they can.	
4.	**What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?**	
	July of 2008	
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 local market to develop depreciation tables.	
6.	**Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?**	
	Yes; The county develops their depreciation countywide then determines a local multiplier based on the market, except for the unique and single purpose properties.	
7.	**When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?**	
	Depreciation for each valuation grouping is developed when it is reviewed or when new cost tables are implemented. The commercial depreciation was developed in 2009.	
8.	**When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?**	
	1993 for most commercials, but values are more recent in newer subdivisions. Going forward, the county plans to inspect, review and update all of the commercial property during 2012 for use in 2013. This process will include a review of all commercial land values, and they will either be affirmed or updated, based on any available market information.	
9.	**Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.**	
	Sales Comparison (by square foot)	
10.	**How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?**	
	Following are some of the circumstances that are considered: -The construction of a new structure on a previously vacant or minimally improved lot. -A major addition or alteration to the structure, usually results in a change in square footage. -A dramatic increase in the depreciation, usually due to something like fire damage, vandalism or demolition of a structure. -Extensive rehabilitation and remodeling (change to the interior finish, mechanical systems or fixtures) of an existing structure causing a significant reduction of depreciation.	

30 Fillmore

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 :	22	MEDIAN :	98	COV :	61.76	95% Median C.I. :	62.44 to 114.90
Total Sales Price :	1,332,000	WGT. MEAN :	90	STD :	66.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	78.24 to 101.02
Total Adj. Sales Price :	1,326,500	MEAN :	108	Avg. Abs. Dev :	40.85	95% Mean C.I. :	78.06 to 136.94
Total Assessed Value :	1,188,960						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	60,295	COD :	41.66	MAX Sales Ratio :	344.00		
Avg. Assessed Value :	54,044	PRD :	119.94	MIN Sales Ratio :	33.67		*Printed:3/29/2012 3:05:37PM*

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	129.01	129.01	116.26	23.05	110.97	99.27	158.75	N/A	21,000	24,415
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	175.84	204.52	101.07	47.45	202.35	93.71	344.00	N/A	57,833	58,452
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	100.22	86.85	98.41	17.34	88.25	54.10	106.24	N/A	128,667	126,620
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	78.11	78.11	78.11	00.00	100.00	78.11	78.11	N/A	315,000	246,060
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	101.20	126.48	143.14	27.86	88.36	96.83	181.40	N/A	6,167	8,827
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	62.44	65.45	62.58	08.54	104.59	58.97	74.95	N/A	35,667	22,320
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	58.30	65.79	81.04	44.22	81.18	33.67	114.90	N/A	50,100	40,601
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	125.06	125.06	124.74	08.80	100.26	114.06	136.06	N/A	17,000	21,205
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	5	158.75	174.31	104.03	41.18	167.56	93.71	344.00	N/A	43,100	44,837
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	100.22	102.59	90.67	22.78	113.15	54.10	181.40	54.10 to 181.40	102,786	93,200
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	10	68.70	77.54	79.79	39.93	97.18	33.67	136.06	37.20 to 114.90	39,150	31,238
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	100.22	136.03	91.63	57.04	148.46	54.10	344.00	54.10 to 344.00	124,929	114,468
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	74.95	82.25	78.84	39.85	104.33	33.67	181.40	37.20 to 114.90	34,182	26,950
_____ALL_____	22	98.05	107.50	89.63	41.66	119.94	33.67	344.00	62.44 to 114.90	60,295	54,044

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	12	99.75	105.39	94.49	20.14	111.54	58.97	181.40	84.86 to 114.90	91,042	86,025
02	4	49.82	52.07	51.48	33.38	101.15	33.67	74.95	N/A	35,000	18,018
03	2	201.15	201.15	64.51	71.02	311.81	58.30	344.00	N/A	23,000	14,838
04	1	54.10	54.10	54.10	00.00	100.00	54.10	54.10	N/A	21,000	11,360
05	1	101.20	101.20	101.20	00.00	100.00	101.20	101.20	N/A	2,500	2,530
07	2	167.30	167.30	167.47	05.11	99.90	158.75	175.84	N/A	12,250	20,515
_____ALL_____	22	98.05	107.50	89.63	41.66	119.94	33.67	344.00	62.44 to 114.90	60,295	54,044

30 Fillmore

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 :	22	MEDIAN :	98	COV :	61.76	95% Median C.I. :	62.44 to 114.90
Total Sales Price :	1,332,000	WGT. MEAN :	90	STD :	66.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	78.24 to 101.02
Total Adj. Sales Price :	1,326,500	MEAN :	108	Avg. Abs. Dev :	40.85	95% Mean C.I. :	78.06 to 136.94
Total Assessed Value :	1,188,960						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	60,295	COD :	41.66	MAX Sales Ratio :	344.00		
Avg. Assessed Value :	54,044	PRD :	119.94	MIN Sales Ratio :	33.67		*Printed:3/29/2012 3:05:37PM*

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	22	98.05	107.50	89.63	41.66	119.94	33.67	344.00	62.44 to 114.90	60,295	54,044
04											
_____ALL_____	22	98.05	107.50	89.63	41.66	119.94	33.67	344.00	62.44 to 114.90	60,295	54,044

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Low $ Ranges_____											
Less Than 5,000	2	222.60	222.60	170.57	54.54	130.50	101.20	344.00	N/A	1,750	2,985
Less Than 15,000	6	167.30	176.34	161.25	34.32	109.36	96.83	344.00	96.83 to 344.00	7,333	11,825
Less Than 30,000	11	114.06	133.71	109.01	50.63	122.66	33.67	344.00	54.10 to 181.40	11,500	12,536
__Ranges Excl. Low $__											
Greater Than 4,999	20	95.27	95.99	89.42	33.97	107.35	33.67	181.40	62.44 to 114.06	66,150	59,150
Greater Than 14,999	16	81.49	81.69	87.17	30.03	93.71	33.67	136.06	58.30 to 106.24	80,156	69,876
Greater Than 29,999	11	84.86	81.29	87.59	23.50	92.81	37.20	114.90	58.30 to 106.24	109,091	95,551
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999	2	222.60	222.60	170.57	54.54	130.50	101.20	344.00	N/A	1,750	2,985
5,000 TO 14,999	4	167.30	153.21	160.44	15.19	95.49	96.83	181.40	N/A	10,125	16,245
15,000 TO 29,999	5	74.95	82.57	81.15	43.32	101.75	33.67	136.06	N/A	16,500	13,390
30,000 TO 59,999	6	71.92	74.14	72.89	31.49	101.71	37.20	106.24	37.20 to 106.24	37,917	27,639
60,000 TO 99,999	1	62.44	62.44	62.44	00.00	100.00	62.44	62.44	N/A	67,500	42,150
100,000 TO 149,999	1	114.90	114.90	114.90	00.00	100.00	114.90	114.90	N/A	110,000	126,390
150,000 TO 249,999	1	93.71	93.71	93.71	00.00	100.00	93.71	93.71	N/A	160,000	149,935
250,000 TO 499,999	2	89.17	89.17	89.25	12.40	99.91	78.11	100.22	N/A	317,500	283,375
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
_____ALL_____	22	98.05	107.50	89.63	41.66	119.94	33.67	344.00	62.44 to 114.90	60,295	54,044

30 Fillmore

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 :	22	MEDIAN :	98	COV :	61.76	95% Median C.I. :	62.44 to 114.90
Total Sales Price :	1,332,000	WGT. MEAN :	90	STD :	66.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	78.24 to 101.02
Total Adj. Sales Price :	1,326,500	MEAN :	108	Avg. Abs. Dev :	40.85	95% Mean C.I. :	78.06 to 136.94
Total Assessed Value :	1,188,960						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	60,295	COD :	41.66	MAX Sales Ratio :	344.00		
Avg. Assessed Value :	54,044	PRD :	119.94	MIN Sales Ratio :	33.67		*Printed:3/29/2012 3:05:37PM*

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	2	67.02	67.02	44.22	44.49	151.56	37.20	96.83	N/A	25,500	11,275
326	1	175.84	175.84	175.84	00.00	100.00	175.84	175.84	N/A	12,500	21,980
344	1	78.11	78.11	78.11	00.00	100.00	78.11	78.11	N/A	315,000	246,060
349	1	93.71	93.71	93.71	00.00	100.00	93.71	93.71	N/A	160,000	149,935
350	1	84.86	84.86	84.86	00.00	100.00	84.86	84.86	N/A	32,500	27,580
352	2	107.56	107.56	103.97	06.82	103.45	100.22	114.90	N/A	215,000	223,540
353	2	129.98	129.98	148.83	22.14	87.33	101.20	158.75	N/A	7,250	10,790
406	7	114.06	134.03	94.68	62.47	141.56	33.67	344.00	33.67 to 344.00	13,357	12,647
426	1	58.97	58.97	58.97	00.00	100.00	58.97	58.97	N/A	30,000	17,690
442	1	106.24	106.24	106.24	00.00	100.00	106.24	106.24	N/A	45,000	47,810
528	2	60.37	60.37	60.79	03.43	99.31	58.30	62.44	N/A	56,250	34,193
555	1	99.27	99.27	99.27	00.00	100.00	99.27	99.27	N/A	30,000	29,780
_____ALL_____	22	98.05	107.50	89.63	41.66	119.94	33.67	344.00	62.44 to 114.90	60,295	54,044

A. Commercial Real Property

Fillmore County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. Most of the commercial properties in the county either directly service or support agriculture or the people involved in agriculture. There are a few commercial activities operating outside of those uses but they are in the minority. During the past year and even the past 5 to 10 years, commercial property has had no real economic fluctuations. Some property uses have prospered and grown and some have declined. Some locations have shown positive commercial activity and some have shown decline. In all, the commercial is considered stable but somewhat flat in terms of value.

The sales in the file have been reviewed and the following is noted:

There was no evidence that there was any value for personal property, inventory or going concern included in the adjusted selling price of any of the commercial parcels in Fillmore County. There was no evidence that there was any issue with the verification process and the resulting qualification codes completed by the assessor. The inspection and review process was completed prior to 2011 and is considered to be current, and the records are all up to date. Based on that, the process used to value the commercial property is considered to be uniform.

The key statistics considered for measurement are as follows: there are 22 qualified sales; the median ratio is 98%; the weighted mean ratio is 90%; the mean ratio is 108%; the COD is 41.66; the PRD is 119.94 and the 95% median confidence interval is from 62.44 to 114.90. There is concern whether the 22 sales in the sales file are representative of the population of commercial and industrial property. Of the 22 total qualified sales, 11 occurred in Geneva, the predominant town. When the occupancy codes are reviewed, there are 11 different occupancy codes and 2 blanks. The predominant codes are distributed as follows: 7 sales in occupancy code 406; 2 sales in occupancy code 352; 2 sales in occupancy code 353; and 2 sales in occupancy code 528. This is not the picture of a class that is proportional to the population. Considering that many property types have no representation in the sales file, it is unlikely that one stratum of commercial and industrial property is indicative of the value of another stratum. It is notable that the class of commercial and industrial is so broad that value of the class is impacted by both local and regional economic forces. We must rely on the notion that thorough, timely and consistent assessment actions may produce consistent valuations.

The COD and the PRD of any sample of 22 sales, particularly in a non-homogeneous class is not likely to be stable. If the COD is high, there is a tendency to declare that the valuation is not uniform. If the COD is too low, there is the concern that there were disparate assessment actions for the sales versus the unsold members of the class. Small samples of non-homogeneous property sales can produce excessively high, excessively low or very desirable statistics. In this case, the sample is insufficient to produce meaningful measurement. In the end, the sample is too small to measure any real class or subclass, and class is too diverse to be adequately represented by the sample. That leaves the Department to conclude that there simply is not enough information available to determine a level of value for the class or for any subclass of the commercial and industrial property.

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.

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.

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

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.

Agricultural and/or
Special Valuation Reports

2012 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Fillmore County

For 2012, Fillmore County has followed their 3 Year Plan which includes the following actions:

They completed all pickup work of new improvements on agricultural parcels. They also update the land use on all parcels where changes have been reported or observed.

They have verified, reviewed and analyzed the agricultural sales throughout the county. The verification is done over the phone and typically is followed by a drive-by inspection.

For 2012, Fillmore County inspected all rural residential Parcels, all agricultural residences and outbuildings across the entire county. This same action was reported in the residential assessment actions as the project included both residential and agricultural improvements. Included in this inspection process was; the review of all non-residential sites and vacated sites to record the current condition of all buildings and the addition of new buildings as well as the removal of non-usable buildings. New photos were taken of the buildings and residences that were inspected. The inspection process was conducted on-site. The appraiser went to the door of each residence to contact the owner. The site was walked to inspect all buildings. Any updates to measurements or condition observations were documented. New record cards were prepared for each parcel.

Fillmore also analyzed all agricultural land sales and updated all parcels with new land values. The agricultural land sales continue to show large increases in value, requiring increases to the assessment of literally all tillable acres throughout the county.

Fillmore County reports that the first 6 year inspection and review of residential property has been completed during 2011 for use in 2012.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Fillmore County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Assessor and Staff
2.	**List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.**

Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
1	Area #1 differs mainly from Area 2 in that there is ground water available throughout the area and the crops raised and the purchases of land reflect it.
2	Area #2 is unique because it mostly exists in a location where little or no ground water is available for irrigation. Since there is little potential for future irrigation, the general farming practices vary accordingly. There is usually only dry crop or grass land options available to the land owner, and the price of land reflects that. On the edges of the area, there is some irrigation but it is usually spotty or has limited capacity wells.

3.	**Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.**
	The county verifies sales, monitors wells registrations, and has current information from the NRD. Since the ability to irrigate is reflected in the value of the land, it is the predominant characteristic in the development of the market areas.
4.	**Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.**
	This would be determined by the predominant present use of the parcel. There are presently no parcels classified as recreational.
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; The first acre for the home site at $7,500, and the next 2 acres at $2,500 are valued the same. This is the same throughout the county. Zoning requires rural residential parcels to be at least 3 acres. Additional acres may vary since agricultural use may be a factor on predominantly agricultural parcels.
6.	**What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)**
	Land use is being kept up to date utilizing self-reporting, third party reporting, NRD notifications, FSA maps, individual certifications, and physical inspections. Since 2006, the county has also used GIS maps.

7.	**Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.**
	The county actively verifies all agricultural sales with the buyer or seller. Those verifications, the trend in values, and the ongoing observation of the present use of the parcels are all important to detect non-agricultural characteristics in the market.
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?**
	In the case of agricultural land, the land use is a key indicator of substantial change. If the use of a parcel of land changes from dry or grass to irrigated the valuation difference is substantial. If there are only a few acres that change, that may not be viewed as substantial. If the resulting change in value is sufficient to noticeably distort the measurement of the parcel, it is considered substantial. The reasons that pertain to structures may be similar to the residential or commercial reasons, but the threshold for substantial may be greater if the total purchase price for the land is greater.

30 Fillmore

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 :	41	MEDIAN :	72	COV :	23.57	95% Median C.I. :	64.58 to 77.43
Total Sales Price :	23,523,815	WGT. MEAN :	69	STD :	17.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	63.82 to 74.27
Total Adj. Sales Price :	23,428,315	MEAN :	73	Avg. Abs. Dev :	13.54	95% Mean C.I. :	67.31 to 77.77
Total Assessed Value :	16,175,851						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	571,422	COD :	18.82	MAX Sales Ratio :	108.72		
Avg. Assessed Value :	394,533	PRD :	105.07	MIN Sales Ratio :	44.09		

Printed:3/29/2012 3:05:38PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	75.29	75.29	75.29	00.00	100.00	75.29	75.29	N/A	704,000	530,060
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	76.58	81.36	81.34	14.91	100.02	57.38	105.57	57.38 to 105.57	595,340	484,247
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	88.55	89.62	87.64	06.03	102.26	78.87	99.19	N/A	460,400	403,481
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	85.16	85.16	79.65	24.17	106.92	64.58	105.74	N/A	580,500	462,343
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	69.24	70.91	68.86	08.67	102.98	62.07	85.72	N/A	552,707	380,597
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	74.31	74.31	71.82	08.71	103.47	67.84	80.78	N/A	541,500	388,908
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	76.35	77.88	71.18	15.52	109.41	62.04	108.72	N/A	463,600	329,983
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	59.58	59.58	59.58	00.00	100.00	59.58	59.58	N/A	192,000	114,395
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	10	59.10	60.69	58.88	18.46	103.07	47.22	81.25	47.87 to 77.12	522,170	307,462
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	44.09	44.09	44.09	00.00	100.00	44.09	44.09	N/A	1,081,000	476,615
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	53.79	53.79	54.12	03.79	99.39	51.75	55.83	N/A	1,217,350	658,815
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	13	78.87	84.07	82.77	13.79	101.57	57.38	105.57	75.14 to 99.19	551,798	456,707
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	14	70.60	75.92	71.74	15.23	105.83	62.04	108.72	64.58 to 85.72	523,253	375,386
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	14	56.13	58.44	55.81	16.53	104.71	44.09	81.25	47.87 to 70.67	637,814	355,947
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	82.30	81.08	77.81	15.03	104.20	62.07	105.74	65.59 to 93.94	518,878	403,756
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	18	66.01	66.92	63.72	17.69	105.02	47.22	108.72	56.43 to 77.12	489,706	312,041
_____ALL_____	41	71.95	72.54	69.04	18.82	105.07	44.09	108.72	64.58 to 77.43	571,422	394,533

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	31	71.95	71.75	68.42	17.90	104.87	44.09	105.74	62.07 to 77.43	661,010	452,282
2	10	73.63	74.96	73.38	21.20	102.15	47.87	108.72	49.39 to 99.19	293,700	215,511
_____ALL_____	41	71.95	72.54	69.04	18.82	105.07	44.09	108.72	64.58 to 77.43	571,422	394,533

30 Fillmore

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 :	41	MEDIAN :	72	COV :	23.57	95% Median C.I. :	64.58 to 77.43
Total Sales Price :	23,523,815	WGT. MEAN :	69	STD :	17.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	63.82 to 74.27
Total Adj. Sales Price :	23,428,315	MEAN :	73	Avg. Abs. Dev :	13.54	95% Mean C.I. :	67.31 to 77.77
Total Assessed Value :	16,175,851						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	571,422	COD :	18.82	MAX Sales Ratio :	108.72		
Avg. Assessed Value :	394,533	PRD :	105.07	MIN Sales Ratio :	44.09	*Printed:3/29/2012*	*3:05:38PM*

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	7	85.72	80.60	76.39	21.08	105.51	51.75	105.57	51.75 to 105.57	526,296	402,014
1	7	85.72	80.60	76.39	21.08	105.51	51.75	105.57	51.75 to 105.57	526,296	402,014
_____Dry_____											
County	3	70.67	68.21	68.81	09.06	99.13	57.38	76.58	N/A	267,333	183,955
1	1	57.38	57.38	57.38	00.00	100.00	57.38	57.38	N/A	290,000	166,390
2	2	73.63	73.63	75.29	04.02	97.80	70.67	76.58	N/A	256,000	192,738
_____ALL_____	41	71.95	72.54	69.04	18.82	105.07	44.09	108.72	64.58 to 77.43	571,422	394,533

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	31	73.99	72.73	69.09	17.37	105.27	44.09	105.74	64.58 to 77.91	669,462	462,502
1	30	72.97	72.23	68.58	17.57	105.32	44.09	105.74	64.58 to 77.43	673,377	461,812
2	1	87.54	87.54	87.54	00.00	100.00	87.54	87.54	N/A	552,000	483,218
_____Dry_____											
County	6	73.63	73.92	68.15	20.06	108.47	49.39	108.72	49.39 to 108.72	300,333	204,671
1	1	57.38	57.38	57.38	00.00	100.00	57.38	57.38	N/A	290,000	166,390
2	5	76.58	77.23	70.21	18.14	110.00	49.39	108.72	N/A	302,400	212,327
_____ALL_____	41	71.95	72.54	69.04	18.82	105.07	44.09	108.72	64.58 to 77.43	571,422	394,533

Fillmore County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
30.10	Fillmore	1	3,700	3,600	3,500	3,400	3,100	#DIV/0!	2,700	2,550	3,478
18.10	Clay	1	3,630	3,575	3,355	3,190	2,715	#DIV/0!	2,520	2,185	3,388
41.10	Hamilton	1	3,550	3,550	3,300	3,100	3,000	2,750	2,650	2,650	3,416
48.10	Jefferson	1	3,620	4,288	3,619	3,095	3,097	#DIV/0!	2,570	1,490	3,672
65.10	Nuckolls	1	3,700	3,700	2,680	2,300	2,285	1,785	1,780	1,750	3,259
76.30	Saline	3	3,746	3,749	3,695	3,668	3,297	2,600	2,599	2,550	3,583
80.10	Seward	1	3,750	3,700	3,700	3,600	3,600	#DIV/0!	1,950	1,800	3,482
85.10	Thayer	1	3,340	3,340	3,275	2,875	2,725	2,602	2,570	2,550	3,124
93.20	York	2	3,965	3,965	3,700	3,700	3,400	#DIV/0!	2,990	2,990	3,800
30.20	Fillmore	2	3,700	3,600	3,500	3,400	3,100	2,900	2,700	2,550	3,491
76.10	Saline	1	2,152	2,186	1,524	1,525	1,498	1,500	1,400	1,400	1,866
93.20	York	2	3,965	3,965	3,700	3,700	3,400	#DIV/0!	2,990	2,990	3,800

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Fillmore	1	2,255	2,215	2,065	2,065	1,895	#DIV/0!	1,620	1,555	2,096
Clay	1	2,290	2,080	1,870	1,665	1,610	#DIV/0!	1,250	1,090	1,916
Hamilton	1	2,300	2,070	1,900	1,815	1,755	1,455	1,330	1,210	2,004
Jefferson	1	2,100	2,903	2,100	1,739	1,809	#DIV/0!	1,615	585	2,203
Nuckolls	1	1,625	1,625	1,143	1,144	1,020	950	940	940	1,411
Saline	3	2,694	2,687	2,297	2,140	1,895	1,525	1,522	1,425	2,262
Seward	1	3,100	3,100	2,600	2,600	2,200	#DIV/0!	1,950	1,500	2,599
Thayer	1	2,075	2,075	1,900	1,775	1,650	1,525	1,525	1,500	1,881
York	2	3,400	3,400	2,800	2,800	2,600	#DIV/0!	2,400	2,399	3,068
Fillmore	2	2,155	2,105	2,005	1,925	1,790	1,650	1,515	1,455	2,006
Saline	1	2,114	2,113	1,898	1,899	1,772	1,673	1,535	1,513	1,926
York	2	3,400	3,400	2,800	2,800	2,600	#DIV/0!	2,400	2,399	3,068

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Fillmore	1	960	940	880	820	800	#DIV/0!	700	700	786
Clay	1	1,000	1,000	800	800	720	#DIV/0!	720	720	778
Hamilton	1	975	935	880	825	770	715	660	605	717
Jefferson	1	1,155	1,434	1,138	1,342	778	#DIV/0!	1,301	519	973
Nuckolls	1	696	709	611	709	715	250	713	673	686
Saline	3	1,047	1,224	1,002	1,230	1,148	959	1,008	752	978
Seward	1	841	884	732	685	664	900	607	549	635
Thayer	1	958	1,049	926	907	937	884	909	867	913
York	2	964	945	849	853	816	#DIV/0!	811	803	830
Fillmore	2	960	940	880	820	800	720	700	700	796
Saline	1	1,007	1,336	1,149	1,332	1,231	1,159	1,107	879	1,121
York	2	964	945	849	853	816	#DIV/0!	811	803	830

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

A. Agricultural Land

Fillmore County is an agriculturally based county with an array of villages and small towns that exist primarily to support agriculture. The primary crops are row crops with corn, soybeans, and some grain sorghum. Grass use makes up 8% of the agricultural land and is mostly in Market Area 2 where limited potential for irrigation exists or is spread throughout the county, often along rivers and streams. The agricultural land is valued using two market areas that are more fully described in the survey. Fillmore County is bordered on the north by York County, on the south by Thayer County, on the east by Saline County and on the west by Clay County. The agricultural economy is strong, driven by a very high grain prices for the past few years. The value of crop land has followed the high grain prices with historic increases in value. Grazing land has also experienced very large increases over the past 3 years. The assessed values of agricultural land have likewise increased each year, often at double digit percentages.

The measurement process begins with the sample of qualified sales that occurred within the 3 year study period defined for the 2012 R&O agricultural land measurement process. The sample made up of the county sales is not adequate for Area 2, so comparable sales from adjacent counties were added to make the base sample adequate to measure the level of value of the agricultural land. There were 4 borrowed comparable sales from adjacent counties in order to make the sample adequate for measurement and be considered proportional and representative. The strength of this method is that it uses the subject county sales and only borrows enough additional sales to make the sample statistically adequate. After the data has been analyzed and the county has revalued the agricultural land, the median ratio calculated for the county is 72%; Market Area 1 has a 72% median ratio and Market Area 2 has a 74% median ratio.

The key statistics considered for measurement are as follows: there are 37 qualified sales from the subject county, 4 qualified sales borrowed sales for a total of 41 qualified sales used in the analysis; the median ratio is 72%; the weighted mean ratio is 69%; the mean ratio is 73%; the COD is 18.82; the PRD is 105.07 and the 95% median confidence interval is 64.58 to 77.43.

Based on a review of the county schedule of values and a general knowledge of their assessment practices relating to the valuation of agricultural land the county has achieved intra-county equalization. Fillmore County reported that they completed the inspection and review of all residences and buildings on agricultural parcels by the end of 2011 for use in 2012. The 6 year process of inspection and review of land and structures in the agricultural class has been completed.

Schedule X of the 2012 Abstract of Fillmore County and the surrounding counties were compared to test for inter-county equalization. That comparison of the average assessed value for irrigated, dry and grass land uses revealed that the average assessed value for each of the land uses shows a logical progression from county to county. The values tended to be lower in the counties to the west and south and increase as you progress to the east and north, suggesting inter-county equalization. There are minor exceptions among some of the minor subclasses but most of the relevant ones fit the expected pattern.

The COD falls within the desired range and the PRD is above the desired range in the statistical studies. This is not surprising given the rapid upward trend of the value of agricultural land. The county increased irrigated values by more than 18%, dry values by nearly 12% and grass was unchanged. Given the current market conditions the Department is

not overly concerned that there are any quality issues in the valuation of agricultural land. The county has sound assessment practices relating to the verification and analysis of agricultural values. They have adequate tools and practices to keep land use up to date and there is no weakness or bias noticed in their assessment practices. The quality of assessment for agricultural land is acceptable.

It is the opinion of the Department that the level of value for agricultural land of value falls at or near the median ratio of the R&O Statistics, since the sample is both proportional and representative. In this case, the apparent level of value is 72 % and the quality of the assessment process is acceptable. There are no recommended adjustments to the class or to any subclass of agricultural land.

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.

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.

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

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 : 6,469	Value : 1,262,679,130	Growth 9,440,581	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	263	559,845	13	286,600	4	109,585	280	956,030	
02. Res Improve Land	2,000	5,546,480	62	1,095,870	200	3,310,525	2,262	9,952,875	
03. Res Improvements	2,010	103,161,730	62	6,923,285	200	23,318,995	2,272	133,404,010	
04. Res Total	2,273	109,268,055	75	8,305,755	204	26,739,105	2,552	144,312,915	2,504,614
% of Res Total	89.07	75.72	2.94	5.76	7.99	18.53	39.45	11.43	26.53
05. Com UnImp Land	62	221,430	11	169,590	2	18,250	75	409,270	
06. Com Improve Land	400	1,617,025	48	1,004,915	17	344,705	465	2,966,645	
07. Com Improvements	400	34,474,940	42	4,401,980	13	1,668,185	455	40,545,105	
08. Com Total	462	36,313,395	53	5,576,485	15	2,031,140	530	43,921,020	3,148,817
% of Com Total	87.17	82.68	10.00	12.70	2.83	4.62	8.19	3.48	33.35
09. Ind UnImp Land	1	328,000	2	223,330	0	0	3	551,330	
10. Ind Improve Land	1	7,200	8	448,775	1	42,240	10	498,215	
11. Ind Improvements	1	134,675	8	7,682,375	1	318,870	10	8,135,920	
12. Ind Total	2	469,875	10	8,354,480	1	361,110	13	9,185,465	0
% of Ind Total	15.38	5.12	76.92	90.95	7.69	3.93	0.20	0.73	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	4,425	1	4,425	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	34,655	1	34,655	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	1	39,080	1	39,080	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,273	109,268,055	75	8,305,755	205	26,778,185	2,553	144,351,995	2,504,614
% of Res & Rec Total	89.03	75.70	2.94	5.75	8.03	18.55	39.47	11.43	26.53
Com & Ind Total	464	36,783,270	63	13,930,965	16	2,392,250	543	53,106,485	3,148,817
% of Com & Ind Total	85.45	69.26	11.60	26.23	2.95	4.50	8.39	4.21	33.35
17. Taxable Total	2,737	146,051,325	138	22,236,720	221	29,170,435	3,096	197,458,480	5,653,431
% of Taxable Total	88.40	73.97	4.46	11.26	7.14	14.77	47.86	15.64	59.88

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	1	13,100	2,502,300	0	0	0
20. Industrial	1	328,000	44,548,234	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	1	13,100	2,502,300
20. Industrial	0	0	0	1	328,000	44,548,234
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				**2**	**341,100**	**47,050,534**

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	209	34	80	323

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	49	392,485	303	75,843,465	2,130	656,338,825	2,482	732,574,775
28. Ag-Improved Land	6	72,290	101	27,133,825	787	240,607,505	894	267,813,620
29. Ag Improvements	6	140,845	98	7,619,055	787	57,072,355	891	64,832,255
30. Ag Total							**3,373**	**1,065,220,650**

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	2.00	15,000
32. HomeSite Improv Land	2	2.00	15,000	49	49.00	367,500
33. HomeSite Improvements	2	0.00	55,865	49	0.00	3,534,400
34. HomeSite Total						
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	2	1.43	3,575	29	64.24	131,935
36. FarmSite Improv Land	5	5.02	12,550	74	279.90	601,680
37. FarmSite Improvements	5	0.00	84,980	93	0.00	4,084,655
38. FarmSite Total						
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	278	670.98	0
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	17	17.00	127,500	19	19.00	142,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	387	388.14	2,911,050	438	439.14	3,293,550	
33. HomeSite Improvements	398	0.00	25,121,620	449	0.00	28,711,885	671,720
34. HomeSite Total				**468**	**458.14**	**32,147,935**	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	179	412.60	791,680	210	478.27	927,190	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	589	2,152.66	4,615,745	668	2,437.58	5,229,975	
37. FarmSite Improvements	735	0.00	31,950,735	833	0.00	36,120,370	3,115,430
38. FarmSite Total				**1,043**	**2,915.85**	**42,277,535**	
39. Road & Ditches	2,626	7,205.93	0	2,904	7,876.91	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	1	10.04	3,010	1	10.04	3,010	
41. Total Section VI				**1,511**	**11,260.94**	**74,428,480**	**3,787,150**

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	2	253.30	240,110
	Rural			**Total**		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	3	439.36	606,895	5	692.66	847,005

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	5,944.36	2.69%	21,994,120	2.86%	3,700.00
46. 1A	124,937.63	56.53%	449,775,500	58.51%	3,600.00
47. 2A1	43,864.22	19.85%	153,524,765	19.97%	3,500.00
48. 2A	14,533.52	6.58%	49,413,980	6.43%	3,400.00
49. 3A1	21,696.73	9.82%	67,259,860	8.75%	3,100.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	7,570.29	3.43%	20,439,820	2.66%	2,700.00
52. 4A	2,463.05	1.11%	6,280,890	0.82%	2,550.05
53. Total	221,009.80	100.00%	768,688,935	100.00%	3,478.08
Dry					
54. 1D1	2,227.78	4.31%	5,023,675	4.63%	2,255.01
55. 1D	28,035.30	54.20%	62,098,200	57.26%	2,215.00
56. 2D1	6,892.06	13.32%	14,232,070	13.12%	2,065.00
57. 2D	3,629.87	7.02%	7,495,700	6.91%	2,065.01
58. 3D1	7,057.33	13.64%	13,373,655	12.33%	1,895.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	2,730.08	5.28%	4,422,675	4.08%	1,619.98
61. 4D	1,157.29	2.24%	1,799,600	1.66%	1,555.01
62. Total	51,729.71	100.00%	108,445,575	100.00%	2,096.39
Grass					
63. 1G1	629.66	3.68%	604,480	4.49%	960.01
64. 1G	2,721.93	15.90%	2,558,725	19.02%	940.04
65. 2G1	1,653.57	9.66%	1,455,115	10.82%	879.98
66. 2G	1,510.87	8.83%	1,238,925	9.21%	820.01
67. 3G1	1,727.54	10.09%	1,382,060	10.27%	800.02
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	2,379.78	13.90%	1,665,815	12.38%	699.99
70. 4G	6,493.80	37.94%	4,545,620	33.79%	699.99
71. Total	17,117.15	100.00%	13,450,740	100.00%	785.80

Irrigated Total	221,009.80	75.46%	768,688,935	86.26%	3,478.08
Dry Total	51,729.71	17.66%	108,445,575	12.17%	2,096.39
Grass Total	17,117.15	5.84%	13,450,740	1.51%	785.80
72. Waste	2,599.81	0.89%	287,735	0.03%	110.68
73. Other	415.64	0.14%	308,405	0.03%	742.00
74. Exempt	6,407.39	2.19%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	292,872.11	100.00%	891,181,390	100.00%	3,042.90

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail **Market Area 2**

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,146.73	19.07%	4,242,895	20.21%	3,699.99
46. 1A	2,580.45	42.92%	9,289,645	44.26%	3,600.01
47. 2A1	1,071.11	17.81%	3,748,900	17.86%	3,500.01
48. 2A	308.96	5.14%	1,050,470	5.00%	3,400.02
49. 3A1	578.15	9.62%	1,792,245	8.54%	3,099.97
50. 3A	8.19	0.14%	23,755	0.11%	2,900.49
51. 4A1	189.86	3.16%	512,615	2.44%	2,699.96
52. 4A	129.11	2.15%	329,255	1.57%	2,550.19
53. Total	6,012.56	100.00%	20,989,780	100.00%	3,490.99
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,925.28	5.42%	4,148,980	5.83%	2,155.00
55. 1D	18,727.34	52.75%	39,421,000	55.36%	2,105.00
56. 2D1	5,533.09	15.59%	11,093,885	15.58%	2,005.01
57. 2D	3,086.63	8.69%	5,941,795	8.34%	1,925.01
58. 3D1	4,346.43	12.24%	7,780,150	10.93%	1,790.01
59. 3D	27.86	0.08%	45,975	0.06%	1,650.22
60. 4D1	1,382.67	3.89%	2,094,740	2.94%	1,515.00
61. 4D	471.63	1.33%	686,215	0.96%	1,454.99
62. Total	35,500.93	100.00%	71,212,740	100.00%	2,005.94
Grass					
63. 1G1	299.63	3.27%	287,650	3.95%	960.02
64. 1G	1,801.05	19.67%	1,692,965	23.23%	939.99
65. 2G1	771.29	8.43%	678,735	9.31%	880.00
66. 2G	1,011.49	11.05%	829,420	11.38%	820.00
67. 3G1	1,073.51	11.73%	858,820	11.78%	800.01
68. 3G	173.72	1.90%	125,085	1.72%	720.04
69. 4G1	1,288.91	14.08%	902,230	12.38%	699.99
70. 4G	2,734.79	29.87%	1,914,355	26.26%	700.00
71. Total	9,154.39	100.00%	7,289,260	100.00%	796.26

Irrigated Total	6,012.56	11.79%	20,989,780	21.07%	3,490.99
Dry Total	35,500.93	69.63%	71,212,740	71.49%	2,005.94
Grass Total	9,154.39	17.95%	7,289,260	7.32%	796.26
72. Waste	188.17	0.37%	18,825	0.02%	100.04
73. Other	131.32	0.26%	100,175	0.10%	762.83
74. Exempt	933.91	1.83%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	50,987.37	100.00%	99,610,780	100.00%	1,953.64

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	65.50	233,360	22,372.24	78,259,570	204,584.62	711,185,785	227,022.36	789,678,715
77. Dry Land	83.26	180,495	10,526.70	21,654,335	76,620.68	157,823,485	87,230.64	179,658,315
78. Grass	21.44	19,795	2,207.10	1,800,505	24,043.00	18,919,700	26,271.54	20,740,000
79. Waste	0.00	0	216.19	21,610	2,571.79	284,950	2,787.98	306,560
80. Other	0.00	0	177.95	125,155	369.01	283,425	546.96	408,580
81. Exempt	447.17	0	276.58	0	6,617.55	0	7,341.30	0
82. Total	**170.20**	**433,650**	**35,500.18**	**101,861,175**	**308,189.10**	**888,497,345**	**343,859.48**	**990,792,170**

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	227,022.36	66.02%	789,678,715	79.70%	3,478.42
Dry Land	87,230.64	25.37%	179,658,315	18.13%	2,059.58
Grass	26,271.54	7.64%	20,740,000	2.09%	789.45
Waste	2,787.98	0.81%	306,560	0.03%	109.96
Other	546.96	0.16%	408,580	0.04%	747.00
Exempt	7,341.30	2.13%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	**343,859.48**	100.00%	**990,792,170**	100.00%	2,881.39

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

30 Fillmore

	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	140,483,675	144,312,915	3,829,240	2.73%	2,504,614	0.94%
02. Recreational	39,165	39,080	-85	-0.22%	0	-0.22%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	31,989,135	32,147,935	158,800	0.50%	671,720	-1.60%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	**172,511,975**	**176,499,930**	**3,987,955**	**2.31%**	**3,176,334**	**0.47%**
05. Commercial	41,563,775	43,921,020	2,357,245	5.67%	3,148,817	-1.90%
06. Industrial	9,113,505	9,185,465	71,960	0.79%	0	0.79%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	35,901,094	42,277,535	6,376,441	17.76%	3,115,430	9.08%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	**86,578,374**	**95,384,020**	**8,805,646**	**10.17%**	**6,264,247**	**2.94%**
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	**259,090,349**	**271,886,960**	**12,796,611**	**4.94%**	**9,440,581**	**1.30%**
11. Irrigated	668,040,405	789,678,715	121,638,310	18.21%		
12. Dryland	161,039,905	179,658,315	18,618,410	11.56%		
13. Grassland	21,056,625	20,740,000	-316,625	-1.50%		
14. Wasteland	170,735	306,560	135,825	79.55%		
15. Other Agland	474,540	408,580	-65,960	-13.90%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	**850,782,210**	**990,792,170**	**140,009,960**	**16.46%**		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	**1,109,872,559**	**1,262,679,130**	**152,806,571**	**13.77%**	**9,440,581**	**12.92%**

FILLMORE COUNTY

Plan of Assessment – 2011 Update

State law establishes the framework within which the assessor must operate. However, a real property assessment system requires that an operation or procedure be done completely and in a uniform manner each time it is repeated. An accurate and efficient assessment practice represents prudent expenditure of tax monies, establishes taxpayer confidence in local government, and enables the local government to serve its citizens more effectively. The important role the assessment practices play in local government cannot be overstated. Pursuant to Nebraska Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9 the assessor shall submit a Plan of Assessment to the county board of equalization before July 31st and the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division on or before October 31st. The plan and update shall examine the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the county.

The responsibilities of assessment include record maintenance. Ownership is updated in the cadastrals and on our record cards using 521 RETS (Real Estate Transfer Statements) and the miscellaneous book to check for death certificates, etc. Our mapping procedures include updating the cadastrals and GIS. We use the GIS to draw out any new tracts.

Reports are systematically filed as required by law. Real estate abstract is filed by March 19, personal property abstract is filed by June 15, certification of values for levy setting is mailed to all entities in the county by August 20, and copies of the school valuations are also mailed to the Department of Education. The school district taxable value report is mailed to the state by August 25, tax list of real and personal property is delivered to the treasurer by November 22, and the CTL (Certificate of Taxes Levied) is filed with the state by December 1. Tax list corrections are made only if necessary. Homestead exemption applications are mailed by February 1 and must be filled out, signed and returned to our office by June 30. Personal property forms are mailed by February 15th and must be filled out, signed and returned by May 1. Notices of valuation change are mailed on or before June 1. Exempt property applications are mailed in November and must be filled out, signed and returned by December 31.

The assessor is responsible for valuing at market value all real property in the county except railroads and public service entities as of January 1 of each year. Assessors use professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques, including but not limited to: comparison with sales of property of known or recognized value, taking into account location, zoning, and current functional use; income approach, and cost approach. By statute all real property is assessed at 100% of actual value, except for agricultural land and horticultural land which is assessed at 75% of actual value. Fillmore County currently contracts with Knoche Appraisal & Consulting LLC to assist with the review of sales and do the pick-up work.

Our current aerial photos were taken in 2006 for all rural parcels. This helps identify buildings in the rural area. County-wide zoning was implemented January 1, 2000. Any

new buildings or additions need to be approved prior to construction. This has been very beneficial for our office.

Pick-up work is scheduled based on our permits. We try to schedule pick-up work and sales review in the same area.

After sales are reviewed, we decide whether we need to look at a certain class or sub-class of property. We try to have a systematic review of all property in the county.

The qualification process involves a careful review of the information on the 521 RETS and utilizes the personal knowledge of the assessor and staff to make a decision about the usability of the sales. Some are later modified based on information discovered during the verification and inspection processes. The verification process is primarily accomplished during the on-site inspection, which is done by the contract appraiser. Most of the interviews conducted outside the inspection process are for clarification or when another party to the sale is contacted, and for unimproved parcels that are not inspected. The county attempts to inspect all improved sales in the sales roster.

The assessor and staff do most of the sale qualification with further verification and inspection contracted to Knoche Appraisal & Consulting LLC. The qualification decisions are sometimes modified after the verification or inspection processes are done. Most of the verification process is done during the inspection and most interviews are done at that time. The phone is used for verification with persons who are unavailable during the inspection process or if additional clarification is needed. In Fillmore County the order of preference for verification is buyer, buyer's representative, seller and then real estate agent. The county verifies a larger percentage of the transfers to enhance the input to the county CAMA system that is used to calculate building valuation.

When conducting a physical inspection, the county looks for the same thing we look for when listing property. We check for the accuracy of the listing. We also believe the sale file review serves as a semi-random sampling of the assessed property. The review enables us to plan for reappraisal priorities, and prepare for future changes of classes and sub-classes. The county attempts to inspect all qualified improved sales as well as others that are possibly good sales. We estimate this is 85% of the residential sales, 75% of the commercial sales, 20% of the unimproved ag land sales and 60% of the improved ag land sales that are in the total roster. Unreported pick-up work and alterations are listed and errors that are discovered are corrected on the records accordingly. Omissions are usually parcels of unreported pick-up work, which are listed, valued and added to the tax rolls. We continue to work with the NRD for accurate and up to date land use information. For 2008 we measured and recorded the land use in the rest of the county in our GIS system and applied the new numeric codes. We track our permits in our administrative program and we are then able to run a list of permits from this system. All pick-up work is entered on corresponding property record cards.

The information gathered during the sale review process is kept in the county sales books.

Fillmore County Assessor's office personnel includes the assessor, deputy and clerk. The assessor and deputy have completed their continuing education to keep up their certificates and are certified through 2014. Money has been included in the budget for continuing education for this certification.

Our appraisal work is contracted with Knoche Appraisal and Consulting LLC.

Fillmore County Assessor's office acquired new computers spring 2010 and printers are from July 2005.

Fillmore County utilizes the computerized administrative system County Solutions, provided and supported by NACO. Marshall & Swift costing tables are used for estimating replacement costs for the residential parcels and ag buildings. The county administrative system includes the Microsolve CAMA 2000 package. The assessment records are kept in the hard copy format with updates made in the form of inserts. The valuation history on the face of the hard copy is updated to reflect all valuation changes that are made annually. For 2010 houses were sketched in our new APEX Program.

According to the 2011 abstract, the real property within Fillmore County is comprised of the following: 2,549 residential parcels of which 275 are unimproved, 534 commercial parcels of which 75 are unimproved, 13 industrial parcels, 1 recreational parcel, and 3,365 agricultural parcels of which 2,373 are unimproved. Among the improved agricultural parcels are 517 with residential improvements. The percentage breakdown of the three primary classes of real estate is as follows: residential 39%, commercial/industrial 9%, agricultural 52% and 0.00% comprising any other classes. There are two other groups to mention; the administrative parcels (including Game and Parks and exempt parcels), numbering 319 and there are two parcels that have additional valuation responsibility (TIF Projects). These groups are mentioned because they represent additional assessment responsibility but will not be included in the parcel count in this report. The total number of parcels that are associated with the total real property value from the total records on the front page of the abstract in Fillmore County is estimated at 6,462 and contain no parcels with mineral interests valued. The total including exempt, Game and Parks and TIF parcels is 6,783.

The total valuation as certified on the abstract of assessment for real property 2011 to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division is 110,147,473. The breakdown of valuation is as follows:

	Valuation	Total Parcels
Real Estate	1, 110,147,473	6,462
Personal Property	103,602,389	1,247
Railroad & Public Service Utilities (Certified by PA&T in 2010)	18,573,823	
TOTAL	1, 232,323,685	

Homestead Exemption applications for 2011 are 298

Charitable exemption applications for 2011 were 36 excluding cemeteries.

Cadastrals are maps showing the boundaries of subdivisions of land usually with the bearings and lengths thereof and the areas of individual tracts for the purpose of describing and recording ownership. Our current set of cadastrals was made in 1989. The ownership names and property lines are routinely updated, and we consider them current.

Our property record cards serve as a reference to and inventory of all portions of the property. It contains a summary of the general data relevant to the parcel it represents. Our most recent record cards (for all classes of property) were prepared in 1993 during our county-wide reappraisal. Our 2011 records are currently up-to-date along with the 2011 values. We also updated all photos for ALL our town/village record cards for 2007. The Geneva and rural photos were updated for 2006. We replaced all our record cards for 2010.

When a parcel of real property in the State of Nebraska transfers and a deed is recorded a Real Estate Transfer Statement, form 521, is required. A copy of Form 521 is provided to the assessor. The assessor is responsible for maintaining the changes of ownership on the property record cards of the county. The assessor completes supplemental worksheets on these sales and submits this information to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division within 45 days or sooner.

Our office has developed a formal manual of office and assessment procedures, which includes a job description. It is our practice to follow all rules, regulations, and directives that govern the assessment process.

We qualify all sales, review most of them, prepare in-depth analysis on most property classes or subclasses and identify the projects that need to be done.

Our level of value, quality and uniformity for assessment year 2011:

Property Class	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	99%	16.29	109.06
Commerical	N/A	N/A	N/A
Agricultural Land	73%	18.50	107.62

Our three year plan is as follows:

2012 Continue sales review for all classes of property
Examine the level, quality and uniformity of assessment in the county
Review level of value and make any needed changes by class of property
Review ag land for any changes in land areas and values
Verify land usage with FSA & NRD information (as needed)
Add new construction
Review Rural Homes and Outbuildings
New photos of homes in Geneva City & villages
Rural Oblique Photos (aerial)
Send forms for IOLL
Number & identify Outbuildings/Print 8x10
Set up new GIS computer for editing/combine east & west
Review nursing homes/hospital

2013 Continue sales review for all classes of property
Examine the level, quality and uniformity of assessment in the county
Review level of value and make any needed changes by class of property
Review ag land for any changes in land areas and values
Verify land usage with FSA & NRD information (as needed)
Add new construction
Continue our systematic review of property
Complete rural review of homes & outbuildings
Measure exempt Properties

2014 Continue sales review of all classes of property
Examine the level, quality and uniformity of assessment in the county
Review level of value and make any needed changes by class of property
Review ag land for any changes in values and land areas
Verify land usage with FSA & NRD information (as needed)

Add new construction
Continue our systematic review of property

2006 The staff had the parcel layer in and aerial photos identified.

2008 Land use layer was completed and the numeric codes applied
Continue our systematic review of property –

2006 Reviewed the rural homes and buildings and Geneva

2007 Reviewed all the small town

2008 Worked on completing the land use layer and converted the land classification codes from the old soil symbols to the new numeric codes

2009 Commercial & Industrial values reviewed including new photos
-20% all homes 1939 or older with average or lower condition in Geneva due to statistics

2010 Reviewed Geneva and all towns
Made new record cards
New APEX sketching program, drew all residential sketches in this program.

2011 Beginning rural residential and building review/new rural home & OB photos/ begin aerial imagery

2012 New Rural Home & OB Values will be completed (6 year review process) Aerial Imagery completed. City and Village Photos completed

2012 Assessment Survey for Fillmore 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:**
	$181,930
7.	**Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:**
	$180,730
8.	**Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:**
	$40,000
9.	**Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:**
	0
10.	**Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:**
	N/A (this is in the county data processing budget)
11.	**Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:**
	$1,250
12.	**Other miscellaneous funds:**
	$12,000 is in the surveyor's budget for GIS Workshop & office support; also $16,000 is budgeted for aerial photos. GIS Workshop has been contracted to provide photos during 2012.
13.	**Amount of last year's budget not used:**
	Yes; about $3,470

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	**Administrative software:**
	County Solutions
2.	**CAMA software:**
	County Solutions / Micro Solve
3.	**Are cadastral maps currently being used?**
	Yes
4.	**If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?**
	Assessor and Staff
5.	**Does the county have GIS software?**
	Yes
6.	**Who maintains the GIS software and maps?**
	Assessor and Staff and GIS Workshop
7.	**Personal Property software:**
	County Solutions

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?**
	All towns are zoned except Strang
4.	**When was zoning implemented?**
	2000

D. Contracted Services

1.	**Appraisal Services:**
	Knoche Consulting LLC
2.	**Other services:**
	County Solutions and GIS Workshop

2012 Certification for Fillmore 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 Fillmore County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

STATE OF NEBRASKA
PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR
DEPT. OF REVENUE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT DIVISION