

# 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 Nemaha County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	202	Median	96.59
Total Sales Price	\$14,163,404	Mean	109.38
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$14,163,404	Wgt. Mean	92.97
Total Assessed Value	\$13,168,155	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$57,759
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$70,116	Avg. Assessed Value	\$65,189

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.81 to 99.06
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.08 to 95.87
95% Mean C.I	99.48 to 119.28
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	25.68
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.46
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.29

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	211	97	97
2010	247	97	97
2009	253	94	94
2008	243	96	96

## 2012 Commission Summary for Nemaha County

---

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	28	Median	99.74
Total Sales Price	\$2,170,630	Mean	111.37
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,170,630	Wgt. Mean	111.46
Total Assessed Value	\$2,419,280	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$57,955
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$77,523	Avg. Assessed Value	\$86,403

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	70.29 to 127.37
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.46 to 131.45
95% Mean C.I	90.94 to 131.80
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.82
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.03
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	9.00

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	34		96
2010	37	95	95
2009	39	95	95
2008	38	97	97



## 2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Nemaha County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	70	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



*Ruth A. Sorensen*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## **2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Nemaha County**

The county conducted an analysis of the sales along with their review. In reviewing the statistical analysis the county determined that adjustments were warranted for the towns of Peru, Johnson, and Nemaha. The appraiser arrived at a factor and applied that percentage to these valuation groups

The county also completed the pickup and permit work for the residential class of property.

## 2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Ron Elliot the counties contract appraiser	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
		The valuation groups in Nemaha County are more of a reflection of the appraisal review cycle as much as differences in the market. The county conducts a market analysis for each group and develops depreciation table from that market.
	01	Auburn- Auburn is the county seat and the major trade area of the county.
	02	Brock- Small village with little economic development but located within commuting distance to both Auburn and Nebraska City.
	03	Brownville- Unique as a historical river town that attracts tourism
	04	Johnson-Village that is between two trade and employment centers and maintains a unique market for residential properties
	06	Nemaha-Small village more isolated from larger towns with very little economic development
	07	Peru-Small college town.
	08	Rural
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	The county uses a market approach based on appreciation or depreciation the cost approach	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2007	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The county uses depreciation developed from the local market of each valuation group.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	The county updates depreciation tables at the time of review of the valuation group	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Auburn was completed in 2008.	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>	
	During the review of the valuation group the county conducts a review of the lot values by using vacant lot sales and also by doing an allocation of value on improved sales.	

10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>
	The county relies on the appraisers experience to determine if a physical change to the property is substantial enough to change the market value of the property. Where the present value does not represent the property at the date of sale.

**64 Nemaha  
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 : 202  
 Total Sales Price : 14,163,404  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,163,404  
 Total Assessed Value : 13,168,155  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 70,116  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 65,189

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 109  
 COD : 27.37  
 PRD : 117.65

COV : 65.61  
 STD : 71.76  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.44  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 775.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 31.79

95% Median C.I. : 94.81 to 99.06  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.08 to 95.87  
 95% Mean C.I. : 99.48 to 119.28

Printed:4/2/2012 8:26:07AM

**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	31	98.79	102.70	97.77	12.49	105.04	65.84	158.00	94.04 to 104.01	58,097	56,802
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	94.89	101.54	94.45	12.89	107.51	62.60	185.19	92.95 to 99.17	71,031	67,091
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	19	95.67	126.10	95.40	42.62	132.18	43.03	683.50	89.71 to 101.87	66,553	63,494
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	27	95.06	126.70	94.79	46.75	133.66	59.44	775.00	88.08 to 121.75	85,803	81,329
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	26	94.67	101.42	88.56	27.27	114.52	50.19	251.27	79.49 to 118.15	68,592	60,747
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	29	103.96	100.45	96.21	14.38	104.41	31.79	136.27	89.79 to 115.06	69,866	67,215
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	15	106.08	103.42	89.80	21.34	115.17	45.55	180.10	87.07 to 121.87	47,344	42,515
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	37	94.34	112.58	88.20	35.89	127.64	37.93	385.00	87.45 to 106.66	80,622	71,109
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	95	95.84	113.98	95.65	28.42	119.16	43.03	775.00	94.29 to 98.84	70,113	67,061
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	107	97.13	105.30	90.60	26.46	116.23	31.79	385.00	92.21 to 104.17	70,118	63,527
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	101	97.13	112.54	93.78	31.85	120.00	31.79	775.00	92.84 to 101.87	73,175	68,623
<u>ALL</u>	202	96.59	109.38	92.97	27.37	117.65	31.79	775.00	94.81 to 99.06	70,116	65,189

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	122	97.08	107.98	96.71	19.30	111.65	37.93	385.00	94.96 to 100.31	75,526	73,040
02	6	93.14	97.82	91.03	11.31	107.46	85.71	121.75	85.71 to 121.75	20,300	18,480
03	8	78.17	73.31	68.75	24.61	106.63	31.79	123.52	31.79 to 123.52	61,250	42,108
04	9	99.89	101.47	94.58	15.07	107.28	52.99	141.17	89.71 to 127.17	40,333	38,148
05	1	115.93	115.93	115.93	00.00	100.00	115.93	115.93	N/A	70,000	81,150
06	11	97.00	200.56	76.17	139.47	263.31	43.03	775.00	55.15 to 683.50	22,427	17,082
07	16	94.34	101.31	96.69	25.76	104.78	50.19	155.77	79.49 to 127.97	30,344	29,339
08	29	95.01	99.71	85.99	25.65	115.96	58.62	215.00	77.90 to 116.04	109,386	94,059
<u>ALL</u>	202	96.59	109.38	92.97	27.37	117.65	31.79	775.00	94.81 to 99.06	70,116	65,189

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	196	96.41	109.21	92.74	27.65	117.76	31.79	775.00	94.34 to 98.84	71,181	66,011
06											
07	6	118.54	115.06	108.50	07.29	106.05	93.84	125.82	93.84 to 125.82	35,333	38,338
<u>ALL</u>	202	96.59	109.38	92.97	27.37	117.65	31.79	775.00	94.81 to 99.06	70,116	65,189

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 202  
Total Sales Price : 14,163,404  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,163,404  
Total Assessed Value : 13,168,155  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 70,116  
Avg. Assessed Value : 65,189

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 93  
MEAN : 109  
COD : 27.37  
PRD : 117.65

COV : 65.61  
STD : 71.76  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.44  
MAX Sales Ratio : 775.00  
MIN Sales Ratio : 31.79

95% Median C.I. : 94.81 to 99.06  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.08 to 95.87  
95% Mean C.I. : 99.48 to 119.28

Printed:4/2/2012 8:26:07AM

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	7	121.75	292.59	198.86	166.69	147.13	70.00	775.00	70.00 to 775.00	2,386	4,744	
Less Than 15,000	35	121.06	170.17	137.52	58.29	123.74	62.60	775.00	111.71 to 137.61	7,970	10,960	
Less Than 30,000	70	114.45	139.25	116.01	40.38	120.03	37.93	775.00	104.06 to 122.93	14,435	16,745	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	195	96.42	102.81	92.85	20.71	110.73	31.79	385.00	94.74 to 98.96	72,547	67,359	
Greater Than 14,999	167	95.01	96.64	92.08	16.12	104.95	31.79	180.10	93.38 to 96.89	83,140	76,554	
Greater Than 29,999	132	93.82	93.54	91.20	14.38	102.57	31.79	157.34	91.91 to 95.83	99,644	90,879	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	7	121.75	292.59	198.86	166.69	147.13	70.00	775.00	70.00 to 775.00	2,386	4,744	
5,000 TO 14,999	28	119.76	139.56	133.61	31.26	104.45	62.60	385.00	111.71 to 137.61	9,366	12,514	
15,000 TO 29,999	35	104.06	108.33	107.80	19.21	100.49	37.93	180.10	95.84 to 121.22	20,900	22,531	
30,000 TO 59,999	45	95.06	97.88	97.34	18.53	100.55	43.03	157.34	92.21 to 101.53	44,075	42,903	
60,000 TO 99,999	35	96.29	93.56	92.44	12.12	101.21	31.79	121.87	91.10 to 99.17	79,397	73,396	
100,000 TO 149,999	25	92.95	90.74	90.44	10.73	100.33	63.95	122.15	86.76 to 95.77	121,171	109,588	
150,000 TO 249,999	22	87.29	88.65	88.12	13.45	100.60	64.99	136.27	77.90 to 97.60	181,200	159,665	
250,000 TO 499,999	5	85.93	90.00	90.48	05.02	99.47	85.55	100.90	N/A	275,000	248,825	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	202	96.59	109.38	92.97	27.37	117.65	31.79	775.00	94.81 to 99.06	70,116	65,189	



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Nemaha County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

Nemaha County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Auburn which is centered in the County. Nemaha is bordered to the south by Richardson County, with Johnson County to the east and Otoe County to the north. The county has the Missouri River for a majority of its eastern border with the McKissick Island lying on the east side of the Missouri River. Nemaha County has seen a slight decline in population over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat.

The sales file consists of 202 qualified residential sales and is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the residential class of property. Two of the measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range with only the mean being outside the range. The mean no doubt is affected by wide range of sale prices represented in the file. All of the valuation groups with an adequate sample of sales fall within the acceptable range for a median.

The qualitative statistics overall are outside the recommended range but when analyzing the sales with a sale price of greater than 29,999 both come within the acceptable range. As can be seen in the statistics there are outliers remaining in the file, along with the low dollar sales that are having an impact. The counties valuation groups represent the assessor locations in the county and the appraisal cycle of the county more than unique markets.

Nemaha County has had a consistent procedure for sales verification. The contract appraiser completes a statistical review of all sales in the file. A physical inspection is completed on any sales with a perceived discrepancy and on all sales in conjunction with a review of a valuation group. The county utilizes a higher portion of available sales when compared to other area counties. In reviewing the assessor comments there is an adequate explanation for the sales that are not qualified. There is no evidence of excessive trimming in the file.

The Counties assessment plan states that an analysis of the residential sales will be conducted and areas outside the range will be reviewed or adjusted. The County has a consistent approach to valuing and reviewing the property in Nemaha County. They utilize a contract appraiser who is familiar with the local market. The County has a web site for parcel searches and is implementing GIS capabilities for mapping.

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha County**

The County conducted an analysis of the sales and concluded that no adjustments were necessary for the commercial class of property. The contract appraiser continually reviews and verifies sales for the commercial class.

The appraiser also completed the pickup and permit work for the commercial class of property.

## 2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Ron Elliot the contract appraiser for the County	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Auburn is the county seat and is the trade center for the county
	02	Remainder of the assessor locations in the county
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Market approach based on either a depreciated or appreciated cost approach	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.</b>	
	The county relies on the appraisers experience and opinion as well as researching similar sales from other counties in the state and adjusting to the local market.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2007 is the costing year for the entire class of commercial properties	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The county develops depreciation table based on the local market.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	During the last cycle of review which occurred in 2007	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	During the review in 2007	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Sales comparison based on local sales. The majority are calculated on a square foot basis	
10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>	
	If a parcel undergoes a change such as from improved to unimproved or a substantial change in the square footage of the improvement or a change in use	

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 2,170,630  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,170,630  
Total Assessed Value : 2,419,280  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 77,523  
Avg. Assessed Value : 86,403

MEDIAN : 100  
WGT. MEAN : 111  
MEAN : 111  
COD : 37.67  
PRD : 99.92

COV : 47.30  
STD : 52.68  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 37.57  
MAX Sales Ratio : 266.93  
MIN Sales Ratio : 58.14

95% Median C.I. : 70.29 to 127.37  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.46 to 131.45  
95% Mean C.I. : 90.94 to 131.80

Printed:4/2/2012 8:26:08AM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	3	80.00	130.45	88.50	71.50	147.40	69.88	241.47	N/A	23,667	20,945
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	99.48	99.48	99.48	00.00	100.00	99.48	99.48	N/A	110,000	109,430
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	78.14	78.14	80.10	19.25	97.55	63.10	93.18	N/A	57,500	46,060
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	83.74	90.85	104.88	32.96	86.62	59.02	136.89	N/A	138,279	145,024
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	144.05	144.05	140.71	11.58	102.37	127.37	160.73	N/A	25,000	35,178
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	174.97	174.97	174.97	00.00	100.00	174.97	174.97	N/A	30,000	52,490
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	127.28	127.28	128.40	21.43	99.13	100.00	154.56	N/A	12,008	15,418
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	118.22	128.86	131.21	45.55	98.21	58.14	266.93	N/A	174,160	228,517
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	81.64	83.84	79.77	16.35	105.10	64.92	104.97	N/A	52,500	41,877
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	94.87	99.31	80.44	36.75	123.46	59.40	148.09	N/A	46,250	37,205
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	97.26	97.26	97.26	00.00	100.00	97.26	97.26	N/A	4,200	4,085
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	10	86.59	101.05	99.45	38.30	101.61	59.02	241.47	63.10 to 136.89	84,912	84,448
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	10	129.05	136.19	132.98	32.07	102.41	58.14	266.93	70.29 to 174.97	97,482	129,627
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	8	89.45	93.25	80.34	27.27	116.07	59.40	148.09	59.40 to 148.09	43,338	34,817
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	9	100.00	109.19	106.28	35.24	102.74	59.02	174.97	63.10 to 160.73	83,124	88,340
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	14	102.49	110.55	117.02	37.62	94.47	58.14	266.93	64.92 to 148.09	88,380	103,419
<u>ALL</u>	28	99.74	111.37	111.46	37.67	99.92	58.14	266.93	70.29 to 127.37	77,523	86,403

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	21	100.00	114.13	108.76	40.00	104.94	59.02	266.93	69.88 to 130.73	85,235	92,703
02	7	97.26	103.10	124.12	30.72	83.06	58.14	174.97	58.14 to 174.97	54,386	67,501
<u>ALL</u>	28	99.74	111.37	111.46	37.67	99.92	58.14	266.93	70.29 to 127.37	77,523	86,403

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	3	100.00	106.57	102.58	06.92	103.89	99.48	120.24	N/A	97,372	99,880
03	25	97.26	111.95	112.84	42.30	99.21	58.14	266.93	69.88 to 130.73	75,141	84,786
04											
<u>ALL</u>	28	99.74	111.37	111.46	37.67	99.92	58.14	266.93	70.29 to 127.37	77,523	86,403

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 2,170,630  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,170,630  
Total Assessed Value : 2,419,280  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 77,523  
Avg. Assessed Value : 86,403

MEDIAN : 100  
WGT. MEAN : 111  
MEAN : 111  
COD : 37.67  
PRD : 99.92

COV : 47.30  
STD : 52.68  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 37.57  
MAX Sales Ratio : 266.93  
MIN Sales Ratio : 58.14

95% Median C.I. : 70.29 to 127.37  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.46 to 131.45  
95% Mean C.I. : 90.94 to 131.80

Printed:4/2/2012 8:26:08AM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	3	80.00	82.25	82.61	11.56	99.56	69.50	97.26	N/A	3,900	3,222	
Less Than 15,000	6	98.63	123.80	135.62	42.13	91.28	69.50	241.47	69.50 to 241.47	7,203	9,768	
Less Than 30,000	9	100.00	124.34	127.44	43.40	97.57	67.47	241.47	69.50 to 160.73	11,302	14,403	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	25	100.00	114.87	111.61	39.95	102.92	58.14	266.93	70.29 to 130.73	86,357	96,385	
Greater Than 14,999	22	99.74	107.98	110.96	36.58	97.31	58.14	266.93	67.47 to 130.73	96,701	107,303	
Greater Than 29,999	19	99.48	105.23	110.67	34.96	95.08	58.14	266.93	64.92 to 127.37	108,890	120,508	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	3	80.00	82.25	82.61	11.56	99.56	69.50	97.26	N/A	3,900	3,222	
5,000 TO 14,999	3	154.56	165.34	155.31	30.51	106.46	100.00	241.47	N/A	10,505	16,315	
15,000 TO 29,999	3	148.09	125.43	121.40	20.99	103.32	67.47	160.73	N/A	19,500	23,673	
30,000 TO 59,999	10	111.60	118.59	117.86	38.49	100.62	58.14	266.93	63.10 to 174.97	43,330	51,068	
60,000 TO 99,999	3	69.88	75.99	75.87	13.48	100.16	64.92	93.18	N/A	65,000	49,313	
100,000 TO 149,999	4	79.44	79.48	78.98	25.52	100.63	59.02	100.00	N/A	129,279	102,105	
150,000 TO 249,999	1	136.89	136.89	136.89	00.00	100.00	136.89	136.89	N/A	248,500	340,175	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999	1	130.73	130.73	130.73	00.00	100.00	130.73	130.73	N/A	675,000	882,440	
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	28	99.74	111.37	111.46	37.67	99.92	58.14	266.93	70.29 to 127.37	77,523	86,403	

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 2,170,630  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,170,630  
Total Assessed Value : 2,419,280  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 77,523  
Avg. Assessed Value : 86,403

MEDIAN : 100  
WGT. MEAN : 111  
MEAN : 111  
COD : 37.67  
PRD : 99.92

COV : 47.30  
STD : 52.68  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 37.57  
MAX Sales Ratio : 266.93  
MIN Sales Ratio : 58.14

95% Median C.I. : 70.29 to 127.37  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.46 to 131.45  
95% Mean C.I. : 90.94 to 131.80

Printed:4/2/2012 8:26:08AM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	1	59.02	59.02	59.02	00.00	100.00	59.02	59.02	N/A	140,000	82,625
300	2	109.86	109.86	105.02	09.45	104.61	99.48	120.24	N/A	75,000	78,763
309	1	174.97	174.97	174.97	00.00	100.00	174.97	174.97	N/A	30,000	52,490
336	1	67.47	67.47	67.47	00.00	100.00	67.47	67.47	N/A	22,500	15,180
344	3	93.18	98.33	116.35	25.75	84.51	64.92	136.89	N/A	127,833	148,730
346	1	69.50	69.50	69.50	00.00	100.00	69.50	69.50	N/A	4,000	2,780
350	1	104.97	104.97	104.97	00.00	100.00	104.97	104.97	N/A	37,500	39,365
352	2	113.69	113.69	104.77	12.04	108.51	100.00	127.37	N/A	86,058	90,163
353	9	118.22	128.15	103.52	35.21	123.79	63.10	241.47	69.88 to 160.73	24,557	25,423
384	1	80.00	80.00	80.00	00.00	100.00	80.00	80.00	N/A	3,500	2,800
387	1	58.14	58.14	58.14	00.00	100.00	58.14	58.14	N/A	53,000	30,815
391	1	81.64	81.64	81.64	00.00	100.00	81.64	81.64	N/A	50,000	40,820
406	2	64.85	64.85	62.40	08.40	103.93	59.40	70.29	N/A	86,250	53,820
455	2	198.83	198.83	141.17	34.25	140.84	130.73	266.93	N/A	365,500	515,960
<u>ALL</u>	<u>28</u>	99.74	111.37	111.46	37.67	99.92	58.14	266.93	70.29 to 127.37	77,523	86,403



## 2012 Correlation Section for Nemaha County

---

### **A. Commercial Real Property**

Nemaha County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Auburn which is centered in the County. Nemaha is bordered to the south by Richardson County, with Johnson County to the east and Otoe County to the north. The county has the Missouri River for a majority of its eastern border with the McKissick Island lying on the east side of the Missouri River. Nemaha County has seen a slight decline in population over the past 10 years and the economic trend is relatively flat.

The 2012 Nemaha County commercial statistical profile reveals a total of 28 qualified commercial sales to be used as a sample for the three-year study period. The calculated median is 100. The profile indicates that of the three measures of central tendency only the median is within the acceptable range.

Regarding the qualitative statistical measures, the COD is outside the recommended range with the PRD in the range. Valuation group 01, which represents Auburn, is the only group with a large enough sample for any hope of meaningful analysis. Even in this group of 21 sales, 8 occupancies appear as well as 3 sales with an average selling price of just over 10,000 dollars. Sale amounts vary from 7,500 to 675,000 for just this valuation group. The COD for valuation group 01 is well above the recommended range demonstrating no confidence in the statistical output.

The contract appraiser reviews and verifies all commercial sales in the County. The appraiser conducts a physical inspection in conjunction with the sales verification. The appraiser has worked in Nemaha County for a number of years and is familiar with the commercial market in the county. A review of the nonqualified sales shows that the assessor has documented the exclusion by adding comments for the reasoning of the qualification.

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha County**

The County completed an analysis of the sales to aid in determining values for the agricultural class of property. The county reviewed the utilization of market areas in Nemaha County and determined that for 2012 they would combine the market areas. The County continues to value the agricultural land by using various values within the LCG classification structure determined by the type of soil. The necessary adjustments were made to class and sub-class to bring the level of value to within the required range.

The county continually reviews land use in the county relying on their GIS information as well as physical inspections and FSA maps when available.

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

## 2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Ron Elliot the counties contract appraiser	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	01	The County considers the entire county as one market area
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The county completed an analysis with all sales combined and they also review the sales by geo code to determine if different factors attribute to a different market values. These studies are done to see if they can achieve a reasonable level of value while maintaining the quality of assessment with or without market areas.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	The county determines highest and best use and compares that to present use.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?</b>	
	No. First acre has been determined to be higher for rural residential than for farm home sites. The difference has continued to shrink for the past several years.	
6.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	GIS imagery and physical inspection as needed.	
7.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	The county relies on a sales verification process to determine if any non-agricultural characteristics influence the sales price for properties.	
8.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	No	
9.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>	
	The county considers land use changes on the parcel. If the change has a substantial impact on the market value for the property. Other changes would include the addition of improvements or the removal of them.	

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 87  
Total Sales Price : 28,098,608  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 28,098,608  
Total Assessed Value : 19,439,128  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 322,973  
Avg. Assessed Value : 223,438

MEDIAN : 70  
WGT. MEAN : 69  
MEAN : 77  
COD : 25.49  
PRD : 110.67

COV : 34.23  
STD : 26.21  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.81  
MAX Sales Ratio : 188.03  
MIN Sales Ratio : 37.36

95% Median C.I. : 66.96 to 74.15  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
95% Mean C.I. : 71.05 to 82.07

Printed:4/2/2012 8:26:09AM

**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	9	71.87	88.45	77.72	28.73	113.81	62.01	188.03	68.34 to 102.89	167,772	130,394
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	57.74	54.93	56.82	07.14	96.67	47.35	59.70	N/A	376,954	214,177
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	7	74.54	83.64	84.24	23.91	99.29	57.50	129.62	57.50 to 129.62	149,118	125,620
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	84.58	90.08	89.84	14.26	100.27	70.70	117.20	70.70 to 117.20	242,455	217,810
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	4	115.94	111.21	90.40	21.47	123.02	73.29	139.68	N/A	433,834	392,189
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	74.47	77.37	66.86	26.04	115.72	45.18	145.51	55.94 to 94.20	412,792	275,990
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	6	73.74	81.78	79.46	21.01	102.92	61.86	109.07	61.86 to 109.07	250,542	199,088
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	64.43	71.39	65.95	16.92	108.25	59.82	96.87	N/A	215,413	142,075
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	99.93	99.93	99.93	00.00	100.00	99.93	99.93	N/A	203,700	203,550
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	22	63.65	67.39	64.90	19.47	103.84	40.06	137.08	58.89 to 70.34	357,266	231,850
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	10	61.99	57.92	54.05	18.73	107.16	37.36	74.23	40.21 to 70.50	492,869	266,379
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	86.39	86.39	90.57	12.96	95.38	75.19	97.58	N/A	335,400	303,770
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	26	73.94	83.73	78.41	25.55	106.78	47.35	188.03	68.94 to 91.26	206,993	162,311
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	26	74.47	82.67	73.38	27.49	112.66	45.18	145.51	66.64 to 96.87	348,221	255,518
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	35	65.16	66.70	62.76	20.53	106.28	37.36	137.08	59.93 to 69.72	390,373	245,016
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	30	75.66	86.31	77.25	27.25	111.73	45.18	145.51	73.29 to 94.65	314,328	242,822
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	33	66.96	71.48	67.77	20.73	105.47	40.06	137.08	61.49 to 70.34	316,014	214,154
<u>ALL</u>	87	69.88	76.56	69.18	25.49	110.67	37.36	188.03	66.96 to 74.15	322,973	223,438

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	87	69.88	76.56	69.18	25.49	110.67	37.36	188.03	66.96 to 74.15	322,973	223,438
<u>ALL</u>	87	69.88	76.56	69.18	25.49	110.67	37.36	188.03	66.96 to 74.15	322,973	223,438

**64 Nemaha**  
**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 : 87  
Total Sales Price : 28,098,608  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 28,098,608  
Total Assessed Value : 19,439,128  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 322,973  
Avg. Assessed Value : 223,438

MEDIAN : 70  
WGT. MEAN : 69  
MEAN : 77  
COD : 25.49  
PRD : 110.67

COV : 34.23  
STD : 26.21  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.81  
MAX Sales Ratio : 188.03  
MIN Sales Ratio : 37.36

95% Median C.I. : 66.96 to 74.15  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
95% Mean C.I. : 71.05 to 82.07

Printed:4/2/2012 8:26:09AM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	1	75.65	75.65	75.65	00.00	100.00	75.65	75.65	N/A	156,000	118,015
1	1	75.65	75.65	75.65	00.00	100.00	75.65	75.65	N/A	156,000	118,015
<b>Dry</b>											
County	28	70.42	75.19	73.42	23.03	102.41	40.06	137.08	61.99 to 75.67	340,990	250,361
1	28	70.42	75.19	73.42	23.03	102.41	40.06	137.08	61.99 to 75.67	340,990	250,361
<b>Grass</b>											
County	4	69.66	93.68	78.14	54.46	119.89	47.35	188.03	N/A	127,950	99,984
1	4	69.66	93.68	78.14	54.46	119.89	47.35	188.03	N/A	127,950	99,984
<b>ALL</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>69.88</b>	<b>76.56</b>	<b>69.18</b>	<b>25.49</b>	<b>110.67</b>	<b>37.36</b>	<b>188.03</b>	<b>66.96 to 74.15</b>	<b>322,973</b>	<b>223,438</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	2	107.67	107.67	115.60	29.74	93.14	75.65	139.68	N/A	207,386	239,732
1	2	107.67	107.67	115.60	29.74	93.14	75.65	139.68	N/A	207,386	239,732
<b>Dry</b>											
County	52	70.11	75.23	69.66	23.53	108.00	40.06	137.08	67.70 to 74.23	364,423	253,873
1	52	70.11	75.23	69.66	23.53	108.00	40.06	137.08	67.70 to 74.23	364,423	253,873
<b>Grass</b>											
County	5	64.13	87.24	76.61	48.15	113.88	47.35	188.03	N/A	112,700	86,345
1	5	64.13	87.24	76.61	48.15	113.88	47.35	188.03	N/A	112,700	86,345
<b>ALL</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>69.88</b>	<b>76.56</b>	<b>69.18</b>	<b>25.49</b>	<b>110.67</b>	<b>37.36</b>	<b>188.03</b>	<b>66.96 to 74.15</b>	<b>322,973</b>	<b>223,438</b>

## Nemaha County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
64.83	Nemaha	8300	2,951	3,122	2,458	2,806	2,022	2,541	1,412	1,248	2,413
66.70	Otoe	7000	3,240	2,910	2,910	2,010	1,890	#DIV/0!	1,740	850	2,194
66.80	Otoe	8000	3,630	3,630	3,360	2,750	2,750	2,750	2,090	1,210	2,895
49.10	Johnson	1	3,331	3,103	3,100	2,632	2,500	#DIV/0!	1,556	1,300	2,626
74.50	Richardson	50	3,500	3,435	2,997	3,100	2,718	2,300	1,800	1,750	2,910

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Nemaha	8300	2,933	2,991	2,652	2,038	1,718	2,267	1,471	1,018	2,160
	Otoe	7000	2,950	2,650	2,650	1,830	1,720	#DIV/0!	1,580	770	1,841
	Otoe	8000	3,300	3,300	3,050	2,500	2,500	2,500	1,900	1,100	2,581
	Johnson	1	2,465	2,276	2,310	1,882	1,950	1,962	1,185	1,000	1,798
	Richardson	50	3,074	2,874	2,523	2,592	2,473	2,446	2,095	1,649	2,535

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Nemaha	8300	1,763	2,031	1,906	1,162	1,200	1,158	977	830	1,170
	Otoe	7000	1,006	1,106	1,026	1,157	992	#DIV/0!	996	677	1,016
	Otoe	8000	1,217	1,232	1,174	1,282	1,140	1,111	1,037	729	1,084
	Johnson	1	1,288	1,666	1,453	1,204	1,251	1,236	940	679	1,039
	Richardson	50	1,032	1,140	871	973	928	879	829	700	864

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



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Nemaha County**

---

**A. Agricultural Land**

Nemaha County is located in southeast Nebraska. The largest town and county seat is Auburn which is centered in the County. Nemaha is bordered to the south by Richardson County, with Johnson County to the east and Otoe County to the north. The county has the Missouri River for a majority of its eastern border with the McKissick Island lying on the east side of the Missouri River. Nemaha County is comprised of approximately 3% irrigated land, 76% dry crop land and 19% grass/pasture land. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the market area determination. For 2012 the county determined that the agricultural market did not necessitate the use of market areas for Nemaha County.

Nemaha County continues to value agricultural land by soil types within the LCG structure. This is reflected in the schedule of values used in the county. While the spread of value within the LCG can be seen as quite large,(1000 dollars in 1A1 and 1D1) in some cases it effects few acres. The County has determined that the classification does not match the market values for those soils thus requiring the difference in values. A comparison of values with neighboring counties is more difficult without knowing the makeup of the soils from one area to the other. When comparing averages by LCG they are relatively similar and generally fall somewhere in between.

The agricultural market in the County along with the area and state is seeing a rapid increase and has for the past several years. 87 qualified sales were utilized in the agricultural analysis for the three year study period. The statistical sample consists of sales that meet the required balance as to date of sale and are proportionate by majority land use. This was met by including comparable sales from the same general market all within six miles of the subject county. Comparable sales were added to make up for the deficiency of sales to the first and second year of the study. With the predominate use of the agricultural land being dry land it is no surprise to see the 80% majority land use statistics mirror the overall county statistics. The 80% majority land use of grass displays a calculated median below the range but the 95% majority use of grass shows it to be in the range. With the small sample no recommended adjustment is recommended.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 70% of market value for the residential class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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.



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 6,128</b>	<b>Value : 703,644,145</b>	<b>Growth 3,608,855</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	354	1,316,975	68	405,850	54	184,540	476	1,907,365	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,038	10,705,890	123	1,569,240	379	5,533,895	2,540	17,809,025	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,076	115,098,400	129	9,907,440	398	33,636,775	2,603	158,642,615	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,430	127,121,265	197	11,882,530	452	39,355,210	3,079	178,359,005	2,460,250
<b>% of Res Total</b>	78.92	71.27	6.40	6.66	14.68	22.07	50.24	25.35	68.17
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	78	391,900	2	9,740	2	14,335	82	415,975	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	328	2,422,020	17	227,875	14	133,230	359	2,783,125	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	338	17,188,670	22	1,288,835	17	688,035	377	19,165,540	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	416	20,002,590	24	1,526,450	19	835,600	459	22,364,640	286,530
<b>% of Com Total</b>	90.63	89.44	5.23	6.83	4.14	3.74	7.49	3.18	7.94
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	26,650	4	107,285	0	0	5	133,935	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	1	1,605,670	4	2,786,925	0	0	5	4,392,595	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	1	1,632,320	4	2,894,210	0	0	5	4,526,530	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	20.00	36.06	80.00	63.94	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.64	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	7	412,000	39	1,717,970	46	2,129,970	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	2	26,905	2	173,905	4	200,810	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	2	33,130	2	4,040	4	37,170	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	9	472,035	41	1,895,915	50	2,367,950	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	18.00	19.93	82.00	80.07	0.82	0.34	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,430	127,121,265	206	12,354,565	493	41,251,125	3,129	180,726,955	2,460,250
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	77.66	70.34	6.58	6.84	15.76	22.83	51.06	25.68	68.17
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	417	21,634,910	28	4,420,660	19	835,600	464	26,891,170	286,530
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	89.87	80.45	6.03	16.44	4.09	3.11	7.57	3.82	7.94
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,847	148,756,175	234	16,775,225	512	42,086,725	3,593	207,618,125	2,746,780
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	79.24	71.65	6.51	8.08	14.25	20.27	58.63	29.51	76.11

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	284	9,561,715	4,121,160	0	0	0
19. Commercial	214	9,870,345	7,114,525	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	284	9,561,715	4,121,160
19. Commercial	0	0	0	214	9,870,345	7,114,525
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				498	19,432,060	11,235,685

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	249	56	98	403

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	57	730,700	137	17,874,150	1,452	252,857,060	1,646	271,461,910
28. Ag-Improved Land	7	308,440	75	13,228,675	781	180,559,655	863	194,096,770
29. Ag Improvements	7	310,565	77	2,600,970	805	27,555,805	889	30,467,340
30. Ag Total							2,535	496,026,020

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	6,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	4	4.58	15,395	44	44.97	121,420	
33. HomeSite Improvements	5	4.58	282,205	49	44.97	1,949,315	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	4.97	14,295	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	2	1.46	3,485	55	108.51	110,420	
37. FarmSite Improvements	3	0.00	28,360	72	0.00	651,655	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	5.07	0	0	265.37	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	3	13.57	35,620	4	14.57	41,620	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	444	470.09	1,256,280	492	519.64	1,393,095	
33. HomeSite Improvements	460	458.04	19,704,295	514	507.59	21,935,815	862,075
34. HomeSite Total				<b>518</b>	<b>534.21</b>	<b>23,370,530</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	28	396.66	153,475	30	401.63	167,770	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	579	1,102.13	1,213,780	636	1,212.10	1,327,685	
37. FarmSite Improvements	776	0.00	7,851,510	851	0.00	8,531,525	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>881</b>	<b>1,613.73</b>	<b>10,026,980</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,454.78	0	0	4,725.22	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,399</b>	<b>6,873.16</b>	<b>33,397,510</b>	<b>862,075</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	3	272.74	229,110
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	10	728.46	649,165	13	1,001.20	878,275

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 8300

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	351.47	4.69%	1,037,275	5.73%	2,951.25
46. 1A	601.08	8.02%	1,876,695	10.37%	3,122.21
47. 2A1	2,883.11	38.44%	7,086,840	39.17%	2,458.05
48. 2A	937.30	12.50%	2,630,320	14.54%	2,806.27
49. 3A1	1,797.43	23.97%	3,634,360	20.09%	2,021.98
50. 3A	464.68	6.20%	1,180,910	6.53%	2,541.34
51. 4A1	412.67	5.50%	582,505	3.22%	1,411.55
52. 4A	51.67	0.69%	64,495	0.36%	1,248.21
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>7,499.41</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>18,093,400</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,412.64</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,303.01	1.27%	6,754,025	1.73%	2,932.69
55. 1D	16,218.76	8.95%	48,510,965	12.39%	2,991.04
56. 2D1	38,958.88	21.50%	103,314,040	26.39%	2,651.87
57. 2D	16,139.71	8.91%	32,891,785	8.40%	2,037.94
58. 3D1	37,189.22	20.52%	63,891,825	16.32%	1,718.02
59. 3D	42,888.90	23.66%	97,236,695	24.84%	2,267.18
60. 4D1	23,797.63	13.13%	35,017,850	8.95%	1,471.48
61. 4D	3,739.44	2.06%	3,806,615	0.97%	1,017.96
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>181,235.55</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>391,423,800</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,159.75</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	305.19	0.68%	538,115	1.02%	1,763.21
64. 1G	2,605.41	5.77%	5,292,085	10.02%	2,031.19
65. 2G1	6,289.89	13.93%	11,991,675	22.70%	1,906.50
66. 2G	4,185.53	9.27%	4,864,075	9.21%	1,162.12
67. 3G1	2,670.62	5.91%	3,203,640	6.07%	1,199.59
68. 3G	4,518.69	10.01%	5,234,175	9.91%	1,158.34
69. 4G1	8,759.11	19.39%	8,561,445	16.21%	977.43
70. 4G	15,827.64	35.05%	13,132,700	24.86%	829.73
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>45,162.08</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>52,817,910</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,169.52</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>7,499.41</b>	<b>3.16%</b>	<b>18,093,400</b>	<b>3.91%</b>	<b>2,412.64</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>181,235.55</b>	<b>76.42%</b>	<b>391,423,800</b>	<b>84.61%</b>	<b>2,159.75</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>45,162.08</b>	<b>19.04%</b>	<b>52,817,910</b>	<b>11.42%</b>	<b>1,169.52</b>
72. Waste	2,630.22	1.11%	263,080	0.06%	100.02
73. Other	635.53	0.27%	30,320	0.01%	47.71
74. Exempt	423.69	0.18%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>237,162.79</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>462,628,510</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,950.68</b>

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	672.51	1,885,100	6,826.90	16,208,300	7,499.41	18,093,400
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	367.69	838,785	11,258.97	25,190,905	169,608.89	365,394,110	181,235.55	391,423,800
<b>78. Grass</b>	145.35	181,455	3,521.91	3,743,385	41,494.82	48,893,070	45,162.08	52,817,910
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.19	20	294.97	29,535	2,335.06	233,525	2,630.22	263,080
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	65.70	1,765	569.83	28,555	635.53	30,320
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	331.39	0	92.30	0	423.69	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>513.23</b>	<b>1,020,260</b>	<b>15,814.06</b>	<b>30,850,690</b>	<b>220,835.50</b>	<b>430,757,560</b>	<b>237,162.79</b>	<b>462,628,510</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	7,499.41	3.16%	18,093,400	3.91%	2,412.64
<b>Dry Land</b>	181,235.55	76.42%	391,423,800	84.61%	2,159.75
<b>Grass</b>	45,162.08	19.04%	52,817,910	11.42%	1,169.52
<b>Waste</b>	2,630.22	1.11%	263,080	0.06%	100.02
<b>Other</b>	635.53	0.27%	30,320	0.01%	47.71
<b>Exempt</b>	423.69	0.18%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>237,162.79</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>462,628,510</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,950.68</b>

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

64 Nemaha

	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	176,259,210	178,359,005	2,099,795	1.19%	2,460,250	-0.20%
02. Recreational	2,454,630	2,367,950	-86,680	-3.53%	0	-3.53%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	23,097,370	23,370,530	273,160	1.18%	862,075	-2.55%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>201,811,210</b>	<b>204,097,485</b>	<b>2,286,275</b>	<b>1.13%</b>	<b>3,322,325</b>	<b>-0.51%</b>
05. Commercial	22,038,735	22,364,640	325,905	1.48%	286,530	0.18%
06. Industrial	4,525,005	4,526,530	1,525	0.03%	0	0.03%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	9,822,450	10,026,980	204,530	2.08%	0	2.08%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>36,386,190</b>	<b>36,918,150</b>	<b>531,960</b>	<b>1.46%</b>	<b>286,530</b>	<b>0.67%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>238,197,400</b>	<b>241,015,635</b>	<b>2,818,235</b>	<b>1.18%</b>	<b>3,608,855</b>	<b>-0.33%</b>
11. Irrigated	14,818,015	18,093,400	3,275,385	22.10%		
12. Dryland	330,944,070	391,423,800	60,479,730	18.27%		
13. Grassland	47,566,685	52,817,910	5,251,225	11.04%		
14. Wasteland	121,550	263,080	141,530	116.44%		
15. Other Agland	15,385	30,320	14,935	97.08%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>393,465,705</b>	<b>462,628,510</b>	<b>69,162,805</b>	<b>17.58%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>631,663,105</b>	<b>703,644,145</b>	<b>71,981,040</b>	<b>11.40%</b>	<b>3,608,855</b>	<b>10.82%</b>

**2012-2013-2014  
PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
FOR  
NEMAHA COUNTY, NE**

To: Nemaha County Board of Equalization  
Nebraska Department of Revenue--Property Assessment Division

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

The following is a plan of assessment for:

**Tax Year 2012:**

Residential—

1. Revalued improvement on leased land mobile homes and applied new values for 2012. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

Commercial/Recreational—

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

Agricultural/Horticultural Land—

1. Review remaining rural improvements and preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible class/subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measures as required by law.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
3. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified.

**BUDGET REQUEST FOR 2011-2012:**

Requested budget of \$32,345 is needed to:

1. Complete pickup work for new improvements or improvement changes made throughout county in all classes;
2. Review remaining rural improvements to include new pictures of houses and buildings. New value to be applied for 2013 tax roll.
3. Analyze and possible adjustment to class/subclass of residential properties
4. Analyze and possible adjustments to class/subclass of commercial/recreational properties.
5. Analyze and possible adjustments to class/subclass of agricultural properties.

**TAX YEAR 2013:**

Residential—

1. Reappraisal of all residential property in the towns of Brock, Julian & Nemaha. This would include all related improvements associated with the main improvement, new photos of property improvement, new market analysis and depreciation, implement new replacement cost new, and establish new assessed value for 2014.

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

Commercial/Recreational—

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

Agricultural/Horticultural—

1. Complete reappraisal on to the agricultural houses and outbuildings.
3. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, analyze for any possible subclass percentage adjustment needed to comply with statistical measurer as required by law.
4. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.
5. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified.

**TAX YEAR 2014:**

Residential—

1. Reappraisal of residential property in Brownville, Johnson, & Peru. This would include all related improvements associated with the main improvement, new photos of property development, new market analysis and depreciation, implement new replacement cost new, and establish new assessed value for 2015.
2. Continue with review and analysis of sales as they occur.

PAGE 4  
2012-2014 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
FOR NEMAHA COUNTY, NE

Commercial/Recreational—

1. Review preliminary sale statistics developed in-house and preliminary statistical information received from Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, Adjusting by class/subclass to arrive at acceptable levels of value.
2. Continue land use updates when discovered or identified.

## 2012 Assessment Survey for Nemaha County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	0
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	1 clerical
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	119,987
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	32,345
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	It all comes out of the county general
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	2000
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	6,800

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

6.	<b>Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?</b>
	No
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Assessor and staff
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	No
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	No
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	All of the towns are zoned
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	The office is unsure as to the date of implementation, for Auburn probably 30 years.

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Ron Elliot
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	Terra Scan



## 2012 Certification for Nemaha 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 Nemaha 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



