

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 Johnson County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	51	Median	97.48
Total Sales Price	\$3,221,750	Mean	101.14
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,221,750	Wgt. Mean	97.85
Total Assessed Value	\$3,152,585	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$53,364
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$63,172	Avg. Assessed Value	\$61,815

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.54 to 101.24
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.82 to 101.89
95% Mean C.I	94.82 to 107.46
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	18.89
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.83
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.28

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	60	97	97
2010	73	97	97
2009	75	97	97
2008	120	97	97

2012 Commission Summary for Johnson County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	9	Median	84.72
Total Sales Price	\$386,500	Mean	122.82
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$386,500	Wgt. Mean	85.77
Total Assessed Value	\$331,520	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$69,908
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$42,944	Avg. Assessed Value	\$36,836

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	65.46 to 210.60
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	65.84 to 105.71
95% Mean C.I	45.20 to 200.44
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.49
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.75
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.45

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	8		75
2010	13	100	93
2009	12	95	95
2008	12	99	99

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Johnson 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	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	72	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Johnson County

For 2012 Johnson County completed a review of Tecumseh. This review consisted of updating cost tables for a new RCN, new depreciation, and new photos as well as reviewing the listing for the property. During the review the additions or deletions of improvements were noted on the property record card. The statistics were reviewed to see if adjustments were necessary in the individual valuation groups. This analysis demonstrated the need for adjustments for the town of Sterling and the rural residential market areas. The County increased the economic depreciation for Sterling by 10%, and decreased the economic depreciation of the rural areas by 5%. This action brought the valuation groups into the acceptable range.

The County also completed pickup and permit work for the class.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Johnson County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Contract appraiser as well as Assessor and Deputy	
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>
		The county maintains that the groupings are tied to amenities available in the communities and the appraisal cycle the county has. Each valuation group is analyzed separately and they tend to have their own unique markets.
	01	Tecumseh- County seat main trade center of County
	02	Cook- situated between Tecumseh and Syracuse very limited retail. Elementary and Middle school.
	04	Elk Creek, Located in southern portion of County. Bank, Bar, Elevator, Service Station. No school
	06	Sterling-Bedroom community to Lincoln, School. Limited retail.
	09	Mirrors area 1 of ag Location to Lincoln
	10	Area 2 of ag. Proximity to Tecumseh Good access to highways.
	11	Ares 3 of Ag. Further removed from developed amenities.
	15	Crab Orchard Only a post office very few parcels.
	20	St Mary, Vesta, No market activity and limited economic activity.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	RCNLD	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2011-Tecumseh 2008 for Balance of the County	
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?	
	Depreciation tables from CAMA are used with an economic factor developed for each valuation group.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2011 for Tecumseh and 2008 for the balance of the County	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	Lot values are analyzed in conjunction with the review cycle of the valuation group.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	Market value based on sq. ft.	

10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	The county uses an approximate 5% -10% change in the square footage of the improvement, to determine if the parcel is substantially changed. The county also relies on if major improvements have been added or deleted from a parcel. The assessor also determines if the change has an effect on the overall market value of the parcel.

49 Johnson
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 : 51
Total Sales Price : 3,221,750
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,221,750
Total Assessed Value : 3,152,585
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 63,172
Avg. Assessed Value : 61,815

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 98
MEAN : 101
COD : 15.44
PRD : 103.36

COV : 22.76
STD : 23.02
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.05
MAX Sales Ratio : 179.25
MIN Sales Ratio : 44.40

95% Median C.I. : 94.54 to 101.24
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.82 to 101.89
95% Mean C.I. : 94.82 to 107.46

Printed:3/29/2012 3:18:26PM

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>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	5	97.46	87.35	109.00	27.48	80.14	44.40	120.07	N/A	23,800	25,942
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	98.64	97.17	99.04	06.32	98.11	83.52	106.41	N/A	71,100	70,416
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	112.15	112.15	112.15	00.00	100.00	112.15	112.15	N/A	40,000	44,860
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	95.32	105.71	92.89	19.95	113.80	78.00	163.00	78.00 to 163.00	78,243	72,680
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	12	98.51	99.44	96.15	13.66	103.42	70.60	151.09	83.60 to 103.50	71,858	69,090
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	97.77	103.41	101.04	14.47	102.35	83.33	138.80	83.33 to 138.80	76,938	77,740
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	5	96.47	115.40	110.39	25.57	104.54	87.72	179.25	N/A	15,900	17,552
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	8	98.33	98.23	96.04	06.60	102.28	81.87	108.83	81.87 to 108.83	75,281	72,301
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	18	97.47	98.60	97.48	18.03	101.15	44.40	163.00	84.03 to 112.15	59,011	57,523
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	33	97.75	102.53	98.04	13.98	104.58	70.60	179.25	94.11 to 103.49	65,441	64,157
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	28	97.62	102.60	97.05	15.56	105.72	70.60	163.00	93.73 to 103.50	73,768	71,594
<u>ALL</u>	51	97.48	101.14	97.85	15.44	103.36	44.40	179.25	94.54 to 101.24	63,172	61,815

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	28	98.96	103.55	102.38	11.15	101.14	83.33	151.09	94.68 to 103.49	53,923	55,204
02	6	98.09	115.00	90.49	37.17	127.09	70.60	179.25	70.60 to 179.25	39,067	35,350
04	2	96.97	96.97	97.10	00.52	99.87	96.47	97.46	N/A	23,250	22,575
06	2	94.63	94.63	101.88	11.74	92.88	83.52	105.74	N/A	30,250	30,820
09	6	94.53	96.09	92.48	10.76	103.90	78.00	116.52	78.00 to 116.52	133,500	123,460
10	5	102.79	101.25	96.55	09.63	104.87	81.87	120.07	N/A	112,700	108,812
15	2	51.35	51.35	52.50	13.53	97.81	44.40	58.29	N/A	3,000	1,575
<u>ALL</u>	51	97.48	101.14	97.85	15.44	103.36	44.40	179.25	94.54 to 101.24	63,172	61,815

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	45	98.64	103.15	97.93	13.30	105.33	70.60	179.25	94.68 to 103.49	70,789	69,325
06											
07	6	83.47	86.09	90.95	28.86	94.66	44.40	151.09	44.40 to 151.09	6,042	5,495
<u>ALL</u>	51	97.48	101.14	97.85	15.44	103.36	44.40	179.25	94.54 to 101.24	63,172	61,815

49 Johnson
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 : 51
Total Sales Price : 3,221,750
Total Adj. Sales Price : 3,221,750
Total Assessed Value : 3,152,585
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 63,172
Avg. Assessed Value : 61,815

MEDIAN : 97
WGT. MEAN : 98
MEAN : 101
COD : 15.44
PRD : 103.36

COV : 22.76
STD : 23.02
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.05
MAX Sales Ratio : 179.25
MIN Sales Ratio : 44.40

95% Median C.I. : 94.54 to 101.24
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 93.82 to 101.89
95% Mean C.I. : 94.82 to 107.46

Printed:3/29/2012 3:18:26PM

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	3	58.29	62.01	62.78	22.27	98.77	44.40	83.33	N/A	3,000	1,883	
Less Than 15,000	11	95.85	106.12	112.16	33.85	94.61	44.40	179.25	58.29 to 163.00	7,977	8,947	
Less Than 30,000	18	96.97	103.31	104.98	23.57	98.41	44.40	179.25	83.60 to 120.07	12,736	13,370	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	48	98.20	103.59	97.95	14.02	105.76	70.60	179.25	94.68 to 103.49	66,932	65,561	
Greater Than 14,999	40	97.62	99.77	97.45	10.48	102.38	70.60	138.80	94.54 to 102.79	78,350	76,354	
Greater Than 29,999	33	98.64	99.95	97.31	10.91	102.71	70.60	138.80	94.51 to 103.49	90,682	88,240	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	3	58.29	62.01	62.78	22.27	98.77	44.40	83.33	N/A	3,000	1,883	
5,000 TO 14,999	8	110.44	122.66	117.80	27.79	104.13	83.52	179.25	83.52 to 179.25	9,844	11,596	
15,000 TO 29,999	7	97.46	98.90	100.52	07.77	98.39	83.60	122.68	83.60 to 122.68	20,214	20,320	
30,000 TO 59,999	11	103.49	105.26	105.33	10.48	99.93	80.99	138.80	93.92 to 121.37	39,455	41,558	
60,000 TO 99,999	13	99.27	99.70	99.69	12.35	100.01	70.60	128.43	84.03 to 116.52	73,038	72,810	
100,000 TO 149,999	4	94.60	97.66	97.15	03.74	100.52	93.73	107.72	N/A	118,250	114,880	
150,000 TO 249,999	3	85.24	85.93	85.79	06.46	100.16	78.00	94.54	N/A	170,667	146,410	
250,000 TO 499,999	2	98.03	98.03	97.68	02.96	100.36	95.13	100.93	N/A	312,000	304,753	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	51	97.48	101.14	97.85	15.44	103.36	44.40	179.25	94.54 to 101.24	63,172	61,815	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Johnson County**

A. Residential Real Property

Johnson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Tecumseh which is centered in the County. Johnson is bordered to the south by Pawnee County with Gage County to the west. Otoe County is directly north with Nemaha to the east. Johnson County has seen a population increase since 2000 of over 700 people. The County has seen both a population and economic impact from the state correctional facility being located just north of Tecumseh.

The sales file consists of 51 qualified residential sales and is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the residential sample for the residential class of property. Two of the measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range with the mean being above the range by one point. The quality statistic measurements of the PRD and the COD both round to be within the recommended range. The valuation groups with adequate representation all have medians within the acceptable range. The valuation groups utilized in the county represent the assessor locations in the county. These groupings are influenced as much by the appraisal and inspection cycle the county uses than overall distinct markets.

Johnson County has a consistent procedure for sales verification. The County relies on the intimate knowledge of the residential properties in the county as well as working relationships with realtors and appraisers in the County. The office contacts buyers and sellers as well as real estate professionals to clarify terms of the sales. In reviewing the non-qualified sales the county has done a good job of noting in the file the reason for the sale disqualification. The County utilizes an acceptable portion of available sales and there is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

The County has followed the three year plan of assessment by reviewing the town of Tecumseh and they also made percentage adjustments to the town of Sterling as well as the rural areas.

Johnson County has a consistent approach to valuing and reviewing the property in the county. The assessor and deputy are very aggressive in reviewing the county and spend a portion of their time out of the office physically inspecting properties. The County has a web site for parcel searches with GIS capabilities.

Based on the consideration of all available information the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson County**

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

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

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

2012 Commercial Assessment Actions for Johnson County

For 2012 the County conducted a statistical analysis of the commercial class of property. There was no indication for an adjustment to this class of property.

The County conducted sales verifications and completed pickup and permit work for the class.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Johnson County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Contract Appraiser	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	The entire county is considered as one valuation group. For Johnson County there is not a lot of commercial activity in the County and what does occur is not an organized or consistent market.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	RCNLD plus economic depreciation	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	Rely on the experience and expertise of the appraiser. The county does rely on the state sales file to find similar properties.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2007 for the entire class	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	The County uses the tables from CAMA along with economic depreciation based on local market information.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	There is only one grouping for the Commercial class.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	Whenever the market analysis indicates an adjustment is needed.	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2007 In conjunction with the review of the class of property.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Market based on square foot method.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	The Counties method is based on major changes to the improvements, generally a 5-10% change to the market value of the parcel.	

49 Johnson
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 : 9
Total Sales Price : 386,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 386,500
Total Assessed Value : 331,520
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,944
Avg. Assessed Value : 36,836

MEDIAN : 85
WGT. MEAN : 86
MEAN : 123
COD : 65.46
PRD : 143.20

COV : 82.22
STD : 100.98
Avg. Abs. Dev : 55.46
MAX Sales Ratio : 361.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 45.05

95% Median C.I. : 65.46 to 210.60
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.84 to 105.71
95% Mean C.I. : 45.20 to 200.44

Printed:3/29/2012 3:18:28PM

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											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	87.38	87.38	87.38	00.00	100.00	87.38	87.38	N/A	150,000	131,070
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	69.53	158.53	60.60	151.47	261.60	45.05	361.00	N/A	25,667	15,553
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10											
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	80.74	80.74	80.74	00.00	100.00	80.74	80.74	N/A	35,000	28,260
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	138.03	138.03	118.24	52.58	116.74	65.46	210.60	N/A	27,500	32,515
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	84.72	84.72	84.72	00.00	100.00	84.72	84.72	N/A	59,500	50,410
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	100.90	100.90	100.90	00.00	100.00	100.90	100.90	N/A	10,000	10,090
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	78.46	140.74	78.30	106.36	179.74	45.05	361.00	N/A	56,750	44,433
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	1	80.74	80.74	80.74	00.00	100.00	80.74	80.74	N/A	35,000	28,260
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	4	92.81	115.42	100.83	43.45	114.47	65.46	210.60	N/A	31,125	31,383
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	69.53	158.53	60.60	151.47	261.60	45.05	361.00	N/A	25,667	15,553
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	80.74	118.93	103.66	59.92	114.73	65.46	210.60	N/A	30,000	31,097
<u>ALL</u>	9	84.72	122.82	85.77	65.46	143.20	45.05	361.00	65.46 to 210.60	42,944	36,836

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	9	84.72	122.82	85.77	65.46	143.20	45.05	361.00	65.46 to 210.60	42,944	36,836
<u>ALL</u>	9	84.72	122.82	85.77	65.46	143.20	45.05	361.00	65.46 to 210.60	42,944	36,836

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	9	84.72	122.82	85.77	65.46	143.20	45.05	361.00	65.46 to 210.60	42,944	36,836
04											
<u>ALL</u>	9	84.72	122.82	85.77	65.46	143.20	45.05	361.00	65.46 to 210.60	42,944	36,836

49 Johnson
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 : 9
Total Sales Price : 386,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 386,500
Total Assessed Value : 331,520
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,944
Avg. Assessed Value : 36,836

MEDIAN : 85
WGT. MEAN : 86
MEAN : 123
COD : 65.46
PRD : 143.20

COV : 82.22
STD : 100.98
Avg. Abs. Dev : 55.46
MAX Sales Ratio : 361.00
MIN Sales Ratio : 45.05

95% Median C.I. : 65.46 to 210.60
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.84 to 105.71
95% Mean C.I. : 45.20 to 200.44

Printed:3/29/2012 3:18:28PM

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Low \$ Ranges											
Less Than 5,000	1	361.00	361.00	361.00	00.00	100.00	361.00	361.00	N/A	1,000	3,610
Less Than 15,000	2	230.95	230.95	124.55	56.31	185.43	100.90	361.00	N/A	5,500	6,850
Less Than 30,000	3	210.60	224.17	180.06	41.17	124.50	100.90	361.00	N/A	10,333	18,607
Ranges Excl. Low \$											
Greater Than 4,999	8	82.73	93.05	85.06	33.66	109.39	45.05	210.60	45.05 to 210.60	48,188	40,989
Greater Than 14,999	7	80.74	91.93	84.64	35.86	108.61	45.05	210.60	45.05 to 210.60	53,643	45,403
Greater Than 29,999	6	75.14	72.15	77.55	16.14	93.04	45.05	87.38	45.05 to 87.38	59,250	45,950
Incremental Ranges											
0 TO 4,999	1	361.00	361.00	361.00	00.00	100.00	361.00	361.00	N/A	1,000	3,610
5,000 TO 14,999	1	100.90	100.90	100.90	00.00	100.00	100.90	100.90	N/A	10,000	10,090
15,000 TO 29,999	1	210.60	210.60	210.60	00.00	100.00	210.60	210.60	N/A	20,000	42,120
30,000 TO 59,999	5	69.53	69.10	70.38	15.81	98.18	45.05	84.72	N/A	41,100	28,926
60,000 TO 99,999											
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999	1	87.38	87.38	87.38	00.00	100.00	87.38	87.38	N/A	150,000	131,070
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
ALL	9	84.72	122.82	85.77	65.46	143.20	45.05	361.00	65.46 to 210.60	42,944	36,836

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	2	230.95	230.95	124.55	56.31	185.43	100.90	361.00	N/A	5,500	6,850
352	1	210.60	210.60	210.60	00.00	100.00	210.60	210.60	N/A	20,000	42,120
353	1	80.74	80.74	80.74	00.00	100.00	80.74	80.74	N/A	35,000	28,260
390	1	84.72	84.72	84.72	00.00	100.00	84.72	84.72	N/A	59,500	50,410
406	1	69.53	69.53	69.53	00.00	100.00	69.53	69.53	N/A	36,000	25,030
426	1	87.38	87.38	87.38	00.00	100.00	87.38	87.38	N/A	150,000	131,070
470	1	45.05	45.05	45.05	00.00	100.00	45.05	45.05	N/A	40,000	18,020
528	1	65.46	65.46	65.46	00.00	100.00	65.46	65.46	N/A	35,000	22,910
ALL	9	84.72	122.82	85.77	65.46	143.20	45.05	361.00	65.46 to 210.60	42,944	36,836

**2012 Correlation Section
for Johnson County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Johnson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Tecumseh which is centered in the County. Johnson is bordered to the south by Pawnee County with Gage County to the west. Otoe County is directly north with Nemaha to the east. Johnson County has seen a population increase since 2000 of over 700 people. The County has seen both a population and economic impact from the state correctional facility being located just north of Tecumseh.

The R&O statistics reveal a sample of 9 commercial sales in the three year study period. Although the calculated statistics indicate a median level of value outside the acceptable range there are not a sufficient number of sales to have any confidence in the statistics. The qualitative statistics demonstrate that the sales may not be representative of the population of commercial properties. The statistics also reveal there are 7 occupancies represented in the 9 sales in the commercial file.

Johnson County has consistent sales review and verification process for the commercial class of property. The counties contract appraiser verifies all commercial sales along with a physical review of the property. The counties plan of assessment details a commercial review for 2013.

Based on 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 the most uniform and proportionate manner as is possible.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson County**

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

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

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

2012 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Johnson County

Johnson County conducted a market analysis and updated land use using GIS along with physical inspections. The County concentrated on CRP parcels due to the increase of acres being removed from the program, and to verify present use of the parcel. The County continually verifies agricultural sales. After the analysis of the statistics the County made the decision to combine the three market areas into one for 2012. The County continues to analyze sales by soil types and make adjustments to values within the LCG structure. The County made valuation changes to the majority of classes and sub-classes as well majority land use.

The County also completed pickup and permit work for the agricultural class.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Johnson County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Deputy	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	The entire County is considered as one market area.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Sales review and analysis of the motivation of the buyers.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	By present use, if it is split off for residential development (Permits filed for zoning), recreational is land not used predominantly for agriculture, residential or commercial purposes. Such as WRP.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	Yes	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	By use of the most current aerial maps that are available, physical inspection, and reported changes by the landowner.	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Sales review and verification.	
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	Land use changes, example (ag to non-ag). Major changes on improvements. Generally over 5% to 10% on improvement value.	

49 Johnson
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 : 65
Total Sales Price : 16,100,752
Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,100,752
Total Assessed Value : 11,363,774
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 247,704
Avg. Assessed Value : 174,827

MEDIAN : 72
WGT. MEAN : 71
MEAN : 74
COD : 20.94
PRD : 105.03

COV : 25.60
STD : 18.98
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.08
MAX Sales Ratio : 126.83
MIN Sales Ratio : 40.93

95% Median C.I. : 63.97 to 77.57
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.25 to 75.91
95% Mean C.I. : 69.52 to 78.74

Printed:3/29/2012 3:18:30PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	71.37	71.37	71.16	00.88	100.30	70.74	72.00	N/A	290,063	206,410
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	77.32	77.15	75.92	11.45	101.62	55.56	100.33	69.50 to 83.11	261,460	198,505
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	8	71.94	80.71	77.46	25.76	104.20	56.00	126.83	56.00 to 126.83	220,482	170,790
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	84.80	82.72	78.79	17.03	104.99	61.99	99.28	N/A	109,900	86,590
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	93.92	97.33	90.67	16.14	107.35	78.40	123.07	N/A	256,958	232,971
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	75.12	76.73	72.37	20.69	106.02	49.36	98.31	49.36 to 98.31	326,139	236,038
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	71.92	74.65	71.99	25.92	103.69	52.45	102.32	N/A	274,752	197,783
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	53.83	64.40	66.73	26.57	96.51	49.30	93.53	49.30 to 93.53	221,225	147,620
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	72.55	80.67	75.69	12.10	106.58	71.55	97.90	N/A	120,133	90,933
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	6	61.26	66.40	64.35	15.08	103.19	51.78	101.22	51.78 to 101.22	260,537	167,648
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	5	62.69	63.16	52.29	15.66	120.79	40.93	78.66	N/A	247,816	129,576
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	56.49	56.48	56.33	06.37	100.27	48.26	63.97	N/A	321,186	180,936
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	26	75.72	78.66	76.13	16.69	103.32	55.56	126.83	69.54 to 83.11	227,735	173,368
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	20	80.11	76.74	74.38	23.22	103.17	49.30	123.07	57.00 to 93.53	270,551	201,248
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	19	61.32	65.19	59.37	16.60	109.80	40.93	101.22	56.49 to 72.43	250,980	149,013
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	80.11	83.01	78.27	21.73	106.06	49.36	126.83	65.81 to 98.31	235,824	184,582
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	19	61.32	69.76	67.94	24.25	102.68	49.30	102.32	52.45 to 85.57	228,946	155,555
<u>ALL</u>	65	72.00	74.13	70.58	20.94	105.03	40.93	126.83	63.97 to 77.57	247,704	174,827

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	65	72.00	74.13	70.58	20.94	105.03	40.93	126.83	63.97 to 77.57	247,704	174,827
<u>ALL</u>	65	72.00	74.13	70.58	20.94	105.03	40.93	126.83	63.97 to 77.57	247,704	174,827

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
<u>Dry</u>											
County	14	68.96	73.88	68.48	21.39	107.89	48.26	126.83	55.69 to 93.53	333,625	228,468
1	14	68.96	73.88	68.48	21.39	107.89	48.26	126.83	55.69 to 93.53	333,625	228,468
<u>Grass</u>											
County	12	71.91	74.42	73.93	21.11	100.66	56.00	101.89	57.99 to 85.94	181,894	134,477
1	12	71.91	74.42	73.93	21.11	100.66	56.00	101.89	57.99 to 85.94	181,894	134,477
<u>ALL</u>	65	72.00	74.13	70.58	20.94	105.03	40.93	126.83	63.97 to 77.57	247,704	174,827

49 Johnson
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 : 65
 Total Sales Price : 16,100,752
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,100,752
 Total Assessed Value : 11,363,774
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 247,704
 Avg. Assessed Value : 174,827

MEDIAN : 72
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 20.94
 PRD : 105.03

COV : 25.60
 STD : 18.98
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.08
 MAX Sales Ratio : 126.83
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.93

95% Median C.I. : 63.97 to 77.57
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.25 to 75.91
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.52 to 78.74

Printed:3/29/2012 3:18:30PM

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	1	69.54	69.54	69.54	00.00	100.00	69.54	69.54	N/A	415,018	288,600
1	1	69.54	69.54	69.54	00.00	100.00	69.54	69.54	N/A	415,018	288,600
_____Dry_____											
County	28	68.96	72.19	66.63	23.17	108.34	40.93	126.83	61.07 to 77.57	284,461	189,532
1	28	68.96	72.19	66.63	23.17	108.34	40.93	126.83	61.07 to 77.57	284,461	189,532
_____Grass_____											
County	17	71.55	73.08	72.09	19.68	101.37	52.45	101.89	57.86 to 85.94	177,504	127,956
1	17	71.55	73.08	72.09	19.68	101.37	52.45	101.89	57.86 to 85.94	177,504	127,956
_____ALL_____											
	65	72.00	74.13	70.58	20.94	105.03	40.93	126.83	63.97 to 77.57	247,704	174,827

Johnson County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
49.10	Johnson	1	3,331	3,103	3,100	2,632	2,500	#DIV/0!	1,556	1,300	2,626
34.10	Gage	1	2,848	2,872	2,566	2,575	2,303	2,309	2,130	2,113	2,609
67.10	Pawnee	1	2,750	2,750	#DIV/0!	2,020	1,905	#DIV/0!	1,435	1,435	2,185
66.70	Otoe	7000	3,240	2,910	2,910	2,010	1,890	#DIV/0!	1,740	850	2,194
66.80	Otoe	8000	3,630	3,630	3,360	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,090	1,210	2,895
64.83	Nemaha	8300	2,951	3,122	2,458	2,806	2,022	2,541	1,412	1,248	2,413
55.10	Lancaster	1	3,734	3,750	3,747	3,744	3,000	2,986	2,623	2,616	3,493

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Johnson	1	2,465	2,276	2,310	1,882	1,950	1,962	1,185	1,000	1,798
	Gage	1	2,205	2,205	1,860	1,860	1,575	1,575	1,400	1,400	1,780
	Pawnee	1	2,200	2,200	1,542	1,615	1,525	1,250	1,150	1,150	1,563
	Otoe	7000	2,950	2,650	2,650	1,830	1,720	#DIV/0!	1,580	770	1,841
	Otoe	8000	3,300	3,300	3,050	2,500	2,500	2,500	1,900	1,100	2,581
	Nemaha	8300	2,933	2,991	2,652	2,038	1,718	2,267	1,471	1,018	2,160
	Lancaster	1	3,371	3,375	2,845	2,847	2,250	2,248	1,649	1,647	2,649

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Johnson	1	1,288	1,666	1,453	1,204	1,251	1,236	940	679	1,039
	Gage	1	786	1,097	935	1,105	984	885	885	641	889
	Pawnee	1	1,097	1,457	1,046	1,254	1,129	945	919	846	1,075
	Otoe	7000	1,006	1,106	1,026	1,157	992	#DIV/0!	996	677	1,016
	Otoe	8000	1,217	1,232	1,174	1,282	1,140	1,111	1,037	729	1,084
	Nemaha	8300	1,763	2,031	1,906	1,162	1,200	1,158	977	830	1,170
	Lancaster	1	1,860	2,017	1,707	1,786	1,440	1,451	1,052	996	1,401

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Johnson County**

A. Agricultural Land

Johnson County is located in southeast Nebraska. The County is bordered by Pawnee to the south Gage to the west Nemaha to the east and Otoe to the north. Johnson County is comprised of approximately 9% irrigated land, 44% dry crop land and 48% grass/pasture land. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the market area determination. For 2012 the county has combined the three market areas used in the past into one for the entire county. The county uses a schedule of values based on different soils within the LCG structure.

The sales review and verification process relies on the knowledge of the local market as well as contact with real estate professionals. If there are questions about the transaction they will contact the buyer or seller to clarify terms of the sales. They will also conduct physical inspections to verify the land use of the parcel. There has been a portion of the sales where CRP land is being returned to the production of row crops.

The agricultural market in the County along with the area and state is seeing a rapid increase and has for the past several years. 85 qualified agricultural sales were used in the agricultural analysis for the three year study period. The statistical sample consists of sales that meet the required balance as to date of sale and are proportionate by majority land use. This was met by including 7 comparable sales from the same general agricultural market all within six miles of the subject county. These sales were added to the middle year of the study period.

All subclasses within the county are at the same relative proportion of market value as demonstrated by the statistics for both the 95% and the 80% MLU calculation in the statistical profile.

The schedule of values for Johnson County is similar when compared to the market area 1 of Gage County in irrigated and dry and the grass land measures well against the Otoe and Pawnee county grass. The dry land in Nemaha tends to trend higher due to greater capability of the soils. Due to the variability of the values within the LCG'S a direct comparison is difficult.

The calculated median of the sample is rounded to 72. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to 72% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 : 4,349	Value : 509,393,555	Growth 3,674,430	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	198	785,300	28	164,550	26	507,210	252	1,457,060	
02. Res Improve Land	1,178	6,189,580	64	1,326,570	275	6,285,350	1,517	13,801,500	
03. Res Improvements	1,200	52,181,490	64	5,334,910	286	23,343,500	1,550	80,859,900	
04. Res Total	1,398	59,156,370	92	6,826,030	312	30,136,060	1,802	96,118,460	827,860
% of Res Total	77.58	61.55	5.11	7.10	17.31	31.35	41.43	18.87	22.53
05. Com UnImp Land	40	326,035	3	21,850	3	76,200	46	424,085	
06. Com Improve Land	251	1,590,090	6	195,250	11	573,530	268	2,358,870	
07. Com Improvements	255	11,936,430	8	202,460	15	5,576,430	278	17,715,320	
08. Com Total	295	13,852,555	11	419,560	18	6,226,160	324	20,498,275	104,870
% of Com Total	91.05	67.58	3.40	2.05	5.56	30.37	7.45	4.02	2.85
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	3	77,260	0	0	0	0	3	77,260	
11. Ind Improvements	3	2,284,510	0	0	0	0	3	2,284,510	
12. Ind Total	3	2,361,770	0	0	0	0	3	2,361,770	0
% of Ind Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.46	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	95,000	1	95,000	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	1,340	1	1,340	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	1	96,340	1	96,340	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	0.02	0.00
Res & Rec Total	1,398	59,156,370	92	6,826,030	313	30,232,400	1,803	96,214,800	827,860
% of Res & Rec Total	77.54	61.48	5.10	7.09	17.36	31.42	41.46	18.89	22.53
Com & Ind Total	298	16,214,325	11	419,560	18	6,226,160	327	22,860,045	104,870
% of Com & Ind Total	91.13	70.93	3.36	1.84	5.50	27.24	7.52	4.49	2.85
17. Taxable Total	1,696	75,370,695	103	7,245,590	331	36,458,560	2,130	119,074,845	932,730
% of Taxable Total	79.62	63.30	4.84	6.08	15.54	30.62	48.98	23.38	25.38

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	4	698,285	2,880,795	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	4	698,285	2,880,795
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				4	698,285	2,880,795

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	174	63	252	489

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	8	31,820	150	16,843,990	1,279	188,464,520	1,437	205,340,330
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	4,590	55	8,735,160	703	132,295,650	759	141,035,400
29. Ag Improvements	1	1,760	55	2,121,470	726	41,819,750	782	43,942,980
30. Ag Total							2,219	390,318,710

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	22	24.00	307,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	23	24.00	1,658,820	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	0.87	2,180	12	38.03	80,510	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	1.00	2,500	52	118.30	266,580	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	1,760	52	0.00	462,650	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.61	0	0	268.59	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	1	1.00	10,500	1	1.00	10,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	423	430.44	4,783,220	445	454.44	5,090,220	
33. HomeSite Improvements	438	421.44	31,928,680	461	445.44	33,587,500	2,741,700
34. HomeSite Total				462	455.44	38,688,220	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	45	75.59	170,630	58	114.49	253,320	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	663	1,905.12	4,343,720	716	2,024.42	4,612,800	
37. FarmSite Improvements	698	0.00	9,891,070	751	0.00	10,355,480	0
38. FarmSite Total				809	2,138.91	15,221,600	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,388.28	0	0	4,657.48	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,271	7,251.83	53,909,820	2,741,700

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	20	2,027.46	2,204,260	20	2,027.46	2,204,260

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,784.52	14.70%	9,276,310	18.65%	3,331.39
46. 1A	2,753.14	14.54%	8,543,140	17.17%	3,103.05
47. 2A1	910.63	4.81%	2,823,010	5.68%	3,100.06
48. 2A	5,694.97	30.07%	14,988,080	30.13%	2,631.81
49. 3A1	3,778.23	19.95%	9,445,990	18.99%	2,500.11
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	2,903.55	15.33%	4,518,290	9.08%	1,556.13
52. 4A	114.46	0.60%	148,810	0.30%	1,300.10
53. Total	18,939.50	100.00%	49,743,630	100.00%	2,626.45
Dry					
54. 1D1	4,292.73	4.39%	10,581,820	6.02%	2,465.06
55. 1D	9,324.79	9.53%	21,225,920	12.07%	2,276.29
56. 2D1	6,816.46	6.97%	15,745,520	8.95%	2,309.93
57. 2D	20,587.01	21.04%	38,747,410	22.03%	1,882.13
58. 3D1	29,348.33	30.00%	57,229,490	32.54%	1,950.01
59. 3D	0.26	0.00%	510	0.00%	1,961.54
60. 4D1	26,387.97	26.97%	31,264,800	17.78%	1,184.81
61. 4D	1,081.60	1.11%	1,081,600	0.61%	1,000.00
62. Total	97,839.15	100.00%	175,877,070	100.00%	1,797.61
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,353.04	1.27%	1,743,260	1.57%	1,288.40
64. 1G	3,626.53	3.40%	6,040,850	5.46%	1,665.74
65. 2G1	6,558.81	6.16%	9,527,250	8.60%	1,452.59
66. 2G	14,646.19	13.75%	17,629,160	15.92%	1,203.67
67. 3G1	12,385.10	11.62%	15,487,830	13.99%	1,250.52
68. 3G	4.50	0.00%	5,560	0.01%	1,235.56
69. 4G1	54,225.44	50.89%	50,951,870	46.02%	939.63
70. 4G	13,748.79	12.90%	9,332,770	8.43%	678.81
71. Total	106,548.40	100.00%	110,718,550	100.00%	1,039.14
Irrigated Total					
	18,939.50	8.45%	49,743,630	14.79%	2,626.45
Dry Total					
	97,839.15	43.63%	175,877,070	52.28%	1,797.61
Grass Total					
	106,548.40	47.51%	110,718,550	32.91%	1,039.14
72. Waste	928.52	0.41%	69,640	0.02%	75.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	839.37	0.37%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	224,255.57	100.00%	336,408,890	100.00%	1,500.11

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	2,099.90	5,826,050	16,839.60	43,917,580	18,939.50	49,743,630
77. Dry Land	12.56	27,660	6,469.83	12,555,590	91,356.76	163,293,820	97,839.15	175,877,070
78. Grass	3.45	4,070	6,534.64	6,529,360	100,010.31	104,185,120	106,548.40	110,718,550
79. Waste	0.00	0	187.23	14,060	741.29	55,580	928.52	69,640
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	78.84	0	760.53	0	839.37	0
82. Total	16.01	31,730	15,291.60	24,925,060	208,947.96	311,452,100	224,255.57	336,408,890

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	18,939.50	8.45%	49,743,630	14.79%	2,626.45
Dry Land	97,839.15	43.63%	175,877,070	52.28%	1,797.61
Grass	106,548.40	47.51%	110,718,550	32.91%	1,039.14
Waste	928.52	0.41%	69,640	0.02%	75.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	839.37	0.37%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	224,255.57	100.00%	336,408,890	100.00%	1,500.11

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

49 Johnson

	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	91,022,170	96,118,460	5,096,290	5.60%	827,860	4.69%
02. Recreational	96,340	96,340	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	35,052,400	38,688,220	3,635,820	10.37%	2,741,700	2.55%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	126,170,910	134,903,020	8,732,110	6.92%	3,569,560	4.09%
05. Commercial	20,274,785	20,498,275	223,490	1.10%	104,870	0.59%
06. Industrial	2,361,770	2,361,770	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	13,240,300	15,221,600	1,981,300	14.96%	0	14.96%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	35,876,855	38,081,645	2,204,790	6.15%	104,870	5.85%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	162,047,765	172,984,665	10,936,900	6.75%	3,674,430	4.48%
11. Irrigated	41,407,610	49,743,630	8,336,020	20.13%		
12. Dryland	153,733,520	175,877,070	22,143,550	14.40%		
13. Grassland	104,956,830	110,718,550	5,761,720	5.49%		
14. Wasteland	1,422,090	69,640	-1,352,450	-95.10%		
15. Other Agland	1,380	0	-1,380	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	301,521,430	336,408,890	34,887,460	11.57%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	463,569,195	509,393,555	45,824,360	9.89%	3,674,430	9.09%

PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR JOHNSON COUNTY

To: Johnson County Board of Equalization
Nebr. Dept of Revenue--Property Assessment Division

As required by Sec. 77-1311.02, R.R.S. Nebr. as amended by 2007 Neb. Laws LB334, Section 64, the assessor shall prepare a Plan of Assessment on or before June 15 of each year, which shall describe the assessment actions the county assessor plans to make for the next assessment year and two years thereafter and submit such plan to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31 of each year, and may amend the plan, if necessary, after a budget is approved by the County Board, and submit a copy of the plan and any amendments to the Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year. 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.

The following is a plan of assessment for:

Tax Year 2012:

Residential—

1. Re-appraisal of all urban residential property in Tecumseh, including all related improvements associated with the main improvement, to include all buildings, with new photos of the property, develop new market analysis and depreciation, implement new replacement cost new, and establish new assessed value for 2012.
2. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
3. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
3. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified, and use new aerial photography as it becomes available.

BUDGET REQUEST FOR 2011-2012:

Requested budget of \$14,000 is needed to:

1. Complete pickup work for new improvements or improvement changes made throughout county in all classes;
2. In September 2012 drive-by reviews will begin in Tecumseh for Residential— It will include new pictures of houses and buildings, new June 2008 cost, and re-calculation of physical and economic depreciation. New values will be applied for the 2012 tax roll.
3. Analyze and possible adjustment to class/subclass of residential (includes mobile homes)
4. Analyze and possible adjustment to class/subclass of commercial.
5. Analyze and possible adjustments to class/subclass of agland.

Tax Year 2013:

Residential—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial—

1. Re-appraisal of all commercial property in Johnson County, including all related improvements associated with the main improvement, to include all buildings, with new photos of the property, develop new market analysis and depreciation, implement new replacement cost new, and establish new assessed value for 2013.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, adjusting by class/subclass to arrive at acceptable levels of value.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
3. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified, and use new aerial photography as it becomes available.

Tax Year 2014:

Residential—

1. Re-appraisal of all residential property in the towns of Sterling and Cook, include all related improvements associated improvement, with new photos of the property, develop new market analysis and depreciation, implement new replacement cost new, and establish new assessed value for 2014.
2. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
3. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebr. Dept of Revenue—Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
3. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified, and use new aerial photography as it becomes available.

Date: June 15, 2011

Karen A. Koehler
Johnson County Assessor

UPDATE FOLLOWING September 2011 ADOPTION OF 2011-2012 BUDGET

No changes.

Date: Sept. 19, 2011

Karen A. Koehler
Johnson County Assessor

2012 Assessment Survey for Johnson County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	0
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	1
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	97,826
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	14,000
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	16,657 Includes TerraScan, Web-site, Hardware and software.
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	1,700
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	None

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Terra Scan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	NO
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
5.	Does the county have GIS software?

	Yes
6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	No
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessors Office
8.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	January of 2006

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Wayne Cole dba. Linsali Inc
2.	Other services:
	Terra Scan and GIS Workshop

2012 Certification for Johnson 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 Johnson 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

