

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 Gage County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	432	Median	97.93
Total Sales Price	\$41,958,152	Mean	109.46
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$41,958,152	Wgt. Mean	98.27
Total Assessed Value	\$41,232,080	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$72,885
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$97,125	Avg. Assessed Value	\$95,445

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.70 to 98.91
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	96.05 to 100.49
95% Mean C.I	103.94 to 114.98
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	37.22
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.57
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.98

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	468	96	96
2010	553	97	97
2009	654	97	97
2008	709	97	97

2012 Commission Summary for Gage County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	35	Median	93.54
Total Sales Price	\$4,808,952	Mean	93.06
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,808,952	Wgt. Mean	93.35
Total Assessed Value	\$4,489,385	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$147,077
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$137,399	Avg. Assessed Value	\$128,268

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	86.31 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	87.03 to 99.68
95% Mean C.I	86.41 to 99.71
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	9.84
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.82
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.46

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	34	97	97
2010	45	96	96
2009	69	100	100
2008	83	96	96

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Gage 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	94	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	70	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Gage County

Gage County conducted a sales analysis and reviewed the statistics for the residential class of property. For 2012 the valuation group that includes the town of Cortland was reviewed. For the review the contract appraiser verified all of the sales and constructed a model. A drive by review was completed for all properties, and the condition was updated for the improvements. New photos were taken and the property record card was updated.

Gage County is on track to complete the six year assessment cycle. The county relies on an appraisal assistant in the office in addition to the contract appraiser. The County completed all of the pickup, and permit work for the residential class.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Gage County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
		Gage County addresses the residential class by using each incorporated area as its own valuation group. During their sales analysis they complete a market study at a minimum by reviewing the statistical analysis provided in the state sales file and by reviewing and verifying the sales throughout the year. The County has a systematical review process in place to meet the six year review cycle. The county contends that each of the valuation groups has its own unique market and that any adjustments are only considered within the confines of these valuation groups. The groups correspond with the appraisal cycle in the County so that any adjustment outside the valuation grouping strata would tend to cause a disparate treatment of the class.
	01	Adams
	02	Barneston
	03	Beatrice
	04	Beatrice Subdivision
	05	Blue Springs
	06	Clatonia
	07	Cortland
	09	Filley
	10	Liberty
	11	Odell
	12	Pickrell
	13	Rockford
	14	Rural
	15	Rural Sub North
	17	Virginia
	18	Wymore
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Gage County uses a market approach that is tied to the RCN, based on RCN less market based depreciation.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
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 does not use the cost approach solely in developing market value. The County utilizes market studies for each valuation grouping. The depreciation is based on local market information.
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes, In conjunction with the market analysis.
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?
	During the review cycle outlined in the 3 year plan for the County.
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?
	2010
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?
	The County uses a sales comparison approach, in the valuation group of Beatrice it is applied on a square foot basis. For the rest of the groups they are valued by lot with adjustments for larger vacant parcels.
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	If additions to structures as well as new improvements have been added on the parcel. The county, during the sales verification determines if the change to the parcel has a substantial effect on the market value of the property.

34 Gage
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 : 432
Total Sales Price : 41,958,152
Total Adj. Sales Price : 41,958,152
Total Assessed Value : 41,232,080
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 97,125
Avg. Assessed Value : 95,445

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 98
MEAN : 109
COD : 22.97
PRD : 111.39

COV : 53.49
STD : 58.55
Avg. Abs. Dev : 22.49
MAX Sales Ratio : 647.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 10.00

95% Median C.I. : 96.70 to 98.91
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 96.05 to 100.49
95% Mean C.I. : 103.94 to 114.98

Printed:3/29/2012 3:08:04PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	71	99.21	117.27	107.38	27.93	109.21	59.67	640.65	97.19 to 105.12	97,485	104,680
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	56	95.02	102.15	94.02	19.04	108.65	25.50	471.00	91.14 to 97.49	100,393	94,389
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	30	98.67	103.16	99.20	15.89	103.99	64.01	191.50	92.20 to 108.42	83,982	83,312
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	82	95.67	97.44	94.73	11.73	102.86	31.22	208.41	92.38 to 98.12	101,079	95,749
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	39	100.40	108.44	97.48	19.53	111.24	67.73	220.32	93.35 to 106.52	97,824	95,359
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	64	99.89	105.23	97.19	16.89	108.27	10.00	219.69	97.09 to 104.08	108,650	105,593
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	35	99.87	117.57	98.30	33.77	119.60	37.14	388.57	93.22 to 110.38	91,452	89,898
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	55	101.32	128.70	97.90	40.30	131.46	65.35	647.00	94.90 to 111.84	84,313	82,542
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	239	96.86	105.15	98.79	19.07	106.44	25.50	640.65	95.06 to 98.38	97,705	96,522
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	193	99.97	114.80	97.62	27.33	117.60	10.00	647.00	97.41 to 103.14	96,408	94,110
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	215	97.90	102.55	96.53	15.56	106.24	10.00	220.32	95.86 to 99.14	100,357	96,873
<u>ALL</u>	432	97.93	109.46	98.27	22.97	111.39	10.00	647.00	96.70 to 98.91	97,125	95,445

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	15	94.38	91.88	90.45	11.11	101.58	71.64	127.20	81.72 to 97.92	103,000	93,159
02	1	66.44	66.44	66.44	00.00	100.00	66.44	66.44	N/A	16,000	10,630
03	267	99.35	111.44	100.56	22.50	110.82	25.50	640.65	97.64 to 101.54	95,108	95,641
04	10	96.05	98.98	98.34	06.91	100.65	87.01	128.15	90.71 to 104.08	135,815	133,564
05	6	139.40	254.54	123.83	104.95	205.56	101.79	647.00	101.79 to 647.00	12,917	15,995
06	7	101.38	102.49	101.28	12.97	101.19	81.06	141.21	81.06 to 141.21	68,429	69,305
07	12	93.52	96.21	95.91	05.68	100.31	86.11	110.64	92.20 to 106.75	132,992	127,553
09	2	78.73	78.73	65.31	33.68	120.55	52.21	105.25	N/A	40,500	26,450
10	1	112.21	112.21	112.21	00.00	100.00	112.21	112.21	N/A	7,000	7,855
11	6	101.90	105.18	93.92	17.33	111.99	85.01	137.22	85.01 to 137.22	39,167	36,784
12	4	84.18	88.64	87.25	08.22	101.59	79.69	106.53	N/A	74,500	65,004
14	45	94.76	96.20	91.01	15.32	105.70	65.35	174.80	89.10 to 101.29	127,882	116,391
15	14	98.07	121.92	99.93	32.44	122.01	67.73	478.71	92.97 to 99.21	266,691	266,515
17	4	84.84	101.37	91.55	26.98	110.73	73.00	162.79	N/A	19,863	18,184
18	35	97.28	110.32	98.42	21.35	112.09	37.14	388.57	95.39 to 98.21	34,440	33,895
19	3	57.40	47.49	72.20	37.79	65.78	10.00	75.08	N/A	32,833	23,707
<u>ALL</u>	432	97.93	109.46	98.27	22.97	111.39	10.00	647.00	96.70 to 98.91	97,125	95,445

34 Gage
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 : 432
Total Sales Price : 41,958,152
Total Adj. Sales Price : 41,958,152
Total Assessed Value : 41,232,080
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 97,125
Avg. Assessed Value : 95,445

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 98
MEAN : 109
COD : 22.97
PRD : 111.39

COV : 53.49
STD : 58.55
Avg. Abs. Dev : 22.49
MAX Sales Ratio : 647.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 10.00

95% Median C.I. : 96.70 to 98.91
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 96.05 to 100.49
95% Mean C.I. : 103.94 to 114.98

Printed:3/29/2012 3:08:04PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	424	97.91	109.38	98.28	22.74	111.29	10.00	647.00	96.64 to 98.83	98,419	96,722
06											
07	8	107.68	113.84	97.21	30.79	117.11	37.14	184.67	37.14 to 184.67	28,563	27,766
<u>ALL</u>	432	97.93	109.46	98.27	22.97	111.39	10.00	647.00	96.70 to 98.91	97,125	95,445

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	9	184.67	256.78	188.35	101.07	136.33	10.00	647.00	37.14 to 471.00	2,256	4,248
Less Than 15,000	40	105.57	162.78	137.75	76.25	118.17	10.00	647.00	96.61 to 159.00	7,476	10,298
Less Than 30,000	75	114.69	147.68	132.04	50.07	111.84	10.00	647.00	103.14 to 127.97	14,362	18,964
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	423	97.90	106.33	98.23	19.17	108.25	25.50	640.65	96.64 to 98.83	99,144	97,385
Greater Than 14,999	392	97.69	104.02	97.99	16.85	106.15	31.22	640.65	96.34 to 98.64	106,273	104,133
Greater Than 29,999	357	97.19	101.44	97.38	14.89	104.17	31.22	640.65	95.69 to 98.11	114,513	111,512
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	9	184.67	256.78	188.35	101.07	136.33	10.00	647.00	37.14 to 471.00	2,256	4,248
5,000 TO 14,999	31	103.63	135.49	134.06	45.42	101.07	25.50	484.50	96.00 to 137.22	8,992	12,055
15,000 TO 29,999	35	119.80	130.42	129.85	25.15	100.44	66.44	219.69	105.96 to 138.97	22,232	28,868
30,000 TO 59,999	73	107.47	123.11	124.33	29.47	99.02	31.22	640.65	101.22 to 115.23	45,267	56,278
60,000 TO 99,999	99	96.70	97.21	97.20	11.90	100.01	52.21	144.44	93.35 to 98.63	76,725	74,579
100,000 TO 149,999	104	95.08	96.44	96.27	09.72	100.18	65.35	146.49	93.32 to 97.41	123,990	119,360
150,000 TO 249,999	62	96.05	93.94	93.86	07.12	100.09	75.18	109.86	92.40 to 97.75	180,324	169,258
250,000 TO 499,999	19	94.82	91.93	91.62	07.79	100.34	67.73	105.19	83.62 to 98.91	310,822	284,772
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	432	97.93	109.46	98.27	22.97	111.39	10.00	647.00	96.70 to 98.91	97,125	95,445

**2012 Correlation Section
for Gage County**

A. Residential Real Property

Gage County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Beatrice which is centered in the County. Gage is bordered to the south by the state of Kansas. Lancaster County is directly north of Gage County. The eastern border of the County is shared with Johnson and Pawnee counties, with Saline and Jefferson to the west. Gage County has seen a decline in population over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat. The residential market in the county is seeing a slight decline as evidenced by the statistical profile.

The sales file consists of 432 qualified residential sales and is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the residential class of property. Two of the measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range with only the mean being outside the range by 9 points. In reviewing the statistical report the effect of low dollar sales on the mean is evident. The mean drops into the range when excluding the sales under 30,000. All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range. The counties valuation groups represent the assessor locations in the county and they represent the appraisal cycle of the county more than unique markets.

Gage County has a consistent procedure for sales verification. The county uses a sales questionnaire to verify sale price as well as gathering detailed information pertaining to the transaction. The contract appraiser completes a statistical review of all sales in the file. A physical inspection is completed on any sales with a perceived discrepancy and on all sales in conjunction with a review of a valuation group. The county utilizes an acceptable portion of available sales and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

The appraiser also conducted a sales analysis of all the assessor locations and continually updates the sales books for the residential class of properties. The County reviewed the town of Cortland for 2012. The review consisted of a physical inspection and verification by the contract appraisal company.

The County has a consistent approach to valuing and reviewing the property in Gage County. They utilize a contract appraiser and also have an appraiser assistant in the office. The known assessment practices are reliable and consistent and the residential class is treated uniformly and proportionately. The County has a web site for parcel searches with GIS capabilities.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 98% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Gage County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of real property.

The Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

2012 Correlation Section for Gage County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization. The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

2012 Correlation Section for Gage County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Gage County**

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

2012 Commercial Assessment Actions for Gage County

For 2012 the County conducted a statistical analysis and concluded that no adjustments were necessary in the commercial class of property. The contract appraiser continually verifies the commercial sales. Included in the verification the appraiser conducts an on-site interview and inspection on all commercial sales. The county also completed pickup work and permit work for the class.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Gage County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Contract Appraiser and Staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Beatrice
	05	Remainder of the County
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The county uses a correlated market, cost and income, weighted towards market and income. Where possible the county gathers income information from the market and during sales verification. Beatrice is the only location where enough contract rents are collected to be useful in analyzing the commercial properties.	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	The Counties contract appraiser uses information that he has gathered across the state in conjunction with the work he does in other counties as well as relying on the State Sales File.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
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 relies more on market information and income, but they do use tables provided by the CAMA vendor, but they do develop their own tables for some unique properties	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Only in those groups where there is adequate sales information.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2010	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2008	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	The County develops the value for lots based on vacant lot sales.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	If a parcel changes from vacant to improved, or if improvements are removed, it would be coded as substantially improved. If the footprint of the improvement changes as to have a substantial market difference on the property.	

34 Gage
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 : 35
Total Sales Price : 4,808,952
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,808,952
Total Assessed Value : 4,489,385
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 137,399
Avg. Assessed Value : 128,268

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 93
COD : 15.15
PRD : 99.69

COV : 21.56
STD : 20.06
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.17
MAX Sales Ratio : 130.98
MIN Sales Ratio : 33.54

95% Median C.I. : 86.31 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 87.03 to 99.68
95% Mean C.I. : 86.41 to 99.71

Printed:3/29/2012 3:08:05PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	94.93	91.12	91.96	07.04	99.09	79.19	99.23	N/A	471,667	433,722
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	67.92	67.92	67.92	00.00	100.00	67.92	67.92	N/A	200,000	135,840
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	94.31	94.31	94.50	00.82	99.80	93.54	95.07	N/A	160,000	151,193
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	91.83	92.43	91.87	08.96	100.61	81.88	104.17	N/A	23,569	21,653
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	111.53	111.53	108.25	16.16	103.03	93.51	129.55	N/A	110,000	119,080
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	81.42	74.37	75.01	10.32	99.15	52.00	84.14	N/A	44,750	33,568
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	116.28	111.77	109.96	04.84	101.65	101.07	117.95	N/A	57,333	63,043
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	62.20	62.20	61.85	46.08	100.57	33.54	90.86	N/A	81,000	50,095
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	95.42	104.11	105.30	13.19	98.87	86.31	130.98	N/A	153,000	161,102
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	5	94.86	98.58	94.14	10.42	104.72	83.36	121.28	N/A	191,000	179,809
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	90.95	96.43	93.47	16.29	103.17	76.93	121.40	N/A	93,975	87,837
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	10	94.24	89.96	89.98	08.65	99.98	67.92	104.17	79.19 to 99.23	202,928	182,600
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	10	88.83	93.02	96.65	21.00	96.24	52.00	129.55	72.21 to 117.95	61,575	59,513
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	15	94.79	95.14	95.58	15.93	99.54	33.54	130.98	86.31 to 113.07	144,262	137,884
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	13	86.51	88.71	92.65	14.16	95.75	52.00	129.55	81.42 to 97.14	66,002	61,153
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	10	98.25	98.03	99.62	18.16	98.40	33.54	130.98	86.31 to 117.95	109,900	109,483
<u>ALL</u>	35	93.54	93.06	93.35	15.15	99.69	33.54	130.98	86.31 to 97.14	137,399	128,268

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	23	95.42	100.83	96.94	12.91	104.01	79.19	130.98	90.97 to 113.07	164,806	159,762
50	12	81.98	78.16	80.01	17.17	97.69	33.54	101.07	67.92 to 93.54	84,869	67,906
<u>ALL</u>	35	93.54	93.06	93.35	15.15	99.69	33.54	130.98	86.31 to 97.14	137,399	128,268

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	34	93.53	92.87	92.09	15.42	100.85	33.54	130.98	84.14 to 97.14	116,440	107,232
04	1	99.23	99.23	99.23	00.00	100.00	99.23	99.23	N/A	850,000	843,490
<u>ALL</u>	35	93.54	93.06	93.35	15.15	99.69	33.54	130.98	86.31 to 97.14	137,399	128,268

34 Gage
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 : 35
Total Sales Price : 4,808,952
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,808,952
Total Assessed Value : 4,489,385
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 137,399
Avg. Assessed Value : 128,268

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 93
COD : 15.15
PRD : 99.69

COV : 21.56
STD : 20.06
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.17
MAX Sales Ratio : 130.98
MIN Sales Ratio : 33.54

95% Median C.I. : 86.31 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 87.03 to 99.68
95% Mean C.I. : 86.41 to 99.71

Printed:3/29/2012 3:08:05PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	2	79.41	79.41	78.76	03.12	100.83	76.93	81.88	N/A	11,488	9,048	
Less Than 30,000	4	89.51	90.03	92.26	11.88	97.58	76.93	104.17	N/A	15,938	14,704	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	35	93.54	93.06	93.35	15.15	99.69	33.54	130.98	86.31 to 97.14	137,399	128,268	
Greater Than 14,999	33	94.79	93.88	93.42	14.91	100.49	33.54	130.98	86.51 to 99.23	145,030	135,494	
Greater Than 29,999	31	93.54	93.45	93.37	15.63	100.09	33.54	130.98	86.31 to 99.23	153,071	142,922	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	2	79.41	79.41	78.76	03.12	100.83	76.93	81.88	N/A	11,488	9,048	
15,000 TO 29,999	2	100.66	100.66	99.86	03.50	100.80	97.14	104.17	N/A	20,389	20,360	
30,000 TO 59,999	8	85.33	88.33	86.19	18.61	102.48	52.00	121.40	52.00 to 121.40	38,219	32,941	
60,000 TO 99,999	8	94.86	92.89	92.93	18.52	99.96	33.54	129.55	33.54 to 129.55	73,375	68,185	
100,000 TO 149,999	4	93.53	93.95	94.19	04.32	99.75	86.31	102.45	N/A	121,250	114,205	
150,000 TO 249,999	7	95.07	102.02	99.90	16.77	102.12	67.92	130.98	67.92 to 130.98	183,207	183,032	
250,000 TO 499,999	2	89.39	89.39	87.63	06.75	102.01	83.36	95.42	N/A	367,500	322,030	
500,000 TO 999,999	2	89.21	89.21	91.81	11.23	97.17	79.19	99.23	N/A	675,000	619,730	
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	35	93.54	93.06	93.35	15.15	99.69	33.54	130.98	86.31 to 97.14	137,399	128,268	

34 Gage
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 : 35
Total Sales Price : 4,808,952
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,808,952
Total Assessed Value : 4,489,385
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 137,399
Avg. Assessed Value : 128,268

MEDIAN : 94
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 93
COD : 15.15
PRD : 99.69

COV : 21.56
STD : 20.06
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.17
MAX Sales Ratio : 130.98
MIN Sales Ratio : 33.54

95% Median C.I. : 86.31 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 87.03 to 99.68
95% Mean C.I. : 86.41 to 99.71

Printed:3/29/2012 3:08:05PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
299	1	94.86	94.86	94.86	00.00	100.00	94.86	94.86	N/A	170,000	161,255
326	2	94.06	94.06	93.54	03.29	100.56	90.97	97.14	N/A	30,000	28,063
344	6	92.91	97.09	95.76	19.31	101.39	72.21	129.55	72.21 to 129.55	149,083	142,756
349	1	95.07	95.07	95.07	00.00	100.00	95.07	95.07	N/A	200,000	190,135
350	4	97.31	104.11	108.12	12.24	96.29	90.86	130.98	N/A	108,750	117,576
352	1	93.51	93.51	93.51	00.00	100.00	93.51	93.51	N/A	130,000	121,565
353	6	90.65	98.26	103.57	15.70	94.87	81.42	121.40	81.42 to 121.40	63,792	66,071
384	1	76.93	76.93	76.93	00.00	100.00	76.93	76.93	N/A	14,475	11,135
386	2	87.31	87.31	84.74	09.30	103.03	79.19	95.42	N/A	380,000	322,030
406	4	86.52	82.30	85.15	17.64	96.65	52.00	104.17	N/A	89,557	76,260
442	1	117.95	117.95	117.95	00.00	100.00	117.95	117.95	N/A	32,000	37,745
494	1	99.23	99.23	99.23	00.00	100.00	99.23	99.23	N/A	850,000	843,490
528	5	86.31	79.80	75.78	25.43	105.30	33.54	116.28	N/A	104,400	79,114
<u>ALL</u>	<u>35</u>	93.54	93.06	93.35	15.15	99.69	33.54	130.98	86.31 to 97.14	137,399	128,268

2012 Correlation Section for Gage County

A. Commercial Real Property

Gage County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town is Beatrice which is centered in the County. Gage is bordered to the south by the state of Kansas. Lancaster County is directly north of Gage County. The eastern border of the County is shared with Johnson and Pawnee counties, with Saline and Jefferson to the west. Gage County has seen a decline in population over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat.

The 2012 Gage County commercial statistical profile reveals a total of 35 qualified commercial sales to be used as a sample for the three-year study period. The calculated median is 94. The profile indicates that all of the three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. Regarding the qualitative statistical measures, the COD and the PRD are both in the recommended range.

Valuation group 01, which represents Beatrice, is the only group with a large enough sample for any meaningful analysis. Valuation group 50 represents the remainder of the County, which includes 5 occupancies and includes 6 assessor locations (towns). This valuation group has such variability and without any organized market that attempting to rely on a calculated level of value for the group in my opinion would be ill advised.

Gage County was selected for an expanded AVU (Assessed Value Update) review of the commercial class of property in 2011. The AVU value was audited to see if it matched the value on the property record card for 2011. The values were also compared to unsold neighboring properties with the same occupancy where available. There was no indication of selective valuation in Gage County.

The contract appraiser reviews and verifies all commercial sales in the County. The appraiser conducts a physical inspection in conjunction with the sales verification. The appraiser has worked in Gage County for a number of years and coordinated the review of all commercial properties that was completed for the tax year 2010. It appears that the County uses all available sales and there is no indication of excessive trimming. It is believed that the assessment practices of the County produce an overall uniform and proportionate treatment of commercial property.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 94% of market value for the commercial class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Gage County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of real property.

The Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

2012 Correlation Section for Gage County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization. The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

2012 Correlation Section for Gage County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Gage County**

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Gage County

The County conducted an analysis on the agricultural sales in the study period. Part of the annual review consists of the analysis of the market areas used in the County. For 2012 Gage County continues the use of two market areas.

The county adjusted values in both market areas to bring the level of assessment within the acceptable range. The county continually reviews sales by verifying sale prices and land use. The County completed permit and pickup work for the agricultural class of property for 2012.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Gage County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	The entire county except for the three townships bordering Pawnee county to the east.
	02	The three townships sharing a border with Pawnee County. The general soil association is more consistent with Pawnee County than the soils in the townships within the county directly to the west. The market is more consistent with and has similar influences with the Pawnee county land.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	The county analyzes all agricultural sales to determine if all areas in the county are selling for the same amount. Where differences are noted they try to identify what characteristics are causing the difference.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	The county uses the sales verification forms and interviews with buyers or sellers to determine if there are influences other than agricultural affecting the sales.	
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?	
	The only differences would be if the rural residential home sites are in a rural residential subdivision.	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	GIS, physical inspection and some FSA maps if available.	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales review and verification that includes physical inspection of all ag sales. Questionnaires are mailed out that ask the question of the intent of the use of the property.	
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	Yes. At this time the county has not recognized a difference.	
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	If the parcel changes from vacant to improved, it would be coded as substantially changed. If the footprint of the improvement changes it is considered substantially changed. The County considers if the changes to the parcel have an effect on the market value of the parcel by a significant amount.	

34 Gage
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 : 120
 Total Sales Price : 35,536,940
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 35,536,940
 Total Assessed Value : 24,215,201
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 296,141
 Avg. Assessed Value : 201,793

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 23.31
 PRD : 108.89

COV : 32.70
 STD : 24.26
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.42
 MAX Sales Ratio : 178.43
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.54

95% Median C.I. : 65.02 to 73.32
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.58 to 71.70
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.86 to 78.54

Printed:3/29/2012 3:08:06PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	6	83.72	82.64	80.38	19.18	102.81	56.93	114.67	56.93 to 114.67	422,385	339,495
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	16	75.15	77.54	73.27	15.57	105.83	51.52	115.49	69.95 to 81.40	271,354	198,811
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	8	68.56	88.91	71.02	45.23	125.19	53.34	177.11	53.34 to 177.11	197,278	140,102
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	71.63	74.75	76.07	15.93	98.26	54.45	94.84	54.45 to 94.84	251,529	191,342
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	74.59	83.06	76.55	15.94	108.50	66.17	117.17	N/A	234,433	179,456
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	11	68.59	70.10	65.83	11.82	106.49	51.53	92.70	62.31 to 81.84	395,873	260,597
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	16	70.04	74.27	71.37	25.61	104.06	41.99	125.29	56.03 to 94.00	312,869	223,283
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	14	72.14	86.20	78.09	32.59	110.39	52.21	178.43	61.46 to 108.06	240,249	187,600
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	9	62.83	64.81	59.83	23.79	108.32	35.54	118.39	49.30 to 70.57	236,621	141,565
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	14	58.62	62.76	59.69	19.24	105.14	37.91	99.41	49.63 to 73.85	276,500	165,054
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	10	67.73	69.06	60.05	17.14	115.00	44.30	95.50	55.07 to 81.71	276,657	166,126
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	50.31	49.68	49.95	02.96	99.46	46.70	51.39	N/A	664,680	332,040
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	37	74.76	80.30	75.17	22.59	106.82	51.52	177.11	70.32 to 81.18	276,079	207,518
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	46	71.35	77.86	71.69	23.76	108.61	41.99	178.43	66.17 to 77.46	302,090	216,582
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	37	59.43	63.55	57.54	21.44	110.44	35.54	118.39	55.07 to 69.04	308,808	177,683
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	31	71.63	78.10	70.20	22.09	111.25	51.53	177.11	62.88 to 81.18	285,990	200,776
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	53	68.15	72.77	68.08	26.29	106.89	35.54	178.43	59.43 to 71.56	271,132	184,600
<u>ALL</u>	120	70.44	74.20	68.14	23.31	108.89	35.54	178.43	65.02 to 73.32	296,141	201,793

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	99	70.55	74.52	67.99	24.69	109.60	35.54	178.43	63.45 to 73.32	311,926	212,068
2	21	70.32	72.67	69.16	16.64	105.08	37.91	114.67	64.01 to 78.25	221,727	153,354
<u>ALL</u>	120	70.44	74.20	68.14	23.31	108.89	35.54	178.43	65.02 to 73.32	296,141	201,793

34 Gage
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 : 120
 Total Sales Price : 35,536,940
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 35,536,940
 Total Assessed Value : 24,215,201
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 296,141
 Avg. Assessed Value : 201,793

MEDIAN : 70
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 23.31
 PRD : 108.89

COV : 32.70
 STD : 24.26
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 16.42
 MAX Sales Ratio : 178.43
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.54

95% Median C.I. : 65.02 to 73.32
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.58 to 71.70
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.86 to 78.54

Printed:3/29/2012 3:08:06PM

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	1	70.55	70.55	70.55	00.00	100.00	70.55	70.55	N/A	291,000	205,300
1	1	70.55	70.55	70.55	00.00	100.00	70.55	70.55	N/A	291,000	205,300
_____Dry_____											
County	34	71.50	77.93	70.46	23.80	110.60	37.91	133.44	65.02 to 83.18	230,639	162,500
1	29	71.44	79.07	71.29	23.57	110.91	49.67	133.44	65.02 to 87.59	236,374	168,522
2	5	81.18	71.32	64.64	19.89	110.33	37.91	94.89	N/A	197,373	127,576
_____Grass_____											
County	2	69.17	69.17	73.20	17.70	94.49	56.93	81.40	N/A	298,375	218,408
1	2	69.17	69.17	73.20	17.70	94.49	56.93	81.40	N/A	298,375	218,408
_____ALL_____	120	70.44	74.20	68.14	23.31	108.89	35.54	178.43	65.02 to 73.32	296,141	201,793

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	2	70.85	70.85	71.01	00.42	99.77	70.55	71.14	N/A	666,000	472,940
1	2	70.85	70.85	71.01	00.42	99.77	70.55	71.14	N/A	666,000	472,940
_____Dry_____											
County	59	69.20	72.23	64.06	23.99	112.75	37.91	133.44	59.43 to 74.47	275,923	176,756
1	51	69.20	73.10	64.54	24.16	113.26	44.30	133.44	61.46 to 74.47	283,883	183,227
2	8	65.13	66.69	60.18	24.31	110.82	37.91	94.89	37.91 to 94.89	225,174	135,503
_____Grass_____											
County	7	74.24	75.58	81.18	16.80	93.10	56.93	112.61	56.93 to 112.61	217,750	176,770
1	5	74.24	77.60	83.12	20.00	93.36	56.93	112.61	N/A	241,250	200,519
2	2	70.52	70.52	73.83	09.23	95.52	64.01	77.03	N/A	159,000	117,398
_____ALL_____	120	70.44	74.20	68.14	23.31	108.89	35.54	178.43	65.02 to 73.32	296,141	201,793

Gage County 2012 Avg LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
34.10	Gage	1	2,848	2,872	2,566	2,575	2,303	2,309	2,130	2,113	2,609
49.10	Johnson	1	3,331	3,103	3,100	2,632	2,500	#DIV/0!	1,556	1,300	2,626
76.10	Saline	1	2,152	2,186	1,524	1,525	1,498	1,500	1,400	1,400	1,866
76.20	Saline	2	2,796	2,797	2,686	2,397	2,196	#DIV/0!	1,897	1,827	2,569
48.10	Jefferson	1	3,620	4,288	3,619	3,095	3,097	#DIV/0!	2,570	1,490	3,672
48.20	Jefferson	2	3,535	3,903	3,105	2,829	2,358	#DIV/0!	1,922	1,565	3,175
48.30	Jefferson	3	3,040	3,074	2,490	2,375	2,265	#DIV/0!	1,810	1,585	2,536
55.10	Lancaster	1	3,734	3,750	3,747	3,744	3,000	2,986	2,623	2,616	3,493
34.20	Gage	2	1,960	1,960	1,760	1,760	1,570	#DIV/0!	1,495	1,497	1,738
49.10	Johnson	1	3,331	3,103	3,100	2,632	2,500	#DIV/0!	1,556	1,300	2,626
67.10	Pawnee	1	2,750	2,750	#DIV/0!	2,020	1,905	#DIV/0!	1,435	1,435	2,185

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Gage	1	2,205	2,205	1,860	1,860	1,575	1,575	1,400	1,400	1,780
	Johnson	1	2,465	2,276	2,310	1,882	1,950	1,962	1,185	1,000	1,798
	Saline	1	2,114	2,113	1,898	1,899	1,772	1,673	1,535	1,513	1,926
	Saline	2	1,948	1,947	1,749	1,696	1,618	1,300	1,296	1,198	1,735
	Jefferson	1	2,100	2,903	2,100	1,739	1,809	#DIV/0!	1,615	585	2,203
	Jefferson	2	2,480	2,690	1,907	1,654	1,401	#DIV/0!	1,275	680	2,023
	Jefferson	3	1,800	1,872	1,794	1,195	1,158	#DIV/0!	956	811	1,400
	Lancaster	1	3,371	3,375	2,845	2,847	2,250	2,248	1,649	1,647	2,649
	Gage	2	1,780	1,780	1,760	1,760	1,375	#DIV/0!	1,045	1,045	1,505
	Johnson	1	2,465	2,276	2,310	1,882	1,950	1,962	1,185	1,000	1,798
	Pawnee	1	2,200	2,200	1,542	1,615	1,525	1,250	1,150	1,150	1,563

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Gage	1	786	1,097	935	1,105	984	885	885	641	889
	Johnson	1	1,288	1,666	1,453	1,204	1,251	1,236	940	679	1,039
	Saline	1	1,007	1,336	1,149	1,332	1,231	1,159	1,107	879	1,121
	Saline	2	1,015	1,060	911	1,037	987	816	924	738	870
	Jefferson	1	1,155	1,434	1,138	1,342	778	#DIV/0!	1,301	519	973
	Jefferson	2	699	794	547	883	921	#DIV/0!	803	625	767
	Jefferson	3	962	1,062	869	845	1,050	#DIV/0!	839	723	820
	Lancaster	1	1,860	2,017	1,707	1,786	1,440	1,451	1,052	996	1,401
	Gage	2	872	1,091	965	1,142	933	1,235	802	647	884
	Johnson	1	1,288	1,666	1,453	1,204	1,251	1,236	940	679	1,039
	Pawnee	1	1,097	1,457	1,046	1,254	1,129	945	919	846	1,075

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

GAGE COUNTY ASSESSOR'S OFFICE
612 Grant, Room 8
Beatrice, NE 68310
Phone: (402) 223-1308

Patricia L. Milligan, Assessor

Loreene Stein, Deputy Assessor

REPORT OF SPECIAL VALUATION PROCEDURES/METHODOLOGY

FOR ASSESSMENT YEAR 2012

MARCH 1, 2012

- GENERAL INFORMATION:

On December 1, 1999, the Gage County Board of Supervisors officially adopted temporary zoning regulations for the county. At their December 29, 1999 Board Meeting, Resolution 1033 was passed stating that the special valuation or greenbelt provision would be available in Gage County beginning with the tax year 2000 and that the Gage County Assessor would implement the special valuation or greenbelt provision beginning with tax year 2000 for those land owners who make application on the prescribed form and meet all qualifying criteria.

The special valuation or greenbelt provision was implemented to recognize influences on sales of agricultural/horticultural land where such influences were other than agricultural/horticultural purposes. These non-agricultural/ horticultural influences include, but are not limited to, residential, commercial, investment, or recreational. By recognizing these influences, the assessed value determination can be based on the lands value as if the lands only use is for agricultural/horticultural purposes.

Gage County lies adjacent to Lancaster County on the north and approximately 20 miles south of Lincoln. Additionally, U.S. Highway 77 from Lincoln south through Cortland into Beatrice has been reconfigured from a two lane road to a four lane Highway providing for easy access to Lincoln and Interstate Highway 80 with convenient Interstate access east and west from all areas of Gage County. During previous years, a proliferation of rural residential subdivisions had influenced the sale price of agricultural/horticultural land. Additionally, sales of agricultural/horticultural land within close proximity to the city of Beatrice reflected development or developmental potential for residential and/or commercial uses.

At the time we initiated the Special Valuation or Green Belt provisions, our review of sales along with our sale verification procedures indicated that agricultural/horticultural sales in Gage County, with the exception of the southwestern most portion of Gage County, were influenced by non-agricultural/horticultural influences. Later studies determined those same non-agricultural/horticultural influences were being experienced throughout the county. However, recent sales studies and sale verifications indicate the non-agricultural/horticultural influences on sales of agricultural/horticultural land throughout the county no longer exists.

- Since 1994, Gage County has been divided into agricultural or horticultural neighborhoods for valuation purposes. Initially, the county was divided into two areas-north of Highway 136 and south of Highway 136. Subsequently, a study and sales review by Great Plains Appraisal Company of Lincoln recommended the division of the county into three neighborhoods. These neighborhood or area boundaries were redefined in 1995 and the county was divided into four areas. The four neighborhood areas were further refined for tax year 2002 with the addition of a neighborhood or area 5 made up of townships or portion of townships from existing areas 2 and 3. There has been further minor realignment of neighborhood boundaries during subsequent years. The county neighborhoods were developed to account for the different market influences and reactions on similar type land capability groups and soil classes throughout the county. For tax year 2008, an analysis of sales along with an analysis of the soil makeup of the county (results of a new soil survey), resulted in a major realignment of neighborhoods dividing the county into two neighborhoods-neighborhood 1 consisting of all townships except the southeastern three most townships and neighborhood 2 consisting of those townships.
- Methodology (influenced or recapture value):
In determining recapture value of agricultural/horticultural land, Gage County utilizes the sales comparison approach. It is recognized in the appraisal of real property that sale prices of comparable properties are usually considered the best evidence of market value. It is further recognized that when selecting comparable sales, they are selected based on their similarity to the subject property.

All agricultural/horticultural qualified sales are reviewed and analyzed by neighborhood and, at the same time, each neighborhood is reviewed for possible realignment. In determining recapture values within each neighborhood, arms length sales are broken down and grouped by similar number of acres sold

(i.e.<40 acres, 40-100 acres, etc.), similar predominate soil classes (i.e. Class 1, Class 2 etc.); and similar land groups (ie. Irrigated, Dry land etc.) and plotted on a sale spreadsheet. Difference in the number of acres in each land capability group for each sale is taken in the analysis. From this data, we determine ranges of value and the most appropriate value for each land capability group. In accordance with existing state statutes, agricultural/horticultural land is assessed at 75% of market value.

- Methodology (Uninfluenced or “special value”)

Initially, our analysis indicated that agricultural sales in the southwestern most portion of Gage County did not have the nonagricultural or horticultural influences that were being experienced in other areas of Gage County. Subsequent analysis indicated these

Nonagricultural/horticultural influences existed in all areas of Gage County. However, recent sales studies and sale verifications indicate that non agricultural/horticultural influences on sales of agricultural/horticultural land throughout the county no longer exists and that sales of agricultural/horticultural land in Gage County are as if the lands only available use is for agricultural/horticultural purposes.

To verify and support our conclusions, we developed a “base” areas outside of Gage County to develop comparison values. Since the adjoining counties of Saline, Jefferson, Johnson, and Pawnee do not recognize non-agricultural/horticultural influences occurring in their agricultural/horticultural land sales, we reviewed sales in these counties to develop a range of values. We reviewed and analyzed qualified sales in each of the adjacent townships of those adjoining counties. Our analysis of the qualified sales utilized the same methodology as we used in developing the recapture value for Gage County. From our analyses, we developed a range of values for each land capability group. Based on the values developed in the adjoining non special value counties and comparing with the recapture values developed for Gage County, the indication was no significant differences existed between special or green belt values and recapture values. This conclusion was supported by our sales verification process which indicated that non-agricultural/horticultural influences on the value of Gage County agricultural/horticultural no longer existed.

2012 Correlation Section for Gage County

A. Agricultural Land

Gage County is located in southeast Nebraska. The County is bordered by Kansas to the south, Jefferson and Saline counties to the west, Johnson and Pawnee to the east, and Lancaster to the north. Gage County is comprised of approximately 11% irrigated land, 64% dry crop land and 22% grass/pasture land. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the market area determination. For 2012 Gage County has two market areas the same as the past several years. The county contends that topography and soils as well as the overall size of fields affect the market values for land between the two areas. Also less than two percent of the agricultural land in market area 2 is irrigated.

The agricultural market in the County along with the area and state is seeing a rapid increase and has for the past several years. 120 qualified agricultural sales were used in the agricultural analysis for the three year study period. The statistical sample consists of sales that meet the required balance as to date of sale and are proportionate by majority land use. This was met by including comparable sales from the same general agricultural market all within six miles of the subject county.

Market area one can be described as the entire county with the exception of the three townships bordering Pawnee County. The majority land use for area one closely mirrors the county totals, 13% irrigated, 64% dry and 21% grass. Gage County has 99 qualified sales in the statistical profile for area one for the three year study period. In analyzing by the 80 per cent majority land use for the market area all three are within the acceptable range.

Area two is made up of the three townships that border Pawnee County. For area two there are 21 sales in the statistical profile for the three year study period. Area two consists of 64% dry land and 31% grass land. In analyzing the 80% majority land use by market area only the grass is in the range with the dry land below the range, but in looking at the 90% majority land use the dry land is above the range. Both of these majority land use groups for area two have few sales. In comparing the values per acre with Pawnee County they are relatively close in the LCG's that make up the majority of the two counties namely 2D, 3D1, and 4D1(80% of dry in Gage area 2 and 83% of dry in Pawnee). For area one, a review of the neighboring counties, shows that the 2012 values in Gage County are within the range of neighboring counties. It is difficult for a full comparison due to the fact of seven different market areas adjoining area one.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 70% of market value for the agricultural class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Gage County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of real property.

The Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

2012 Correlation Section for Gage County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization. The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

2012 Correlation Section for Gage County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Gage County**

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 16,364	Value : 1,851,649,505	Growth 16,884,000	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	1,241	7,411,575	85	878,855	108	1,560,460	1,434	9,850,890	
02. Res Improve Land	6,746	66,826,330	258	5,122,145	907	20,579,525	7,911	92,528,000	
03. Res Improvements	6,811	438,687,910	286	32,891,965	912	114,587,255	8,009	586,167,130	
04. Res Total	8,052	512,925,815	371	38,892,965	1,020	136,727,240	9,443	688,546,020	5,391,280
% of Res Total	85.27	74.49	3.93	5.65	10.80	19.86	57.71	37.19	31.93
05. Com UnImp Land	207	2,428,770	10	80,535	7	68,330	224	2,577,635	
06. Com Improve Land	877	19,803,475	23	507,580	29	565,615	929	20,876,670	
07. Com Improvements	900	106,676,945	27	4,712,585	42	13,916,495	969	125,306,025	
08. Com Total	1,107	128,909,190	37	5,300,700	49	14,550,440	1,193	148,760,330	5,920,080
% of Com Total	92.79	86.66	3.10	3.56	4.11	9.78	7.29	8.03	35.06
09. Ind UnImp Land	14	448,495	1	10,650	1	2,110	16	461,255	
10. Ind Improve Land	17	676,695	10	390,480	3	224,760	30	1,291,935	
11. Ind Improvements	17	7,257,525	10	18,458,665	3	5,998,185	30	31,714,375	
12. Ind Total	31	8,382,715	11	18,859,795	4	6,225,055	46	33,467,565	25,915
% of Ind Total	67.39	25.05	23.91	56.35	8.70	18.60	0.28	1.81	0.15
13. Rec UnImp Land	1	3,685	2	17,875	4	292,495	7	314,055	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	3	255,985	3	255,985	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	7	154,215	7	154,215	
16. Rec Total	1	3,685	2	17,875	11	702,695	14	724,255	0
% of Rec Total	7.14	0.51	14.29	2.47	78.57	97.02	0.09	0.04	0.00
Res & Rec Total	8,053	512,929,500	373	38,910,840	1,031	137,429,935	9,457	689,270,275	5,391,280
% of Res & Rec Total	85.15	74.42	3.94	5.65	10.90	19.94	57.79	37.22	31.93
Com & Ind Total	1,138	137,291,905	48	24,160,495	53	20,775,495	1,239	182,227,895	5,945,995
% of Com & Ind Total	91.85	75.34	3.87	13.26	4.28	11.40	7.57	9.84	35.22
17. Taxable Total	9,191	650,221,405	421	63,071,335	1,084	158,205,430	10,696	871,498,170	11,337,275
% of Taxable Total	85.93	74.61	3.94	7.24	10.13	18.15	65.36	47.07	67.15

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	241	3,630,720	4,241,155	0	0	0
19. Commercial	77	1,623,915	5,111,350	0	0	0
20. Industrial	5	389,055	72,095,435	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	241	3,630,720	4,241,155
19. Commercial	0	0	0	77	1,623,915	5,111,350
20. Industrial	0	0	0	5	389,055	72,095,435
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				323	5,643,690	81,447,940

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	987	135	167	1,289

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	6	66,990	502	50,985,305	3,422	517,968,930	3,930	569,021,225
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	38,545	191	27,482,205	1,418	240,567,625	1,610	268,088,375
29. Ag Improvements	1	50,525	198	16,985,750	1,539	126,005,460	1,738	143,041,735
30. Ag Total							5,668	980,151,335

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	10,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1	1.00	10,000	128	133.00	1,313,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1	1.00	50,525	140	130.00	14,087,685	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	7.91	11,865	8	19.46	25,680	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	172	371.86	582,290	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	181	0.00	2,898,065	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	1.35	0	0	872.37	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	57	57.00	570,000	58	58.00	580,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	960	997.01	9,956,100	1,089	1,131.01	11,279,100	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,038	984.01	97,235,710	1,179	1,115.01	111,373,920	5,546,725
34. HomeSite Total				1,237	1,189.01	123,233,020	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	90	209.11	319,815	99	236.48	357,360	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,263	3,001.89	4,577,475	1,435	3,373.75	5,159,765	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,477	0.00	28,769,750	1,658	0.00	31,667,815	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,757	3,610.23	37,184,940	
39. Road & Ditches	0	10,457.28	0	0	11,331.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				2,994	16,130.24	160,417,960	5,546,725

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	6	0.00	304,470	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	6	0.00	304,470

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	509	39,208.12	63,943,820
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	509	39,208.12	63,943,820
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	3,848	390,487.87	619,357,175	4,357	429,695.99	683,300,995
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	5,460.52	9.36%	15,549,895	10.21%	2,847.69
46. 1A	20,208.35	34.63%	58,044,100	38.13%	2,872.28
47. 2A1	3,350.39	5.74%	8,596,410	5.65%	2,565.79
48. 2A	15,266.51	26.16%	39,304,495	25.82%	2,574.56
49. 3A1	4,662.27	7.99%	10,736,295	7.05%	2,302.80
50. 3A	2.57	0.00%	5,935	0.00%	2,309.34
51. 4A1	8,960.93	15.36%	19,085,145	12.54%	2,129.82
52. 4A	437.02	0.75%	923,335	0.61%	2,112.80
53. Total	58,348.56	100.00%	152,245,610	100.00%	2,609.24
Dry					
54. 1D1	8,636.83	3.06%	19,044,185	3.79%	2,205.00
55. 1D	53,566.90	18.97%	118,115,215	23.51%	2,205.00
56. 2D1	15,502.20	5.49%	28,834,145	5.74%	1,860.00
57. 2D	89,398.12	31.66%	166,280,500	33.09%	1,860.00
58. 3D1	50,623.37	17.93%	79,732,365	15.87%	1,575.01
59. 3D	55.53	0.02%	87,470	0.02%	1,575.18
60. 4D1	61,526.30	21.79%	86,136,835	17.14%	1,400.00
61. 4D	3,042.65	1.08%	4,259,765	0.85%	1,400.02
62. Total	282,351.90	100.00%	502,490,480	100.00%	1,779.66
Grass					
63. 1G1	773.02	0.84%	607,240	0.74%	785.54
64. 1G	3,568.16	3.86%	3,912,505	4.76%	1,096.50
65. 2G1	3,765.07	4.08%	3,519,925	4.28%	934.89
66. 2G	11,612.03	12.57%	12,830,780	15.62%	1,104.96
67. 3G1	29,428.80	31.86%	28,945,150	35.23%	983.57
68. 3G	71.95	0.08%	63,640	0.08%	884.50
69. 4G1	18,927.23	20.49%	16,754,140	20.39%	885.19
70. 4G	24,219.10	26.22%	15,516,165	18.89%	640.66
71. Total	92,365.36	100.00%	82,149,545	100.00%	889.40
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	58,348.56	13.21%	152,245,610	20.64%	2,609.24
Dry Total					
Dry Total	282,351.90	63.92%	502,490,480	68.11%	1,779.66
Grass Total					
Grass Total	92,365.36	20.91%	82,149,545	11.14%	889.40
72. Waste	8,661.08	1.96%	866,175	0.12%	100.01
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	457.55	0.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	441,726.90	100.00%	737,751,810	100.00%	1,670.15

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	139.89	16.63%	274,185	18.76%	1,960.00
46. 1A	90.96	10.81%	178,280	12.20%	1,959.98
47. 2A1	90.23	10.73%	158,805	10.86%	1,760.00
48. 2A	220.63	26.23%	388,310	26.56%	1,760.01
49. 3A1	192.41	22.87%	302,080	20.67%	1,569.98
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	103.68	12.33%	155,005	10.60%	1,495.03
52. 4A	3.39	0.40%	5,075	0.35%	1,497.05
53. Total	841.19	100.00%	1,461,740	100.00%	1,737.70
Dry					
54. 1D1	678.82	1.64%	1,208,305	1.94%	1,780.01
55. 1D	4,302.86	10.37%	7,659,100	12.27%	1,780.00
56. 2D1	2,871.08	6.92%	5,053,130	8.10%	1,760.01
57. 2D	14,539.66	35.05%	25,589,800	41.00%	1,760.00
58. 3D1	8,956.96	21.59%	12,316,160	19.73%	1,375.04
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	9,480.68	22.85%	9,907,325	15.87%	1,045.00
61. 4D	656.34	1.58%	685,880	1.10%	1,045.01
62. Total	41,486.40	100.00%	62,419,700	100.00%	1,504.58
Grass					
63. 1G1	15.51	0.08%	13,520	0.08%	871.70
64. 1G	519.94	2.57%	567,245	3.17%	1,090.98
65. 2G1	712.80	3.52%	687,670	3.84%	964.74
66. 2G	2,616.37	12.93%	2,988,520	16.71%	1,142.24
67. 3G1	8,825.81	43.61%	8,235,420	46.04%	933.11
68. 3G	3.15	0.02%	3,890	0.02%	1,234.92
69. 4G1	3,291.67	16.27%	2,638,910	14.75%	801.69
70. 4G	4,251.55	21.01%	2,752,520	15.39%	647.42
71. Total	20,236.80	100.00%	17,887,695	100.00%	883.92
Irrigated Total					
	841.19	1.30%	1,461,740	1.78%	1,737.70
Dry Total					
	41,486.40	64.13%	62,419,700	76.14%	1,504.58
Grass Total					
	20,236.80	31.28%	17,887,695	21.82%	883.92
72. Waste	2,124.19	3.28%	212,430	0.26%	100.01
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	64,688.58	100.00%	81,981,565	100.00%	1,267.33

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	5,164.50	13,361,840	54,025.25	140,345,510	59,189.75	153,707,350
77. Dry Land	32.58	63,655	30,667.93	54,819,505	293,137.79	510,027,020	323,838.30	564,910,180
78. Grass	28.63	19,340	9,742.96	8,245,960	102,830.57	91,771,940	112,602.16	100,037,240
79. Waste	6.77	675	1,092.24	109,235	9,686.26	968,695	10,785.27	1,078,605
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	48.63	0	14.03	0	394.89	0	457.55	0
82. Total	67.98	83,670	46,667.63	76,536,540	459,679.87	743,113,165	506,415.48	819,733,375

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	59,189.75	11.69%	153,707,350	18.75%	2,596.86
Dry Land	323,838.30	63.95%	564,910,180	68.91%	1,744.42
Grass	112,602.16	22.24%	100,037,240	12.20%	888.41
Waste	10,785.27	2.13%	1,078,605	0.13%	100.01
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	457.55	0.09%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	506,415.48	100.00%	819,733,375	100.00%	1,618.70

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

34 Gage

	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	680,996,260	688,546,020	7,549,760	1.11%	5,391,280	0.32%
02. Recreational	702,595	724,255	21,660	3.08%	0	3.08%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	122,334,475	123,233,020	898,545	0.73%	5,546,725	-3.80%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	804,033,330	812,503,295	8,469,965	1.05%	10,938,005	-0.31%
05. Commercial	142,831,505	148,760,330	5,928,825	4.15%	5,920,080	0.01%
06. Industrial	33,865,625	33,467,565	-398,060	-1.18%	25,915	-1.25%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	33,634,485	37,184,940	3,550,455	10.56%	0	10.56%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	210,331,615	219,412,835	9,081,220	4.32%	5,945,995	1.49%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	1,014,364,945	1,031,916,130	17,551,185	1.73%	16,884,000	0.07%
11. Irrigated	149,794,110	153,707,350	3,913,240	2.61%		
12. Dryland	553,505,170	564,910,180	11,405,010	2.06%		
13. Grassland	90,999,050	100,037,240	9,038,190	9.93%		
14. Wasteland	1,031,095	1,078,605	47,510	4.61%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	795,329,425	819,733,375	24,403,950	3.07%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,809,694,370	1,851,649,505	41,955,135	2.32%	16,884,000	1.39%

Gage County
3-Year Plan
June 2011

Budget, Staffing, and Contracts

Budget

2011-2012 Proposed Budget =\$234,240 (including salaries) 3500 is allotted for education, lodging, and other travel related expenses. \$8000 for a used vehicle.

Appraisal Maintenance \$45,000 (Contracted)

Budget Comments

I would like to hire a full time appraiser for Gage County at some point in time. In my estimation an appraiser's salary would run in the range of \$40,000 to \$45,000. With the economy issues, this will need to be put on hold.

Staff

Assessor: assumes responsibility for all functions within the office and prepares all necessary reports and documents

Deputy Assessor: assists the Assessor with all functions within the office and also helps in the building of the GIS system.

Real Property Appraisal Technician: responsible for all 521's, updating and developing the GIS system. Creates Sales File.

Personal Property Clerk: responsible for all personal property filed in the county, also assists in updating real estate records including sketching, and entering data for the reappraisals. Keeps all records concerning building permits filed. General office duties. Assisting taxpayers.

Clerk: responsible for assisting taxpayer and maintaining homestead exemption records, permissive exemption records, sending out sales review questionnaires. She assists with data entry within the CAMA system, answers phones, and performs other general office duties.

Appraiser Assistant: Performs all appraisal maintenance and pickup work.

Part-time County Appraiser

Bob Thoma is now a county employee. His responsibilities include developing valuation studies, for agricultural properties.

Contract Appraiser

Darrell Stanard is contracted for 4 days a month. His responsibilities include sales verification, appraisal maintenance and pricing pickup work and developing valuation studies.

3 Year Appraisal Plan

2012

Residential

For 2012 a plan for an appraisal maintenance will be done for all Beatrice residential properties. Review in- house preliminary statistical information and analyze for any possible subclass adjustments needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed. New Pictures will be taken and a drive by review of the property will be done to see if any changes have been made.

Commercial

For 2012 a plan for an appraisal maintenance will be done for all commercial properties. Review in house preliminary statistical information and analyze for any possible subclass adjustments needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed.

Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Sales will be plotted on a map to determine if the current market areas are supported by the current sales. The market analysis is conducted in house by Bob Thoma by utilizing the county's current CAMA system. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed for agricultural properties. Rural residential properties will also be reviewed and analyzed for any adjustments needed to comply with statistical measures required by law. Vacant agland is being reviewed by our GIS and also by drive by inspections to determines changes in the land.

2013

Residential

For 2013 the county will continue reviewing Beatrice residential properties (2 year project). A new photo will be taken and any changes that may have occurred to the property will be updated. All other residential properties will be reviewed in house with preliminary statistical information and any possible subclass adjustments needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed.

Commercial

There will be an appraisal maintenance for the commercial properties in 2013. Appraisal adjustments may be needed in order to comply with statistical measures required by law. Sales review and pick-up work will also be completed for commercial properties.

Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures required by law. Rural residential properties will be reviewed and analyzed for any adjustments needed to comply with statistical measures.

2014

Residential

For 2014 a plan for an appraisal maintenance will be done for all residential properties. Review in house preliminary statistical information from our sales file and adjust values to comply with statistical measures required by law. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed.

Commercial

There will be an appraisal maintenance for commercial properties in 2014. New photos will be taken and a review of the property to see if any changes were made to the property. Appraisal adjustments may be needed in order to comply with statistical measures required by law. Sales review and pickup work will also be completed.

Agricultural

A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine any possible adjustments to comply with statistical measures. Rural residential properties will be reviewed and analyzed for any adjustments needed to comply with statistical measures.

Patricia Milligan, Gage County Assessor

Date:

2012 Assessment Survey for Gage County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	4
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	226,239
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	234,239 Board added for a vehicle for the assessor office
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	32,045 (lister and ag analysis)
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	42,500
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	Terra Scan comes out of County General, GIS funding is also budgeted out of the County General.
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	3,500
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	0
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	Nominal amount

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	TerraScan
2.	CAMA software:
	TerraScan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?

	Yes
6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	Yes, http://gage.assessor.gisworkshop.com/
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor staff
8.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

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 with the exception of Ellis, Rockford, Holmesville, and Lanham
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2000

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Stanard Appraisal
2.	Other services:
	GIS Workshop

2012 Certification for Gage 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 Gage County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

