

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 Keith County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	270	Median	97.01
Total Sales Price	\$23,452,250	Mean	101.01
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$23,498,000	Wgt. Mean	94.40
Total Assessed Value	\$22,182,910	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$55,891
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$87,030	Avg. Assessed Value	\$82,159

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.08 to 100.04
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.93 to 96.88
95% Mean C.I	97.97 to 104.05
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	40.35
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.48
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.58

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	294	98	98
2010	264	96	96
2009	276	96	96
2008	343	95	95

2012 Commission Summary for Keith County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	28	Median	97.68
Total Sales Price	\$4,783,060	Mean	100.94
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,773,060	Wgt. Mean	93.44
Total Assessed Value	\$4,460,050	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$132,826
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$170,466	Avg. Assessed Value	\$159,288

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.09 to 104.39
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	86.48 to 100.40
95% Mean C.I	94.29 to 107.59
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	11.16
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.99
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.78

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	45	98	98
2010	48	100	95
2009	53	97	97
2008	47	99	99

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Keith 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	98	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	74	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 Keith County

2011-2012 was a year of massive change as well as major accomplishments. As of July 1, 2012 Keith County went from State assumption back to County assumption and from six employees down to just two employees, the Assessor and one staff person. Three new employees were hired with two starting the end of July and the third starting in August. One of the new employees that were hired in July took a job in Colorado so another new employee started in October. Training of three new staff consumed a large amount of time; as well as the training time with the transition from Terra Scan to the new computer system, Orion.

Another major accomplishment was implementation of GIS Countywide that is presently 95% complete. We still have to edit all parcels to insure accuracy. Our property Record Card (PRC) is generated through our GIS Workshop website. Therefore, since we were the only county in the State of Nebraska on the new Orion system that was integrating information into GIS Workshop it took time to integrate the correct information into the correct places for the PRC to display on the GIS Workshop Website.

All new construction within the county was physically reviewed with measurements, pictures and valuation.

All new construction within the county was physically reviewed with measurements, pictures and valuation. Residential properties were within statistical standards so no adjustment was necessary.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Keith 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>
	01	Location within the City limits of Ogallala
	02	Location within the Village limits of Paxton; east of Ogallala
	03	Location within the Village limits of Brule
	04	Parcels located outside the City or Village limits and excluding Lake McConaughy and Ogallala Suburban
	05	Parcels surrounding Lake McConaughy
	06	Parcel within the K-Lake Area which are owned and leased by Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District
	07	Suburban properties outside the City limits of Ogallala
	08	Parcels within the smaller Villages of Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	The cost approach is primarily used for determining market value for residential property. The sales comparison and Income are not excluded from the valuation process although it is limited because of the diversity of data for the county.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
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?	
	Local market data is used to develop depreciation tables with our new CAMA program through Tyler Technology systems.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	The depreciation tables were built in TerraScan and are now awaiting the programming in Orion	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	Within the last Six Year Inspection and Review Cycle and during each cyclical pattern in each valuation grouping	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	By local market data for vacant lot sales	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	Substantially changed properties are not classified until a physical inspection is completed or the land has been re-platted on record in the Clerk's office. Usually	

	the standard of a 10% or larger difference is used to qualify if the change requires a physical review for substantially changed since the date of sale.
--	--

**51 Keith
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 : 270
 Total Sales Price : 23,452,250
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,498,000
 Total Assessed Value : 22,182,910
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 87,030
 Avg. Assessed Value : 82,159

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 101
 COD : 18.89
 PRD : 107.00

COV : 25.25
 STD : 25.51
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.33
 MAX Sales Ratio : 200.08
 MIN Sales Ratio : 49.38

95% Median C.I. : 95.08 to 100.04
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.93 to 96.88
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.97 to 104.05

Printed:3/29/2012 3:19:34PM

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	38	105.06	109.50	98.33	19.47	111.36	49.38	182.68	95.00 to 109.66	82,987	81,603
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	32	103.66	107.43	100.84	17.53	106.54	69.50	183.87	96.42 to 114.59	82,197	82,889
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	15	108.59	111.92	106.33	13.62	105.26	72.35	158.91	100.51 to 124.23	60,887	64,742
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	46	93.34	92.18	91.51	14.13	100.73	52.65	162.65	88.13 to 97.22	88,656	81,132
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	46	92.43	97.47	90.66	20.08	107.51	57.34	157.07	86.22 to 102.71	92,687	84,031
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	28	95.62	97.43	91.67	16.37	106.28	57.73	159.30	85.64 to 103.31	104,714	95,988
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	25	97.19	102.76	92.51	19.13	111.08	67.96	200.08	86.26 to 107.66	79,828	73,848
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	40	95.80	99.33	94.21	21.32	105.43	58.47	179.90	85.02 to 100.80	88,284	83,176
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	131	100.00	103.19	97.04	17.76	106.34	49.38	183.87	95.56 to 104.17	82,254	79,821
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	139	94.90	98.95	92.17	19.64	107.36	57.34	200.08	91.22 to 98.56	91,530	84,362
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	135	95.36	97.27	92.36	17.26	105.32	52.65	162.65	91.50 to 98.18	90,275	83,380
<u>ALL</u>	270	97.01	101.01	94.40	18.89	107.00	49.38	200.08	95.08 to 100.04	87,030	82,159

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	1	67.96	67.96	67.96	00.00	100.00	67.96	67.96	N/A	84,000	57,090
01	150	100.09	105.90	98.88	17.79	107.10	63.99	200.08	97.19 to 103.62	69,976	69,193
02	14	93.35	90.73	88.61	13.05	102.39	52.65	115.42	82.64 to 105.47	52,486	46,505
03	9	94.27	87.03	89.27	14.24	97.49	49.38	114.25	63.34 to 100.80	51,489	45,962
04	12	99.53	102.23	96.15	18.57	106.32	67.73	158.82	85.02 to 114.59	127,923	123,000
05	63	91.74	93.82	89.04	22.43	105.37	53.60	170.76	82.89 to 97.22	115,426	102,772
06	7	92.11	96.59	92.77	17.75	104.12	64.06	144.88	64.06 to 144.88	110,214	102,248
07	13	97.54	100.43	94.06	13.22	106.77	75.48	146.75	86.89 to 106.44	164,377	154,612
08	1	145.88	145.88	145.88	00.00	100.00	145.88	145.88	N/A	4,000	5,835
<u>ALL</u>	270	97.01	101.01	94.40	18.89	107.00	49.38	200.08	95.08 to 100.04	87,030	82,159

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	258	97.38	101.60	94.57	18.78	107.43	49.38	200.08	95.10 to 100.38	88,366	83,569
06	4	100.06	93.56	91.12	12.93	102.68	65.68	108.44	N/A	95,250	86,795
07	8	80.04	85.72	86.33	20.61	99.29	58.47	140.58	58.47 to 140.58	39,813	34,369
<u>ALL</u>	270	97.01	101.01	94.40	18.89	107.00	49.38	200.08	95.08 to 100.04	87,030	82,159

**51 Keith
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 : 270
 Total Sales Price : 23,452,250
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,498,000
 Total Assessed Value : 22,182,910
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 87,030
 Avg. Assessed Value : 82,159

MEDIAN : 97
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 101
 COD : 18.89
 PRD : 107.00

COV : 25.25
 STD : 25.51
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.33
 MAX Sales Ratio : 200.08
 MIN Sales Ratio : 49.38

95% Median C.I. : 95.08 to 100.04
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.93 to 96.88
 95% Mean C.I. : 97.97 to 104.05

Printed:3/29/2012 3:19:34PM

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	2	158.32	158.32	159.07	07.86	99.53	145.88	170.76	N/A	4,258	6,773	
Less Than 15,000	11	145.88	137.92	135.17	17.04	102.03	100.40	179.90	102.92 to 170.76	8,297	11,215	
Less Than 30,000	44	111.87	119.46	115.64	24.69	103.30	52.65	200.08	101.27 to 125.96	19,684	22,762	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	268	96.82	100.58	94.38	18.60	106.57	49.38	200.08	95.00 to 100.01	87,647	82,722	
Greater Than 14,999	259	96.17	99.44	94.24	18.04	105.52	49.38	200.08	94.40 to 98.56	90,373	85,172	
Greater Than 29,999	226	95.39	97.41	93.59	16.58	104.08	49.38	163.44	92.42 to 97.77	100,141	93,723	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	2	158.32	158.32	159.07	07.86	99.53	145.88	170.76	N/A	4,258	6,773	
5,000 TO 14,999	9	125.96	133.39	132.71	20.17	100.51	100.40	179.90	102.92 to 167.90	9,194	12,202	
15,000 TO 29,999	33	106.18	113.31	113.33	24.41	99.98	52.65	200.08	96.17 to 121.44	23,480	26,611	
30,000 TO 59,999	60	105.27	107.06	106.58	19.52	100.45	49.38	163.44	97.19 to 112.23	46,602	49,669	
60,000 TO 99,999	79	97.81	99.96	99.58	14.14	100.38	53.60	158.82	95.00 to 100.51	75,309	74,989	
100,000 TO 149,999	48	89.86	89.14	89.13	13.28	100.01	57.73	135.88	85.75 to 92.11	120,338	107,257	
150,000 TO 249,999	31	86.48	88.03	88.63	11.32	99.32	58.55	108.50	82.89 to 95.49	178,839	158,502	
250,000 TO 499,999	8	85.55	85.90	86.32	14.34	99.51	59.24	103.00	59.24 to 103.00	320,769	276,900	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	270	97.01	101.01	94.40	18.89	107.00	49.38	200.08	95.08 to 100.04	87,030	82,159	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

A. Residential Real Property

The residential sample for Keith County includes 270 improved qualified sales for the measurement of this property class. In review of the information contained in the data, nearly 80% of the sales are located in the City of Ogallala and around Lake McConaughy. This would be an adequate and reliable sample for statistical measures. Ogallala, with a population of approximately 5,142 is located along Interstate 80 and is on the western edge of the state before you reach the panhandle counties. Typically the residential population base represents 65% of the valuation within the City. Historically the area around Lake McConaughy is populated with several recreational residents and the market has been a contributing factor to residential sales.

In review of the total residential class, the median and weighted mean support each other although the mean falls above the acceptable range by one point. The qualitative statistics are showing signs of needed improvement within the county. The Keith County Assessor has assumed the office as of July 1, 2011 after the functions were the responsibility of the State. Along with a new staff, new GIS program, the assessor has begun the implementation of the GIS system in Keith County. Several goals will be ongoing to update the functions of the entire office. The staff has eagerly worked to learn the assessor's responsibilities and daily functions. Three out of the four employees are new to the office.

Overall, the assessor is well informed of the real estate market in Keith County. She has been a resident of the county and has worked in the assessor's office for many years. She has begun training the staff and delegating duties to achieve equalization and good assessment practices. The office completes sales review questionnaires and often times follows up with phone calls and further research. The Department will continue to work with the assessor to help train and teach all aspects of assessment work.

Based on all information available and through the known assessment practices of Keith County, it is determined the level of value for residential property is 97. It is believed there is uniform and proportionate treatment within the residential class of property.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Keith 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 Keith 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 Keith 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 Keith 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 Keith County

Commercial properties were within statistical standards so no adjustment was necessary. However, all 2011 Board of Equalization (BOE) decisions were reviewed for equalization. Some of the Commercial and Industrial values were reinstated which explains the change in the 2011 CTL and the 2012 Abstract Valuations. In 2011 the appraiser removed the 50% adjustment he had formerly given to 4 industrial properties affected by Environmental Contamination due to a sale of one of their properties that appeared to be unaffected by the prior Environmental Contamination. Our BOE decision was to still allow the 50% adjustment to the three properties that had not sold. Due to information acquired that the Environment Contamination was cured, sales of other properties within the county that had had cured Environment Contamination and review of the "Standard on the Valuation of Properties Affected by Environmental Contamination" the 50% discount was removed. This explains why the extreme change in the Industrial Valuation when you compare the 2011 CTL Industrial Valuation with the 2012 Abstract Industrial Valuation. Also the 50% adjustment during BOE on some Commercial Vacant Land lying south of I-80 was also reviewed for equalization and the 2011 Valuation were reinstated. This explains some of the change in the 2011 CTL Commercial Valuation with the 2012 Abstract Commercial Valuation.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Keith 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>
	01	Location within the City Limits of Ogallala
	02	Location within the Village Limits of Paxton
	03	Location within the Village Limits of Brule
	04	Parcels located outside the City or Village limits and not including Ogallala Suburban or Lake McConaughy
	05	Parcels surrounding Lake McConaughy
	06	Parcels within the K-Lake Area which are owned and leased by Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District
	07	Ogallala Suburban properties outside the City limits but within Ogallala zoning requirements
	08	Parcels within the smaller Villages of Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The cost approach is primarily used for determining market value for commercial property.	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	Stanard Appraisal Services, Inc. has been hired on a as needed basis for 2012 for the appraisals of unique commercial properties.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June 2005	
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?	
	As of this date Orion has not built depreciation tables for 2012	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Previously they were built in the CAMA system by TerraScan.	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2011	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Market data from the similar valuation groupings is used to establish the values	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	Substantially changed properties are not classified until a physical inspection is completed or the land has been replatted in the Clerk's office. Typically the	

	standard of a 10% difference is used to mark any inspection to verify the differences since the date of sale.
--	---

**51 Keith
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 : 28
 Total Sales Price : 4,783,060
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,773,060
 Total Assessed Value : 4,460,050
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 170,466
 Avg. Assessed Value : 159,288

MEDIAN : 98
 WGT. MEAN : 93
 MEAN : 101
 COD : 12.10
 PRD : 108.03

COV : 17.00
 STD : 17.16
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.82
 MAX Sales Ratio : 150.83
 MIN Sales Ratio : 66.82

95% Median C.I. : 93.09 to 104.39
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.48 to 100.40
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.29 to 107.59

Printed:3/29/2012 3:19:35PM

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	85.41	85.41	85.41	00.00	100.00	85.41	85.41	N/A	105,000	89,680
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	85.34	85.34	85.34	00.00	100.00	85.34	85.34	N/A	350,000	298,680
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	98.65	98.63	96.71	05.16	101.99	90.64	106.56	N/A	166,250	160,779
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	96.88	96.88	96.88	00.00	100.00	96.88	96.88	N/A	175,000	169,540
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	95.30	101.36	95.84	10.29	105.76	88.04	130.74	88.04 to 130.74	150,333	144,074
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	106.69	106.41	91.84	11.33	115.86	84.25	128.01	N/A	298,525	274,158
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	93.06	93.06	100.50	09.94	92.60	83.81	102.31	N/A	110,655	111,213
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	4	95.74	89.35	81.25	09.81	109.97	66.82	99.08	N/A	179,750	146,054
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	103.66	103.66	103.66	00.00	100.00	103.66	103.66	N/A	95,000	98,475
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	93.31	93.31	93.31	00.00	100.00	93.31	93.31	N/A	62,000	57,855
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	3	130.01	129.95	117.68	10.72	110.43	109.01	150.83	N/A	94,883	111,663
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	6	93.54	94.21	92.10	07.57	102.29	85.34	106.56	85.34 to 106.56	186,667	171,913
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	13	96.97	101.29	94.41	11.16	107.29	83.81	130.74	88.04 to 108.99	191,724	181,003
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	9	99.08	104.91	92.67	15.92	113.21	66.82	150.83	93.09 to 130.01	128,961	119,504
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	11	96.88	99.96	96.27	07.43	103.83	88.04	130.74	90.64 to 106.56	158,364	152,464
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	99.08	97.53	89.79	11.10	108.62	66.82	128.01	83.81 to 108.99	202,674	181,977
<u>ALL</u>	28	97.68	100.94	93.44	12.10	108.03	66.82	150.83	93.09 to 104.39	170,466	159,288

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	17	99.08	100.87	91.62	12.13	110.10	66.82	130.74	88.04 to 106.56	169,118	154,952
03	1	83.81	83.81	83.81	00.00	100.00	83.81	83.81	N/A	21,555	18,065
05	9	96.97	104.69	98.86	11.12	105.90	90.64	150.83	92.98 to 109.01	169,612	167,680
07	1	85.34	85.34	85.34	00.00	100.00	85.34	85.34	N/A	350,000	298,680
<u>ALL</u>	28	97.68	100.94	93.44	12.10	108.03	66.82	150.83	93.09 to 104.39	170,466	159,288

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	28	97.68	100.94	93.44	12.10	108.03	66.82	150.83	93.09 to 104.39	170,466	159,288
04											
<u>ALL</u>	28	97.68	100.94	93.44	12.10	108.03	66.82	150.83	93.09 to 104.39	170,466	159,288

**51 Keith
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 : 28
 Total Sales Price : 4,783,060
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,773,060
 Total Assessed Value : 4,460,050
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 170,466
 Avg. Assessed Value : 159,288

MEDIAN : 98
 WGT. MEAN : 93
 MEAN : 101
 COD : 12.10
 PRD : 108.03

COV : 17.00
 STD : 17.16
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.82
 MAX Sales Ratio : 150.83
 MIN Sales Ratio : 66.82

95% Median C.I. : 93.09 to 104.39
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.48 to 100.40
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.29 to 107.59

Printed:3/29/2012 3:19:35PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000												
Less Than 30,000	2	94.10	94.10	94.96	10.94	99.09	83.81	104.39	N/A	23,528	22,343	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	28	97.68	100.94	93.44	12.10	108.03	66.82	150.83	93.09 to 104.39	170,466	159,288	
Greater Than 14,999	28	97.68	100.94	93.44	12.10	108.03	66.82	150.83	93.09 to 104.39	170,466	159,288	
Greater Than 29,999	26	97.68	101.46	93.43	12.22	108.59	66.82	150.83	93.09 to 105.79	181,769	169,822	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999												
15,000 TO 29,999	2	94.10	94.10	94.96	10.94	99.09	83.81	104.39	N/A	23,528	22,343	
30,000 TO 59,999	2	140.42	140.42	138.19	07.41	101.61	130.01	150.83	N/A	42,325	58,488	
60,000 TO 99,999	10	99.98	102.56	102.58	07.45	99.98	93.09	130.74	93.31 to 108.99	69,200	70,989	
100,000 TO 149,999	1	85.41	85.41	85.41	00.00	100.00	85.41	85.41	N/A	105,000	89,680	
150,000 TO 249,999	8	100.35	103.89	103.02	07.55	100.84	92.98	128.01	92.98 to 128.01	192,594	198,413	
250,000 TO 499,999	4	86.69	82.71	82.10	07.65	100.74	66.82	90.64	N/A	341,250	280,181	
500,000 TO 999,999	1	84.25	84.25	84.25	00.00	100.00	84.25	84.25	N/A	938,600	790,800	
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	28	97.68	100.94	93.44	12.10	108.03	66.82	150.83	93.09 to 104.39	170,466	159,288	

51 Keith
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 : 28
Total Sales Price : 4,783,060
Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,773,060
Total Assessed Value : 4,460,050
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 170,466
Avg. Assessed Value : 159,288

MEDIAN : 98
WGT. MEAN : 93
MEAN : 101
COD : 12.10
PRD : 108.03

COV : 17.00
STD : 17.16
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.82
MAX Sales Ratio : 150.83
MIN Sales Ratio : 66.82

95% Median C.I. : 93.09 to 104.39
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 86.48 to 100.40
95% Mean C.I. : 94.29 to 107.59

Printed:3/29/2012 3:19:35PM

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	87.91	87.91	74.15	23.99	118.56	66.82	108.99	N/A	230,000	170,548
306	1	88.04	88.04	88.04	00.00	100.00	88.04	88.04	N/A	285,000	250,905
316	1	150.83	150.83	150.83	00.00	100.00	150.83	150.83	N/A	33,250	50,150
329	1	85.34	85.34	85.34	00.00	100.00	85.34	85.34	N/A	350,000	298,680
341	1	98.39	98.39	98.39	00.00	100.00	98.39	98.39	N/A	200,000	196,785
344	3	106.56	107.57	104.39	14.18	103.05	85.41	130.74	N/A	118,333	123,528
350	3	96.88	95.61	95.45	01.37	100.17	92.98	96.97	N/A	200,333	191,220
353	3	93.31	91.18	93.19	04.51	97.84	83.81	96.43	N/A	47,852	44,592
386	1	93.62	93.62	93.62	00.00	100.00	93.62	93.62	N/A	62,500	58,510
406	3	100.87	101.45	100.66	01.75	100.78	99.08	104.39	N/A	53,167	53,517
410	3	103.66	105.31	91.36	14.07	115.27	84.25	128.01	N/A	394,533	360,432
419	2	91.87	91.87	91.05	01.34	100.90	90.64	93.09	N/A	210,000	191,198
426	1	105.79	105.79	105.79	00.00	100.00	105.79	105.79	N/A	68,500	72,465
442	1	130.01	130.01	130.01	00.00	100.00	130.01	130.01	N/A	51,400	66,825
531	2	105.66	105.66	105.66	03.17	100.00	102.31	109.01	N/A	199,878	211,188
<u>ALL</u>	28	97.68	100.94	93.44	12.10	108.03	66.82	150.83	93.09 to 104.39	170,466	159,288

**2012 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

A. Commercial Real Property

The commercial population in Keith County primarily lies within the City of Ogallala, along Interstate 80 and around Lake McConaughy north of Ogallala. Ogallala is a City with over 5,100 residents and has a variety of commercial businesses that include motels, fast food, convenience stores, hardware stores, automobile dealerships, downtown retail, medical offices and a hospital. The lake areas contain businesses that offer food, fuel and typical convenience facilities that you would see around recreational areas. Historically Keith County has approximately 9% of the total value attributing to commercial property.

The qualified improved commercial sample includes a total of 28 sales. 17 of these are located in the City of Ogallala, and 9 are at the Lake area. This is typical of the population and fairly represents the commercial base within Keith County. The minority sales are: one from Brule and one in the Ogallala Suburban area. The sales by occupancy code appear to vary from all types within the commercial population. The overall statistics show the median at 98 and weighted mean at 93. Both of these are within the acceptable range. The mean falls slightly over 100, at 100.94. The coefficient of dispersion (COD) is well within the acceptable IAAO standards at 12.10. The price-related differential is over acceptable parameters at 108.03. This could reflect signs of regressive assessments.

Regarding the six-year inspection cycle, Keith County reported in 2011 they had completed the physical review and actions included a complete appraisal. The appraisal included new measurements, digital photographs, updated cost tables and full market analysis. The office has converted the computer CAMA and administrative software to Orion through Tyler Technologies in 2012 and is working through those changes. With any program change there are some value changes in all property types. The Keith County Assessor has actively been training a new staff with the implementation of a GIS system and the new Orion program.

Therefore, based on all available information, the level of value for commercial property in Keith County is 98% and after reviewing the assessment practices it is believed there is uniform and proportionate treatment of all commercial property within the County.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Keith 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 Keith 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 Keith 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 Keith 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 Keith County

All Rural Improvements within the county, including agricultural dwellings, outbuildings and all other agricultural improvements were physically reviewed with onsite inspections, new pictures and measurements verified. Since the last Rural Improvement Review whoever protested their small grain bins; the appraiser recommended removal of the small grain bins valuations. Therefore, we removed all the small old grain bins that are no longer used to provide equalization across the county. Also outbuildings less than \$100 value were removed from the Tax Roll as they added no contributory valuation. Agricultural Land Values were reviewed and valued according to 75% preference of the market value.

Also, all rural properties with Accretion Acres were reviewed for Accretion Acres verses Deeded Acres; as well as adjoining parcels with the same ownership. In previous years the Special Valuation were given a 50% discount off of the lowest grassland valuation. Sales were reviewed since 1999 when Accretion started selling for other than Agricultural Use. The Assessor also reviewed Special Valuation Methodology with adjoining Counties who had Accretion; as well as doing physical review of Accretion properties. After all information was gathered the median of the last 3 years of sales during the Study Period of July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2011 was used to set the Market Value of the Accretion. The Special Valuation was set at the same value as the lowest class of grass in the County. Letters of Denial will be sent on all properties with more accretion acres than deeded acres without adjoining land in the same ownership. This may allow us with further verification of agricultural presence.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Keith 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
	01	<p>Area 1 market boundaries are the north side of Keith County. This area is north of the North Platte River, and North of Lake McConaughy. It spans the full length east and west of Keith County. This area is rolling grassy sand hills mainly for the grazing of cattle.</p> <p>In this area there are limited county roads and most of them are minimum maintenance roads. The Union Pacific Railroad has two tracks that run east and west along the North side of Lake McConaughy. There is very little farming in this area and mostly consists of grass land for cattle grazing. This area contains the Keystone Bank, Keystone-Lemoyne Fire Department, and seasonal convenience stores. The topography is rolling sand hills, Highway 61 runs north and south, and Highway 92 runs along the north side of Lake McConaughy. There are some residential parcels in this area including the town of Keystone, Lemoyne, and residential neighborhoods along the north side of Lake McConaughy. Most parcels in this area are full sections and usually surrounded by a barbed wire fence to show boundaries.</p> <p>There are a few small creeks in this area Otter Creek, Clear Creek, Lonergran Creek, Whitetail Creek, and Corn Creek. Most soils are valent association soils and classified very steep nearly level to very steep, excessively drained, sandy soils that form in sand eolian material; on uplands. Slopes range from 0-60 percent.</p> <p>Most water in this area is from wells run with windmills and some public electricity is run mainly along county roads. There is not any public gas, water or sewer.</p>
	02	<p>Area 2 market boundaries are south of the North Platte River and Lake McConaughy, and north of the South Platte River Valley. This area is mainly located on a plateau between the river valleys. A majority of this land is dry land farming.</p> <p>This area sits on the north side of Ogallala. Highway 61 runs north of Ogallala and highway 92 runs west of Ogallala. Both of these highways run into Ogallala which have all of the business resources. Other than the state highways and Keystone –Roscoe road all other roads are gravel roads usually well maintained. Most of this area is dry land farming because the difficulty in drilling wells deep enough to reach good water. In this area there is the small town of Sarben, Bayside 18 Hole Golf course, seasonal convenience stores,</p>

	<p>Eichners Sales and Service which sells recreational vehicles and boats, Dan’s Marine which maintains and sells boats, and Eagle Crest Manufactured Homes Sales.</p> <p>There are many residential neighborhoods along the south side of Lake McConaughy, as well as a few commercial parcels, however, approximately 90 percent of this neighborhood consists of Agriculture and zoned A- Agricultural. Most parcels in this area are quarter sections up to full sections.</p> <p>On the west end of this neighborhood there are many canyons and gulches. Also on the northeast side of this neighborhood, the Sutherland Canal runs from Lake McConaughy to South of Paxton. Most soils are Kuma-Duroc-Keith Association and Sully-McConaughy Association. Kuma-Duroc-Keith Association soils are classified as very deep, nearly level to gently sloping, well drained lomey and silty soils that form in loess; on uplands. Slopes range from 0-6 percent. Sully-McConaughy soils are mainly located on the edges of the plateau and are classified as very deep, strongly sloping to very steep, well drained, lomey soils that formed in loess; on uplands. Slopes range from 6-60 percent.</p> <p>There are limited amounts of wells in this area, mainly because of deep water sources. A majority of the wells in this neighborhood are located in the North Platte River Valley below the Plateau. There is some public electricity along the county roads, and there isn’t any public gas, water, or sewer.</p>
03	<p>Area 3 market boundaries include the South Platte River Valley and everything south. This area is concentrated with majority of irrigated land. It also spans the full length east and west of Keith County.</p> <p>This area includes the towns of Brule, Ogallala, Roscoe, and Paxton. Highway 30, and Interstate 80 runs east and west, Highway 61 runs south of Ogallala to Perkins County. The Union Pacific Railroad also runs east and west along this neighborhood. There are some asphalt paved county roads but a majority of them are well maintained gravel. Most of this area is irrigated farm ground. The crops include wheat, soybeans, dry edible beans, beets, pumpkins, milo, alpha, sunflowers, and mostly corn. There is a well moratorium throughout Keith County that restricts the drilling of new wells, but by reviewing the well map this area has many irrigation wells.</p> <p>The towns of Ogallala, Brule, and Paxton provide retail sales in this area, including discount stores, hardware stores, grocery stores, gas stations/convenience stores, fitness and training, fast food and fine dining restaurants, and Farmer Coops.</p> <p>This neighborhood makes up most of the residential and commercial parcels in Keith County, because of the towns and the county seat of Ogallala. Above 90% of this area is zoned A-</p>

	<p>agricultural. Most parcels in this area are a quarter of a section. Along the north side of this neighborhood the South Platte River runs west to east. Also in this area is the Western Irrigation Canal and Sutherland Canal for irrigation purposes. Most soils in this area are Satanta-Kuma Association. This soil is classified as very deep, nearly level to gently sloping, well drained, loamy soils that formed in loamy material and loess; on uplands. Typically this area slopes from 0-6 percent.</p> <p>In this area public power is available to most parcels because of the electric irrigated pumps. There isn't any public gas, water, or sewer to the agricultural parcels.</p>
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.
	Soil maps, topography, zoning, rainfall, and all surrounding comparable maps are used to best determine the representation of market area boundaries.
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.
	The actual use of the parcel is determined by physical reviews which identifies the classification of either rural residential or agricultural land.
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.)
	GIS, FSA Maps, NRCS maps, NRD maps, and physical reviews are all used to update the current land use of the parcel.
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.
	A physically inspection is completed to monitor any signs of agricultural characteristics.
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.
	Yes, there are 139 applications on file and they do have a different in value.
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	Any signs of a large portion of the parcel has been improved or removed since the date of sale.

51 Keith
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 : 76
Total Sales Price : 24,434,724
Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,958,016
Total Assessed Value : 16,703,741
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 315,237
Avg. Assessed Value : 219,786

MEDIAN : 74
WGT. MEAN : 70
MEAN : 73
COD : 15.00
PRD : 104.02

COV : 21.10
STD : 15.30
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.03
MAX Sales Ratio : 120.82
MIN Sales Ratio : 27.82

95% Median C.I. : 68.46 to 76.86
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.21 to 74.23
95% Mean C.I. : 69.08 to 75.96

Printed:3/29/2012 3:19:36PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	75.06	74.48	75.07	07.30	99.21	65.58	82.21	N/A	241,375	181,196
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	76.62	76.23	77.32	18.82	98.59	51.96	116.28	54.89 to 83.38	331,785	256,545
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	62.36	64.73	63.77	04.81	101.51	61.19	71.74	N/A	306,078	195,176
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	73.36	70.16	68.82	16.49	101.95	39.27	86.07	39.27 to 86.07	661,083	454,978
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	81.69	79.62	76.47	04.38	104.12	73.21	83.96	N/A	183,627	140,412
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	74.91	75.07	72.10	11.64	104.12	53.68	95.15	N/A	416,949	300,634
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	76.23	76.15	72.32	08.95	105.30	56.75	94.15	56.75 to 94.15	243,843	176,353
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	11	73.86	72.17	67.44	08.69	107.01	53.37	87.68	64.84 to 79.71	288,880	194,816
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	82.50	90.49	93.25	21.28	97.04	68.14	120.82	N/A	119,041	111,003
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	7	71.22	67.82	62.82	17.05	107.96	42.88	83.89	42.88 to 83.89	301,187	189,199
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	8	73.18	73.52	71.48	16.56	102.85	51.45	100.46	51.45 to 100.46	230,410	164,692
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	58.93	55.77	54.46	21.65	102.41	27.82	71.44	N/A	337,060	183,576
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	27	71.74	72.49	71.90	15.95	100.82	39.27	116.28	65.39 to 80.07	386,808	278,114
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	26	74.85	74.66	70.50	09.41	105.90	53.37	95.15	72.83 to 78.68	289,238	203,917
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	23	70.42	70.14	64.95	19.92	107.99	27.82	120.82	62.62 to 80.72	260,609	169,253
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	19	73.21	71.52	69.23	13.13	103.31	39.27	95.15	62.36 to 81.69	428,027	296,324
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	28	74.64	74.04	68.50	12.96	108.09	42.88	120.82	68.15 to 78.68	262,500	179,816
<u>ALL</u>	76	73.54	72.52	69.72	15.00	104.02	27.82	120.82	68.46 to 76.86	315,237	219,786

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	19	74.74	72.72	69.87	10.07	104.08	51.96	87.68	65.73 to 80.57	407,788	284,939
2	13	74.48	75.39	71.33	17.28	105.69	39.27	120.82	68.14 to 83.96	223,541	159,451
3	44	72.65	71.59	69.28	16.35	103.33	27.82	116.28	65.78 to 77.70	302,364	209,478
<u>ALL</u>	76	73.54	72.52	69.72	15.00	104.02	27.82	120.82	68.46 to 76.86	315,237	219,786

51 Keith
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 : 76
Total Sales Price : 24,434,724
Total Adj. Sales Price : 23,958,016
Total Assessed Value : 16,703,741
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 315,237
Avg. Assessed Value : 219,786

MEDIAN : 74
WGT. MEAN : 70
MEAN : 73
COD : 15.00
PRD : 104.02

COV : 21.10
STD : 15.30
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.03
MAX Sales Ratio : 120.82
MIN Sales Ratio : 27.82

95% Median C.I. : 68.46 to 76.86
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.21 to 74.23
95% Mean C.I. : 69.08 to 75.96

Printed:3/29/2012 3:19:36PM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Irrigated_____											
County	7	76.83	73.40	65.33	08.27	112.35	50.25	82.21	50.25 to 82.21	345,500	225,706
3	7	76.83	73.40	65.33	08.27	112.35	50.25	82.21	50.25 to 82.21	345,500	225,706
_____Dry_____											
County	15	68.46	75.40	71.62	19.98	105.28	42.88	120.82	64.84 to 86.07	153,254	109,755
2	6	77.12	84.47	82.20	19.48	102.76	68.14	120.82	68.14 to 120.82	162,110	133,248
3	9	65.39	69.35	63.86	17.02	108.60	42.88	94.15	58.93 to 86.07	147,349	94,092
_____Grass_____											
County	24	74.17	70.81	69.82	11.57	101.42	27.82	87.68	65.73 to 79.06	359,537	251,024
1	17	73.86	71.96	69.55	10.61	103.47	51.96	87.68	62.36 to 80.72	440,152	306,136
2	3	74.96	76.17	76.17	02.04	100.00	74.48	79.06	N/A	289,333	220,398
3	4	68.51	61.91	57.16	22.20	108.31	27.82	82.80	N/A	69,575	39,768
_____ALL_____	76	73.54	72.52	69.72	15.00	104.02	27.82	120.82	68.46 to 76.86	315,237	219,786

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	19	73.21	72.94	67.20	15.34	108.54	50.25	102.57	56.75 to 81.69	349,237	234,699
3	19	73.21	72.94	67.20	15.34	108.54	50.25	102.57	56.75 to 81.69	349,237	234,699
_____Dry_____											
County	15	68.46	75.40	71.62	19.98	105.28	42.88	120.82	64.84 to 86.07	153,254	109,755
2	6	77.12	84.47	82.20	19.48	102.76	68.14	120.82	68.14 to 120.82	162,110	133,248
3	9	65.39	69.35	63.86	17.02	108.60	42.88	94.15	58.93 to 86.07	147,349	94,092
_____Grass_____											
County	26	74.17	69.94	69.22	12.77	101.04	27.82	87.68	65.73 to 79.06	342,265	236,920
1	18	74.30	72.39	69.65	10.40	103.93	51.96	87.68	65.73 to 80.57	419,727	292,339
2	4	74.72	66.94	69.33	13.48	96.55	39.27	79.06	N/A	266,375	184,690
3	4	68.51	61.91	57.16	22.20	108.31	27.82	82.80	N/A	69,575	39,768
_____ALL_____	76	73.54	72.52	69.72	15.00	104.02	27.82	120.82	68.46 to 76.86	315,237	219,786

Keith County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
51.10	Keith	1	#DIV/0!	735	#DIV/0!	705	675	675	645	645	656
51.20	Keith	2	#DIV/0!	930	#DIV/0!	890	855	855	825	825	887
51.30	Keith	3	1,785	1,785	1,700	1,700	1,645	1,645	1,585	1,585	1,730
68.10	Perkins	1	#DIV/0!	1,764	1,723	1,693	1,698	1,649	1,658	1,669	1,711
25.10	Deuel	1	#DIV/0!	855	850	845	730	670	590	500	811
35.10	Garden	1	#DIV/0!	975	850	750	650	650	650	650	702
3.10	Arthur	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	655	#DIV/0!	655	655	655	655	655
60.10	McPherson	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	490	490	#DIV/0!	490	490	490	490
56.20	Lincoln	2	1,180	1,180	1,168	1,180	1,180	1,163	1,176	1,178	1,176
56.10	Lincoln	1	2,125	2,123	2,124	2,122	2,028	2,004	2,013	1,989	2,075

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Keith	1	#DIV/0!	420	#DIV/0!	427	351	425	413	316	403
	Keith	2	#DIV/0!	550	550	539	485	488	446	445	535
	Keith	3	1,317	578	609	579	486	583	446	516	562
	Perkins	1	#DIV/0!	650	650	600	600	500	500	500	612
	Deuel	1	#DIV/0!	475	375	375	375	300	300	300	442
	Garden	1	#DIV/0!	505	445	400	400	400	400	400	466
	Arthur	1	#DIV/0!								
	McPherson	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	275	#DIV/0!	275	275	275	275
	Lincoln	2	435	435	435	435	435	435	435	435	435
	Lincoln	1	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Keith	1	#DIV/0!	311	#DIV/0!	305	278	275	258	255	256
	Keith	2	#DIV/0!	367	344	386	331	334	312	306	314
	Keith	3	424	379	358	366	345	333	316	308	332
	Perkins	1	#DIV/0!	350	350	350	350	350	350	350	350
	Deuel	1	#DIV/0!	235	237	235	230	229	230	230	232
	Garden	1	#DIV/0!	297	250	249	243	249	233	230	232
	Arthur	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	240	#DIV/0!	240	240	240	240	240
	McPherson	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	245	245	#DIV/0!	245	245	245	245
	Lincoln	2	300	300	300	300	300	280	280	280	280
	Lincoln	1	860	860	860	860	860	830	830	830	834

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

Ruth Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator
Department of Revenue
Property Assessment Division
PO Box 98919
Lincoln NE 68509-8919

RE: 2012 Special Valuation Methodology for Keith County

Dear Ms Sorensen:

Please see attached the 2012 Methodology for Special Valuation for Keith County pursuant to Title 350, Neb. R. & Regs., Reg-11-005.004. Special Valuation Methodologies are used to value agricultural land that is influenced by market factors other than purely agricultural or horticultural purposes. The residential and/or recreational non-agricultural influences have been identified. The office maintains a file of all data used for determining the special and actual valuation. This file shall be available for inspection at the Keith County Assessor Office by any interested person.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Schiel
Keith County Assessor

2012 Special Valuation Methodology for Keith County

- A. **Identification of the influenced area:** The Special Valuation Area is the accretion land along the North & South Platte Rivers and Lake Mc Conaughy. This area was first recognized in Assessment year 2007. This area is not in any specific Market Area as it is located within each of the three Agricultural Market Areas.
- B. **Describe the highest and best use of the properties in the influenced area, and how this was determined:** The highest and best use of the accretion market area is for recreational use. The Special Valuation Area was determined by market trends as the majority of all the agricultural properties that have sold along either river have been purchased for residential living and/or recreational use. The highest and best use is legally permitted, physically possible, economically feasible, and the most profitable.
- C. **Describe the valuation models used in arriving at the value estimates, and explain why and how they were selected:** The valuation models used in these areas are unit comparison or value per acre. The models were created by using sold properties with accretion acres that were influenced by other than agricultural use. This Special Valuation Area was selected because the sold properties were not reflecting the true agricultural market. This Special Valuation Area was developed to define a market trend for agricultural parcels being used for residential or recreational use within Keith County.
- D. **Describe which market areas were analyzed, both in the County and in any county deemed comparable:** All market areas within Keith County area analyzed on an annual basis. Market trends are analyzed and sales within the Special Valuation area are used to determine the areas and market value. We have also reviewed adjoining counties, Garden and Lincoln, Special Valuation Areas and their Valuation Methodology.
- E. **Describe any adjustments made to sales to reflect current cash equivalency of typical market conditions. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**
We have not adjusted the sales. Typically the most recent sales reflect current cash equivalency. We rely on the most recent sales in determining value.
- F. **Describe any estimates of economic rent or net operating income used in an income capitalization approach. Include estimates of yields, commodity prices, typical crop share:** We have not studied rents for these properties. Typically actual income information is not readily available to our office.
- G. **Describe the typical expenses allowed in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:** We have not studied the income approach for these properties. Typically actual income information is not readily available to our office.
- H. **Describe the overall capitalization rate used in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:** We have not studied the income

approach for these properties. Typically actual income information is not readily available to our office.

- I. **Describe any other information used in supporting the estimate of actual and special value. Include how this affects the actual and special value:** Market trends for agricultural land in Keith County have been highly influenced by residential and recreational uses due to Lake Mc Conaughy, the North Platte River and the South Platte River. This area is primarily agricultural parcels. The Special Valuation Market Area is determined by current sales within Keith County. The Special Value Methodologies are used to value agricultural land that is influenced by market factors other than purely agricultural or horticultural purposes. The Keith County Assessor office maintains a file of all data used for determining the special and actual valuation. This file shall be available for inspection at the Keith County Assessor Office by any interested person.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

A. Agricultural Land

Three market areas are defined by the Keith County Assessor based on unique market characteristics as described in the agricultural survey. Market area one is 95% grass with only 4% irrigated acres and a few dry acres. The region is rolling plains very similar to Arthur County grasses. The assessor increased the grass values for this year by \$5-\$10 per acre. This is consistent with the increase in the market. Market Areas two and three both experienced increases in dry land values ranging between 8-19% per each LCG. Only minor adjustments were made to irrigated and grass sub-classifications.

In reviewing the agricultural sample of qualified minimally improved sales, market area one consisted of five older sales, 3 from the middle study year and 6 in the newest time period. The makeup of the majority land use is grass in the population and the sample although the times of sales appear to be doubled from the middle year to the newest. Additionally testing was completed to balance the market area due to time distribution. Five sales were borrowed from comparable counties with similar market characteristics. The final sampling for market area one included 14 sales within Keith County, MA One and two Arthur County sales, one McPherson, one Lincoln and one Garden. These 19 sales were analyzed with the assessment actions of increased grass values in the current year.

Market Area Two lies in the middle of Keith County where the west end is wider than the eastern edge near Lincoln County. The makeup is mainly grass, approximately 60%, with 32% dry land and 6% irrigated acres. The sample included only 10 sales within the County arrayed with 5 in the oldest study year, 4 in the middle and 1 in the newest. The distribution for time was heavily weighted on the oldest study year. The proportionality for land use was adequate although improvement would be an asset to the measures. Three comparable sales were utilized from the similar markets of Deuel and Garden Counties. The end result of sales used was 5 from the oldest study year and four each from the middle and newest year. This balanced sampling will be reliable for measurement purposes. The assessor's actions for 2012 included minor adjustments to the irrigated and grass sub-classifications and increases to the dry land values ranging from 8-19%.

Market Area Three consists of approximately one-third of the southern portion of Keith County. This area lies next to Perkins County and to the west is Deuel and to the east is Lincoln County. The market area is primarily irrigation where most of the wells are located and is prime irrigable land. It is similar in soil characteristics and market influences to Perkins County. The irrigated acres total nearly 45% to the dry acres of 28% and grass acres of 23%. The sales arrayed from 16 in the oldest year, 13 in the middle and only 8 in the newest for a total of 37. Although the land uses meet the minimal thresholds for distribution, the sales are heavily weighted towards the oldest year in the sample. Four sales were used from comparable market areas from Perkins, Deuel, and Lincoln County from the sale dates of the newest study year. Two additional sales were used from the middle time line to balance the entire market area. It was then determined the sample was reliable for measurement purposes and the statistical results were representative of the three market areas.

In review of the measures of central tendency, all three represent acceptable statistics and

**2012 Correlation Section
for Keith County**

support the level of value. Each of the three market areas are also with acceptable IAAO standards for the median, mean and weighted mean. The qualitative measure, COD is acceptable and well within the parameters for each market area and the overall county measurement. When you study the price related differential, market area three is acceptable at 103.33; whereas the overall PRD is over by one point.

Based on all analyses described above, and the 2012 assessment actions, it is believed the level of value for agricultural land in Keith County is 74. Based on the known assessment practices in the county it is determined the assessments are uniform and proportionate as shown through the qualitative measures.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Keith 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 Keith 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 Keith 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 Keith 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 : 9,178	Value : 835,550,898	Growth 6,938,657	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	204	1,877,385	78	935,920	268	4,658,215	550	7,471,520	
02. Res Improve Land	2,373	19,252,275	171	2,407,585	1,964	29,220,485	4,508	50,880,345	
03. Res Improvements	2,373	136,996,092	171	20,968,972	1,964	110,982,456	4,508	268,947,520	
04. Res Total	2,577	158,125,752	249	24,312,477	2,232	144,861,156	5,058	327,299,385	3,034,698
% of Res Total	50.95	48.31	4.92	7.43	44.13	44.26	55.11	39.17	43.74
05. Com UnImp Land	110	3,137,905	18	710,765	34	984,945	162	4,833,615	
06. Com Improve Land	411	15,017,625	42	1,355,575	72	1,979,790	525	18,352,990	
07. Com Improvements	411	50,996,581	42	4,952,175	72	9,861,099	525	65,809,855	
08. Com Total	521	69,152,111	60	7,018,515	106	12,825,834	687	88,996,460	1,694,260
% of Com Total	75.84	77.70	8.73	7.89	15.43	14.41	7.49	10.65	24.42
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	1	24,010	0	0	1	24,010	
10. Ind Improve Land	13	343,585	1	36,170	0	0	14	379,755	
11. Ind Improvements	13	3,734,025	1	109,410	0	0	14	3,843,435	
12. Ind Total	13	4,077,610	2	169,590	0	0	15	4,247,200	8,405
% of Ind Total	86.67	96.01	13.33	3.99	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.51	0.12
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	924	8,497,015	924	8,497,015	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	50	304,825	50	304,825	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	50	1,030,811	50	1,030,811	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	974	9,832,651	974	9,832,651	539,306
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	10.61	1.18	7.77
Res & Rec Total	2,577	158,125,752	249	24,312,477	3,206	154,693,807	6,032	337,132,036	3,574,004
% of Res & Rec Total	42.72	46.90	4.13	7.21	53.15	45.89	65.72	40.35	51.51
Com & Ind Total	534	73,229,721	62	7,188,105	106	12,825,834	702	93,243,660	1,702,665
% of Com & Ind Total	76.07	78.54	8.83	7.71	15.10	13.76	7.65	11.16	24.54
17. Taxable Total	3,111	231,355,473	311	31,500,582	3,312	167,519,641	6,734	430,375,696	5,276,669
% of Taxable Total	46.20	53.76	4.62	7.32	49.18	38.92	73.37	51.51	76.05

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	3	10,390	198,255	0	0	0
19. Commercial	15	2,474,305	9,097,295	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	3	10,390	198,255
19. Commercial	0	0	0	15	2,474,305	9,097,295
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				18	2,484,695	9,295,550

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	64	37,060	64	37,060	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	37,060	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	238	73	280	591

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	5	654,180	128	13,456,975	1,735	254,946,670	1,868	269,057,825
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	8,120	41	5,050,215	439	81,993,170	481	87,051,505
29. Ag Improvements	1	163,450	41	4,800,534	470	44,064,828	512	49,028,812
30. Ag Total							2,380	405,138,142

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	12,100	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	25	27.34	330,815	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	25	0.00	3,020,364	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	2.30	3,335	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	5.60	8,120	36	25.59	37,110	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	163,450	36	0.00	1,780,170	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	6.72	0	0	195.83	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	11	11.00	133,100	12	12.00	145,200	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	314	353.50	4,277,350	339	380.84	4,608,165	
33. HomeSite Improvements	331	0.00	28,899,773	356	0.00	31,920,137	930,553
34. HomeSite Total				368	392.84	36,673,502	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	9	4.01	5,825	10	6.31	9,160	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	409	325.50	467,815	446	356.69	513,045	
37. FarmSite Improvements	432	0.00	15,165,055	469	0.00	17,108,675	731,435
38. FarmSite Total				479	363.00	17,630,880	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,883.77	0	0	5,086.32	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				847	5,842.16	54,304,382	1,661,988

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	2	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	3	0.00	0	5	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	1	1.84	3,180	72	8,228.51	8,541,195
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	160	38,503.88	28,918,270	233	46,734.23	37,462,645
44. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	3.43	0.03%	2,520	0.04%	734.69
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	614.24	6.21%	433,045	6.67%	705.01
49. 3A1	72.28	0.73%	48,790	0.75%	675.01
50. 3A	2,327.10	23.53%	1,570,815	24.21%	675.01
51. 4A1	4,931.03	49.86%	3,180,530	49.02%	645.00
52. 4A	1,940.87	19.63%	1,251,875	19.30%	645.01
53. Total	9,888.95	100.00%	6,487,575	100.00%	656.04
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	33.90	4.23%	14,235	4.40%	419.91
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	198.22	24.72%	84,695	26.19%	427.28
58. 3D1	122.10	15.23%	42,880	13.26%	351.19
59. 3D	173.36	21.62%	73,705	22.79%	425.16
60. 4D1	217.22	27.09%	89,775	27.76%	413.29
61. 4D	57.08	7.12%	18,050	5.58%	316.22
62. Total	801.88	100.00%	323,340	100.00%	403.23
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	115.05	0.04%	35,810	0.05%	311.26
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	746.86	0.28%	227,955	0.33%	305.22
67. 3G1	1,166.90	0.44%	323,955	0.47%	277.62
68. 3G	5,706.46	2.14%	1,571,455	2.29%	275.38
69. 4G1	49,350.21	18.48%	12,722,925	18.58%	257.81
70. 4G	209,977.18	78.62%	53,607,545	78.27%	255.30
71. Total	267,062.66	100.00%	68,489,645	100.00%	256.46
Irrigated Total	9,888.95	3.51%	6,487,575	8.39%	656.04
Dry Total	801.88	0.28%	323,340	0.42%	403.23
Grass Total	267,062.66	94.90%	68,489,645	88.57%	256.46
72. Waste	3,669.99	1.30%	2,031,850	2.63%	553.64
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	2.13	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	281,423.48	100.00%	77,332,410	100.00%	274.79

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	2,393.82	26.08%	2,226,250	27.35%	930.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	3,759.52	40.96%	3,345,960	41.11%	890.00
49. 3A1	412.31	4.49%	352,530	4.33%	855.01
50. 3A	1,997.67	21.77%	1,708,020	20.98%	855.01
51. 4A1	89.63	0.98%	73,950	0.91%	825.06
52. 4A	524.61	5.72%	432,845	5.32%	825.08
53. Total	9,177.56	100.00%	8,139,555	100.00%	886.90
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	33,819.73	69.06%	18,604,940	71.02%	550.12
56. 2D1	438.33	0.90%	241,085	0.92%	550.01
57. 2D	5,951.69	12.15%	3,206,465	12.24%	538.75
58. 3D1	1,366.84	2.79%	662,915	2.53%	485.00
59. 3D	4,401.87	8.99%	2,149,410	8.20%	488.29
60. 4D1	780.87	1.59%	348,285	1.33%	446.02
61. 4D	2,212.34	4.52%	985,075	3.76%	445.26
62. Total	48,971.67	100.00%	26,198,175	100.00%	534.97
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	4,159.97	4.59%	1,525,725	5.36%	366.76
65. 2G1	45.29	0.05%	15,600	0.05%	344.45
66. 2G	3,791.81	4.18%	1,462,435	5.14%	385.68
67. 3G1	1,086.38	1.20%	359,410	1.26%	330.83
68. 3G	4,360.55	4.81%	1,454,545	5.11%	333.57
69. 4G1	3,477.68	3.83%	1,083,380	3.81%	311.52
70. 4G	73,767.89	81.34%	22,558,570	79.27%	305.80
71. Total	90,689.57	100.00%	28,459,665	100.00%	313.81
Irrigated Total					
	9,177.56	6.06%	8,139,555	12.82%	886.90
Dry Total					
	48,971.67	32.32%	26,198,175	41.28%	534.97
Grass Total					
	90,689.57	59.86%	28,459,665	44.84%	313.81
72. Waste	2,675.06	1.77%	672,720	1.06%	251.48
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	634.97	0.42%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	151,513.86	100.00%	63,470,115	100.00%	418.91

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	169.26	0.19%	302,135	0.19%	1,785.03
46. 1A	49,306.17	53.91%	88,011,600	55.64%	1,785.00
47. 2A1	169.42	0.19%	288,015	0.18%	1,700.01
48. 2A	23,987.33	26.23%	40,778,480	25.78%	1,700.00
49. 3A1	3,769.64	4.12%	6,201,090	3.92%	1,645.01
50. 3A	5,283.86	5.78%	8,692,010	5.50%	1,645.01
51. 4A1	7,149.18	7.82%	11,331,530	7.16%	1,585.01
52. 4A	1,620.84	1.77%	2,569,055	1.62%	1,585.01
53. Total	91,455.70	100.00%	158,173,915	100.00%	1,729.51
Dry					
54. 1D1	17.18	0.03%	22,620	0.07%	1,316.65
55. 1D	34,484.94	60.04%	19,929,845	61.75%	577.93
56. 2D1	109.09	0.19%	66,415	0.21%	608.81
57. 2D	12,230.19	21.29%	7,079,650	21.94%	578.87
58. 3D1	2,359.94	4.11%	1,145,820	3.55%	485.53
59. 3D	2,272.70	3.96%	1,324,580	4.10%	582.82
60. 4D1	5,343.07	9.30%	2,385,340	7.39%	446.44
61. 4D	617.89	1.08%	318,900	0.99%	516.11
62. Total	57,435.00	100.00%	32,273,170	100.00%	561.91
Grass					
63. 1G1	14.37	0.03%	6,100	0.04%	424.50
64. 1G	5,271.73	11.26%	1,995,900	12.85%	378.60
65. 2G1	226.72	0.48%	81,110	0.52%	357.75
66. 2G	8,811.86	18.82%	3,228,465	20.79%	366.38
67. 3G1	1,672.85	3.57%	576,615	3.71%	344.69
68. 3G	3,746.53	8.00%	1,246,655	8.03%	332.75
69. 4G1	7,843.42	16.75%	2,475,405	15.94%	315.60
70. 4G	19,231.81	41.08%	5,921,320	38.12%	307.89
71. Total	46,819.29	100.00%	15,531,570	100.00%	331.73
Irrigated Total					
	91,455.70	44.91%	158,173,915	75.31%	1,729.51
Dry Total					
	57,435.00	28.20%	32,273,170	15.37%	561.91
Grass Total					
	46,819.29	22.99%	15,531,570	7.39%	331.73
72. Waste	7,954.06	3.91%	4,052,580	1.93%	509.50
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	203,664.05	100.00%	210,031,235	100.00%	1,031.26

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	351.44	610,500	7,573.06	12,140,470	102,597.71	160,050,075	110,522.21	172,801,045
77. Dry Land	81.92	42,460	4,492.09	2,472,355	102,634.54	56,279,870	107,208.55	58,794,685
78. Grass	4.00	1,220	9,587.66	3,028,985	394,979.86	109,450,675	404,571.52	112,480,880
79. Waste	0.00	0	1,523.59	482,020	12,775.52	6,275,130	14,299.11	6,757,150
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	637.10	0	637.10	0
82. Total	437.36	654,180	23,176.40	18,123,830	612,987.63	332,055,750	636,601.39	350,833,760

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	110,522.21	17.36%	172,801,045	49.25%	1,563.50
Dry Land	107,208.55	16.84%	58,794,685	16.76%	548.41
Grass	404,571.52	63.55%	112,480,880	32.06%	278.02
Waste	14,299.11	2.25%	6,757,150	1.93%	472.56
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	637.10	0.10%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	636,601.39	100.00%	350,833,760	100.00%	551.10

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

51 Keith

	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	320,078,640	327,299,385	7,220,745	2.26%	3,034,698	1.31%
02. Recreational	9,299,055	9,832,651	533,596	5.74%	539,306	-0.06%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	35,743,265	36,673,502	930,237	2.60%	930,553	0.00%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	365,120,960	373,805,538	8,684,578	2.38%	4,504,557	1.14%
05. Commercial	84,871,470	88,996,460	4,124,990	4.86%	1,694,260	2.86%
06. Industrial	2,794,890	4,247,200	1,452,310	51.96%	8,405	51.66%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	18,042,740	17,630,880	-411,860	-2.28%	731,435	-6.34%
08. Minerals	37,060	37,060	0	0.00	0	0.00
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	105,746,160	110,911,600	5,165,440	4.88%	2,434,100	2.58%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	470,867,120	484,717,138	13,850,018	2.94%	6,938,657	1.47%
11. Irrigated	170,224,510	172,801,045	2,576,535	1.51%		
12. Dryland	54,046,205	58,794,685	4,748,480	8.79%		
13. Grassland	110,464,590	112,480,880	2,016,290	1.83%		
14. Wasteland	3,509,585	6,757,150	3,247,565	92.53%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	338,244,890	350,833,760	12,588,870	3.72%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	809,112,010	835,550,898	26,438,888	3.27%	6,938,657	2.41%

**2011 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT
FOR
KEITH COUNTY**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), 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 or 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 Revenue, Property Assessment Division 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 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.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (2003).

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 horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2009).

General Description of Real Property in Keith County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	Taxable Value Base	% of Value
Residential	5072	50 %	323,346,260	39.59 %
Commercial	690	7 %	87,757,450	10.74 %
Industrial	15	0.14 %	4,238,795	0.51 %
Recreational	1009	10%	9,871,065	1.20 %

Agricultural	2364	23 %	391,477,510	47.93 %
Exempt	674	7 %	0	0.00 %
Special Value	232	2 %	27,961,915	
Tax Increment Financing	18		9,371,870	
Minerals	65	0.64 %	37,060	0 %
Game & Parks	5	0.04 %		0%
Totals	10144 Parcels		Total Valuation 816,728,140*	
			*excludes Special Value & TIF	

Agricultural land - taxable acres [**637,871.88**]

	Use	Acres	Value
	Irrigated	110,471.99	170,289,025
	Dry	107,908.06	54,243,085
	Grass	405,147.93	111,124,590
	Waste (Primarily Accretion)		14,343.90
<u>2,475,940</u>			
	Sub-Total Land only	637,871.88	338,132,640
	Exempt	37,748.36	0
	Ag Home Sites	405.94	4,879,360
	Ag Farm Sites	355.35	529,655
	Improvements		47,935,855
	Total Agricultural Valuation		391,477,510

Other pertinent facts: The majority of parcels and valuation by class in Keith County are Residential. It is important to note that 60% of these Residential properties surround Lake Mc Conaughy. Also, approximately 11% of the total Residential parcels are mobile homes.

While the Agricultural parcel count consists of less than half of the Residential parcel count the Agricultural total valuations is more than the Residential total valuation. This is a shift from 2008 when Residential total valuations were 6% more than Agricultural total valuations. As you can see from the acre count and values listed above, the majority of Agricultural land use consists of Grassland. The majority of the Grassland lies in the northern region of Keith County which is north of Lake Mc Conaughy and the North Platte River. While Irrigated acres consist of a little over a fourth of the Grassland acres the total valuation of Irrigated Land is higher than the total Grassland valuation. Prior to 2008 the total Grassland valuation ran a close second to Irrigated land for the largest valuation per use of Keith County Agricultural land. However, due to major increases in Irrigated Land Market the total Grassland Valuation is only 65% of the total Valuation of Irrigated Land for 2011. This is 10% less than the valuation difference in 2008 where the variance was 75%. Dry land consists of slightly more acres than Irrigated; however, it comprises the least amount of valuation per use. Please note that 2007 was the first year that the Appraiser implemented market value on Accretion. Also, in 2008 the Appraiser implemented market value on 33 parcels of Agland lying near the I-80 Interchange.

New Property: For assessment year 2010, an estimated [367] building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county. An additional [303] parcels were reviewed for new property construction/additions in Keith County due to other forms of discovery than building permit reporting. Unfortunately, Keith County does not require building permits for our Agricultural Zoned Parcels and only several Information Statements have ever been completed and returned to the office since 1998. With the reappraisal of all rural improvements in 2006 we identified multiple new improvements and changes in existing improvements. As we assumed, our fear was that we were not locating all the changes in improvements or new construction in the rural areas due to Information Statements not being filed. This problem needed to be remedied. With consistent staffing we have improved identification of new construction in the rural areas. We have visited with our board again and encourage utilization of permits in the rural area and will again attempt education on filing the Information Statements.

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

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training:

1 Assessment Manager, No Assessment Assistant, 2 Assessment Clerks, 1 Appraiser II, and 1 Appraiser I. This is subject to change with the county being reassumed by the County.

Keith County Board voted to have the State assume the Assessment Office of Keith County in September 1998 and the State assumed the office in July 1999. The County Assessor became a State Assessor July 1, 1999 and in July 2003 the State Assessor was reclassified as an Assessment Administrative Manager. In late November 1999 the ASI Terra Scan CAMA Program replaced the former MIPS that had been in use prior to state assumption. In July 2007 the office was budgeted through the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division. Beginning July 1 2011 the office will be reassumed by Keith County and again be budgeted by Keith County.

The assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years. The assessor has met all the educational hours required. The assessor also attends other workshops and meetings to further her knowledge of the assessment field.

The assessment staff at this time does not have continuing education requirements. The staff has voluntarily taken classes such as Windows, TerraScan user education, as well as IAAO classes.

B. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1329 the Assessor shall maintain tax maps. Keith County was flown in 1988 for aerial maps. All mapping for splits, as well as new subdivision plats, are kept up to date by the Assessment Manager. Ownership maintenance is updated continually utilizing the information from the 521 transfer statement by an Assessment Clerk. In 2011 the Keith County Board signed a contract with GIS Workshop for a web based GIS system and Keith County will be flown by GIS

Workshop for new aerials in the fall of 2011. This system will be a definite asset to the Assessor Office due to saving time with computer generated information as well as providing improved accuracy; most especially with regards to the listing of soils and acres for the Agland inventory.

C. Property Record Cards:

Ownership transfers are no longer being kept up to date on paper property record cards. Changes in the property structures are no longer being kept current on the property record cards. A concentrated effort towards a “paperless” property record card is in effect. This was achieved in 2010 with the completion of Paxton and Ogallala Suburban Reappraisal which completed the 6 year cycle of a complete reappraisal of every parcel within Keith County. Keith County Assessment Office went on-line in June of 2006 with the property record information.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS:

Keith County will be converting from the Terra Scan system for CAMA & Assessment Administration to a new system with Tyler Technologies called Orion.

GIS Workshop will provide the software for the web based GIS system.

E. Web based – property record information access:

www.keith.pat.gisworkshop.com

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property. All property located within the County must be listed. This includes field data collection, taking digital photos, annual pick-up work utilizing all the forms of discovery utilized by the County such as from building permits, self reporting, neighbor reporting, newspaper realtor advertising, etc. The data is gathered using all forms of discovery in a systematic process so that all properties are treated uniformly with the attempt for all the values to be equalized with comparable properties.

B. Data Collection. Data collection and physical review of property located within Keith County is completed on an annual basis to achieve the six year legislative requirement of every property being reviewed. The condition is called from the field and all the data collected is entered into the Cama system. This includes field data collection, digital photos, and annual pick-up work. Keith County utilizes all the forms of discovery.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions. Both Ratio studies produced by the county, as well as by the State are reviewed. These studies are reviewed with the field liaison.

D. Approaches to Value;

1) Market Approach; sales comparisons,

2) Cost Approach; Marshall and Swift cost manual is used. As of 2009 we have all of our Residential or Recreational improvements valued on the Cama system with updated cost and depreciation tables. Depreciation studies are completed on an annual basis.

3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market: Income and expense data analysis is completed when information is available. All approaches to value are looked at. Currently, the Cost Approach bears the most weight. We are working on a notation within the record file referencing the correlation of the three approaches to value and the reconciliation of the approach

carrying the most weight in determining the final estimate of value. Also used as a guideline for revaluation is “Mass Appraisal of Real Property” pg 27 by Robert J. Gloudemans and Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice by Appraisal Standards Board. After determining the market value; residential and commercial real estate are both targeted to be assessed at 100% of market value. This includes all agricultural dwellings and outbuildings. All agricultural land is targeted to be assessed at 75% of market value

- E. Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land: e Land Valuation Studies, Market Areas, along with the Special Valuation for Agricultural land have been established and are reviewed on an annual basis.
- F. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation: For 2010 the State Appraiser was ultimately responsible for estimating all the values of Real Property within the county and documenting his procedures. For 2011 since the Assessment Office will again be the Keith County Assessor Office the County Assessor will be ultimately responsible for estimating all the values of Real Property within the county and documenting procedures.
- G. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions. For 2011 the County Assessor will review the Ratio studies produced by Property Assessment Division.
- H. Notices and Public Relations are completed by the County Assessor

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	98	28.13	113.70
Commercial	98	25.66	117.93
Agricultural Land	72	15.51	105.09
Special Value Agland	72	15.51	105.09

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2011 Reports & Opinions.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

The main goal for 2012 will be to verify information in the Orion computer and the new GIS systems to insure accuracy, as well as, educating three new staff members. Keith County had loss of four staff and rehired three staff that will need education on all aspects of the office.

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Relist, Remeasure and a process a complete Reappraisal of Residential Property to all Residential Improvements not located within a subdivision; located in the rural areas using new cost tables and depreciation tables. This includes all Agricultural Dwellings, Outbuildings and Rural Residential Acreages. Verify year of agricultural outbuildings. Verify Condition and Quality of improvements to insure uniformity.

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Continue analysis of Ag Land Market Areas. Refine as indicated.

Continue to process all Irrigation Transfers of Certified Base areas approved by the NRD.

Review small tracts of land sales to consider a subclass of LVG's

Special Value – Agland: Continue analysis for Special Valuation and refine as indicated.

Analyze agland influences for other than agriculture-horticulture use. Review all sales and value accordingly. Process and send disqualification letters to all owners not meeting qualifications.

Complete all pickup work from all forms of discovery by March 1.

Mail Information Statements to all agland owners.

Verify information in Orion due to conversion from Terra Scan for accuracy.

Verify information in new GIS system for accuracy.

Identify contiguous lots that are valued with a price break on excessive square footage or acres and combine them for valuation or value as if combined to provide equalization of all land.

Request FSA Maps for use verification to all new Agland owners per Sales File.

Identify and remap agricultural land use changes.

Map all new splits and subdivisions.

Edit Property Assessment Division Sales File to insure it is identical to the Orion Sales File.

Review all sold properties July 01, 2010 thru June 30, 2011.

Edit all Property Assessment Division NDR classification codes for accuracy.

Input last Deed Book & Page on parcels not in Sales File for historical research capability

Continued Education for all staff

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Continue to Relist, Remeasure and complete a Reappraisal of Residential Property within Rural Subdivisions to include all Lake Improvements. Verify Condition and Quality of improvements to insure uniformity.

Review ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Continue analysis of Ag Land Market Areas. Refine as indicated.

Continue to process all Irrigation Transfers of Certified Base areas approved by the NRD.

Special Value – Agland: Continue analysis for Special Valuation and refine as indicated. Analyze agland influences for other than agriculture-horticulture use.

Complete all pickup work from all forms of discovery by March 1.

Mail Information Statements to all Agland owners.

Edit Property Assessment Division Sales File to insure it is identical to the Orion Sales File.

Review all sold properties July 01, 2011 thru June 30, 2012.

Edit all Property Assessment Division NDR classification codes for accuracy.

Continued Education for all staff

Continued annual review of a portion of the county of all property in Keith County

Mail request for FSA Maps for verification of acres per use to all new Agland owners.

Map all new splits and subdivisions.

Identify and remap agricultural land use changes.

Process all NRD transfer of irrigated acres.

Utilize NRD maps to identify irrigated land use.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Continue to Relist, Remeasure and complete a Reappraisal of Residential Property within Paxton, Brule, Roscoe, Sarben and Sudman's Addition to include all Suburban Improvements for Ogallala, Paxton and Brule. Continue to Relist, Remeasure and complete a Reappraisal of Residential Property within all Mobile Home Parks. Verify Condition and Quality of improvements to insure uniformity.

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Continue ratio studies of all county neighborhoods. Refine as indicated.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Continue analysis of Ag Land Market Areas. Refine as indicated.

Continue to process all Irrigation Transfers of Certified Base areas approved by the NRD.

Special Value – Agland:

Continue Analysis of Special Valuation and refine as indicated.

Analyze agland influences for other than agriculture-horticulture use.

Complete all pickup work from all forms of discovery by March 1.

Map all new splits and subdivisions.

Utilize NRD maps to identify irrigated land use.

Identify and remap agricultural land use changes.

Edit Property Assessment Division Sales File to insure it is identical to the Orion Sales File.
Review all sold properties July 01, 2009 thru June 30, 2010.
Edit all Property Assessment Division NDR classification codes for accuracy.
Verify all Zoning based on Zoning Map.
Input last Deed Book & Page on parcels not in Sales File for historical research capability
Verify Situs
Continued Education for all staff

Other functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:

Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes: Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1303 and §77-1331. Record Maintenance is kept current on almost 100% on computerized form with anticipation of relying solely on computer generated cards. In 2010 we completed the first cycle of our annual review resulting with all of our property record cards being completely generated by the computer system. We need to have all appraisal and cost tables generated on all parcels in Orion and be assured that the CAMA stores all the annual property record cards. Property Record Cards contain the information as set forth in Regulation 10-004.04 and 10-001.10 including ownership, legal description, cadastral map reference data, parcel I.D., property classification codes, taxing district, land information, building characteristics and annual value postings.

The sketches and the appraisal information are updated in the CAMA. The 2005 cost is on all Residential and Commercial Improvements including Mobile Homes; within the City of Ogallala as well as Ogallala Suburban, Lake, Agricultural, Rural Residential, Villages of Paxton, Brule, Keystone, Roscoe and Sarben. The appraisal file is a work in progress file and does not always balance with the ATR file. All information within the Appraisal File will need to be verified for accuracy and many sketches will need to be drawn.

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1329 the Assessor shall maintain tax maps. Keith County was flown in 1988 for aerial maps. All mapping is kept up to date by the Assessor. Ownership maintenance is updated continually utilizing the information from the 521 transfer statement by an Assessment Clerk. The Keith County Board has signed a contract with GIS Workshop to have a web based GIS system that will be accessible to the public via the Internet and will provide valuable property information to users. All of the mapping completed by the Assessor's office that currently is mapped in paper Cadastral Books will be overlaid on the GIS base maps and all the Assessor's office improved accuracy of mapping. Other offices may use the base maps to overlay maps for surveying, zoning, etc. which, in turn, will assist the Assessor's office.

Until this GIS system is up and running the Assessor's Office is utilizing the Aerials that are bound in large books with 4 sections per page. There are two sets of overlays. One with ownership boundary lines; and the other with soil and use lines bound in separate books. In 1988 Sall Engineering was hired by the Keith County Assessor to fly Keith County to provide the County with new aerials. When the new maps were completed acres were computer digitized to provide accuracy with soil types and land valuation groups captured in the computer system. It is important to note that prior to 1994 all sections were recorded as exactly 640 Acres and the Accretion ran straight with the Section Lines. With the new aerials being utilized the accretion lines were drawn in perpendicular to the thread of the river, as the river laid at the time the new aerial was produced. Therefore, the way accretion was distributed between land owners was changed. The acres from the new aerials were utilized in 1994. Changes were implemented on all

parcels with Accretion. Some Accretion acres changed substantially. Letters were sent out to all landowners explaining the change in methodology of Accretion acres as well as Sections no longer being exactly 640 Acres. The letter requested property owners to come in to the Assessment Office if the property owner had any questions. Very few property owners contacted the Assessment Office with questions about new acre counts. If they had a survey the acres were corrected to match the survey.

The soil survey is dated 1988 and the 2009 Soil Conversion is currently utilized. This Soil Conversion was done in mass. Composite maps are utilized for a record of soils as well as a new program called Agri-Data for updating of acres per soil type. Use change updates are completed on an annual basis on the composite overlay by the Assessment Staff utilizing information obtained from Twin Platte N R D, Farm Service Agency, well registration and physical review. Prior to April 2008 updates were completed by utilizing a grid and counting dots. Since April 2008 a new Agri Data, Inc Website has been utilized to more accurately inventory soil types per use. We have a blue line copy that includes both the aerial picture and the ownership boundary lines. There are also separate pages for each subdivision filed directly behind the section map the subdivision is located in. For each blue line there is a corresponding page that lists Cadastral Map #, Parcel #, Ownership Name and Legal Description. Maps for split updates and new subdivisions are completed by the Assessor. These maps, maintained by assessor staff, are kept up to date and in good condition. However, we anxiously anticipate a GIS system to provide better accuracy.

We have several boundary disputes over Accretion land now that it has become so valuable. There has been a District Court case between Westerbuhr and TBT in an Accretion boundary dispute that was appealed to a higher court. The Nebraska Court of Appeals reversed the District Court decision and ruled in favor of Westerbuhr. The Supreme Court upheld the decision of the District Court. Therefore, Accretion Acres are left as they have been inventoried since 1994. Ownership changes are entered into the Orion system by an assessor clerk on an ongoing basis. Our County Clerk's office provides us with the 521 Real Estate Transfer Statements on a daily basis.

1. Annually prepare and file Assessor Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)(*2012 PP Abstract was last one required*)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PAD rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
 - i. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
 - j. Average Assessed Value Report for Homestead Exemption
 - k. Generate Tax Roll
2. Personal Property; administer annual filing of approximately 900 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as

required. We diligently try to assess all personal property in Keith County. We have frustration with this “honest man’s tax” and share the opinion of many assessors that we would like to see Depreciation Worksheets required to be file with the Personal Property. Within the corporate limits we often see a decline in valuation; as Property Owners continue to file without their Depreciation Worksheet. Our Assessment Clerk spends countless hours correcting past year tax rolls due to prior year’s inaccurate filings. Property Owners are then extremely upset about the penalties and interest on past years tax. If we could have the Depreciation Worksheet at the time of filing, these issues would be eliminated. The Assessor and clerks assist the applicants with their annual filing.

3. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board. We currently have 58 Real Properties that have a partial or complete Permissive Use Exemption on them; as well as 2 Organizations that have exemptions on their Personal Property. The Assessor and clerks assist the applicants with their annual filing.
4. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc: Currently we have 97 parcels that are leased for other than public purpose that we send Intent to Tax Notices on, one of these entities is Central Nebraska Public Power District (CNPPD). In 2008 the Assessment Office sent a Notice of Taxable Status to CNPPD in order to value their property that is not used for Public Purpose for the areas they lease for location of Improvements on Leased Land (IOLL). CNPPD protested to the County Board of Equalization (BOE) and the BOE ruled in favor of CNPPD so the Assessment Office had to put the value back on each individual lessee. The Tax Commissioner, Doug Ewald appealed the County Boards decision to the Tax Equalization Review Commission, however, the Keith County Board responded that the Tax Commissioner of the State of Nebraska had no standing to appeal the decision of the Keith County Board quoting 77-202. 4. The Tax Equalization determined that the Tax Commissioner lacked standing so all of these appeals were dismissed. Again in 2009, the Assessment Office sent a Notice of Taxable Status to CNPPD in order to value their property that is not used for Public Purpose for the areas they lease for location of IOLL. CNPPD again protested to the BOE and the BOE ruled in favor of CNPPD so the Assessment Office again had to put the value back on the lessees. Both, the Tax Commissioner, Doug Ewald, and the Property Tax Administrator, Ruth Sorenson; signed the 2009 appeal of the Keith County Board’s Decision to the Tax Equalization Review Commission. The 2009 case was dismissed since Central Nebraska Public Power had not been issued a Change of Value Notice. The Change of Value Notice was not issued as when the BOE exempted the property the property value was zero, therefore, the computer didn’t print a notice. For 2011 CNPPD was again sent a Notice of Intent to Tax in order to value their property that is not used for Public Purpose for the areas they lease for location of IOLL. CNPPD protested to the BOE and again the BOE ruled in favor of CNPPD so the Assessment Office had to put the value back on each individual lessee. The Tax Commissioner, Doug Ewald has again appealed the County Boards decision to the Tax Equalization Review Commission. For 2011 CNPPD was issued Change of Value Notices so the Assessor is in hopes that this issue of CNPPD being valued as property used for other than public purpose is put to rest.
5. Homestead Exemptions; administer approximately 500 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance: One of our

clerks is the primary person who handles all the mailing of applications as well as entering approval amounts into the CAMA system. The Assessor, as well as the other clerk takes care of mailing the rejection notices for reasons other than income information. The Assessor Manger completes the corrections of the prior year's tax rolls after receiving the corrections from the Department of Revenue after they have verified IRS information with the filed Income Statements as well as completing the Average Assessed Valuation of Homestead Exemption Report for filing annually. The Assessor and clerks assist the applicants with their annual filing and completing their Income Statements, as well as, mailing any required Physician Certifications to the applicant's doctor after receiving permission from the applicant.

6. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list. The Assessor reviews the valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities to insure accuracy.
7. 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. Keith County had 18 TIF projects that are maintained by the Assessor.
8. 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 are maintained by the Assessor.
9. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed are prepared and certified by the Assessor.
10. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approvals are prepared by the clerks as well as the Assessor.
11. County Board of Equalization - attends county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information: All protested properties are reviewed and personal inspections are made when deemed necessary, protest information is entered into the County Board of Equalization File of the Orion system. All staff assist property owners at the counter and on the phone with questions in regards to their values. The Assessor attends all County Board of Equalization meetings and makes the valuation recommendations to the Board of Equalization. The Assessor documents information for record keeping and balancing values back to values set at abstract time to insure accurate valuations. The Assessor processes all of the Informal protests for over and undervalued properties to present to the County Board of Equalization for their decision.
12. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
13. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.

14. Education: Assessor attends meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc.

-

Conclusion:

With all the entities of county government that utilize the assessor records in their operation, it is paramount for this office to constantly work toward perfection in record keeping.

With the continual review of all properties and implementation of GIS, records will become more accurate, and values will be assessed more equally and fairly across the county. With a well-developed plan in place, this process can flow more smoothly. Sales review will continue to be important in order to adjust for market areas in the county.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature: _____ Date: _____

2012 Assessment Survey for Keith County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	4
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$317,358
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$268,960
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	There is no amount set aside for appraisal work in the assessor's total budget.
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	Keith County has a separate IT fund that is for all computer systems
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$8,000 total; this includes \$3,000 for travel expenses
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	0
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	N/A; this was a state operated county assessor's office and partially paid by Keith County.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Tyler Technology/Orion
2.	CAMA software:
	Tyler Technology/Orion
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and Clerk
5.	Does the county have GIS software?

	Yes; but not fully completed at this time.
6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	Yes
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Workshop
8.	Personal Property software:
	Orion

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?
	Ogallala, Paxton and Brule
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1975

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Darryl Standard is hired on a per day basis for unique properties
2.	Other services:
	GIS Workshop contract

2012 Certification for Keith 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 Keith 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

