

# 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 Gosper County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	61	Median	96.90
Total Sales Price	\$5,393,524	Mean	100.40
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,386,524	Wgt. Mean	91.47
Total Assessed Value	\$4,927,045	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$81,284
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$88,304	Avg. Assessed Value	\$80,771

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.52 to 99.84
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.86 to 98.08
95% Mean C.I	91.62 to 109.18
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	23.07
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.26
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.23

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	75	96	96
2010	65	96	96
2009	59	95	95
2008	70	93	93

## 2012 Commission Summary for Gosper County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	Median	92.44
Total Sales Price	\$741,000	Mean	87.83
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$726,000	Wgt. Mean	86.75
Total Assessed Value	\$629,821	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$88,389
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$66,000	Avg. Assessed Value	\$57,256

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	67.10 to 102.42
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	72.98 to 100.52
95% Mean C.I	78.54 to 97.12
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.23
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	10.68
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.92

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	10		94
2010	8	100	100
2009	5	100	98
2008	5	100	94



## 2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Gosper 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
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	73	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 Gosper County**

A sales study was completed for the residential class. New costing and depreciation were applied for all valuation groupings in 2011; this year's sales study indicated that the appraisal tables were still acceptable except for those at Johnson Lake. Improvements at Johnson Lake were given seven percent less depreciation this year, except for those in the Bullhead Point neighborhood. Properties at Bullhead Point are not lakefront, and are generally less desirable; the sale study indicated that the appraisal tables at Bullhead Point were still acceptable.

Only routine maintenance was completed in the rest of the residential class.

## 2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Gosper County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The deputy assessor and the contract appraiser	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Elwood is the largest community in the county. Its location provides easy commuting to job opportunities and other services in Lexington and Holdrege. The market is active in Elwood, and growth is steady.
	02	Smithfield – is a small village with no services. The market is sporadic as is typical for small towns.
	03	Johnson Lake – strong demand due to the recreational opportunities at the lake. Demand for existing housing and growth are both strong.
	04	Rural – all properties outside of the Villages with the exception of those located around Johnson Lake.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Only the cost approach is used in the county, as there are too few sales to develop a sales comparison approach.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June 2010 for the entire class	
5.	<b>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?</b>	
	Depreciation tables are developed using local market information.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Elwood, Smithfield and Rural for 2011; the Johnson Lake tables for 2012.	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>	
	Values are applied to lots based on the general size of the lots. For example, within Elwood all lots 1-25' wide receive a set value. At Johnson Lake, general size is considered; location will also affect lot/leasehold values. Areas that are located along the lakefront are valued higher than those that are not. The rural areas are assessed by the acre using sales of vacant land plus a value for site improvements.	
10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>	
	A parcel is considered substantially changed when a new improvement is constructed, or when an addition or major remodel has occurred.	

**37 Gosper  
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 : 61  
 Total Sales Price : 5,393,524  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,386,524  
 Total Assessed Value : 4,927,045  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 88,304  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 80,771

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 91  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 21.11  
 PRD : 109.76

COV : 34.84  
 STD : 34.98  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.46  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 269.89  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.25

95% Median C.I. : 90.52 to 99.84  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.86 to 98.08  
 95% Mean C.I. : 91.62 to 109.18

Printed:3/29/2012 3:10:17PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	11	97.98	93.09	92.58	09.10	100.55	72.75	106.11	73.73 to 102.60	91,900	85,083
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	7	97.63	97.06	95.33	03.64	101.81	86.61	102.11	86.61 to 102.11	92,429	88,109
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	176.68	176.68	130.07	52.76	135.83	83.47	269.89	N/A	30,000	39,022
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	9	97.21	107.73	100.07	14.75	107.65	88.99	192.03	92.41 to 107.91	79,600	79,659
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	10	89.90	99.04	102.59	20.28	96.54	65.49	154.67	74.80 to 129.86	102,287	104,934
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	85.73	90.66	86.62	12.43	104.66	79.77	111.42	N/A	84,375	73,082
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	75.50	74.82	73.73	07.14	101.48	65.26	83.02	N/A	132,813	97,925
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	14	103.74	103.28	79.77	30.88	129.47	35.25	187.00	61.19 to 148.71	75,757	60,430
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	29	97.63	104.36	96.44	15.52	108.21	72.75	269.89	94.39 to 102.11	83,941	80,954
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	32	89.90	96.82	87.37	26.97	110.82	35.25	187.00	77.40 to 109.38	92,257	80,606
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	25	93.26	107.04	99.99	24.08	107.05	65.49	269.89	88.99 to 102.46	85,471	85,466
<u>ALL</u>	61	96.90	100.40	91.47	21.11	109.76	35.25	269.89	90.52 to 99.84	88,304	80,771

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	19	99.84	113.89	96.54	27.91	117.97	72.75	269.89	83.47 to 111.42	55,732	53,805
03	30	97.42	95.32	90.67	20.21	105.13	35.25	154.67	83.02 to 102.46	98,957	89,726
04	12	93.40	91.76	89.26	10.28	102.80	58.91	125.92	86.61 to 97.63	113,242	101,082
<u>ALL</u>	61	96.90	100.40	91.47	21.11	109.76	35.25	269.89	90.52 to 99.84	88,304	80,771

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	61	96.90	100.40	91.47	21.11	109.76	35.25	269.89	90.52 to 99.84	88,304	80,771
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	61	96.90	100.40	91.47	21.11	109.76	35.25	269.89	90.52 to 99.84	88,304	80,771

**37 Gosper  
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 : 61  
 Total Sales Price : 5,393,524  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,386,524  
 Total Assessed Value : 4,927,045  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 88,304  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 80,771

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 91  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 21.11  
 PRD : 109.76

COV : 34.84  
 STD : 34.98  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.46  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 269.89  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 35.25

95% Median C.I. : 90.52 to 99.84  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.86 to 98.08  
 95% Mean C.I. : 91.62 to 109.18

Printed:3/29/2012 3:10:17PM

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	1	187.00	187.00	187.00	00.00	100.00	187.00	187.00	N/A	6,500	12,155	
Less Than 30,000	7	153.03	162.96	153.74	28.96	106.00	88.65	269.89	88.65 to 269.89	20,700	31,825	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	61	96.90	100.40	91.47	21.11	109.76	35.25	269.89	90.52 to 99.84	88,304	80,771	
Greater Than 14,999	60	95.94	98.96	91.35	20.12	108.33	35.25	269.89	89.27 to 99.84	89,667	81,915	
Greater Than 29,999	54	94.48	92.29	89.75	14.91	102.83	35.25	154.67	88.99 to 97.98	97,067	87,116	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	1	187.00	187.00	187.00	00.00	100.00	187.00	187.00	N/A	6,500	12,155	
15,000 TO 29,999	6	150.87	158.95	152.18	30.51	104.45	88.65	269.89	88.65 to 269.89	23,067	35,103	
30,000 TO 59,999	12	101.22	98.03	99.25	10.91	98.77	71.95	118.71	83.47 to 109.38	40,917	40,608	
60,000 TO 99,999	18	95.89	95.81	95.61	08.48	100.21	78.46	125.92	89.27 to 102.28	75,275	71,972	
100,000 TO 149,999	17	88.99	89.82	89.88	21.67	99.93	35.25	154.67	70.53 to 102.55	128,260	115,279	
150,000 TO 249,999	7	73.73	79.43	79.14	18.38	100.37	58.91	98.52	58.91 to 98.52	173,607	137,390	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	61	96.90	100.40	91.47	21.11	109.76	35.25	269.89	90.52 to 99.84	88,304	80,771	



## 2012 Correlation Section for Gosper County

---

### **A. Residential Real Property**

The residential market within Gosper County is influenced by the local agriculturally based economy. Properties at Johnson Lake are recreationally influenced and market trends are less impacted by the local economy. The market at the lake has been increasing in recent years while the market in the rest of the county has been relatively flat. Four valuation groupings have been developed based on these influences.

The sales verification process in the county involves sending a sales questionnaire to the buyers of all properties. Often interviews are conducted with parties involved in the transaction to verify sale terms. A review of the qualified and non-qualified sale rosters revealed no apparent bias in the qualification determinations.

A complete review of the residential class began in 2008 and was completed for 2010. The contract appraiser and deputy county assessor complete the physical review work, appraisal determinations are made by the county assessor and deputy county assessor. Every other year, the county updates the costing tables and completes a depreciation study for all valuation groupings.

Within the residential sample, only valuation groupings 01 and 03 contain a sufficient number of sales; these groups appear to have been assessed within the acceptable range. Valuation group 02 had no sales in the study period, and 04 had an insufficient number of sales; since these groups were subject to the same review and reappraisal cycle as the rest of the class, it is believed that they are also within the acceptable range. The sales price substrata shows seven sales with selling prices less than \$30,000. As is typical, these low dollar sales show a high level of dispersion in the assessment to sale ratios; their hypothetical removal reduces the qualitative statistics to ranges that support assessment uniformity. Four of the seven low dollar sales are within the Elwood valuation grouping; analysis of the valuation grouping after the removal of the low dollar sales also supported acceptable and uniform assessments.

During 2011, the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division implemented a cyclical review process to annually conduct an assessment practices review of one-third of the counties within the state. Gosper County was one of the counties reviewed during 2011. The review indicated that appraisal techniques were consistently and equitably applied within the class. Assessment practices within the class are determined to be in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal standards.

Based on a review of all available information the level of value of residential parcels in Gosper County is determined to be 97%; all subclasses are within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper County**

Only routine maintenance was completed within the commercial class. New costing tables were implemented for 2011; there was no available information to warrant adjusting the appraisal tables this year. Some inconsistencies were discovered in the rural commercial land assessments, so minor changes were made to improve equalization. The pickup work was completed timely.

## 2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Gosper County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The deputy assessor and the contract appraiser	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	There are no valuation groupings within the commercial class; there are so few sales that it is not practical to stratify them further.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Only the cost approach is used.	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.</b>	
	All properties are valued using the cost approach. Properties are priced using Marshall and Swift occupancy codes. Depreciation is applied based on general structure type and the age/condition of the property.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June 2010 is used for the entire class	
5.	<b>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?</b>	
	Depreciation tables are established using local market information.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	There are no valuation groupings, one table is used.	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	In the Villages, lot values are applied based on the size of the lot. At Johnson Lake, values are established by neighborhood; areas that are along the lakefront are valued higher than those that are not. Size is not a factor when establishing lot values at the lake. The rural areas are assessed by the acre using sales of vacant land plus a value for the site improvements on the first acre.	
10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>	
	A parcel is considered substantially changed when an addition or major remodel has occurred. Within the commercial class, parcels can also be considered substantially changed if there has been a change in the use of the parcel that would dramatically affect the market value of the parcel.	

**37 Gosper**  
**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 : 11  
Total Sales Price : 741,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 726,000  
Total Assessed Value : 629,821  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 66,000  
Avg. Assessed Value : 57,256

MEDIAN : 92  
WGT. MEAN : 87  
MEAN : 88  
COD : 11.92  
PRD : 101.24

COV : 15.75  
STD : 13.83  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.02  
MAX Sales Ratio : 102.54  
MIN Sales Ratio : 62.83

95% Median C.I. : 67.10 to 102.42  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.98 to 100.52  
95% Mean C.I. : 78.54 to 97.12

Printed:3/29/2012 3:10:18PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	92.44	92.44	92.44	00.00	100.00	92.44	92.44	N/A	37,000	34,202
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	96.93	96.93	96.93	00.00	100.00	96.93	96.93	N/A	65,500	63,488
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	101.18	101.18	101.96	01.35	99.23	99.81	102.54	N/A	47,500	48,433
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	84.86	84.86	84.86	00.00	100.00	84.86	84.86	N/A	50,000	42,430
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	87.10	87.10	87.51	09.93	99.53	78.45	95.75	N/A	52,500	45,945
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	84.76	84.76	91.22	20.84	92.92	67.10	102.42	N/A	102,500	93,500
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	62.83	62.83	62.83	00.00	100.00	62.83	62.83	N/A	128,500	80,731
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10											
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	83.04	83.04	83.04	00.00	100.00	83.04	83.04	N/A	40,000	33,216
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	98.37	97.93	98.51	03.30	99.41	92.44	102.54	N/A	49,375	48,639
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	5	84.86	85.72	89.26	12.40	96.03	67.10	102.42	N/A	72,000	64,264
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	2	72.94	72.94	67.62	13.86	107.87	62.83	83.04	N/A	84,250	56,974
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	98.37	96.04	96.33	05.23	99.70	84.86	102.54	N/A	52,625	50,696
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	78.45	81.31	82.01	17.40	99.15	62.83	102.42	N/A	87,700	71,924
<u>ALL</u>	11	92.44	87.83	86.75	11.92	101.24	62.83	102.54	67.10 to 102.42	66,000	57,256

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	11	92.44	87.83	86.75	11.92	101.24	62.83	102.54	67.10 to 102.42	66,000	57,256
<u>ALL</u>	11	92.44	87.83	86.75	11.92	101.24	62.83	102.54	67.10 to 102.42	66,000	57,256

**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	11	92.44	87.83	86.75	11.92	101.24	62.83	102.54	67.10 to 102.42	66,000	57,256
04											
<u>ALL</u>	11	92.44	87.83	86.75	11.92	101.24	62.83	102.54	67.10 to 102.42	66,000	57,256

**37 Gosper  
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 : 11  
 Total Sales Price : 741,000  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 726,000  
 Total Assessed Value : 629,821  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 66,000  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 57,256

MEDIAN : 92  
 WGT. MEAN : 87  
 MEAN : 88  
 COD : 11.92  
 PRD : 101.24

COV : 15.75  
 STD : 13.83  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.02  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 102.54  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 62.83

95% Median C.I. : 67.10 to 102.42  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.98 to 100.52  
 95% Mean C.I. : 78.54 to 97.12

Printed:3/29/2012 3:10:18PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											
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											
Less Than 15,000											
Less Than 30,000	1	99.81	99.81	99.81	00.00	100.00	99.81	99.81	N/A	20,000	19,962
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	11	92.44	87.83	86.75	11.92	101.24	62.83	102.54	67.10 to 102.42	66,000	57,256
Greater Than 14,999	11	92.44	87.83	86.75	11.92	101.24	62.83	102.54	67.10 to 102.42	66,000	57,256
Greater Than 29,999	10	88.65	86.64	86.38	12.84	100.30	62.83	102.54	67.10 to 102.42	70,600	60,986
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	1	99.81	99.81	99.81	00.00	100.00	99.81	99.81	N/A	20,000	19,962
30,000 TO 59,999	4	88.65	89.02	89.29	05.72	99.70	83.04	95.75	N/A	45,500	40,628
60,000 TO 99,999	4	87.69	86.26	87.37	15.37	98.73	67.10	102.54	N/A	63,875	55,808
100,000 TO 149,999	2	82.63	82.63	83.47	23.96	98.99	62.83	102.42	N/A	134,250	112,058
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	11	92.44	87.83	86.75	11.92	101.24	62.83	102.54	67.10 to 102.42	66,000	57,256

<b>OCCUPANCY CODE</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
340	1	95.75	95.75	95.75	00.00	100.00	95.75	95.75	N/A	55,000	52,663
349	1	78.45	78.45	78.45	00.00	100.00	78.45	78.45	N/A	50,000	39,226
352	1	83.04	83.04	83.04	00.00	100.00	83.04	83.04	N/A	40,000	33,216
386	2	81.32	81.32	67.81	22.74	119.92	62.83	99.81	N/A	74,250	50,347
406	2	84.82	84.82	86.09	20.89	98.52	67.10	102.54	N/A	70,000	60,260
410	1	96.93	96.93	96.93	00.00	100.00	96.93	96.93	N/A	65,500	63,488
442	1	102.42	102.42	102.42	00.00	100.00	102.42	102.42	N/A	140,000	143,384
472	1	92.44	92.44	92.44	00.00	100.00	92.44	92.44	N/A	37,000	34,202
851	1	84.86	84.86	84.86	00.00	100.00	84.86	84.86	N/A	50,000	42,430
<u>ALL</u>	11	92.44	87.83	86.75	11.92	101.24	62.83	102.54	67.10 to 102.42	66,000	57,256



## 2012 Correlation Section for Gosper County

---

### A. Commercial Real Property

In Gosper County commercial properties will primarily exist in the town of Elwood or around Johnson Lake. The commercial market is unorganized as businesses will often rely upon small local populations for sustainability. There is more demand for properties at the lake, but sales here are still sporadic and will often involve going concerns. While there are slight economic differences in various areas, the county accounts for locational influences in the land values and does not differentiate valuation groupings within the class.

The sales verification process in the county involves sending a sales questionnaire to the buyers of all properties; the document includes questions that are designed to determine how selling prices were established and whether they included any personal property or business interest. Interviews are often conducted with parties involved in the transaction to verify sale terms. A review of the qualified and non-qualified sale rosters, revealed no apparent bias in the qualification determinations.

A complete relisting of the commercial class began in 2008 and was completed for 2010. The contract appraiser and the deputy county assessor complete the review work, all appraisal determinations and tables are developed by the county assessor and deputy county assessor. Since there is little sales activity annually, the depreciation table is based on general building type and condition. The building type has more to do with the highest and best use of the parcel than the present occupancy. The costing tables are updated every other year; the depreciation tables are reviewed at least that often and are adjusted when warranted. New depreciation tables were last implemented in 2010.

During 2011, the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division implemented a cyclical review process to annually conduct an assessment practices review of one-third of the counties within the state. Gosper County was one of the counties reviewed during 2011. The review indicated that appraisal techniques were consistently and equitably applied within the class.

The sample of sales available for the measurement of the commercial class is very small; based on the sample size it is unlikely that the sample could proportionately represent the types of commercial properties that exist in the class. The coefficient of dispersion (COD) is quite low at only 12%. Many of the sales were used to establish the new depreciation table in 2010; therefore, it not unexpected that the sample is producing a very low COD. Because the commercial market is unorganized, it is unlikely that the COD would be so low had more than a few sales occurred since the tables were implemented. The low COD does not provide support for using the measures of central tendency as an indication of the level of value of the class.

Based on the assessment practices employed in the county, it is believed that commercial assessments are at uniform portions of market value. There is no reliable information available with which to determine a level of value for commercial parcels in Gosper County.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper County**

Only routine maintenance was completed for the agricultural improvements. A land use study was completed using 2010 GIS imagery. This review completes the inspection cycle within the county, as all improved parcels were reviewed prior to this year.

A sales study of agricultural land sales was completed. Adjustments were made to all subclasses. Dry and grass land are valued using the same schedule of values in both market areas. Dry land increased about 14% and grass increased about 5%. Irrigated values increased about 14% in area one and 21% in area four.

## 2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Gosper County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	The deputy county assessor and the contract appraiser	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	This area consists of flat, rich farmland. Irrigation is accessible and well depths are shallow.
	04	The terrain in this area is rougher than area 1, and generally the soils are poorer. Well depths can be extreme; it is not always possible for irrigators to pump a sufficient amount of water for their crops in this area.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The market areas were developed based on topography, soil type and access to water for irrigation. Sales are plotted annually, and a sales study is completed to monitor the market areas.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Non-agricultural land uses are identified by completing the land use study and through the sales verification process. Currently, the only recreational parcels within the county are those at Johnson Lake.	
5.	<b>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?</b>	
	Farm home sites and rural home sites carry the same value countywide.	
6.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	Discovery through information collected from the NRD, tax payers, and some physical inspection. Land use maps are reviewed when they are available.	
7.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	The county assessor conducts a sales ratio study and a sales verification process to attempt to identify sales that have a non-agricultural influence. Land sales are also plotted annually to look for areas of non-agricultural influence. At this time, the office has not observed a non-agricultural influence in the sales of agricultural land.	
8.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	No	
9.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>	
	A parcel is considered substantially changed when an improvement has been added to or removed from a parcel. In the agricultural class, land use changes will also constitute a parcel being coded substantially changed.	

**37 Gosper**  
**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 : 53  
Total Sales Price : 17,772,087  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,668,862  
Total Assessed Value : 12,690,571  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 333,375  
Avg. Assessed Value : 239,445

MEDIAN : 73  
WGT. MEAN : 72  
MEAN : 76  
COD : 19.90  
PRD : 105.50

COV : 28.56  
STD : 21.64  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.60  
MAX Sales Ratio : 150.91  
MIN Sales Ratio : 17.04

95% Median C.I. : 68.06 to 81.37  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
95% Mean C.I. : 69.94 to 81.60

Printed:3/29/2012 3:10:19PM

**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	5	76.37	74.19	72.47	19.79	102.37	37.31	102.04	N/A	70,145	50,834
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	57.62	57.62	57.62	00.00	100.00	57.62	57.62	N/A	200,000	115,241
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	78.77	90.28	80.58	25.43	112.04	67.50	148.74	67.50 to 148.74	366,790	295,576
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	79.55	76.39	77.87	12.47	98.10	59.47	91.53	59.47 to 91.53	233,071	181,501
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	84.03	99.42	89.29	24.66	111.35	73.37	150.91	N/A	225,291	201,163
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	82.25	78.60	72.25	09.60	108.79	62.94	92.23	62.94 to 92.23	307,721	222,315
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	75.60	72.80	70.32	10.30	103.53	56.38	83.62	N/A	877,500	617,061
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	72.29	69.66	67.93	04.05	102.55	63.95	72.74	N/A	336,667	228,713
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	85.00	85.00	85.00	00.00	100.00	85.00	85.00	N/A	300,000	255,002
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	10	63.44	68.41	67.57	16.13	101.24	53.77	91.37	54.36 to 90.58	356,628	240,975
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	53.01	53.01	52.92	07.73	100.17	48.91	57.10	N/A	686,250	363,174
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	68.97	55.62	70.72	30.84	78.65	17.04	80.84	N/A	184,781	130,669
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	19	76.37	79.21	77.88	19.79	101.71	37.31	148.74	67.50 to 87.29	230,682	179,651
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	18	79.34	81.60	73.33	15.89	111.28	56.38	150.91	72.29 to 83.86	416,266	305,227
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	16	63.44	65.12	65.30	21.09	99.72	17.04	91.37	54.36 to 80.84	362,070	236,444
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	24	82.38	85.21	79.11	17.46	107.71	59.47	150.91	70.28 to 87.29	283,543	224,320
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	18	70.65	70.52	69.39	14.01	101.63	53.77	91.37	61.25 to 77.56	465,904	323,285
<u>ALL</u>	53	73.37	75.77	71.82	19.90	105.50	17.04	150.91	68.06 to 81.37	333,375	239,445

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	23	72.97	78.09	72.97	18.06	107.02	48.91	148.74	68.04 to 83.62	401,240	292,777
4	30	74.87	73.99	70.57	20.93	104.85	17.04	150.91	61.54 to 83.38	281,345	198,557
<u>ALL</u>	53	73.37	75.77	71.82	19.90	105.50	17.04	150.91	68.06 to 81.37	333,375	239,445

**37 Gosper**  
**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 : 53  
Total Sales Price : 17,772,087  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 17,668,862  
Total Assessed Value : 12,690,571  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 333,375  
Avg. Assessed Value : 239,445

MEDIAN : 73  
WGT. MEAN : 72  
MEAN : 76  
COD : 19.90  
PRD : 105.50

COV : 28.56  
STD : 21.64  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.60  
MAX Sales Ratio : 150.91  
MIN Sales Ratio : 17.04

95% Median C.I. : 68.06 to 81.37  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
95% Mean C.I. : 69.94 to 81.60

Printed:3/29/2012 3:10:19PM

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	12	68.52	79.02	73.95	19.57	106.86	62.94	148.74	65.33 to 79.55	398,678	294,841
1	12	68.52	79.02	73.95	19.57	106.86	62.94	148.74	65.33 to 79.55	398,678	294,841
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	10	72.48	68.65	64.38	21.01	106.63	17.04	92.23	57.10 to 90.58	193,676	124,688
1	2	70.06	70.06	59.40	18.50	117.95	57.10	83.02	N/A	368,663	218,976
4	8	72.48	68.30	67.44	21.80	101.28	17.04	92.23	17.04 to 92.23	149,930	101,116
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>73.37</b>	<b>75.77</b>	<b>71.82</b>	<b>19.90</b>	<b>105.50</b>	<b>17.04</b>	<b>150.91</b>	<b>68.06 to 81.37</b>	<b>333,375</b>	<b>239,445</b>

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	21	70.28	77.93	74.10	18.38	105.17	54.36	148.74	65.34 to 83.62	384,654	285,037
1	16	70.99	80.15	75.90	19.28	105.60	62.94	148.74	65.34 to 83.86	391,980	297,530
4	5	70.28	70.85	67.85	14.85	104.42	54.36	84.56	N/A	361,208	245,062
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	16	72.26	70.22	66.45	21.34	105.67	17.04	102.04	57.62 to 90.58	175,329	116,509
1	3	72.29	70.80	62.61	11.95	113.08	57.10	83.02	N/A	327,442	205,020
4	13	72.22	70.09	68.52	23.50	102.29	17.04	102.04	57.62 to 91.37	140,226	96,083
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>73.37</b>	<b>75.77</b>	<b>71.82</b>	<b>19.90</b>	<b>105.50</b>	<b>17.04</b>	<b>150.91</b>	<b>68.06 to 81.37</b>	<b>333,375</b>	<b>239,445</b>

## Gosper County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
37.10	Gosper	1	#DIV/0!	2,450	2,050	1,710	1,591	1,540	1,480	1,368	2,351
37.40	Gosper	4	#DIV/0!	2,050	1,780	1,400	1,295	#DIV/0!	975	905	1,661
24.10	Dawson	1	#DIV/0!	2,294	2,222	2,063	1,865	1,579	1,590	1,495	2,144
24.20	Dawson	2	#DIV/0!	1,615	1,565	1,345	927	#DIV/0!	700	700	1,480
69.10	Phelps	1	1,966	2,700	2,500	2,398	2,000	1,900	1,700	1,500	2,552
69.20	Phelps	2	#DIV/0!	1,735	1,450	1,200	950	750	600	550	1,358
42.20	Harlan	2	2,340	2,202	1,827	1,585	1,318	1,207	1,159	1,160	1,895
33.10	Furnas	1	2,440	2,105	1,830	1,740	1,325	1,230	1,040	855	1,884
32.10	Frontier	1	1,300	1,299	1,218	1,246	1,200	1,200	1,148	1,121	1,273

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Gosper	1	#DIV/0!	800	750	700	640	550	530	530	748
	Gosper	4	#DIV/0!	800	749	700	640	#DIV/0!	530	530	740
	Dawson	1	#DIV/0!	1,160	1,090	1,025	950	880	730	730	948
	Dawson	2	#DIV/0!	770	720	600	550	#DIV/0!	445	415	593
	Phelps	1	1,300	1,300	1,100	950	700	600	550	500	1,131
	Phelps	2	#DIV/0!	1,050	850	825	775	460	450	425	807
	Harlan	2	920	909	766	745	645	632	635	635	845
	Furnas	1	915	900	775	700	670	580	550	500	795
	Frontier	1	790	790	740	740	690	690	640	640	760

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Gosper	1	#DIV/0!	557	494	441	407	487	400	396	412
	Gosper	4	#DIV/0!	550	490	440	400	#DIV/0!	396	395	408
	Dawson	1	#DIV/0!	690	585	540	515	475	471	465	481
	Dawson	2	#DIV/0!	640	560	475	475	#DIV/0!	365	365	400
	Phelps	1	447	634	857	658	520	543	479	399	521
	Phelps	2	#DIV/0!	468	460	445	452	435	430	420	426
	Harlan	2	#DIV/0!	500	500	500	500	500	500	500	500
	Furnas	1	600	595	565	460	415	405	385	380	403
	Frontier	1	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350

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



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Gosper County**

---

**A. Agricultural Land**

Gosper County is divided into two different market areas; however, dry and grassland are valued the same in both areas. Only irrigated land is valued differently. Irrigation is plentiful in area one and well depths are shallow; in area four well depths can be severe and irrigators are often unable to pump a sufficient amount of water. All areas adjoining Gosper County were considered comparable where they are adjacent to the county. Frontier, Furnas, and Harlan Counties are all in Republican Basin Natural Resource Districts (NRD) and are impacted by water allocation restrictions. Gosper County is not subjected to these restrictions; however, because market area four has natural restrictions affecting irrigation, area four is considered comparable to the Republican Basin NRD Counties.

In analyzing the sample of sales within Gosper County, both market areas were determined to be proportionately distributed and reasonably representative of the land use distribution in the population; however, both market areas had unreliably small samples. The market areas were expanded to maximize the size of the sample while maintaining acceptable study year and land use distribution. The area one sample remained slightly smaller than is typically desirable, but the coefficient of dispersion is low enough to suggest that the sample is reliable; all other thresholds were achieved.

The county assessor increased all crop land in the county 14-20% and grass land 5%. These adjustments are typical for the agricultural market in this part of the state, and resulted in values that are generally comparable to all adjoining counties. The statistics support that both market areas have been assessed at similar portions of market value, as have the majority land use irrigated and grass subclasses. There are no dry land sales in the sample; the dry land values established by the county compare very closely to Furnas and Frontier County. Since the majority of the dry land acres in Gosper County are in area four, this is reasonable and supports that the dry land values are acceptable. The analysis supports that the subclasses of agricultural land have been assessed at uniform portions of market value and are generally equalized with adjoining counties.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Gosper County is determined to be 73%; all subclasses are within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper 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 Gosper County**

---

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

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

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



**Total Real Property**  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

**Records : 2,887**

**Value : 408,692,618**

**Growth 3,920,355**

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

**Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	70	174,850	0	0	56	657,456	126	832,306	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	307	1,260,010	0	0	603	15,866,644	910	17,126,654	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	323	19,804,512	0	0	673	56,432,715	996	76,237,227	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	393	21,239,372	0	0	729	72,956,815	1,122	94,196,187	1,730,355
<b>% of Res Total</b>	35.03	22.55	0.00	0.00	64.97	77.45	38.86	23.05	44.14
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	4	17,732	0	0	4	12,225	8	29,957	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	52	264,575	0	0	31	507,848	83	772,423	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	53	3,708,774	0	0	40	3,029,525	93	6,738,299	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	57	3,991,081	0	0	44	3,549,598	101	7,540,679	961,336
<b>% of Com Total</b>	56.44	52.93	0.00	0.00	43.56	47.07	3.50	1.85	24.52
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	9,035	0	0	0	0	1	9,035	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	2	1,554,354	0	0	0	0	2	1,554,354	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	2	1,563,389	0	0	0	0	2	1,563,389	616,948
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.38	15.74
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	36	27,000	36	27,000	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	38	66,570	38	66,570	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	38	93,570	38	93,570	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	1.32	0.02	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	393	21,239,372	0	0	767	73,050,385	1,160	94,289,757	1,730,355
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	33.88	22.53	0.00	0.00	66.12	77.47	40.18	23.07	44.14
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	59	5,554,470	0	0	44	3,549,598	103	9,104,068	1,578,284
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	57.28	61.01	0.00	0.00	42.72	38.99	3.57	2.23	40.26
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	452	26,793,842	0	0	811	76,599,983	1,263	103,393,825	3,308,639
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	35.79	25.91	0.00	0.00	64.21	74.09	43.75	25.30	84.40

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	4	8,600	458,931	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	4	8,600	458,931
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				4	8,600	458,931

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	3	8,478	3	8,478	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	3	8,478	3	8,478	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	31	0	225	256

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	2	47,298	0	0	1,302	211,098,343	1,304	211,145,641
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	303	76,786,224	303	76,786,224
29. Ag Improvements	1	81,460	0	0	316	17,276,990	317	17,358,450
30. Ag Total							1,621	305,290,315

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	81,460	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.45	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	9	9.00	54,900	9	9.00	54,900	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	216	218.58	1,321,740	216	218.58	1,321,740	
33. HomeSite Improvements	194	193.58	10,732,516	194	193.58	10,732,516	611,716
34. HomeSite Total				<b>203</b>	<b>227.58</b>	<b>12,109,156</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	19	45.98	33,885	19	45.98	33,885	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	261	1,037.44	637,218	261	1,037.44	637,218	
37. FarmSite Improvements	302	0.00	6,544,474	303	0.00	6,625,934	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>322</b>	<b>1,083.42</b>	<b>7,297,037</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,494.29	0	0	4,494.74	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>525</b>	<b>5,805.74</b>	<b>19,406,193</b>	<b>611,716</b>

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	46,994.78	87.37%	115,114,691	91.02%	2,449.52
47. 2A1	1,848.67	3.44%	3,789,785	3.00%	2,050.01
48. 2A	459.20	0.85%	785,234	0.62%	1,710.00
49. 3A1	2,413.91	4.49%	3,840,455	3.04%	1,590.97
50. 3A	195.93	0.36%	301,732	0.24%	1,540.00
51. 4A1	616.21	1.15%	911,993	0.72%	1,480.00
52. 4A	1,258.14	2.34%	1,721,164	1.36%	1,368.02
53. Total	53,786.84	100.00%	126,465,054	100.00%	2,351.23
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	5,763.35	70.46%	4,610,680	75.34%	800.00
56. 2D1	352.74	4.31%	264,560	4.32%	750.01
57. 2D	202.44	2.47%	141,708	2.32%	700.00
58. 3D1	1,043.15	12.75%	667,619	10.91%	640.00
59. 3D	55.76	0.68%	30,668	0.50%	550.00
60. 4D1	376.33	4.60%	199,457	3.26%	530.01
61. 4D	386.28	4.72%	204,734	3.35%	530.01
62. Total	8,180.05	100.00%	6,119,426	100.00%	748.09
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	4,636.99	8.27%	2,582,780	11.19%	556.99
65. 2G1	640.36	1.14%	316,390	1.37%	494.08
66. 2G	1,032.77	1.84%	455,693	1.97%	441.23
67. 3G1	1,692.54	3.02%	688,795	2.98%	406.96
68. 3G	121.17	0.22%	59,028	0.26%	487.15
69. 4G1	1,611.39	2.87%	644,164	2.79%	399.76
70. 4G	46,327.79	82.64%	18,339,073	79.44%	395.85
71. Total	56,063.01	100.00%	23,085,923	100.00%	411.79
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	53,786.84	45.39%	126,465,054	81.23%	2,351.23
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	8,180.05	6.90%	6,119,426	3.93%	748.09
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	56,063.01	47.31%	23,085,923	14.83%	411.79
72. Waste	429.13	0.36%	12,874	0.01%	30.00
73. Other	39.80	0.03%	4,776	0.00%	120.00
74. Exempt	5,980.22	5.05%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	118,498.83	100.00%	155,688,053	100.00%	1,313.84

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	23,169.72	59.05%	47,497,974	72.88%	2,050.00
47. 2A1	308.01	0.78%	548,258	0.84%	1,780.00
48. 2A	294.36	0.75%	412,104	0.63%	1,400.00
49. 3A1	6,685.73	17.04%	8,658,024	13.29%	1,295.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	1,546.94	3.94%	1,508,276	2.31%	975.01
52. 4A	7,232.30	18.43%	6,544,260	10.04%	904.87
53. Total	39,237.06	100.00%	65,168,896	100.00%	1,660.90
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	31,063.69	69.04%	24,846,978	74.59%	799.87
56. 2D1	705.37	1.57%	528,649	1.59%	749.46
57. 2D	294.27	0.65%	205,989	0.62%	700.00
58. 3D1	7,975.65	17.73%	5,104,147	15.32%	639.97
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	2,419.19	5.38%	1,281,901	3.85%	529.89
61. 4D	2,535.93	5.64%	1,344,056	4.03%	530.01
62. Total	44,994.10	100.00%	33,311,720	100.00%	740.36
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	5,502.90	7.08%	3,028,513	9.55%	550.35
65. 2G1	751.01	0.97%	368,148	1.16%	490.20
66. 2G	560.52	0.72%	246,490	0.78%	439.75
67. 3G1	3,919.29	5.04%	1,568,749	4.95%	400.26
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	4,960.24	6.38%	1,962,377	6.19%	395.62
70. 4G	62,058.98	79.82%	24,528,507	77.37%	395.25
71. Total	77,752.94	100.00%	31,702,784	100.00%	407.74
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	39,237.06	24.19%	65,168,896	50.05%	1,660.90
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	44,994.10	27.74%	33,311,720	25.59%	740.36
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	77,752.94	47.93%	31,702,784	24.35%	407.74
72. Waste	172.12	0.11%	5,165	0.00%	30.01
73. Other	62.54	0.04%	7,504	0.01%	119.99
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	162,218.76	100.00%	130,196,069	100.00%	802.60

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	13.00	31,850	0.00	0	93,010.90	191,602,100	93,023.90	191,633,950
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	19.31	15,448	0.00	0	53,154.84	39,415,698	53,174.15	39,431,146
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	133,815.95	54,788,707	133,815.95	54,788,707
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	601.25	18,039	601.25	18,039
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	102.34	12,280	102.34	12,280
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,980.22	0	5,980.22	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>32.31</b>	<b>47,298</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>280,685.28</b>	<b>285,836,824</b>	<b>280,717.59</b>	<b>285,884,122</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	93,023.90	33.14%	191,633,950	67.03%	2,060.05
<b>Dry Land</b>	53,174.15	18.94%	39,431,146	13.79%	741.55
<b>Grass</b>	133,815.95	47.67%	54,788,707	19.16%	409.43
<b>Waste</b>	601.25	0.21%	18,039	0.01%	30.00
<b>Other</b>	102.34	0.04%	12,280	0.00%	119.99
<b>Exempt</b>	5,980.22	2.13%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>280,717.59</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>285,884,122</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,018.40</b>

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

37 Gosper

	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	89,149,287	94,196,187	5,046,900	5.66%	1,730,355	3.72%
02. Recreational	93,570	93,570	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	12,511,123	12,109,156	-401,967	-3.21%	611,716	-8.10%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>101,753,980</b>	<b>106,398,913</b>	<b>4,644,933</b>	<b>4.56%</b>	<b>2,342,071</b>	<b>2.26%</b>
05. Commercial	6,554,719	7,540,679	985,960	15.04%	961,336	0.38%
06. Industrial	946,441	1,563,389	616,948	65.19%	616,948	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	6,773,316	7,297,037	523,721	7.73%	0	7.73%
08. Minerals	8,478	8,478	0	0.00	0	0.00
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>14,282,954</b>	<b>16,409,583</b>	<b>2,126,629</b>	<b>14.89%</b>	<b>1,578,284</b>	<b>3.84%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>116,036,934</b>	<b>122,808,496</b>	<b>6,771,562</b>	<b>5.84%</b>	<b>3,920,355</b>	<b>2.46%</b>
11. Irrigated	165,449,320	191,633,950	26,184,630	15.83%		
12. Dryland	34,147,382	39,431,146	5,283,764	15.47%		
13. Grassland	52,096,094	54,788,707	2,692,613	5.17%		
14. Wasteland	16,583	18,039	1,456	8.78%		
15. Other Agland	10,203	12,280	2,077	20.36%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>251,719,582</b>	<b>285,884,122</b>	<b>34,164,540</b>	<b>13.57%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>367,756,516</b>	<b>408,692,618</b>	<b>40,936,102</b>	<b>11.13%</b>	<b>3,920,355</b>	<b>10.07%</b>

**THREE-YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN  
GOSPER COUNTY  
October 25, 2011**

**Introduction**

Pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2005 Nebraska Legislature, the Assessor shall prepare a Plan of Assessment by June 15 and submit this plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year. On or before October 31 the Assessor shall mail the plan and any amendments to the Department of Revenue, Property Tax Division.

**Office Duties**

Each year, the Assessor's Office is responsible for locating and valuing all taxable real and personal property. This includes overseeing the appraiser when he/she does the yearly reviews on new or changed property and also the complete relisting required by statute every six years. We also recommend to the commissioners the exemptions for educational, charitable and religious organizations. We approve or deny the beginning farmer exemption and mail out and receive the homestead exemption forms. As these forms are somewhat complicated, we offer help to our taxpayers in filling them out. Questions are answered in regard to new valuations and the reasons for changes. We attend protest hearings to provide testimony to the County Board of Equalization.

Keeping our computer system current is a large part of our routine. This includes both updating and adding to the records already on the system and keeping the hardware and programs it uses up to date. We compile and submit data for the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and prepare spreadsheets to determine the values for each political subdivision. We receive certified values for centrally assessed companies from the Department of Revenue and add them into the valuation spreadsheets, giving us a total county value. We are responsible for preparing the permanent tax list and also give permission to send the electronic information to the Treasurer's software vender for the printing of the tax statements.

We are responsible to publish in the local paper notification of the completion of the Real Property Assessment. We certify valuations and growth to all political subdivisions, and certify to the Secretary of State all trusts owning agricultural land in Gosper County.

The Assessor's Office is required to make several reports each year. These include: the mobile home report to all mobile home court owners in the county, a real estate abstract, the final personal property abstract, the 3-year plan of assessment, a report listing over- and under-valued property for correction by the County Board of Equalization, an inventory of county property located in this office, the budget for the office and Certificate of Taxes Levied to the State Tax Administrator. We also prepare maps and charts for protest hearings and general information to the County Commissioners and the taxpayers.

This office has the record of the certified irrigated acres and we work with the NRD for irrigated acre transfers. Each year we compile and give them a list of all the taxpayers with irrigation. We measure proposed irrigation in preparation for presentation to the NRD Board for approval and then change our records accordingly.

I am also, at the request of the County Commissioners, the Zoning Administrator, the Flood Plain Administrator, the Liaison for the Census for Gosper County, and with the elimination of the County School Superintendent's position, I am in charge of the grade school art for the county fair.

**2011 Assessment Year**

**Level of Value, Quality, Uniformity**

<b>PROPERTY CLASS</b>	<b>MEDIAN</b>	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
Residential	96	21.64	113.11
Commercial	N/A	N/A	N/A
Agricultural	70	23.55	107.93

**2012 Assessment Year**

**Residential**

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2012 using **06/10** pricing.
2. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value. New depreciation applied, if needed.

**Commercial**

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2012, using **06/10** pricing.
2. Complete the sales ratio studies to determine level of value. New depreciation schedules made up if needed.

**Agricultural**

1. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2012, using **06/10** pricing.
2. Market area and ratio studies to be completed to determine the accuracy of market areas and the level of value. Corrections to areas and values completed as needed.
3. No new CD for land use will be available, however, we will continue to work on the land use from the 2009 CD.

## **2013 Assessment Year**

### **Residential**

1. All residential buildings to be repriced using the **06/12** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2013 using **06/12** pricing.
3. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value. New depreciation applied, if needed.

### **Commercial**

1. All commercial buildings to be repriced using the **06/12** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2013, using **06/12** pricing.
3. Complete the sales ratio studies to determine level of value. New depreciation schedules made up if needed.

### **Agricultural**

1. All agricultural buildings to be repriced using **06/12** pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2013, using **06/12** pricing.
3. Market area and ratio studies to be completed to determine the accuracy of market areas and the level of value. Corrections to areas and values completed as needed.
4. If a CD for land use will be available from the FSA office, we will update the land use.

## **2014 Assessment Year**

### **Residential**

1. All residential buildings to be repriced using the 06/12 pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2014 using 06/12 pricing.
3. Sales ratio studies completed to determine level of value. New depreciation applied if necessary.

### **Commercial**

1. All commercial buildings to be repriced using 06/12 pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2014 using 06/12 pricing.
3. Complete sales ratio studies to determine level of value. New depreciation schedule made up and implemented as necessary.

### **Agricultural**

1. All agricultural buildings to be repriced using the 06/12 pricing.
2. Pickup work to be completed by March 1, 2014 using 06/12 pricing.

3. Market Areas and ratio studies to be completed to determine the accuracy of market areas and levels of value. Corrections to the land areas and values completed as needed.
4. If a CD for land use is available, land use will be updated.

#### **Other**

Preparation for the next six-year relisting project is to be completed. Applications and/or bids for listers will be taken. A new employment agreement made up for the approved lister.

#### **Summary/Conclusion**

Gosper County presently uses the TerraScan CAMA system contracted with the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation. At present, we have no plans to switch to any other system. There are a few problems with this system, but TerraScan seems open to suggestions for improvement and changes.

All of our personal property schedules and real estate records are in both hardcopy and in the computer. We continue to enter all sales into the computer and we use the sales reports generated to compare to our own ratio reports developed on our PC and to sales reports and rosters provided by Property Tax. We also utilize the "Expanded What If" program for ag sales.

We acquired a new server from TerraScan in October, 2005 and at this time we replaced the battery backup on the server. A new PC was purchased in March, 2009 since the mother board on the old PC went down. We were advised to purchase new, rather than put that much money into an old computer.

All other functions and duties required by the Assessor's office are performed in a timely fashion.

**2011/12 Budget**

Salaries	65,676.90
Telephone	630.00
PTAS/CAMA	3,472.38
Repair	350.00
Lodging	450.00
Mileage	450.00
Dues, Registration	275.00
Reappraisal	555.00
Schooling	600.00
Office Supplies	410.00
Equipment	0.00
<b>Total Request</b>	<b>72,969.28</b>

---

Cheryl L. Taft, Gosper County Assessor

Date: October 25, 2011

## 2012 Assessment Survey for Gosper County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	0
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$72,969.28
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	Same
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$555
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	n/a
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$3,472.38
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$600
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	n/a
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$6,186.90

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	TerraScan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	TerraScan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	The assessor
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No

6.	<b>Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?</b>
	n/a
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	n/a
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	All municipalities are zoned
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1991

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Gene Witte, Hawk Eye, Inc. is hired to assist the deputy assessor with data collection and pickup work. He does not participate in the valuation process.
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None



# 2012 Certification for Gosper 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 Gosper 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



