

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 Howard County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	122	Median	98.64
Total Sales Price	\$10,711,524	Mean	96.94
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$10,711,524	Wgt. Mean	94.79
Total Assessed Value	\$10,153,989	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$72,008
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$87,799	Avg. Assessed Value	\$83,229

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.96 to 99.05
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.27 to 97.32
95% Mean C.I	93.51 to 100.37
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	24.03
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.04
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.82

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	148	96	96
2010	167	97	97
2009	165	98	98
2008	164	94	94

2012 Commission Summary for Howard County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	13	Median	96.72
Total Sales Price	\$859,104	Mean	105.33
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$859,104	Wgt. Mean	92.06
Total Assessed Value	\$790,885	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$76,044
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$66,085	Avg. Assessed Value	\$60,837

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	84.08 to 108.40
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	80.36 to 103.76
95% Mean C.I	74.24 to 136.42
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.31
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.16
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.53

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	15		99
2010	21	98	98
2009	23	98	98
2008	17	93	95

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Howard 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	99	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	71	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Howard County 2012 Assessment Actions taken to address the

Following property classes/subclasses:

Residential:

Howard County updated their residential pricing and applied 06/2008 Marshall/Swift Costing to existing data countywide in 2009.

All sales are reviewed through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Additional resources such as attorney and real estate agents are utilized in this process to acquire more accurate information concerning sales. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations.

A complete review of all residential properties in St. Paul was performed for 2012. All properties were physically inspected, with new photos taken. All corrections were made to the property records. A lot study was performed based on sales comparison and availability. A revaluation was then completed based on cost and sales comparison. There was no overall percentage adjustment used, but rather each property looked at separately due to previous equalization issues.

All residential pick-up work and building permits were reviewed and completed by March 1, 2012. A ratio study was completed on all other residential properties to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Howard County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	(St. Paul): St. Paul is the largest town in Howard County, with a population of 2,218. It is the county seat located on US Highway 281, 20 miles north of Grand Island. St. Paul has an active trade, business center for a prosperous ag area – predominantly irrigated crops. Housing market is very active, with a lot of St. Paul residents commuting to Grand Island for work.
	2	(Small Towns): This valuation group consists of the following seven small town/villages dispersed throughout the county: Boelus, Cotesfield, Cushing, Dannebrog, Elba, Farwell, and St. Libory. These towns each have a population of 350 or less, have very limited trade or business, but enjoy an active housing market.
	3	(Rural): This valuation group includes all residential property sales throughout the county of tracts that are 25 acres or less. There is an active market of rural residential sales due to desirable rural homesites in the area of or overlooking three river valleys that cross through the county. Many of these rural residential sites provide housing for people who are employed in Grand Island.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Cost and Sale Comparison	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2008	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Combination of tables provided by Vendor and depreciation studies per market	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Depreciation tables are developed on a county wide basis and then modified with economic depreciation developed for individual valuation groups.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Each year when the sales are reviewed	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	Lot studies are completed when a valuation group is reviewed. Latest study was St. Paul in 2012.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	Sales Comparison and availability	

10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	Review of questionnaire, building permits, and any other routine office/field work that results in awareness that there may be a substantial change in the physical or structural nature of the property. Change is then reviewed and determination made whether it is substantial or not, based on the structure – not a value/percentage based decision.

**47 Howard
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 : 122
 Total Sales Price : 10,711,524
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,711,524
 Total Assessed Value : 10,153,989
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 87,799
 Avg. Assessed Value : 83,229

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 97
 COD : 09.48
 PRD : 102.27

COV : 19.95
 STD : 19.34
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.35
 MAX Sales Ratio : 189.34
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.56

95% Median C.I. : 97.96 to 99.05
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.27 to 97.32
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.51 to 100.37

Printed:3/29/2012 3:16:10PM

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	26	98.64	98.08	96.35	09.55	101.80	47.67	189.34	97.75 to 99.23	96,308	92,790
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	100.11	107.52	101.15	10.90	106.30	88.13	180.88	98.18 to 105.96	82,350	83,298
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	92.45	89.87	92.98	08.58	96.66	74.97	99.60	N/A	60,125	55,905
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	23	98.73	97.53	95.65	05.78	101.97	71.30	132.63	96.40 to 99.32	82,015	78,446
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	14	97.42	88.91	93.25	12.47	95.35	25.56	107.06	88.82 to 99.69	79,772	74,390
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	16	98.28	97.47	91.37	09.70	106.68	64.31	125.34	94.85 to 107.82	87,373	79,837
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	15	95.91	96.07	92.15	16.36	104.25	57.38	170.95	80.72 to 100.76	79,953	73,675
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	14	99.31	96.63	94.40	03.41	102.36	69.71	101.37	94.45 to 99.96	110,221	104,044
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	63	98.69	98.86	96.68	08.44	102.25	47.67	189.34	98.28 to 99.18	86,577	83,705
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	59	98.39	94.88	92.84	10.60	102.20	25.56	170.95	95.97 to 99.28	89,105	82,722
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	57	98.29	94.86	93.65	08.78	101.29	25.56	132.63	96.40 to 99.16	81,432	76,258
<u>ALL</u>	122	98.64	96.94	94.79	09.48	102.27	25.56	189.34	97.96 to 99.05	87,799	83,229

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	70	98.99	97.87	98.40	02.35	99.46	25.56	107.06	98.63 to 99.23	87,927	86,520
02	26	91.94	98.64	91.39	23.42	107.93	47.67	189.34	83.29 to 107.82	48,410	44,243
03	26	95.02	92.71	89.37	15.43	103.74	40.95	170.95	88.58 to 99.73	126,845	113,356
<u>ALL</u>	122	98.64	96.94	94.79	09.48	102.27	25.56	189.34	97.96 to 99.05	87,799	83,229

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	122	98.64	96.94	94.79	09.48	102.27	25.56	189.34	97.96 to 99.05	87,799	83,229
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	122	98.64	96.94	94.79	09.48	102.27	25.56	189.34	97.96 to 99.05	87,799	83,229

**47 Howard
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 : 122
 Total Sales Price : 10,711,524
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 10,711,524
 Total Assessed Value : 10,153,989
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 87,799
 Avg. Assessed Value : 83,229

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 97
 COD : 09.48
 PRD : 102.27

COV : 19.95
 STD : 19.34
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.35
 MAX Sales Ratio : 189.34
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.56

95% Median C.I. : 97.96 to 99.05
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.27 to 97.32
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.51 to 100.37

Printed:3/29/2012 3:16:10PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	4	113.46	115.98	124.09	39.66	93.46	47.67	189.34	N/A	2,438	3,025	
Less Than 15,000	5	132.63	128.96	156.54	34.42	82.38	47.67	189.34	N/A	4,550	7,123	
Less Than 30,000	15	99.73	103.99	98.25	25.18	105.84	40.95	189.34	89.59 to 109.64	14,883	14,624	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	118	98.64	96.29	94.77	08.25	101.60	25.56	180.88	97.96 to 99.05	90,693	85,948	
Greater Than 14,999	117	98.63	95.57	94.66	07.60	100.96	25.56	170.95	97.96 to 99.03	91,357	86,482	
Greater Than 29,999	107	98.63	95.95	94.72	07.23	101.30	25.56	170.95	97.93 to 99.03	98,021	92,847	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	4	113.46	115.98	124.09	39.66	93.46	47.67	189.34	N/A	2,438	3,025	
5,000 TO 14,999	1	180.88	180.88	180.88	00.00	100.00	180.88	180.88	N/A	13,000	23,514	
15,000 TO 29,999	10	99.01	91.51	91.64	11.67	99.86	40.95	109.64	74.97 to 104.72	20,050	18,374	
30,000 TO 59,999	27	99.02	97.84	96.45	12.34	101.44	25.56	170.95	96.43 to 100.76	44,152	42,586	
60,000 TO 99,999	38	98.54	96.39	96.36	03.53	100.03	76.43	105.96	97.21 to 98.97	77,097	74,292	
100,000 TO 149,999	23	98.63	96.33	96.70	05.80	99.62	61.22	115.25	96.88 to 99.23	121,891	117,873	
150,000 TO 249,999	17	99.45	91.37	90.43	08.92	101.04	64.31	104.13	80.72 to 99.90	175,616	158,809	
250,000 TO 499,999	2	96.38	96.38	95.39	08.09	101.04	88.58	104.17	N/A	288,750	275,450	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	122	98.64	96.94	94.79	09.48	102.27	25.56	189.34	97.96 to 99.05	87,799	83,229	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

A. Residential Real Property

Howard County is located in central Nebraska with St. Paul being the county seat, located 20 miles north of Grand Island on Highway 281.

Howard County had a total of 122 improved, qualified residential sales during the two year study period, which is considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Howard County. The residential class of property in Howard County is made up of three separate valuation groups, each of which contained 26 or more sales.

The county reviews all sales through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. When necessary an attorney and/or real estate agents involved in the sale are contacted to obtain more accurate or additional information. There were 235 total sales during the study period, of which 113 sales (about 48 percent) were determined to be not qualified sales or unimproved parcels at the time of sale. The disqualified sales included 19 unimproved parcels, 30 sales being substantially changed subsequent to purchase, with the rest disqualified due to being: political subdivision, exempt, family, foreclosure, title, or other terms and conditions. All qualified, arms-length transactions are included in the sales file.

Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. All residential pick-up work and building permits were reviewed and completed on schedule. A ratio study was completed on all residential properties to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

For 2012 a complete review, physical inspection, photos, property record updates, lot study and revaluation was completed on all Valuation Group 1 (St. Paul) properties. No other residential assessment actions or adjustments were made to improve the equity within the residential class of real property.

It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for Howard County residential real property is within the acceptable range and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales and because the county applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population. All the valuation groups that are adequately represented in the sales file are within the acceptable range of 92% to 100%.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 99% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Howard 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 Howard 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 Howard 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 Howard 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.

Howard County 2012 Assessment Actions taken to address the

Following property classes/subclasses:

Commercial:

Howard County implemented a new Commercial Appraisal in 2009, completed by Stanard Appraisal.

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified commercial sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property.

Typically, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. However, due to the new commercial appraisal in 2009, no commercial inspections were done for 2012 other than pick up work. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. Some changes were made to correct coding errors as far as location of parcels. Also some pricing of land was adjusted to better reflect the market.

Howard County did not adjust commercial property values for 2012.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Howard County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	(St. Paul): St. Paul is the largest town in Howard County, with a population of 2,218. It is the county seat located on US Highway 281, 20 miles north of Grand Island. St. Paul has an active trade, business center for a prosperous ag area predominantly irrigated crops. A lot of St. Paul residents commuting to Grand Island for work.
	2	(Small Towns): This valuation group consists of the following seven small town/villages dispersed throughout the county: Boelus, Cotesfield, Cushing, Dannebrog, Elba, St. Libory and Farwell. These towns each have a population of 350 or less, have very limited trade or business, but enjoy an active housing market.
	3	(Rural): This valuation group includes all rural commercial sales throughout the county located outside city boundaries.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Sales Comparison, Income and Costing	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	Physical inspection, joint review with commercial appraiser and locate comparable sales using new state sales file query.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2008	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Combination of tables provided by Vendor and depreciation studies per market	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Depreciation tables are developed on a county wide basis and then modified with economic depreciation developed for individual valuation groups.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Annually when sales are reviewed	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2009	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Sales	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	

Review of questionnaire, building permits, and any other routine office/field work that results in awareness that there may be a substantial change in the physical or structural nature of the property. Change is then reviewed and determination made whether it is substantial or not, based on the structure – not a value/percentage based decision.
--

**47 Howard
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 : 13
 Total Sales Price : 859,104
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 859,104
 Total Assessed Value : 790,885
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 66,085
 Avg. Assessed Value : 60,837

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 105
 COD : 24.34
 PRD : 114.41

COV : 48.85
 STD : 51.45
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.54
 MAX Sales Ratio : 265.60
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.29

95% Median C.I. : 84.08 to 108.40
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 80.36 to 103.76
 95% Mean C.I. : 74.24 to 136.42

Printed:3/29/2012 3:16:11PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	265.60	265.60	265.60	00.00	100.00	265.60	265.60	N/A	500	1,328
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	97.10	95.74	94.86	04.39	100.93	88.68	101.45	N/A	67,391	63,927
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	87.42	87.42	86.11	05.35	101.52	82.74	92.10	N/A	76,465	65,842
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	112.65	112.65	112.65	00.00	100.00	112.65	112.65	N/A	120,000	135,184
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	102.38	102.38	97.50	05.88	105.01	96.36	108.40	N/A	116,000	113,102
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	84.08	84.08	84.08	00.00	100.00	84.08	84.08	N/A	59,000	49,610
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	104.11	104.11	104.11	00.00	100.00	104.11	104.11	N/A	24,500	25,506
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	68.01	68.01	43.51	42.23	156.31	39.29	96.72	N/A	34,000	14,795
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	99.28	138.21	95.28	45.65	145.06	88.68	265.60	N/A	50,669	48,277
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	5	96.36	98.45	97.65	09.59	100.82	82.74	112.65	N/A	100,986	98,614
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	4	90.40	81.05	69.11	21.43	117.28	39.29	104.11	N/A	37,875	26,177
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	92.10	92.41	91.09	05.90	101.45	82.74	101.45	N/A	71,021	64,693
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	102.38	100.37	100.00	09.91	100.37	84.08	112.65	N/A	102,750	102,750
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.72	105.33	92.06	24.34	114.41	39.29	265.60	84.08 to 108.40	66,085	60,837

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	6	90.39	87.31	88.23	18.88	98.96	39.29	112.65	39.29 to 112.65	72,155	63,664
02	6	99.28	124.84	95.55	32.44	130.65	84.08	265.60	84.08 to 265.60	36,029	34,425
03	1	96.36	96.36	96.36	00.00	100.00	96.36	96.36	N/A	210,000	202,356
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.72	105.33	92.06	24.34	114.41	39.29	265.60	84.08 to 108.40	66,085	60,837

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
02											
03	13	96.72	105.33	92.06	24.34	114.41	39.29	265.60	84.08 to 108.40	66,085	60,837
04											
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.72	105.33	92.06	24.34	114.41	39.29	265.60	84.08 to 108.40	66,085	60,837

**47 Howard
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 : 13
 Total Sales Price : 859,104
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 859,104
 Total Assessed Value : 790,885
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 66,085
 Avg. Assessed Value : 60,837

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 105
 COD : 24.34
 PRD : 114.41

COV : 48.85
 STD : 51.45
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.54
 MAX Sales Ratio : 265.60
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.29

95% Median C.I. : 84.08 to 108.40
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 80.36 to 103.76
 95% Mean C.I. : 74.24 to 136.42

Printed:3/29/2012 3:16:11PM

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	1	265.60	265.60	265.60	00.00	100.00	265.60	265.60	N/A	500	1,328
Less Than 15,000	2	181.16	181.16	112.07	46.61	161.65	96.72	265.60	N/A	2,750	3,082
Less Than 30,000	4	106.26	143.71	106.77	40.74	134.60	96.72	265.60	N/A	13,000	13,880
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	12	96.54	91.97	91.96	11.84	100.01	39.29	112.65	84.08 to 104.11	71,550	65,796
Greater Than 14,999	11	96.36	91.54	91.93	12.91	99.58	39.29	112.65	82.74 to 108.40	77,600	71,338
Greater Than 29,999	9	92.10	88.27	91.11	13.60	96.88	39.29	112.65	82.74 to 101.45	89,678	81,707
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	265.60	265.60	265.60	00.00	100.00	265.60	265.60	N/A	500	1,328
5,000 TO 14,999	1	96.72	96.72	96.72	00.00	100.00	96.72	96.72	N/A	5,000	4,836
15,000 TO 29,999	2	106.26	106.26	106.14	02.02	100.11	104.11	108.40	N/A	23,250	24,677
30,000 TO 59,999	3	92.10	92.54	91.52	06.29	101.11	84.08	101.45	N/A	51,667	47,287
60,000 TO 99,999	4	85.71	76.95	79.47	18.60	96.83	39.29	97.10	N/A	80,526	63,992
100,000 TO 149,999	1	112.65	112.65	112.65	00.00	100.00	112.65	112.65	N/A	120,000	135,184
150,000 TO 249,999	1	96.36	96.36	96.36	00.00	100.00	96.36	96.36	N/A	210,000	202,356
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.72	105.33	92.06	24.34	114.41	39.29	265.60	84.08 to 108.40	66,085	60,837

**47 Howard
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 : 13
 Total Sales Price : 859,104
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 859,104
 Total Assessed Value : 790,885
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 66,085
 Avg. Assessed Value : 60,837

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 105
 COD : 24.34
 PRD : 114.41

COV : 48.85
 STD : 51.45
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.54
 MAX Sales Ratio : 265.60
 MIN Sales Ratio : 39.29

95% Median C.I. : 84.08 to 108.40
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 80.36 to 103.76
 95% Mean C.I. : 74.24 to 136.42

Printed:3/29/2012 3:16:11PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
304	1	97.10	97.10	97.10	00.00	100.00	97.10	97.10	N/A	86,174	83,674
319	1	112.65	112.65	112.65	00.00	100.00	112.65	112.65	N/A	120,000	135,184
344	1	108.40	108.40	108.40	00.00	100.00	108.40	108.40	N/A	22,000	23,848
353	1	265.60	265.60	265.60	00.00	100.00	265.60	265.60	N/A	500	1,328
378	1	96.36	96.36	96.36	00.00	100.00	96.36	96.36	N/A	210,000	202,356
384	1	92.10	92.10	92.10	00.00	100.00	92.10	92.10	N/A	55,000	50,657
386	1	104.11	104.11	104.11	00.00	100.00	104.11	104.11	N/A	24,500	25,506
406	1	96.72	96.72	96.72	00.00	100.00	96.72	96.72	N/A	5,000	4,836
426	1	88.68	88.68	88.68	00.00	100.00	88.68	88.68	N/A	75,000	66,512
442	1	101.45	101.45	101.45	00.00	100.00	101.45	101.45	N/A	41,000	41,594
444	1	82.74	82.74	82.74	00.00	100.00	82.74	82.74	N/A	97,930	81,026
470	1	84.08	84.08	84.08	00.00	100.00	84.08	84.08	N/A	59,000	49,610
577	1	39.29	39.29	39.29	00.00	100.00	39.29	39.29	N/A	63,000	24,754
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.72	105.33	92.06	24.34	114.41	39.29	265.60	84.08 to 108.40	66,085	60,837

**2012 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Howard County is located in central Nebraska with St. Paul being the county seat, located 20 miles north of Grand Island on Highway 281.

There were a total of 38 commercial sales for Howard County for the three year study period. The county reviews all sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011) through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires and/or interviews with buyers and sellers, and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Of the 38 sales only 13 sales were improved, qualified sales. The disqualified sales were coded out for being substantially changed, foreclosure sales, unimproved at time of sale, family sales, etc. All qualified, arms-length transactions are included in the sales file. There were 6 sales each in two of the valuation groups and 1 sale in the other. These sales were diverse with each having a different occupancy codes and sale prices ranging from \$500 to \$210,000. Average sale price for the 13 improved, qualified sales was \$66,000.

The county completed a review and analysis to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property. Howard County implemented a new commercial appraisal in 2009, completed by Stanard Appraisal.

There were no assessment actions taken in the commercial class of property for assessment year 2012, other than correction of coding errors concerning location of parcels, and some adjustment to pricing of land to better reflect the market.

During 2011 the Department's Property Assessment Division implemented a cyclical review process to conduct an assessment practices review of one-third of the counties within the state. Howard County was one of those selected. Within the commercial class the review confirmed that the county assessor adheres to generally accepted mass appraisal standards, property tax laws, regulations, manuals, and directives issued by the Department of Revenue.

Because there is a very limited number of commercial sales available, the sample should not be relied upon in determining the level of value. There was not sufficient information available to determine a level of value for the commercial real property in Howard County.

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Howard 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 Howard 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 Howard 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 Howard 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.

Howard County 2012 Assessment Actions taken to address the

Following property classes/subclasses:

Agricultural:

All sales are reviewed through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Additional resources such as attorney and real estate agents are utilized in this process to acquire more accurate information concerning sales. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. The county completed all pick up work in a timely manner.

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified agricultural land sales that occurred the current study period (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the agricultural land class of real property. This analysis included a joint review with the field liaison of the sales file for each market area to determine proportionality, representativeness and adequacy of the sales. After completing the analysis, the county added sales in conformance with the R&O Ag spreadsheet analysis and prepared a new schedule of LCG values for each of the market areas.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. Howard County Assessor and staff continued working on the land use inventory as part of the implementation of the new soil survey for the 2011 tax year. All classes of agricultural land were rolled from Alpha Soil System to the Numerical System per state mandate.

Continued working with the Natural Resource Districts in a cooperative effort focused on coordinating the irrigated acres on the records with the corresponding NRD and FSA records, as available.

The three market areas experienced changes to LCG values for 2012.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Howard County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	7100	This market area includes the southerly portion of Howard County lying south of the Middle Loup and Loup Rivers. This area is characterized by the sandy soils common in the “sandhills” of Nebraska, with significant groundwater irrigation development utilizing center pivot systems. The southeast portion of this market area is included in the Central Platte Natural Resource District (Platte River drainage area). The northwest portion of this area is included in the Lower Loup Natural Resource District (Loup River drainage area).
	7200	This market area includes the westerly portion of the county located west of the Middle Loup and North Loup Rivers. The topography ranges from near level along the river valleys to rolling uplands, much of which is suitable for center pivot irrigation. The soils in this area are silty. This area is nearly an equal mix of irrigated land and grassland, with a small amount of dry cropland. This area is included in the Lower Loup Natural Resource District (Loup River drainage area).
	7300	This market area includes the area located north and east of the North Loup and Loup Rivers. This area is transitional from the sandy soils to the southeast and the silty soils to the southwest. This area consists of more uplands with a limited amount of irrigation and dry cropland. This area is primarily grassland, with most of the irrigated close to the river. Most of this area is utilized as grassland due to topography not suitable for dryland or irrigated cropping. This area is included in the Lower Loup Natural Resource District (Loup River drainage area).
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	River boundaries, common geographic characteristics, topography, market characteristics	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Through review of questionnaire, discussions with owner.	
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?	
	Farm home sites and rural residential home sites carry the same value.	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA	

	maps, etc.)
	GIS, aerial photographs, FSA and NRD information provide indications of change. No annual update is made unless a change has been flagged from above information.
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.
	Questionnaires, talk to buyers & sellers, talk to real estate agents, sales analysis.
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.
	Applications have been filed. These parcels are all carrying ag land values.
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	Review of questionnaire, building permits, and any other routine office/field work that results in awareness that there may be a substantial change in the land use or improvements on the property. Change is then reviewed and determination made whether it is substantial or not - based on land use and improvements, not value change.

47 Howard
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 : 73
Total Sales Price : 18,765,786
Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,695,786
Total Assessed Value : 12,968,209
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 256,107
Avg. Assessed Value : 177,647

MEDIAN : 71
WGT. MEAN : 69
MEAN : 73
COD : 16.75
PRD : 104.79

COV : 21.89
STD : 15.91
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.87
MAX Sales Ratio : 117.53
MIN Sales Ratio : 39.03

95% Median C.I. : 68.54 to 74.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.52 to 73.21
95% Mean C.I. : 69.03 to 76.33

Printed:3/29/2012 3:16:12PM

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	117.53	117.53	117.53	00.00	100.00	117.53	117.53	N/A	42,500	49,952
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	78.17	71.34	66.55	16.67	107.20	54.20	87.20	54.20 to 87.20	328,644	218,722
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	11	82.37	83.87	80.72	15.88	103.90	63.84	111.28	69.23 to 107.18	249,808	201,643
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	74.71	79.20	75.27	10.15	105.22	69.07	98.32	N/A	309,552	232,995
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	72.51	71.43	71.80	06.16	99.48	63.83	81.21	63.83 to 81.21	203,214	145,912
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	11	71.75	75.14	71.17	14.62	105.58	54.13	109.22	59.78 to 88.40	237,247	168,856
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	57.73	62.61	61.29	23.47	102.15	39.03	94.32	39.03 to 94.32	250,426	153,492
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	69.74	74.48	66.36	19.92	112.24	56.01	97.68	N/A	296,400	196,705
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	63.97	63.78	61.57	08.80	103.59	51.69	74.18	51.69 to 74.18	280,461	172,687
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	7	61.46	64.54	69.13	19.36	93.36	44.78	91.68	44.78 to 91.68	289,750	200,312
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	8	72.84	71.36	65.04	10.23	109.72	49.87	91.26	49.87 to 91.26	202,946	132,003
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	23	78.17	80.71	74.75	17.51	107.97	54.20	117.53	70.20 to 87.58	275,178	205,698
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	24	71.31	70.56	68.21	15.12	103.45	39.03	109.22	63.83 to 74.87	232,582	158,639
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	26	68.72	67.55	65.29	14.25	103.46	44.78	97.68	61.46 to 73.35	260,950	170,378
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	21	74.18	79.42	77.33	13.68	102.70	63.83	111.28	70.20 to 87.58	247,875	191,691
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	29	68.53	68.91	65.42	16.36	105.33	39.03	109.22	59.78 to 74.18	258,468	169,085
<u>ALL</u>	73	70.87	72.68	69.36	16.75	104.79	39.03	117.53	68.54 to 74.23	256,107	177,647

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
7100	24	70.08	74.14	71.87	19.05	103.16	39.03	109.22	63.84 to 87.20	229,212	164,724
7200	27	72.32	72.73	70.21	15.22	103.59	44.78	111.28	64.65 to 75.49	274,755	192,913
7300	22	71.31	71.04	65.89	15.75	107.82	51.69	117.53	55.28 to 78.17	262,559	173,009
<u>ALL</u>	73	70.87	72.68	69.36	16.75	104.79	39.03	117.53	68.54 to 74.23	256,107	177,647

47 Howard
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 : 73
Total Sales Price : 18,765,786
Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,695,786
Total Assessed Value : 12,968,209
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 256,107
Avg. Assessed Value : 177,647

MEDIAN : 71
WGT. MEAN : 69
MEAN : 73
COD : 16.75
PRD : 104.79

COV : 21.89
STD : 15.91
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.87
MAX Sales Ratio : 117.53
MIN Sales Ratio : 39.03

95% Median C.I. : 68.54 to 74.23
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.52 to 73.21
95% Mean C.I. : 69.03 to 76.33

Printed:3/29/2012 3:16:12PM

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	6	68.84	69.80	65.13	16.47	107.17	55.53	87.20	55.53 to 87.20	297,285	193,618
7100	3	82.37	77.80	74.94	09.46	103.82	63.83	87.20	N/A	166,570	124,831
7200	3	56.01	61.80	61.31	10.91	100.80	55.53	73.85	N/A	428,000	262,404
_____Dry_____											
County	2	55.68	55.68	44.51	29.90	125.10	39.03	72.32	N/A	58,727	26,137
7100	1	39.03	39.03	39.03	00.00	100.00	39.03	39.03	N/A	98,124	38,293
7200	1	72.32	72.32	72.32	00.00	100.00	72.32	72.32	N/A	19,330	13,980
_____Grass_____											
County	25	71.75	73.10	71.23	15.29	102.63	54.20	109.22	64.65 to 81.21	180,326	128,454
7100	10	72.37	76.55	79.17	16.90	96.69	54.21	109.22	59.78 to 97.68	121,565	96,247
7200	5	72.40	70.78	73.11	10.69	96.81	56.76	85.93	N/A	154,927	113,262
7300	10	70.98	70.81	66.83	15.88	105.96	54.20	91.26	54.53 to 83.10	251,786	168,257
_____ALL_____	73	70.87	72.68	69.36	16.75	104.79	39.03	117.53	68.54 to 74.23	256,107	177,647

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	26	69.15	72.24	68.09	18.18	106.09	47.07	111.28	63.83 to 75.42	358,560	244,148
7100	11	69.07	73.69	68.75	18.43	107.19	47.07	107.18	61.46 to 94.38	345,337	237,417
7200	10	71.54	75.79	71.80	18.83	105.56	55.53	111.28	56.01 to 94.32	368,503	264,576
7300	5	57.73	61.97	59.30	14.01	104.50	51.69	75.42	N/A	367,763	218,099
_____Dry_____											
County	2	55.68	55.68	44.51	29.90	125.10	39.03	72.32	N/A	58,727	26,137
7100	1	39.03	39.03	39.03	00.00	100.00	39.03	39.03	N/A	98,124	38,293
7200	1	72.32	72.32	72.32	00.00	100.00	72.32	72.32	N/A	19,330	13,980
_____Grass_____											
County	30	73.29	75.85	72.71	16.74	104.32	54.20	117.53	68.54 to 83.07	175,531	127,631
7100	10	72.37	76.55	79.17	16.90	96.69	54.21	109.22	59.78 to 97.68	121,565	96,247
7200	8	73.29	76.19	76.38	14.35	99.75	56.76	98.32	56.76 to 98.32	152,838	116,735
7300	12	73.31	75.04	68.35	18.36	109.79	54.20	117.53	55.28 to 83.10	235,630	161,049
_____ALL_____	73	70.87	72.68	69.36	16.75	104.79	39.03	117.53	68.54 to 74.23	256,107	177,647

Howard County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
47.71	Howard	7100	2,650	2,550	2,300	2,300	2,220	2,220	1,900	1,800	2,115
47.72	Howard	7200	2,750	2,750	2,500	2,350	2,155	2,100	1,910	1,800	2,439
47.73	Howard	7300	2,200	2,200	1,900	1,900	1,800	1,800	1,650	1,650	1,991
40.10	Hall	1	3,279	3,281	2,810	2,797	1,965	1,963	1,861	1,861	2,890
10.10	Buffalo	1	2,980	2,985	2,846	2,450	1,800	1,650	1,449	1,396	2,127
41.10	Hamilton	1	3,550	3,550	3,300	3,100	3,000	2,750	2,650	2,650	3,416
61.10	Merrick	1	2,685	2,685	2,650	2,650	2,285	2,235	1,780	1,570	2,421
82.10	Sherman	1	#DIV/0!	2,075	2,005	2,005	1,935	1,935	1,895	1,895	1,962
39.20	Greeley	2	#DIV/0!	2,540	2,320	2,170	2,055	2,010	2,010	1,880	2,182
88.10	Valley	1	#DIV/0!	2,400	2,400	1,800	1,400	1,400	1,000	1,000	1,846
63.10	Nance	1	2,700	2,525	2,382	2,275	2,198	2,112	1,859	1,839	2,347

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Howard	7100	1,100	1,100	1,000	1,000	900	850	800	700	858
	Howard	7200	920	900	765	760	730	710	700	660	744
	Howard	7300	925	925	775	700	650	600	580	550	750
	Hall	1	2,047	2,042	1,809	1,520	1,365	1,192	1,200	962	1,697
	Buffalo	1	1,208	1,291	1,005	1,000	853	850	857	845	940
	Hamilton	1	2,300	2,070	1,900	1,815	1,755	1,455	1,330	1,210	2,004
	Merrick	1	1,185	1,150	1,075	1,035	925	900	850	750	967
	Sherman	1	#DIV/0!	865	820	820	775	775	730	730	767
	Greeley	2	#DIV/0!	1,320	1,300	1,290	1,130	1,080	750	615	963
	Valley	1	#DIV/0!	1,000	1,000	1,000	800	800	800	750	875
	Nance	1	1,315	1,190	1,109	1,073	1,051	1,007	970	910	1,078

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Howard	7100	805	800	795	780	750	725	685	685	701
	Howard	7200	740	720	693	693	665	651	556	555	581
	Howard	7300	800	800	700	700	660	660	580	575	589
	Hall	1	1,554	1,556	1,218	1,219	717	717	714	718	868
	Buffalo	1	923	863	839	856	715	642	587	530	615
	Hamilton	1	975	935	880	825	770	715	660	605	717
	Merrick	1	1,010	938	872	845	813	799	746	688	775
	Sherman	1	#DIV/0!	607	594	590	559	556	547	546	550
	Greeley	2	#DIV/0!	689	658	623	612	594	576	554	568
	Valley	1	#DIV/0!	751	751	747	750	743	568	523	557
	Nance	1	874	882	868	879	832	832	818	804	822

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

Neal Dethlefs
Howard County Assessor
(308)754-4261

February 27, 2012

Re: Special Value for 2012

I have reviewed the Special Valuation parcels for Howard County for the 2012 tax year.

The highest and best use for these parcels is agricultural. They are not suburban in nature and are not within any town or village's zoning jurisdiction. There are not any residential or commercial influences in regard to value. They are all currently used for agriculture.

The income approach to value does not apply at this time.

Sincerely,

Neal Dethlefs
Howard County Assessor

2012 Correlation Section for Howard County

A. Agricultural Land

Howard County is located in central Nebraska with St. Paul being the county seat, located 20 miles north of Grand Island on Highway 28.

Howard County is a rural area with 8 small towns in the county, St. Paul being the largest with a population on 2,200. The county is agriculture: 40% irrigated, 11% dry land; and 48% grassland. The majority of the irrigated land is center pivot or gravity irrigated. The North Loup River flowing from the northwest and the Middle Loup River flowing from the southwest converge just northeast of St. Paul to form the Loup River that then flows east out of the county. The majority of Howard County is within the Lower Loup Natural Resource District (LLNRD). Certification of irrigated acres is strictly enforced, with close monitoring of assessed irrigated acres, with regulations prohibiting the irrigation of uncertified acres. The extreme southeast corner of Howard County is located in the Central Platte Natural Resource District (CPNRD). The CPNRD has a groundwater management program that includes certification of irrigated acres, well registration and metering, nitrogen use, irrigation runoff, and groundwater level monitoring which is part of CPNRD's participation in the Cooperative Agreement on the Platte River.

Howard County is bordered on the west by Sherman County, to the north by Greeley County, to the south by Buffalo and Hall Counties, and to the east by Merrick County. It needs to be noted that although Nance County does not adjoin Howard County, it is located less than 1 mile to the east along the northerly third of Howard County. Howard County is made up of three market areas. Market Area 7100 is that portion of the county lying south of the Middle Loup and Loup Rivers. This area is characterized by sandy soils, center pivot irrigation, and generally high ground water tables. This market area includes about 30% of the county, with 44% irrigated cropland, 10% dry land, and 44% grassland. Market Area 7200 is the northwesterly portion of the county, which has silty soils, uplands type topography. This area is made up of 48% irrigated cropland, 11% dry land, and 39% grassland. Market Area 7300 is located in the northeast portion of the county. This area has heavier, silty type soils with center pivot irrigation development where water and topography allow. This area is made up of 17% irrigated cropland, 14% dry land, and 69% grassland.

The Market Area 1 statistical sample includes 15 Howard County agricultural sales in the three year study period. These Market Area 1 sales were not proportionately spread over the three year period and were not representative of land use within the market area with grassland being overrepresented. Nine sales were added from two different counties to the sample for Market Area 1 which resulted in all thresholds being met. All added sales were within 6 miles of Market Area 1. The resulting statistics suggested values in Market Area 1 were uniform and proportionate and at an acceptable level. The irrigated values for 2012 were increased 12 to 25%, the dryland values were increased approximately 5 to 17%, and the lower valued grassland LCG's were decreased 1 to 12%. The assessed values for Howard County Market Area 1 for 2012 are well within the range of and supported by assessed values for 2012 in comparable areas of adjoining counties.

The Market Area 2 statistical sample includes 24 Howard County agricultural sales in the three

**2012 Correlation Section
for Howard County**

year study period. These Market Area 2 sales were representative of land use within the market area but were not proportionately spread over the three year period. Three sales were added to the sample for Market Area 1 which resulted in all thresholds being met. All added sales were within 6 miles of Market Area 1. The resulting statistics suggest values in Market Area 1 were uniform and proportionate and at an acceptable level. The irrigated values for 2012 were increased 13 to 23%, the dryland values were increased approximately 8 to 18%, and the grassland values were increased 3 to 32%. The assessed values for Howard County Market Area 2 for 2012 are well within the range of and supported by assessed values for 2012 in comparable areas of adjoining counties.

The Market Area 3 statistical sample includes 8 Howard County agricultural sales in the three year study period. This market area has had very few sales for a number of years. There is a limited comparable area of lands adjoining Market Area 2 from which to add sales. Only lands lying within 6 miles from Market Area 2 were considered comparable. Because of the limited comparable area 14 sales were added to the sample for Market Area 3. The expanded sample is representative and proportionate. All added sales were within 6 miles of Market Area 1. The resulting statistics suggest values in Market Area 3 were uniform and proportionate and at an acceptable level. The irrigated values for 2012 were increased 25 to 44%, the dryland values were increased approximately 4 to 8%, and the grassland values were increased 8 to 31%. The assessed values for Howard County Market Area 3 for 2012 are well within the range of and supported by assessed values for 2012 in comparable areas of adjoining counties.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 72% of market value for the agricultural class of real property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range. Because of the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent, it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Howard 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 Howard 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 Howard 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 Howard 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 : 5,541	Value : 725,364,804	Growth 6,711,901	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	170	958,920	0	0	161	2,831,025	331	3,789,945	
02. Res Improve Land	1,328	10,598,346	0	0	636	17,005,954	1,964	27,604,300	
03. Res Improvements	1,363	79,678,556	0	0	697	58,558,918	2,060	138,237,474	
04. Res Total	1,533	91,235,822	0	0	858	78,395,897	2,391	169,631,719	3,583,346
% of Res Total	64.12	53.78	0.00	0.00	35.88	46.22	43.15	23.39	53.39
05. Com UnImp Land	84	792,976	0	0	5	23,712	89	816,688	
06. Com Improve Land	265	2,200,776	0	0	38	1,567,572	303	3,768,348	
07. Com Improvements	276	20,193,347	0	0	46	6,475,749	322	26,669,096	
08. Com Total	360	23,187,099	0	0	51	8,067,033	411	31,254,132	478,739
% of Com Total	87.59	74.19	0.00	0.00	12.41	25.81	7.42	4.31	7.13
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	19	1,463,412	19	1,463,412	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	11	1,403,987	11	1,403,987	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	11	1,831,373	11	1,831,373	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	30	4,698,772	30	4,698,772	680,662
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.54	0.65	10.14
Res & Rec Total	1,533	91,235,822	0	0	888	83,094,669	2,421	174,330,491	4,264,008
% of Res & Rec Total	63.32	52.33	0.00	0.00	36.68	47.67	43.69	24.03	63.53
Com & Ind Total	360	23,187,099	0	0	51	8,067,033	411	31,254,132	478,739
% of Com & Ind Total	87.59	74.19	0.00	0.00	12.41	25.81	7.42	4.31	7.13
17. Taxable Total	1,893	114,422,921	0	0	939	91,161,702	2,832	205,584,623	4,742,747
% of Taxable Total	66.84	55.66	0.00	0.00	33.16	44.34	51.11	28.34	70.66

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	9	54,205	1,493	0	0	0
19. Commercial	6	285,854	1,379,644	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	9	54,205	1,493
19. Commercial	0	0	0	6	285,854	1,379,644
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				15	340,059	1,381,137

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	170	0	187	357

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	1,800	0	0	1,682	259,050,498	1,683	259,052,298
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	982	195,632,783	982	195,632,783
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,026	65,095,100	1,026	65,095,100
30. Ag Total							2,709	519,780,181

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	2	2.00	25,000	2	2.00	25,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	725	736.50	9,189,000	725	736.50	9,189,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	747	726.50	46,728,945	747	726.50	46,728,945	1,969,154
34. HomeSite Total				749	738.50	55,942,945	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	50	126.72	293,774	50	126.72	293,774	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	920	4,401.07	10,090,558	920	4,401.07	10,090,558	
37. FarmSite Improvements	953	0.00	18,366,155	953	0.00	18,366,155	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,003	4,527.79	28,750,487	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,467.84	0	0	6,467.84	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,752	11,734.13	84,693,432	1,969,154

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	6	627.88	489,568	6	627.88	489,568

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	11	167.79	159,112	11	167.79	159,112
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 7100

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	433.00	0.95%	1,147,451	1.19%	2,650.00
46. 1A	3,507.01	7.68%	8,942,884	9.26%	2,550.00
47. 2A1	3,497.79	7.66%	8,044,917	8.33%	2,300.00
48. 2A	2,000.74	4.38%	4,601,702	4.77%	2,300.00
49. 3A1	12,500.18	27.38%	27,750,400	28.74%	2,220.00
50. 3A	7,232.25	15.84%	16,055,594	16.63%	2,220.00
51. 4A1	3,384.23	7.41%	6,430,037	6.66%	1,900.00
52. 4A	13,106.81	28.70%	23,592,253	24.43%	1,800.00
53. Total	45,662.01	100.00%	96,565,238	100.00%	2,114.78
Dry					
54. 1D1	74.30	0.77%	81,730	0.98%	1,100.00
55. 1D	563.12	5.81%	619,432	7.45%	1,100.00
56. 2D1	542.21	5.59%	542,210	6.52%	1,000.00
57. 2D	726.50	7.49%	726,500	8.74%	1,000.00
58. 3D1	2,737.83	28.24%	2,464,044	29.63%	900.00
59. 3D	1,912.04	19.73%	1,625,251	19.54%	850.01
60. 4D1	603.66	6.23%	482,928	5.81%	800.00
61. 4D	2,533.69	26.14%	1,773,580	21.33%	700.00
62. Total	9,693.35	100.00%	8,315,675	100.00%	857.87
Grass					
63. 1G1	28.46	0.06%	22,910	0.07%	804.99
64. 1G	379.79	0.84%	303,832	0.95%	800.00
65. 2G1	593.84	1.31%	472,110	1.48%	795.01
66. 2G	1,613.00	3.55%	1,258,141	3.95%	780.00
67. 3G1	2,805.87	6.17%	2,104,422	6.60%	750.01
68. 3G	6,965.96	15.32%	5,050,364	15.85%	725.01
69. 4G1	9,628.50	21.18%	6,595,543	20.70%	685.00
70. 4G	23,442.23	51.57%	16,057,959	50.39%	685.00
71. Total	45,457.65	100.00%	31,865,281	100.00%	700.99
Irrigated Total					
	45,662.01	44.49%	96,565,238	70.24%	2,114.78
Dry Total					
	9,693.35	9.44%	8,315,675	6.05%	857.87
Grass Total					
	45,457.65	44.29%	31,865,281	23.18%	700.99
72. Waste	1,514.60	1.48%	605,841	0.44%	400.00
73. Other	316.04	0.31%	126,416	0.09%	400.00
74. Exempt	619.96	0.60%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	102,643.65	100.00%	137,478,451	100.00%	1,339.38

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 7200

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,801.23	2.42%	4,953,405	2.73%	2,750.01
46. 1A	40,474.37	54.32%	111,304,547	61.25%	2,750.00
47. 2A1	4,632.86	6.22%	11,582,150	6.37%	2,500.00
48. 2A	1,100.91	1.48%	2,587,134	1.42%	2,350.00
49. 3A1	4,574.76	6.14%	9,858,648	5.43%	2,155.01
50. 3A	625.51	0.84%	1,313,571	0.72%	2,100.00
51. 4A1	15,995.88	21.47%	30,552,152	16.81%	1,910.00
52. 4A	5,310.02	7.13%	9,558,045	5.26%	1,800.00
53. Total	74,515.54	100.00%	181,709,652	100.00%	2,438.55
Dry					
54. 1D1	430.14	2.53%	395,730	3.12%	920.00
55. 1D	3,270.85	19.22%	2,943,763	23.24%	900.00
56. 2D1	1,005.68	5.91%	769,364	6.07%	765.02
57. 2D	319.06	1.87%	242,486	1.91%	760.00
58. 3D1	968.63	5.69%	707,100	5.58%	730.00
59. 3D	440.54	2.59%	312,783	2.47%	710.00
60. 4D1	7,736.24	45.45%	5,415,371	42.75%	700.00
61. 4D	2,850.06	16.74%	1,881,041	14.85%	660.00
62. Total	17,021.20	100.00%	12,667,638	100.00%	744.23
Grass					
63. 1G1	880.71	1.45%	651,725	1.84%	740.00
64. 1G	4,132.50	6.79%	2,975,399	8.42%	720.00
65. 2G1	1,806.17	2.97%	1,251,959	3.54%	693.16
66. 2G	1,075.00	1.77%	744,954	2.11%	692.98
67. 3G1	1,289.61	2.12%	857,616	2.43%	665.02
68. 3G	2,105.06	3.46%	1,369,609	3.87%	650.63
69. 4G1	17,152.54	28.20%	9,532,511	26.96%	555.75
70. 4G	32,375.33	53.23%	17,969,189	50.83%	555.03
71. Total	60,816.92	100.00%	35,352,962	100.00%	581.30
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	74,515.54	48.44%	181,709,652	78.89%	2,438.55
Dry Total					
Dry Total	17,021.20	11.07%	12,667,638	5.50%	744.23
Grass Total					
Grass Total	60,816.92	39.54%	35,352,962	15.35%	581.30
72. Waste	1,334.28	0.87%	538,549	0.23%	403.63
73. Other	133.84	0.09%	53,536	0.02%	400.00
74. Exempt	1,203.66	0.78%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	153,821.78	100.00%	230,322,337	100.00%	1,497.33

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 7300

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	556.46	4.12%	1,224,212	4.55%	2,200.00
46. 1A	6,855.99	50.78%	15,083,178	56.11%	2,200.00
47. 2A1	1,136.27	8.42%	2,158,913	8.03%	1,900.00
48. 2A	502.86	3.72%	955,434	3.55%	1,900.00
49. 3A1	200.72	1.49%	361,296	1.34%	1,800.00
50. 3A	564.09	4.18%	1,015,362	3.78%	1,800.00
51. 4A1	1,786.99	13.24%	2,948,544	10.97%	1,650.01
52. 4A	1,898.47	14.06%	3,132,487	11.65%	1,650.01
53. Total	13,501.85	100.00%	26,879,426	100.00%	1,990.80
Dry					
54. 1D1	152.44	1.40%	141,008	1.73%	925.01
55. 1D	5,012.93	46.10%	4,636,970	56.86%	925.00
56. 2D1	353.21	3.25%	273,741	3.36%	775.01
57. 2D	334.22	3.07%	233,954	2.87%	700.00
58. 3D1	161.75	1.49%	105,138	1.29%	650.00
59. 3D	126.11	1.16%	75,666	0.93%	600.00
60. 4D1	2,860.04	26.30%	1,658,823	20.34%	580.00
61. 4D	1,873.47	17.23%	1,030,419	12.63%	550.01
62. Total	10,874.17	100.00%	8,155,719	100.00%	750.01
Grass					
63. 1G1	154.81	0.28%	123,848	0.39%	800.00
64. 1G	2,029.24	3.73%	1,623,394	5.07%	800.00
65. 2G1	536.11	0.99%	375,277	1.17%	700.00
66. 2G	600.27	1.10%	420,187	1.31%	700.00
67. 3G1	168.86	0.31%	111,448	0.35%	660.00
68. 3G	503.27	0.93%	332,158	1.04%	660.00
69. 4G1	11,680.03	21.49%	6,774,409	21.17%	580.00
70. 4G	38,674.80	71.16%	22,238,034	69.50%	575.00
71. Total	54,347.39	100.00%	31,998,755	100.00%	588.78
Irrigated Total					
	13,501.85	17.02%	26,879,426	39.95%	1,990.80
Dry Total					
	10,874.17	13.70%	8,155,719	12.12%	750.01
Grass Total					
	54,347.39	68.49%	31,998,755	47.56%	588.78
72. Waste	627.43	0.79%	252,061	0.37%	401.74
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	625.89	0.79%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	79,350.84	100.00%	67,285,961	100.00%	847.96

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	133,679.40	305,154,316	133,679.40	305,154,316
77. Dry Land	2.00	1,800	0.00	0	37,586.72	29,137,232	37,588.72	29,139,032
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	160,621.96	99,216,998	160,621.96	99,216,998
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,476.31	1,396,451	3,476.31	1,396,451
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	449.88	179,952	449.88	179,952
81. Exempt	26.93	0	0.00	0	2,422.58	0	2,449.51	0
82. Total	2.00	1,800	0.00	0	335,814.27	435,084,949	335,816.27	435,086,749

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	133,679.40	39.81%	305,154,316	70.14%	2,282.73
Dry Land	37,588.72	11.19%	29,139,032	6.70%	775.21
Grass	160,621.96	47.83%	99,216,998	22.80%	617.71
Waste	3,476.31	1.04%	1,396,451	0.32%	401.70
Other	449.88	0.13%	179,952	0.04%	400.00
Exempt	2,449.51	0.73%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	335,816.27	100.00%	435,086,749	100.00%	1,295.61

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

47 Howard

	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	159,422,733	169,631,719	10,208,986	6.40%	3,583,346	4.16%
02. Recreational	2,478,961	4,698,772	2,219,811	89.55%	680,662	62.09%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	55,178,876	55,942,945	764,069	1.38%	1,969,154	-2.18%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	217,080,570	230,273,436	13,192,866	6.08%	6,233,162	3.21%
05. Commercial	31,080,683	31,254,132	173,449	0.56%	478,739	-0.98%
06. Industrial	230,379	0	-230,379	-100.00%	0	-100.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	24,505,190	28,750,487	4,245,297	17.32%	0	17.32%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	55,816,252	60,004,619	4,188,367	7.50%	478,739	6.65%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	272,896,822	290,278,055	17,381,233	6.37%	6,711,901	3.91%
11. Irrigated	253,640,437	305,154,316	51,513,879	20.31%		
12. Dryland	26,757,080	29,139,032	2,381,952	8.90%		
13. Grassland	92,039,923	99,216,998	7,177,075	7.80%		
14. Wasteland	1,387,977	1,396,451	8,474	0.61%		
15. Other Agland	181,952	179,952	-2,000	-1.10%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	374,007,369	435,086,749	61,079,380	16.33%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	646,904,191	725,364,804	78,460,613	12.13%	6,711,901	11.09%

2011 Plan of Assessment for Howard County

Assessment years 2012, 2013, 2014

Date: June 15, 2011

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land.
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticulture land

General Description of Real Property in Howard County

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	2400	44%	26%
Commercial	409	8%	5%
Agricultural	2688	49%	69%

Agricultural land – value for taxable acres for 2011 assessment was \$454,179,489.

Agricultural land is 72% of the real property valuation base in Howard County and of that 56% is assessed as irrigated, 21% is assessed as grass and 6% is assessed as dry.

For assessment year 2011, an estimated 382 permits were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2011 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources

There are currently three full time employees on staff including the assessor. The assessor and deputy are certified by the Property Tax Administrator.

The certificate holders will continue to keep their certifications current by attending continuing education and obtaining the number of hours required by the Property Tax Division. At least part of these hours will be courses offered by IAAO or the equivalent. The assessor or a staff member will attend all the district meetings and workshops provided. Current statutes and regulations will continue to be followed to the best of our ability and the office will keep current on any changes that may be made to them.

The county started a GIS project in 2005, which is greatly needed as Howard County does not have Cadastral Maps. The Howard County Assessor's office is currently working on this project with GIS Workshop with the aid of a \$25,000 grant from the Secretary of State to be completed by the end of 2010. GIS Workshop completed our land use conversion prior to January 1, 2010 and also put Howard County Assessor data on line, our website is <http://howard.assessor.gisworkshop.com>. The Howard County Board accepted GIS Workshop's proposal for maintenance for the mapping and the website. With the GIS Workshop completion of the mapping information, maps will be printed in the future when the information is available.

Office Budget for July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 was \$103,917. Office Budget for July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012 is \$109,700.

Terra Scan is the vendor for the assessment administration and CAMA. ArcView is the GIS software currently being used by Howard County.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

Real Estate transfer statements are handled weekly. Depending on the number of transfers filed, there is a 2-4 week turn around time. Ownership changes are made as sales are processed. All Residential, Agricultural and Commercial sales are verified by sales questionnaires by telephone calls to sellers, buyers and realtors involved in the sale. Physical inspections are performed if

deemed necessary to confirm any corrections to the parcel information. Most residential sales are inspected and new photos taken if necessary. Building permits are checked yearly beginning in July. Pickup work is to be completed by March 1 each year.

2008 Marshall & Swift costing was implemented for 2009.

It is the goal of the office to review at least 25 percent of the properties yearly. Market data is gathered and reviewed yearly.

Ratio studies are done on all the sales after August 15 each year. These studies are used to determine the areas that are out of compliance and need reviewing for the next assessment cycle.

Continual market analysis will be conducted in all categories of properties to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Howard County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes and subclasses of Howard County.

By approximately March 1 of each year, ratio studies are run using the newly established values to see if the areas out of compliance will now meet the guidelines.

Notices of Valuation Changes are mailed to the property owners on or before June 1.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	96	24.85	110.03
Commercial	Not	Enough	Information
Agricultural Land	69	21.6	106.62

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2011 Reports & Opinions.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

Residential: A review of current data on all St Paul residential properties will be completed for 2012. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2012. A ratio study will be done on all other residential properties and adjustments will be made if they are out of compliance. Corrections of listing errors will be done when correct information is obtained.

Commercial: A ratio study will be completed for 2012 to see if any commercial properties are out of compliance. Corrections of listing errors will be done when correct information is obtained. All pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2012. Commercial appraisal was done for 2009 by Stanard Appraisal and implemented by Assessor's Office.

Agricultural Land: A Market Area analysis will be conducted to verify boundaries between the 3 market areas for 2012. The use of agricultural land use for recreational purposes will be reviewed and possibly reclassified as recreational property. A market analysis will be conducted for 2012 and agricultural land values will be assessed at market value. Corrections of listing errors will be done when correct information is obtained. The certification of irrigated acres for the NRD was completed and those changes were updated for the 2009 assessment year. New land use conversion was implemented for 2010.

Assessment actions planned for assessment year 2013:

Residential: A review of current data on all residential properties in all rural subdivisions and acreages will be completed for 2013. A ratio study will be done on all residential properties and adjustments will be made if they are out of compliance. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2013. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained.

Commercial: A review of all commercial properties in the county will be done in 2013. The review and market study will be completed for adjusting values for 2012. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained. All pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2013.

Agricultural: A market analysis will be conducted for 2013 and agricultural land values will be assessed at market value and market areas will be reviewed. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained. We will begin a land use study to update our property record cards with possible changes.

Assessment actions planned for assessment year 2014:

Residential: A review of the rural residential improved agricultural properties will be done in 2014. The review and market study will be used in setting the values for the year 2014. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2014. A ratio study will be done on all other residential properties and adjustments will be made if they are out of compliance. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained.

Commercial: A ratio study will be completed for 2014 to see if any commercial properties are out of compliance. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained. All pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2014.

Agricultural Land: A market analysis will be conducted for 2014 and agricultural land values will be assessed at market value and market areas will be reviewed. Corrections of listing errors will be done when information is obtained. We will continue to do a land use study to update our property record cards with possible changes.

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

1. Appraisal cards are updated yearly. Ownership changes are made as the transfers are given to the assessor's office from the register of deeds and the green sheets are worked and forwarded to the property tax division electronically on a quarterly basis. Splits and subdivision changes are made as they become available to the assessor's office from the county clerk. These will be updated in the GIS system at the same time they are changed on the appraisal cards and in the computer administrative package. Assessor's website is updated monthly by GIS Workshop.
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real and Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value Update & w/Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivision
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of all exempt property and taxable government owned property
 - i. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property: administer annual filing of approximately 890 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions: administer approximately 375 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists – prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization – attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.

13. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education: Assessor and Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops and education classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and work toward an appraiser license. The staff of the assessor’s office with an assessor’s certificate will meet their 60 hours of education in the 4 year period to maintain it and the remainder of the staff will take the required test to obtain an assessor’s certificate. The Assessor and Field Appraiser/Deputy are working toward an appraiser’s license and will obtain the necessary hours to maintain this certification when it is acquired.

Conclusion:

The Howard County Assessor’s Office will strive for a uniform and proportionate valuing of property throughout the county.

2012 Assessment Survey for Howard County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1 Deputy
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	1 Clerk
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1 Summer help (high school kid) to help do property reviews
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$109,200
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$0
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	\$500
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$8,500
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$2,600
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	Short approximately \$3,500 to \$4,500

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Terra Scan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Howard County has never had any cadastral maps
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	N/A
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 howard.assessor.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop & Assessor Staff (provide information to contractor)
8.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	No
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	St. Paul and Boelus
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1973

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	None
2.	Other services:
	GIS Workshop \$9,000 yearly maintenance fee

2012 Certification for Howard 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 Howard 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

